

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MINUTES

June 10, 2020 Meeting

VIRTUAL – Convened at 6:30 PM via the ZOOM Remote Meeting Platform

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

Absent: Andrew Barkley and Nicole D’Amato.

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

Ms. Kristen 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. Christopher & Samantha Lane
20 Marlborough Street; Map 85 AP 1 Lot 187
Proposed Work: Installation of a 17 Module Solar Panel System on
the Primary Structure South Elevation – FINAL**

Ms. Carron stated Commission Standards #4 and 5 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 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. She added in addition to the general standards that apply, the Commission shall also apply Section 260-62(A)(4) Plan Review of Solar Panels, the HDC will consider building-mounted or building-integrated systems; ground-mounted systems are prohibited in the downtown historic district. Solar panels should be placed in areas that are least viewable to the public. Installations that would alter the characteristic features of a historic structure should be avoided. Panels should not be visible above the roofline and panels installed on flat -roof buildings should be set back from the edge.

Mr. Chris Lane, owner of 20 Marlborough Street, represented the application. Mr. Lane explained he was requesting to install a total of 17 solar panels (a total of 6.035 kW) on three different sections of the south side rooftop location. He noted the unit is an all-black net metering building-mounted/building-integrated system with associated service panels to be located on the side of the building and the majority of the panels will be located to the rear and be 98 percent concealed.

Mr. McGeorge stated he had no objections to the application as it was a great example of good stewardship to the environment; it does not diminish from the architectural value of the original structure in any way; the project is completely reversible and will not affect any contributing elements of the building. He was of the opinion it is an acceptable application and meets the standards for approval.

Mr. Maxwell echoed Mr. McGeorge's comments and added the panels will be installed on an asphalt shingle roof which has no historic value therefore he also has no issues with the application.

Mr. Lane confirmed the inverter will be located in the basement with wire connections located in the backyard.

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 Christopher and Samantha Lane.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 20 Marlborough Street.
- 3) The property in question is a contributing structure, being a c.1850 Greek Revival building.
- 4) The building contributes 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. McGeorge to approve the application as submitted at 20 Marlborough Street for the installation of a 17 module solar panel system on the primary structure south elevation (3 different sections). This is consistent with Commission standard #4 and 5).

Seconded by Ms. Calise.

Roll Call Vote: Ms. Calise: Yes, Mr. Maxwell: Yes, Mr. McGeorge: Yes, and Ms. Carron: Yes. (VOTE: 4 – 0).

**2. Angel Winpenny, MMLSAJK, Inc. d/b/a The Patio
431 Main Street; Map 75 AP 3 Lot 97
Proposed Work: Construction of a 12’x18’ Pergola & Exterior
Countertop on South side Existing Concrete Pad; Remediate
Zoning Violations Issued for Installed Signage and Fencing without
Appropriate Approvals – FINAL**

Ms. Angel Winpenny represented the application. Ms. Winpenny explained she would like to install a carved wood sign and has been working with designer Paul Vespia regarding the sign as well as the dumpster enclosure as well. Ms. Winpenny requested to continue her application to the July meeting so she had more time to gather more information. She did confirm that the request to construct a pergola is no longer part of the plan therefore she withdrew that portion of the application. Ms. Winpenny referred to the “bar ledge” that had been installed as she found it to be a simple solution with the hopes the HDC

would allow her to keep it in place for the time being. She pointed out her customers like it and she would like to maintain the look of it.

Ms. Hitchen questioned whether she has a contract with Mr. Paul Vespia. Ms. Winpenny noted Ms. Hitchen would have to contact her husband about that as he would know better.

Mr. McGeorge suggested the application be continued considering there is no information for the Commission to review, particularly with regard to the edge barrier.

There was discussion regarding a couple of Commissioners refereeing the railing/edge barrier. Ms. Carron and Mr. McGeorge volunteered to referee. Mr. McGeorge noted the referee meeting will go through Ms. Hitchen in terms of meeting time and date.

