

**HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MINUTES**  
**May 9, 2018 Meeting**  
**Town Council Chambers – 6:00 PM HDC meeting**

Present: Kim Balkcom, Chair, Matthew McGeorge, Vice-Chair, Gregory Maxwell, Erinn Calise, and Kristen Carron.

Absent: Lauren Drury and Andrew Barkley.

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

---

Ms. Balkcom, Chair of the Commission, started the meeting at 6:00 p.m.

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

#### Historic District Commission Hearings

- 1. Sarah Dentz**  
**31 Mawney Street; Map 85 AP 2 Lot 170**  
**Window Replacement & Partial Demolition (rear chicken coop) –**  
**FINAL**

Ms. Sarah Dentz and Mr. David Purvis represented the application.

Ms. Balkcom pointed out the Applicant is requesting to replace windows as well as demolish the “chicken coop” in the rear. She acknowledged the previous

owner had received permission from the HDC back in 2002 to demolish both the chicken coop and the garage but never followed through; since a Certificate of Appropriateness stays with the home Ms. Dentz only has to seek permission for window replacement.

Mr. Maxwell questioned the condition of the existing windows. Ms. Dentz noted the windows are all in poor condition, are chipping away, there is a lot of friction and is especially concerned about the safety aspect, i.e. lead paint.

Mr. Maxwell queried about the assortment of window configurations. Ms. Dentz said nothing is standard and all the windows are long overdue for a replacement. Mr. Purvis explained that some of the windows are original, others are replacement windows and there is essentially a hodge podge of existing window configurations, mostly being 2/2 and 6/6.

The Commission members wondered where the 2/2 window configuration came from since the home is a cape style structure which generally has a 6/6 configuration. Ms. Carron asked if the plan is to replace all of the windows or only the ones that need replacement. Ms. Dentz explained the only windows she would hold off on replacing are the windows located in the rear dormer (dormer was added in 2005).

Ms. Balkcom recommended providing consistency to all the windows in the house and questioned if Ms. Dentz had a preference to window type. Ms. Dentz had wanted all 6/6 windows to make it a true Cape style home but did not particularly have a preference.

Mr. Purvis commented there are a couple of smaller dormer windows that would not look good with a 6/6 configuration and implied the 2/2 style would look better.

Ms. Balkcom pointed out the survey sheet defines the structure as being a Greek Revival Cape Cod cottage to which a 2/2 configuration would be appropriate for a Greek Revival. Mr. Maxwell added that considering there are 2/2 windows in the main body of the house the new windows should continue to maintain the 2/2 profile as many appear to look original.

Mr. McGeorge and Ms. Balkcom also preferred to maintain the 2/2 window pattern.

Mr. Maxwell noted the Anderson Woodwright double hung window the Applicant has requested to use is a great product as long as it is a true divided light, meaning there being an interior and exterior muntin along with the spacer bar between the glass. Mr. McGeorge agreed noting Mr. Maxwell's point is critical in that the Commission would not approve a window unless it has the interior and exterior grille and spacer bar between the glass; if the windows are installed without this condition then it becomes a violation.

Mr. Purvis said he would order the new windows with the muntin size that closely matches the existing muntin width.

The Commission unanimously agreed to issue blanket approval for all of the windows.

Ms. Balkcom stated Commission Standard #8 applies to this application. It 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.

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

Ms. Carron made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by Sarah Dentz.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 31 Mawney Street.
- 3) The structure in question is a contributing structure; it is a c.1855 Greek Revival Cape Cod cottage 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. Carron to approve the application at 31 Mawney for blanket window replacement with the condition the true divided light window be installed (interior & exterior muntin with spacer bar) and windows be a 2/2 configuration profile. This is consistent with Commission Standard #8.

Seconded by Mr. McGeorge.

VOTE: 5 – 0.

**2. East Greenwich Yacht Club  
10 Water Street; Map 85 AP 1 Lot 1  
Complete Demolition of Chapman Cottage and Steward's Building  
- FINAL**

(Ms. Carron recused herself from the application.)

Mr. Jason Dittleman, Commodore of the EGYC and Mr. Lenny Iannuccilli, an EGYC member, represented the application.

Ms. Balkcom noted Commission Standard #9 applies 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.

