

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MINUTES
April 10, 2019 Meeting
Town Council Chambers – 6:30 PM HDC meeting

Present: Kristen Carron, Chair; Matthew McGeorge, Vice-Chair, Erinn Calise, Gregory Maxwell, and Andrew Barkley.

Absent: Nicole D’Amato and Lauren Drury.

Staff: Lea Anthony Hitchen, Assistant Town Planner and Amy Goins, 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 Historic Preservation Society
110 King Street; Map 85 AP 1 Lot 91
Addition of Front Entrance Handrail – FINAL**

(Mr. Maxwell recused himself from the application.)

Ms. Carron stated Standard Number 4 is applicable to the application which states that proposals for architectural changes or alterations shall be appropriate to the original design of the building or to later changes that have acquired significance of their own.

Ms. Virginia Schmidt Parker, President of the East Greenwich Historic Preservation Society, represented the application. She explained the request is to install a wrought iron handrail to the right of the front door to provide easier and safer access for visitors. The proposed handrail is a salvaged piece which will be refurbished and painted black. She noted most visitors are elderly and it will assist in getting into the front door.

Mr. McGeorge indicated the application was very straight forward and thought the handrail was being appropriately salvaged. He had no objections to the application.

With no further comments Ms. Carron asked for a motion.

Ms. Calise made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by the East Greenwich Historic Preservation Society.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 110 King Street.
- 3) The property in question is a contributing structure; it is representative of a c.1795 early-Republican style structure.
- 4) The building does contribute to the historic and architectural significance of the district.
- 5) The work proposed by the applicant would not affect the character defining elements of the existing building.

Motion by Ms. Calise to approve the application at 110 King Street for a iron handrail to the right of the front door. This is consistent with Commission standard 4.

Seconded by Mr. McGeorge.

VOTE: 4 – 0.

2. Marisa and James Pollard
28 Marion Street; Map 85 AP 1 Lot 250

Minor Modification – Replace Existing Window for a Door and Remove a Section of Deck Railing for a Stair System on South Elevation – FINAL

Ms. Carron noted Commission Standard 4 applies 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.

Ms. Marisa Pollard, applicant and owner of the property, represented the application. She submitted a spec sheet of a Simpson door, model #7571, as the door to be installed. She explained she recently bought the house and is requesting to make modifications to the south side elevation which does not face the street – the project consists of replacing the existing window furthest to the right with an entry door. She plans on keeping the dwelling a two-family; one door will access the main house while the new door will access the third floor. Additionally the center set of balusters will be removed and a staircase is to be constructed. She noted the new staircase will provide better accessibility to the garage. As for the proposed Simpson door, Ms. Pollard noted it was the closest door she could find to match the existing side door.

Mr. Maxwell asked how the two units are accessed currently. Ms. Pollard indicated the existing door acts as access to both units.

Mr. Maxwell pointed out that it appears the baluster system to be removed was not part of the original house. Ms. Hitchen explained in 1986 the former owner made modifications to the same section of the house – a window was removed and door was added and the existing deck and rail system were added; therefore the baluster system to be removed is not original to the structure.

Mr. McGeorge questioned if the new railings will match the existing railings. Ms. Pollard noted there are a couple of different railing styles that currently exist on the home; the intent is to match the railings located on the front. Mr. McGeorge did not have any objections considering the first level and second level railings are different, being spindle versus square pickets and the handrail is currently a metal pipe so he found the request to improve the appearance of the house.

Mr. Barkley found that by changing a window to a door was not really altering the fenestration pattern and did not object to the application.

When questioned about the materials for the new stairs, Ms. Pollard confirmed the stairs will be wood.

Mr. Maxwell commented the submitted drawings do not note anything about the trim. If approved he would like a condition imposed that any new trim, header and/or casing will match the existing profile.

With no further comments Ms. Carron asked for a motion.

Mr. Maxwell made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by Marisa Pollard.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 28 Marion Street.
- 3) The property in question is a contributing structure; it is representative of a c.1907 Late-Victorian, Princess Anne style building
- 4) The building does contribute to the historic and architectural significance of the district.
- 5) The work proposed by the applicant would not affect the character defining elements of the existing building.

Motion by Mr. Maxwell to approve the application at 28 Marion Street for the replacement of an existing window to a door and remove a section of deck railing for a new stair system on the south elevation with the condition the jamb and head casing and trim of the new door matching adjacent door. The submitted door spec (Simpson door, model #7571) is approved. This is consistent with Commission standard 4.