Further discussion ensued regarding the Applicant needing parking relief. Atty. Teitz pointed out the Town Council was in the midst of preparing an ordinance that would provide a temporary suspension from the parking regulations during the Covid-19 pandemic. He noted Town Staff is trying to work with Main Street businesses during these trying times.

Motion by Mr. McGeorge to continue the matter to July 8, 2020, noting the pergola has been withdrawn from the application, and it is incumbent for the Applicant to provide proper documentation for signage, the dumpster enclosure and edge protection, as more detailed information is required. Seconded by Ms. Carron.

Roll Call Vote: Ms. Calise: Yes, Mr. Maxwell: Yes, Mr. McGeorge: Yes, and Ms. Carron: Yes. (VOTE: 4 – 0).

3. Paul & Judith Cullinane
13 Prospect Street; Map 85 AP 2 Lot 201
Proposed Work: Install Vinyl Fencing Along North Side of Rear
Patio – FINAL

Ms. Carron stated fencing is a type of new construction and thus must comply with Commission Standard Number 5. It states that such work must be

compatible with the surrounding buildings in size, scale, materials and siting, as well as with the general character of the historic district.

Mr. Paul Cullinane, property owner, represented the application. He explained there is an existing vinyl flat board with lattice topped fence which runs along the rear of the backyard on the driveway side. He would like to install the same vinyl fence along the north side of the yard at the patio and the property line where there are some dead trees and bushes – the dimensions of the new fence will be 18' long and 7' tall. Mr. Cullinane noted the vegetation will be removed as the property line is very close to the house.

Mr. McGeorge stated that in this particular case, he wanted to make it explicitly clear that he had no objections with the subject application for the following reasons: there is an existing vinyl fence that will match; the application is generally benign and will not be viewable from any public right of way and will not affect any character defining elements of the primary structure. He added that if this was a new submission and under different circumstances he would not approve it.

Ms. Carron agreed with Mr. McGeorge's comments noting the fence will not be visible from the street and she would have a different opinion if in fact it were in a different location.

Ms. Calise noted the backyard might look strange if the fencing did not match therefore she supported the vinyl fence for a more cohesive look.

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 Mr. Paul and Judith Cullinane.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 13 Prospect Street.
- 3) The property in question is a contributing structure, being a c.1900 late Victorian building.
- 4) The building contributes 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 as submitted at 13 Prospect Street to install vinyl fencing along the north side of the rear patio (a total of 18” in length). This is consistent with Commission standard #5.

Seconded by Mr. McGeorge.

Roll Call Vote: Ms. Calise: Yes, Mr. Maxwell: Yes, Mr. McGeorge: Yes, and Ms. Carron: Yes. (VOTE: 4 – 0).

**4. National Sign Corporation by Heather Dudko
333 Main Street; Map 85 AP 1 Lot 193
Proposed Work: New Signage for “Prime Lending” – 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.

Ms. Heather Dudko of National Sign Corporation represented the application. She explained the sign is a replacement non-illuminated wall sign for a new tenant at the subject property, being Prime Lending. The new sign will replace The Hub, A Community Workspace sign located furthest to the left of the building and will be consistent in size with the other signs, being 108”x24” in size. She described the sign as having a white background with red and cool gray lettering. In addition to the wall sign, there is a request to add a dibond panel 24”x32” sign on the north side (facing Spring Street) entrance door which will be six square feet in size.

Mr. McGeorge commented the proposed sign is consistent with the design guidelines thus has no objections to the proposal. Ms. Carron agreed noting she finds the sign appropriate and matches the other tenant’s wall signs on the building.

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 Heather Dudko of National Sign Corporation for J2 Properties.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Downtown District, specifically 333 Main Street.
- 3) The property in question is a contributing structure, being a c.1922 early Twentieth century commercial garage.
- 4) The building contributes 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 as submitted at 333 Main Street to install a new 108"x24" wall sign for Prime Lending. This is consistent with Commission standard #5.

Seconded by Mr. McGeorge.

Roll Call Vote: Ms. Calise: Yes, Mr. Maxwell: Yes, Mr. McGeorge: Yes, and Ms. Carron: Yes. (VOTE: 4 – 0).