Mr. Iannuccilli commented that he recently got involved with the project and obtained an engineer as well as Loren Yoder to analyze the Chapman Cottage. He realized the EGYC has submitted the same request on multiple occasions over the last decade which has proved unsuccessful in their attempt to demolish the cottage. Mr. Iannuccilli is requesting again to demolish the Chapman Cottage but also asking to demolish the Steward's Building which is a concrete block structure located next to the Chapman building.

Ms. Balkcom informed the Applicant that from a procedural standpoint a demo request requires two meetings with this meeting being considered the first meeting and the Commission will also need to address each building separately even though the buildings are on the same lot.

Atty. Teitz pointed out the agenda indicates demolition of both the Chapman and Steward's building while the submitted plans (specifically Plan C1A) show the Steward's building to be demolished and the Chapman Cottage to be relocated. He questioned what the Applicant was really requesting.

Mr. Iannuccilli stated he is requesting to demolish the Chapman Cottage; relocating the Chapman building is essentially an alternative "Plan B."

Mr. McGeorge said the Commission should review each building independently. He reviewed the criteria to determine whether the Steward's building is either contributing or noncontributing: he felt the Steward's building is not contributing to the significance of the district and not valuable to the town; it is not valuable for the period or architecture it represents and it is a non-contributing to the significance of the district therefore he has no objection to demolishing the Steward building as it does not contribute to the Town in any meaningful manner.

All of the Commissioners agreed with Mr. McGeorge in that the Steward's building is a non-contributing structure.

Furthermore, Mr. McGeorge pointed out that based on the structural engineering report the Steward's building could pose a potential threat during a flood or hurricane. As for the Chapman building, Mr. McGeorge commented that when he saw the site plans noting that building was to be relocated he was very happy to see that as the relocation makes the parcel more usable and valuable to both the property owner and Town – he had no objections to the Chapman building being relocated but would not support demolition of the Chapman cottage.

Ms. Balkcom agreed with Mr. McGeorge and stated the Chapman building is contributing to the significance of the district and valuable to the Town; it is also valuable for the period of architecture it represents and determined it is not a non-contributing structure. She has consistently felt the Chapman building is a contributing structure and has not changed her opinion.

Mr. Maxwell also said the Chapman building is a contributing structure and prefers to see it relocated on the parcel as it is a great solution.

Ms. Calise commented that the application indicates the Chapman building was constructed in the 1950s yet staff research pinpoints the building to have been built c.1870. Ms. Balkcom noted there has always been discussion about the construction date; it is obvious that the structure has been relocated and it might have been moved to its current location in the 1950s. Mr. Iannuccilli noted that Mr. Yoder assessed the nails in the building which indicate the building was constructed in the early 1900s but that it was definitely built before 1950.

Mr. Iannuccilli questioned if the EGYC were to move the building whether the Town was still interested with the idea of it becoming a harbormaster office. Ms. Hitchen recalled the joint Town Council, Cove Commission, Planning Board meeting to which Mr. Dittleman also attended back in September where we discussed including the Chapman building in the overall waterfront plan to find out if it had a feasible use – to date the waterfront plan has yet to be put out to bid.

Mr. Iannuccilli explained that if the EGYC has to move forward with “Plan B” then they will try to raise funds to rehab since they currently do not have the finances to fix it now and possibly the Town can contribute down the road. He felt as though the Chapman building would be ideal location for the harbormaster since it is at the mouth of the bay.

The Commission explained a demolition request requires two meetings based on rules and regulations. Mr. McGeorge had the impression the entire Commission agreed the demolition of the Steward’s building is appropriate while relocating the Chapman building until funds can be obtained to properly rehab the structure and residing the New England Yacht Rigging building to improve its appearance.

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

Motion by Mr. McGeorge that the application for the demolition of the Steward’s building is complete. Based upon the standards the Commission finds the Steward’s building is a non-contributing structure to the historic district with

no architectural significance based upon its age and the existing structural conditions being a concrete cinder block construction

Seconded by Mr. Maxwell.

VOTE: 4 – 0.

Motion by Mr. McGeorge to approve the temporary relocation of the Chapman cottage pursuant to Exhibit C1A submitted by the Applicant showing the subject structure to be moved to the west of the New England Yacht Rigging building and not be demolished. Mr. McGeorge finds the Chapman building to be a contributing structure based on previous site visits, the material already in the record, noting the building is not in its original location and does not obtain as much value being located in the middle of a parking lot.

Seconded by Ms. Calise.

Mr. Maxwell felt moving the Chapman building is an excellent solution for the future of the structure and the property in general.

VOTE: 4 – 0.