Seconded by Mr. McGeorge.

VOTE: 5 – 0.

**3. Joe Lomastro of Signarama for Jeff Cammans
333 Main Street; Map 85 AP 1 Lot 193
Rearrangement & Installation of New Wall Signage on Front
Façade – FINAL**

Ms. Carron stated signage is a type of new construction and thus must comply with Commission Standard *Number 5* which states that such work must be compatible with its surroundings in size, scale, materials and siting, as well as with the general character of the historic district.

Mr. Joe Lomastro of Signarama represented the application for property owner Mr. Jeff Cammans. Mr. Lomastro explained that due to the recent space changes within the subject building there is a need to update tenant signage. The building currently has approval for five signs; the Applicant is requesting to have a total of six (6) 24"x108" non-illuminated tube frame signs; each sign will reflect the existing or new tenant in the building. The signs will be realigned for appropriate spacing and symmetry. The *Kenneth Cote*, *Raise the Bar Nutrition* and *Rawbob's* signs are existing while *A Community Workspace* and *Colonial Life* are new signs. There is also a blank sign for a soon-to-be tenant.

Mr. Maxwell thought the layout was a great improvement and aligns uniformly. Ms. Carron also liked the arrangement and scale and thought it was an improvement to the building.

The question was raised as to whether the awning was to be reinstalled. Mr. Lomastro indicated the property owner was waiting to see if there was enough space for an awning to be added after the signs were installed. An awning was not part of this application.

Ms. Hitchen and Ms. Goins clarified that once the sixth tenant is in place and has finalized their signage the signage content will require HDC approval before it is installed.

No public comments.

With no further comments Ms. Carron asked for a motion.

Ms. Calise made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by Joe Lomastro of Signarama.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 333 Main Street.
- 3) The property in question is a contributing structure; it is representative of a c.1922 early Twentieth century commercial garage.
- 4) The building does contribute to the historic and architectural significance of the district.
- 5) The work proposed by the applicant would not affect the character defining elements of the existing building.

Motion by Ms. Calise to approve the application at 333 Main Street for signage. It was noted the sixth sign must return for approval when the sign is filled. . This is consistent with Commission standard 5.

Seconded by Mr. McGeorge.

VOTE: 5 – 0.

- 4. Elizabeth Bancroft and Dan Pettersson
162 Peirce Street; Map 75 AP 1 Lot 190
Complete Demolition of the Detached Garage – FINAL (2nd hearing)
New Construction of Detached Garage – FINAL
New Construction of Retaining Wall – FINAL
Blanket Window Replacement for Primary Structure – FINAL**

Ms. Carron stated Commission Standards 5, 8, and 9 apply to the application. *Standard 5* states new construction includes substantial additions or modifications to the exterior of existing buildings. The design of new construction need not be an exact or modified copy of historic styles and could be totally different in concept. However, all proposals for new construction shall be compatible with the surrounding buildings in size, scale, materials, and siting, as well as with the general character of the historic district. *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. Window manufacturers today offer a wide variety of factory made windows appropriate

for installation in historic buildings. Storm windows of appropriate design are also available and should be installed to be as unobtrusive as possible. *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, property owner and Mr. Richard Pastore of RP Engineering, represented the application.

Ms. Carron recapped the history of the application, noting the applicant had been before the Commission in January requesting preliminary approval for demolition of the garage which the Commission deemed complete and found the garage was not a contributing structure in the district. Mr. Maxwell agreed with the summary and noted there are no issues with the existing detached garage to be demolished.

Mr. Pastore explained the ground work includes a 98' new segmental block retaining wall. Once the ground work has been structurally "restored," the garage will be rebuilt. The new hipped roof garage will be slightly larger at 14'x22' and shifted slightly to the west which has received Zoning Board approval. The specifications for the garage includes shingle shake 5" to the weather siding and asphalt architectural roof shingles. There will be two sets of paired 6/6 double hung Anderson 400 Series windows on both sides of the garage (a total of four windows on each side elevation). A single galvanized steel Fagan Emerald Series door, with five panels across and four panels high, with lights on the top panel will be installed – no faux hardware on garage. Under the soffit a corbel detail will be installed around the perimeter of the garage – being the same feature on the main house.

Mr. Maxwell questioned the 6/6 configuration. Ms. Bancroft commented the garage will be new construction; she was under the impression the windows did not have to match the windows on the house but she was amenable to a 2/2 configuration to match the house. Mr. Maxwell and Mr. McGeorge recommended a 2/2 configuration but were very specific that the window have an interior and exterior muntin with spacer bar between the glass.