5. Robert Euston

24 Somerset Street; Map 75 AP 3 Lot 1

**Proposed Work: Addition to rear Southeast corner of home;
Addition of a Second Vehicle Garage to Northwest corner of home;
and Modification to Roofline - CONCEPTUAL**

Ms. Carron stated commission standards 4 and 5 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.

Mr. Robert Euston, property owner, represented the application. He explained the proposal includes an addition of a master suite to the rear of the home which will not infringe on any side or rear setbacks. Additionally there will be in internal renovation of the kitchen and den which will not affect the current exterior footprint. He is requesting to add a second vehicle garage to the northwest side of the home which also requires zoning board approval. Lastly he explained the home has a low pitched roof and would like to raise the pitch possibly to an 8/12.

Mr. McGeorge commented the proposal is a reasonable design project which does not negatively affect the original structure or district in general and felt the mass, scale and fenestration pattern is appropriate. He also noted the additional garage is not without precedent therefore has no objection.

The discussion turned to the proposed modification in the roof. Mr. McGeorge pointed out the existing roof has the shallowest roof in the area and the proposed 8/12 pitch is extremely excessive as it will create a lot of visual surface area; he suggested a 4/12 or 3/12 instead. The Commissioners recommended a flatter roof is more appropriate based on the style of the home. Mr. Maxwell noted the majority of the homes on Somerset Street have lower pitched roofs with one exception. He recommended going no larger than a 6/12 pitch as there will be a mass of asphalt shingles which will then be out of scale and bulky with the neighborhood.

Mr. Maxwell questioned if there will be a change to the siding. Mr. Euston asserted the front façade will not change, it will remain brick and the intent is to salvage as much brick to keep for the sides. He asserted the plan for now is to install Hardie clapboard for the rear elevation although that has yet to be determined.

Mr. McGeorge commented he had not realized the plate plane and roof elevation was going up which could potentially cause a reframing of the home. He highly recommended the roof pitch go nowhere taller than between a 4-6 pitch.

Overall Mr. Maxwell thought the expansion of the structure was suitable, including the extra garage considering it does not change the characteristics of

the house. The point was made that although the existing chimney was not on the conceptual plan it will remain.

Mr. Maxwell pointed out the conceptual plan does not show any trim details; he was adamant the final plan show appropriate scaled window trim as well as other trim where it would be installed.

Regarding the use of Hardie board, overall the Commission was not opposed to it being used due to the nonhistoric significance of the structure but for the final plan they will want to know how much, exactly where it will be installed and the overall visibility from the street and abutting neighbors.

Mr. Maxwell noted he would also want to see the full visibility of the rear elevation. When asked if there is a full walk-out basement Mr. Euston said there is no walk-out basement and there will not be a walk-out basement. He explained the backyard slopes away and the house will be level with the existing deck and grass line which is about three feet.

With no further questions or comments from the Commission Ms. Carron noted there is no motion or vote required due to the application being conceptual. The Applicant may return to the Commission once the dimensional variances are obtained from the Zoning Board.

6. Joseph Colaluca
104 Duke Street; Map 85 AP 1 Lot 415
Proposed Work: Complete Demolition - FIRST HEARING

Ms. Carron stated Commission Standard of Review Number 9 applies to this application which states demolition 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. In addition to the local standard; the Federal Department of the Interior's "Secretary's Standards for Rehabilitation" guide notes that the following are **NOT** recommended:

- Removing or relocating historic buildings or landscape features, thus destroying the historic relationship between buildings, landscape features, and open space;
- Removing or relocating historic buildings on site – thus diminishing the historic character of the site or complex;
- Failing to maintain site drainage so that buildings and site features are damaged or destroyed;
- Permitting buildings and site features to remain unprotected so that plant materials, fencing, walkways, archeological features, etc. are damaged or destroyed;
- Failing to provide adequate protection of materials on a cyclical basis so that deterioration of building and site features results;
- Failing to undertake adequate measures to assure the preservation of buildings and site features.

Ms. Carron summarized the events that have led up to the present hearing noting at the site visit and May hearing, being the first hearing on the matter, the Commission found the application to be complete and the building to be a contributing structure to the district.