Staff will issue a Certificate of Appropriateness to relocate the Chapman building.

As for the second hearing regarding the Steward's building staff requested the Applicant to bring a few copies of the application to the next meeting.

(Ms. Carron returned to the dais.)

**3. Adam Vanacore for Ann Metzger  
100 Crompton Ave; Map 75, AP 3, Lot 244  
Modification of a previous Final Plan (window type) and Minor  
Modifications to east elevation – FINAL**

Mr. Adam Vanacore represented the application for Ann Metzger, homeowner.

Ms. Balkcom stated Commission Standards #4 and 8 apply to this application. *Standard 4* states 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. Vanacore explained the changes to the plan since he was last before the Commission. He noted the second floor windows on the east elevation have been modified to now be five double hung windows which will directly correlate with the floor plan as well as to get additional light into the bathroom while also making the windows symmetrical.

Mr. McGeorge, Mr. Maxwell and Ms. Balkcom all complimented the revision, noting the five double hung windows looks significantly better than the original window layout.

Mr. Vanacore stated his second request is to change the type of window he was originally approved for; the Anderson Woodwright 400 Series were originally approved but he would like to change the windows to now be Anderson 400 Series true divided light. The reasons being due to cost and the Woodwright does not offer a black interior finish as the 400 Series does. Third, Mr. Vanacore mentioned he has made changes below grade, also on the east elevation. He realized there is an old rubble foundation and decided to improve it with a walk-out basement – the plan is to take out the rubble wall, reframe the footings and install a door as well as two windows.

Mr. McGeorge noted the relationship between the columns and retaining wall seemed unresolved but conceptually acceptable. He noted the east elevation and proposed walk-out basement is on the back of the house and the other proposed improvements will significantly enhance the structure so he had no issues with the walk-out basement as presented. He added the overall design intent and solutions are more important which show a desire of sensitive quality to the home.

Mr. Maxwell agreed and noted the walk-out basement area is not an architecturally significant part of the building and overall there will be a tremendous improvement to the property. Mr. Maxwell pointed out that technically he finds the additional seams in the Anderson 400 Series tilt-wash distracting versus the Woodwright Series which looks like wood but given the amount of work to be done on the home and the improvements the homeowner is making he would be willing to let that small detail go.

Mr. McGeorge commented that based on the state of the existing house, the location of modifications to be made he is okay with approving the project; if it were a more significant structure he would not have the same sentiments. Mr. McGeorge also noted that he did not think it was necessary to require additional information on the walk-out wall detail.

Ms. Balkcom also had no objections to the plan.

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

Mr. Maxwell made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by Adam Vanacore, representing homeowner Ann Metzger.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 100 Crompton Avenue.
- 3) The structure in question is a contributing structure; it is c.1870 Eastlake Victorian.
- 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 100 Crompton Avenue for modification of a previous approved window and minor modifications to the east elevation of the structure. This is consistent with Commission Standards #4 and 8.

Seconded by Mr. McGeorge.

VOTE: 5 – 0.

**4. Travis Lescarbeau for Andrew & Cara Roos  
40 Division Street; Map 85 AP 1 Lot 245  
Partial Demolition (rear mudroom) and Addition - CONCEPTUAL**

Ms. Balkcom stated Commission Standards #4, 5 and 9 apply to the application. *Standard 4* states 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 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 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. Demolition shall not result in a significant threat or loss of an historic and/or architectural resource to the Town, State, or nation.

Mr. Travis Lescarbeau of Abcore Restoration and Mr. Peter Borgemeister, architect for the project represented the application for the homeowners, Andrew and Cara Roos.

Ms. Balkcom confirmed that although the Applicant has requested a partial demolition it does not require a two-step hearing process due to the section of house to be demolished will be rebuilt and it was a poorly constructed later addition.

Mr. McGeorge and Mr. Maxwell commended the Applicant for the professional level of design and detail for a conceptual level project.

Mr. Lescarbeau explained the homeowner's intent is to preserve the structure but after reviewing the later addition it was found to have a rubble foundation, has powder post beetle damage and is not structurally sound to support a second floor addition. He noted the family would like to keep

everything historic but want the modern amenities such as a master bed/bathroom as well as have a mudroom with half bath on the first floor in order to make the house more functional. The dimensions being proposed is a 12'x12' addition which is within ½' of the original ell. He noted the plans are still in the schematic stage but will have the finished plans and material specifications for the next meeting.