Mr. Maxwell questioned the proposed brackets; there appears to be too many brackets on garage compared to that on home. He suggested a bracket every 24". Mr. Pastore liked the idea.

Mr. Maxwell asked about the rear entry door. Mr. Pastore noted he did not specify the door out. The suggestion was to reframe the door.

Ms. Carron pointed out there was one more request, being blanket window replacement for the primary structure (house). Ms. Bancroft explained all of the windows are in various states of disrepair; the former owners did not provide any level of maintenance to the windows.

Mr. Maxwell questioned the reason for replacement. Ms. Bancroft stated the majority of the windows cannot be opened; it took her and her husband 1.5 hours to open one window; many of the panes are broken and jammed and are covered in lead paint. She noted pictures of every window and elevation have been submitted showing the detail and condition of the windows. She commented the majority of the windows have a 2/2 sash which will be retained. The proposed replacement window is the Anderson 400 Series with the exterior/interior grille with spacer bar profile.

Ms. Bancroft pointed out that there is one existing 6/6 double hung basement window located under the deck that she would like to convert to a 2/2 sash for consistency with the rest of the windows.

Ms. Calise asked if there are any windows that have potential to be restored or given to someone as a restoration project. Ms. Bancroft noted there could be one or two windows but she had Rise Engineering provide an audit of the home and the windows proved to be extremely inefficient considering the existing windows are single paned. Mr. McGeorge commented that he would prefer to see a real window profile without a storm window.

With no further comments Ms. Carron asked for a motion.

Mr. McGeorge made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by Elizabeth Bancroft and Dan Pettersson.

- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 162 Peirce Street.
- 3) The property in question is a contributing structure; the primary structure is a c.1873 late-Victorian, Italianate style building while the detached garage is a noncontributing hip-roofed concrete block structure.
- 4) The primary building does contribute to the historic and architectural significance of the district while the detached garage does not contribute to the district.
- 5) The work proposed by the applicant would not affect the character defining elements of the existing building.

Motion by Mr. McGeorge to approve the application at 162 Peirce Street for demolition of the existing detached garage; approve construction for the new detached garage; the garage and house windows must have interior and exterior grilles and spacer bars; the garage corbels should be 32" +/- on center; and blanket window replacement for the primary structure. The rear entry door on garage must be refereed (MM and GM to referee). The project is consistent with Standards 5, 8, and 9 and the new garage meets the scale of the neighborhood.

Seconded by Mr. Barkley.

VOTE: 5 – 0.

- 5. Dean and Kristin Benjamin/Pam Unwin-Barkley
94 West Street; Map 84 AP 2 Lot 104
Window Replacement – Replace Four Windows on West elevation
and Five Windows on South Elevation - FINAL
Minor Modification – Remove Two Windows and Replace with
Three Windows on East Elevation and Install Larger Window in
lieu of Square Window on North Elevation – FINAL**

(Mr. Barkley recused himself from the application.)

Ms. Carron stated Commission Standards 4 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 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. Window manufacturers today offer a wide variety of factory made windows appropriate for installation in historic buildings. Storm windows of appropriate design are also available and should be installed to be as unobtrusive as possible.

Mr. Dean Benjamin, property owner, and Ms. Pam Unwin Barkley, project architect, represented the application.

Ms. Unwin Barkley explained the previous owner had replaced some of the windows located on the back of the house; therefore the Applicant would like to match the remaining windows with the Pella Architect Reserve. She explained the modifications and window adjustments on the house. The request includes replacing four windows on the west (front) elevation and five windows on the south (side) elevation. The new windows will match the existing windows, being Pella Architect Reserve 2/2 windows. With regard to the rear elevation the proposal includes removing the two existing double hung windows (to the right of the bay window) and installing three 2/2 windows with the window trim to match the adjacent bay window. On the north elevation there is a non-original small square window currently located in a bathroom. The owner would like to remove the square window and replace it with a new 2/2 double hung window. This exterior modification is for an interior kitchen remodel.

Mr. McGeorge commented the alteration was an improvement to the fenestration pattern on the home.

Mr. Maxwell said he walked by the property and noticed the front windows appear to be in good condition; he was of the opinion it would be a shame to remove the windows. Ms. Unwin Barkley noted they look to be in good condition but physically they are inoperable - through this process the whole house will now match itself.

Mr. Maxwell suggested finding find someone to take the sashes and repurpose them.