Mr. Joseph Colaluca, owner of 104 Duke Street, asserted he would like to move forward with the demolition of the subject building based upon the structural engineer's report, the information submitted and the site visit.

Considering the Commission found the structure to be contributing Ms. Carron pointed out the Commission then needs to decide whether the application meets the following criteria, being:

- 1) If the structure is deemed valuable to the Town, State or Nation, such that its loss will be a great loss to the Town, State, or Nation, then in order for the HDC to approve demolition, the structure must constitute a hazard to public safety, which hazard cannot be eliminated by economic means available to the owner, including sale of the structure to any purchaser willing to preserve the structure.
- 2) If the structure is deemed valuable for the period of architecture which it represents, or to the district as a whole, then at least one of the following requirements must be met in order for the HDC to approve demolition:

- a. Retention of the structure constitutes a hazard to public safety, which hazard cannot be eliminated by economic means available to the owner, including the sale of the structure on its present site to any purchaser willing to preserve the structure.
- b. Preservation of the structure is a deterrent to a major improvement program that will be of substantial benefit to the community.
- c. Preservation of the structure would cause an undue and unreasonable financial hardship to the owner, taking into account the financial resources available to the owner including the sale of the structure to any purchaser willing to preserve the structure.
- d. Preservation of the structure would not be in the interest of the majority of the community.

Ms. Carron affirmed if the primary criteria have been met, then the HDC may consider any or all of the following secondary criteria in deciding whether to approve or deny the application, those being:

- The merit of the structure to be demolished.
- The effect of the demolition on the surrounding buildings.
- The effect of the demolition on the historic district as a whole and general area.
- The value or usefulness of the proposed replacement structure to the community, and the appropriateness of its design to the historic district and neighborhood.
- If the lot is to be left open, the impact of open space in that location and on that area as a whole.
- The effect of the demolition on the general economy.
- Whether the demolition will foster civic beauty.
- Whether the demolition will stabilize and improve property values in the neighborhood.
- The effect of the demolition on safeguarding the heritage of the Town, State or Nation.
- The effect of the demolition on promotion of the district and its outlying properties for the education, pleasure and welfare of the citizens of the Town of East Greenwich.

Mr. McGeorge acknowledged as far as demolition is concerned the regulations have been satisfied. In his opinion having the Building Official state the

structure is a hazard to public safety satisfies the requirements. He also finds it is questionable but not unreasonable to say the structure is a deterrent to a major improvement. Mr. McGeorge was of the opinion any proposed project on the property would improve the site, the community and the economic state of the town. As an architect, Mr. McGeorge said having reviewed the structural engineer's reports he thought it is a financial hardship to preserve the structure.

Ms. Carron did not necessarily disagree with all of Mr. McGeorge's points but did have concerns about the application. Ms. Carron asserted she went to the site visit on May 20th and saw firsthand the poor condition the subject building is in however the Applicant provided two proposals at the last hearing, those being to 1. Demolish and rebuild and 2. Preserve/Rehab the building. She pointed out the fact that the Applicant has the ability to rehabilitate the building in her opinion means the building should be rehabbed because of criteria needs to be followed noting "no other way to save the building is beyond being saved" but due to the Applicant physically submitting a proposal to rehab including details, with associated costs behind it makes her believe a rehab project is possible.

Mr. Colaluca understood Ms. Carron's position however even he did not think it was 100 percent possible to save. Due to timing purposes he would like to gain the demolition approval but he was willing to continue to explore saving the structure even though he thought it was a longshot. Mr. Colaluca simply did not want to lose time by having to come back at a later date only to have to ask again to demolish the structure.

Mr. Maxwell questioned the report which explains the proposal to restore the building - he asked if the report was prepared prior to further exploring the interior of the structure that exposed the structural problems. Mr. Colaluca said yes.

Mr. McGeorge made a motion stating the structure is NOT contributing or valuable to the Town, State or Nation because it does not have any historical figures or historical events associated with it and it is mainly a vernacular style without a great deal of detail. Seconded by Ms. Carron.