Mr. McGeorge asserted that the design was fantastic and clearly shows how buildings evolve over time as well as to include the modern necessities. He appreciated the way the addition has been “pulled back” which is a critical point with additions which adds to the importance of the house – that detail alone is very well conceived.

Ms. Balkcom questioned whether both chimneys were remaining. Mr. Lescarbeau stated both chimneys will remain. She also commented there are some proposed finishes on the plans that she would not approve, those being PVC materials. Since the house has essentially been untouched and most of the original elements still exist Ms. Balkcom thought the project was small enough to not use PVC products.

Mr. McGeorge questioned the reason for using round post columns on the deck noting it is a very minor detail but was not sure if it is appropriate to the home's style. Mr. Borgemeister said he favors the round posts because he originally drew the deck as having square posts and it looked dull; he felt the round posts liven it up and give the project some “warmth.”

Mr. Maxwell pointed out that back in the day when the house was originally built the railing would not have been set at 36” and the proportions would be different. He agreed with Mr. Borgemeister's logic.

Ms. Balkcom acknowledged the deck is new construction and there are not any other existing porches on the home that it will need to be consistent with. Mr. Borgemeister informed the Commission that most importantly the front façade is not being modified at all.

Mr. McGeorge again complimented the design and noted the changes are sensitive to the historic structure and is overall a well-conceived design.

Mr. Maxwell questioned the type of windows to be installed in the addition. Mr. Borgemeister indicated the windows will be custom made because he is recommending identical windows in the new addition as are in the existing home – the rationale is that he wanted to follow the same scale as those in the main structure. With the scale of the windows being smaller, noting the upper sash will be shorter than the lower sash therefore the windows will have to be custom made. He pointed out the window in the shower area will only have an upper sash.

Mr. Borgemeister asked if cement fiber clapboards would be an acceptable material. Mr. McGeorge, speaking for himself, said for a rear located addition he would consider fiber cement clapboard acceptable as long as the embossed side is not used. Mr. Maxwell asked whether the exposure can be matched using cement fiber claps. Mr. Borgemeister commented the exposure can be matched identically to that on the house.

Mr. McGeorge noted that there are many non-plastic products, such as Boral to be used for cornerboards, etc. that are a composite material and would be appropriate to use.

Mr. Borgemeister noted he would prepare the final details as well as a materials list for the next meeting.

The Commission noted the plans have been conceptually reviewed and are very pleased with the submission.

### **Historic District Commission Business**

Mr. Joseph Yammine was present to represent 155 Main Street/5 Church Street. Ms. Hitchen explained an application was not received therefore was not added to the agenda.

Motion by Ms. Carron to add to the agenda property located at 5 Church Street/155 Main Street for discussion purposes only to discuss whether work to be performed can be approved administratively. Second by Mr. McGeorge.

VOTE: 5 – 0.

Ms. Balkcom commented Mr. Yammine presented a conceptual application at the March meeting. She reviewed the minutes and noted the HDC allowed the Applicant to pull off the asphalt siding and would return to the Commission for final plan approval for the exterior siding and window plan. The HDC agreed by consensus that the removal work can begin and final approval of new exterior plans will take place at a later date.

Atty. Teitz suggested Staff perform a site visit considering the Commission cannot make a decision since it is not on the agenda.

1. MINUTES: Action on the minutes of the February 14, 2018, March 14, 2018 and April 11, 2018 meetings.

Motion by Ms. Carron to approve as written the minutes for the February 14, 2018, March 14, 2018 and April 11, 2018 meetings. Seconded by Mr. McGeorge.

VOTE: 5 – 0.

## 2. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Carron noted the well house and greenhouse has been removed from 70 Kenyon Avenue; Mr. Richard Friend restored the wellhouse before he sold the property. Ms. Hitchen will research if there are any old photos of the well house and inform Mr. Marinaro, the building official on the matter.

Ms. Balkcom disclosed she received a text message from Ms. Jody Sceery who represented the buyer for 16 Somerset Street. She recommended Ms. Sceery contact Ms. Hitchen for additional information.

Mr. Maxwell inquired about 62 South Pierce Street. Atty. Teitz commented the applicant has appealed to SHAB(State Housing Appeal Board); in process of preparing the record, there will eventually be a conference with lawyers and it is still months away from A SHAB decision.

Motion to adjourn by Mr. McGeorge. Seconded by Ms. Calise. Adjourn at 7:35 p.m.

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

Lea Anthony Hitchen, Assistant Town Planner