No public comments.

With no further comments Ms. Carron asked for a motion.

Ms. Calise made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by Dean and Kristin Benjamin.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 94 West Street.
- 3) The property in question is a contributing structure; it is representative of a c.1895 late-Victorian style.
- 4) The building does contribute to the historic and architectural significance of the district.
- 5) The work proposed by the applicant would affect but not compromise the character defining elements of the existing building.

Motion by Ms. Calise to approve the application at 94 West Street as submitted. Approval includes window replacement; replacement of four windows on the west elevation and five windows on the south elevation. Also removing two windows and replace with three windows on the east elevation and install a larger window in lieu of a square window on the north elevation. This is consistent with Commission standards # 4 and 8.

Seconded by Mr. McGeorge.

VOTE: 4 – 0.

6. John D. Fish
78 Greene Street; Map 75 AP 2 Lot 220
Minor Modification/Alterations - Remodel of Existing Detached Garage

Ms. Carron stated Commission Standards 4 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 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. Window manufacturers today offer a wide variety of factory made windows appropriate for installation in historic buildings. Storm windows of appropriate design are also available and should be installed to be as unobtrusive as possible.

Mr. John Fish, property owner, represented the application. He explained that about a decade ago he renovated the main structure and it is now time to restore the two-vehicle detached garage and install a privacy fence. He is proposing to remove the existing 3-tab asphalt roof shingles and replace with asphalt architectural roof shingles; remove existing wood trim and replace with new composite trim; remove existing red cedar sidewall shingles and replace with new red cedar clapboards to match the house. There is an existing 1/1 double hung window located on the rear of the garage and will be replaced with a 6/6 Anderson 400 Series 33"x56" window in order to match the existing house windows. Additionally, a new 6/6 Anderson 400 Series 21"x36" window will be added on the front gable above the garage doors. The west elevation includes a dilapidated and broken five panel wood door; this door will be replaced with a reclaimed door or a new Therma-Tru Classic-Craft fiberglass five panel door. The existing overhead garage doors will be replaced with new steel Haas Carriage House style garage doors with top lights. A new wood board style privacy gate will be added to the left of the garage.

Mr. Maxwell thought the application submission is excellent and will enhance the overall aesthetics of the house.

Ms. Hitchen commented the Applicant submitted two doors, being a five panel door or a reclaimed door; she was curious to know which door the owner was going to use. Mr. Fish preferred to use the resalvaged door as it was originally from the house and in his opinion would fit with the garage.

Mr. McGeorge recommended not to use PVC material but to use Boral or similar product. In his opinion he thought the salvaged door was too formal and preferred the five-panel door but in reality the subject building is an accessory structure and did not have a strong feeling one way or the other. Mr. McGeorge said both options would be appropriate. Mr. Fish said if he goes with the five panel door he definitely plans to paint it.

No public comments.

With no further comments Ms. Carron asked for a motion.

Mr. Maxwell made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by John D. Fish.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 78 Greene Street.
- 3) The property in question is a contributing structure; it is representative of a c.1875 late-Victorian style.
- 4) The building does contribute to the historic and architectural significance of the district.
- 5) The work proposed by the applicant would affect but not compromise the character defining elements of the existing building.

Motion by Mr. Maxwell to approve the application at 78 Greene Street as submitted. Approval is conditional on no PVC trim; composite material is okay. Either door option is acceptable (salvaged or five panel). A true divided light grill must be provided. This is consistent with Commission standards # 4 and 8.

Seconded by Mr. McGeorge.

VOTE: 5 – 0.

Discussion Items

1. Minutes: Review and approval of the March 13, 2019 meeting minutes.

Table the March minutes to the May meeting.

2. COMMISSIONER REPORTS: Commission members may report on cases where they have been appointed as Referee, and refer observations or possible violations that they have observed to staff. Any substantive discussion of any such Report shall require addition to the Agenda by motion.

Ms. Carron requested to add 219 Main Street (Revival) on to the agenda for discussion purposes only. Seconded by Mr. McGeorge.

VOTE: 5 – 0.

Ms. Carron said she noticed a new sign at the subject location and was curious to know if the restaurant owner required HDC approval. Ms. Hitchen said the owner updated sign content therefore HDC approval was not needed.

Motion to adjourn by Ms. Carron. Seconded by Ms. Calise. Approved 5 – 0.

Adjourn at 8:15 pm.

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

Lea Anthony Hitchen, Assistant Town Planner