Roll Call Vote: Ms. Calise: Yes, Mr. Maxwell: Yes, Mr. McGeorge: Yes, and Ms. Carron: Yes. (VOTE: 4 – 0).

Ms. Carron went on to say while the demolition will not be a great loss to the Town, State or Nation the property is still valuable for the period of architecture and valuable to the district given the history of the building, what was there and what it represented to the people who lived in the area and the district.

Mr. McGeorge pointed out that only one of the following requirements must be met in order for the HDC to approve a demolition; he was of the opinion the retention of the structure constitutes a hazard to public safety, which hazard cannot be eliminated by economic means available to the owner, including the sale of the structure on its present site to any purchaser willing to preserve the structure. He added the Town's Building Official has effectively condemned the building.

Ms. Carron disagreed noting the Applicant submitted a proposal stating he could rehabilitate the building therefore the hazard can be eliminated by economic means. Her position is the Applicant proposed to restore the building based upon a proposal submitted at the May meeting which would eliminate the hazard to public safety.

Ms. Carron made a motion stating the property is deemed valuable for the period of architecture of which the building represents and is valuable to the district as a whole. Seconded by Ms. Carron.

Roll Call Vote: Ms. Calise: Yes, Mr. Maxwell: Yes, Mr. McGeorge: Yes, and Ms. Carron: Yes. (VOTE: 4 – 0).

When questioned by the Commission what will replace the existing structure without going into too many details Mr. Colaluca explained he intends to construct a four unit residential development on the site.

Ms. Calise commented she toured the site on May 20th and was surprised of the existing conditions and did not see any original materials remaining. She felt it was jarring as well as disheartening to see the level of deterioration and poor condition of the building.

Mr. Maxwell found the C.A, Pretzer analysis/report clearly spells out the deficiency of the structure in every way possible. He also found the structure to be dangerous, with shocking conditions as he walked through the building on

May 20th. Mr. Maxwell was of the impression to rebuild in place there would be excessive contingency costs and it would be a false replica of what was there.

Mr. McGeorge noted he could not imagine there could be a buyer for this property with this set of circumstances. He added there is nothing salvageable about the building; one can have all the economic means to rehab it but it will ultimately be rebuilt as a new structure essentially from the foundation up as there is nothing original remaining. Ms. Calise agreed saying this is her concern as well since the Commission will be reviewing a new building no matter what; in her mind the word “preservation” is not an appropriate term for this project.

Mr. McGeorge made a motion stating the building constitutes a hazard to the public; although the hazard may be eliminated by economic means the hazard surely cannot be eliminated due to the technical and feasibility of salvaging any of the existing primary elements of the structure. It has less to do with economic means than with physical and technological means as it is physically not possible to maintain the structure. Seconded by Mr. Maxwell.

Roll Call Vote: Ms. Calise: Yes, Mr. Maxwell: Yes, Mr. McGeorge: Yes, and Ms. Carron: No. (VOTE: 3-1).

Ms. Carron opened the hearing to members of the public.

Ms. Kristen Coletti of 66 Duke Street, spoke in favor of the demolition as she simply wanted to see the property cleaned up as it is currently an eyesore and has been for quite some time. She was concerned if the building was rehabbed it might not get finished or the owner would walk away.

Mr. Maxwell was surprised that there were not many abutters tuning in to the meeting considering other nearby proposed projects received a lot of attention.

With no further comments Ms. Carron asked for a motion regarding the demolition request.

Mr. McGeorge made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by Joseph Colaluca of Blue Star Realty, LLC.

- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Downtown District, specifically 104 Duke Street.
- 3) The property in question is a contributing structure, being a c.1890 late-Victorian structure.
- 4) The building contributed to its ties to the community, having been a local neighborhood grocery store/deli known as “Tutters,” however given the current state of the building as evidenced by the C.A. Pretzer engineering report, and the May 20, 2020 site visit, the demolition would not affect the character defining elements of the existing building given the structure is beyond repair and the E.G. Building Official has deemed the building as uninhabitable.

Motion by Mr. McGeorge to approve the application for complete demolition as submitted at 104 Duke Street. This is consistent with Commission standard #9.

Seconded by Ms. Calise.

Roll Call Vote: Ms. Calise: Yes, Mr. Maxwell: Yes, Mr. McGeorge: Yes, and Ms. Carron: No. (VOTE: 3-1).

Historic District Commission Business

1. HDC Advisory Opinion to the Planning Board regarding the proposed minor land development at 235 Kenyon Avenue, being Map 74 AP 9 Lot 283 that calls for the subdivision of this “Outlying Historic Property,” known as the “Spencer-King House.” The parcel is owned by Steven Moss & Lisa Sussman and fronts entirely on Kenyon Avenue. This proposal does not include any improvements, modifications or construction to the historic structure. The proposal is to subdivide the lot into two separate parcels.

Mr. Curt Nunes, of Commonwealth Land Surveyors presented the application to the HDC on June 10, 2020. He explained the project consists of subdividing the existing 4.2 acre lot into two (2) separate lots. Mr. Nunes confirmed there are no proposed modifications and/or changes to the existing farmhouse. The front encroachment of the farmhouse is a pre-existing condition that will not be exacerbated or intensified by the proposed new lot line and since the side setback is met/maintained by the new line, there will be no variances required,

just the standard review process with the Planning Board. Additionally Mr. Nunes established there will be no disruption to any of the existing stone walls or to the existing tree lines. Mr. Nunes pointed out to the rear/western side of the property there is a very scenic stone dam; due to wetland issues this section of the property will remain undisturbed. Finally, Mr. Nunes affirmed there are burial plots or cemeteries on the subject property. Once the new lot is sold the new owner will have to obtain HDC approvals for any new structures considering the lot will remain as an “outlying historic property.”

In a 4 – 0 vote, the EGHDC had no objections to the proposed minor subdivision. The EGHDC found that given the fact the existing stone walls would remain undisturbed, the scenic dam and gentle sloping lawn will not be cleared and there are no family burial plots to contend with the project is compatible with the character of the neighborhood and the historic district. The EGHDC specifically conditioned the subdivision plan must include a note that specifies the newly created lot is an “Outlying Historic Property” and subject to Historic District Commission review of any new structures.

Motion by Mr. McGeorge to have Staff draft an advisory opinion to the Planning Board indicating the HDC did not object to the proposed minor subdivision. Seconded by Ms. Carron.

Roll Call Vote: Ms. Calise: Yes, Mr. Maxwell: Yes, Mr. McGeorge: Yes, and Ms. Carron: Yes. (VOTE: 4-0).

2. Minutes: Review and approval of the November 13, 2019, January 8, 2020, February 12, 2020, February 26, 2020, and March 11, 2020 meeting minutes.

Ms. Carron motioned to approve the November 13, 2019 and January 8, 2020 minutes as drafted. Seconded by Ms. Calise.

Roll Call Vote: Ms. Calise: Yes, Mr. Maxwell: Yes, Mr. McGeorge: Yes, and Ms. Carron: Yes. (VOTE: 4-0).

February 12, 2020, February 26, 2020, and March 11, 2020 meeting minutes tabled until the following meeting.

With Ms. Alicia Lekos not having joined the Zoom meeting Mr. McGeorge motioned to continue the application for 111 Prospect Street to July 8, 2020. Seconded by Ms. Carron.

Roll Call Vote: Ms. Calise: Yes, Mr. Maxwell: Yes, Mr. McGeorge: Yes, and Ms. Carron: Yes. (VOTE: 4-0).

Due to quorum issues the application for 49 Marion Street had to be continued to July 8, 2020. Motion by Mr. McGeorge to continue said application to July 8, 2020. Seconded by Ms. Calise.

Roll Call Vote: Ms. Calise: Yes, Mr. McGeorge: Yes, and Ms. Carron: Yes. (VOTE: 3-0). (Mr. Maxwell recused).

3. 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.

No Commissioner comments.

Motion to adjourn by Mr. McGeorge. Seconded by Mr. Calise. VOTE: 4 - 0

Adjourned at 8:45 pm.

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

Lea Anthony Hitchen, Assistant Town Planner