

**HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MINUTES**  
**June 13, 2018 Meeting**  
**Town Council Chambers – 6:00 PM HDC meeting**

Present: Kim Balkcom, Chair, Matthew McGeorge, Vice-Chair, Gregory Maxwell, Erinn Calise, Kristen Carron, 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 6:05 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. East Greenwich Yacht Club  
10 Water Street; Map 85 AP 1 Lot 1  
Complete Demolition of the Steward's Building – FINAL (Second Hearing)**

(Ms. Carron recused herself from 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.

Ms. Balkcom clarified that this is the second hearing and noted the Commission is only discussing the Steward's building. She added the first meeting which was last month it was determined by the Commission that the Steward's building was not contributing to the significance of the district.

Mr. Lenny Iannuccilli, representing the E.G. Y.C. acknowledged the demolition request is only for the Steward's building while the Champlin Cottage will be moved within the confines of the parcel.

With no one in attendance to speak for or against the application Ms. Balkcom asked for a motion.

Ms. Drury made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by the East Greenwich Yacht Club, represented by Jason Dittleman and Lenny Iannuccilli.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 10 Water Street.
- 3) The Chapman cottage is a contributing structure while the Steward's building is a noncontributing structure; the Chapman cottage is a late 1800s/early 1900s building while the Steward's building is a mid-20<sup>th</sup> century concrete block structure.
- 4) The Chapman cottage building does contribute to the historic and architectural significance of the district while the Steward's building does not 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 buildings.

Motion by Ms. Drury to approve the application at 10 Water Street for demolition of the Steward's buildings while moving the Chapman building. This is consistent with Commission Standard #9.

Seconded by Mr. McGeorge.

VOTE: 6 – 0.

(Ms. Carron returned to the dias.)

**2. Andrew S. Brem**

**11 Reynolds Street; Map 84 AP 2 Lot 263**

**New Construction – Installation of 14 Solar Panels on Garage Roof -  
FINAL**

Ms. Balkcom 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.

Mr. Andrew Brem, property owner, represented the application. He explained that his home was built a few years ago and has considered solar installation since construction. He is now requesting to install 14 solar panels on the south side of the detached garage, being a building-mounted/building-integrated system and will produce 5.040 kW of energy. Mr. Brem noted that he is wedded to the historic fabric of the community and feels as though 21<sup>st</sup> century technology can fit into the historic community. He added the materials can still satisfy the standards and fit in with the neighborhood.

Mr. Brem asserted he did a lot of research on solar panels before submitting the application. He found that he could efficiently install panels on the south side of the detached garage which will not be too visible from the street. He feels as though the proposed panel location is not a predominant place as opposed to on the front of the house. In his opinion, Mr. Brem felt he did the best he could to maintain the spirit of the historic district while also trying to upgrade to the 21<sup>st</sup> century efficiency. He pointed out that solar panels are removable.

Ms. Balkcom stated she had no objections to the solar panel request. She personally felt as though solar panels can be put in the same category as mechanical devices.

Mr. Maxwell noted Mr. Brem's point of the solar panels being removable and the fact that the house is new construction, and the panels will be located on an outbuilding with limited visibility are all valid points, therefore he also has no objections to the application.

Mr. Maxwell queried how the panels are mounted to the roof. Mr. Steve Periera, contractor, said the panels are mounted to a rail system; the panels will be 6" from the roof.

Mr. McGeorge concurred with the comments made by Ms. Balkcom and Mr. Maxwell. He added there is a great amount of environmental stewardship in the project and will be voting in favor of the project.

Mr. Barkley also had no objections to the application but commented that each application is reviewed on a case by case basis; this particular property is new construction and the Applicant is installing the solar panels on an outbuilding. His point being that this does not mean that all solar projects will be approved this easily.

Ms. Carron noted that Mr. Brem hit upon all the information she was looking for. She pointed out the Secretary of the Interior lists several standards to the use of solar technology. She asserted that the Applicant has met all of the Interior's Standards.

Ms. Calise inquired if any trees will be removed to accommodate the solar panels. Mr. Brem explained the staff report includes a picture showing two mature trees along the south property line; one of the trees has since been removed while there is one remaining and will not affect the panel system.

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

Ms. Carron made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by Andrew Brem.

- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 11 Reynolds Street.
- 3) The building is a noncontributing structure as it was built in 2012.
- 4) The building does not 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 buildings.

Motion by Ms. Carron to approve the application at 11 Reynolds Street for installation of solar panels on the south side of the detached garage. This is consistent with Commission Standard #4 and 5.

Seconded by Mr. McGeorge.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

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

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.

The Commissioners commented this particular application should be used as the “Gold Standard” for all applications. Ms. Balkcom noted it appears the

Applicant has submitted all updates and modifications since the conceptual hearing last month.

Mr. McGeorge recalled the project being very complete last month. He asked the Applicant to point out any changes since the conceptual submission.

Mr. Travis Lescarbeau of Abcore Restoration represented the property owners, Andrew and Cara Roos. He explained the PVC trim has been changed to Western Red Cedar and they originally considered HardiPlanks but decided to use wood on everything and use Western Cedar siding as well.

Mr. Maxwell stated the materials list looks great.

Mr. Barkley commented the building is very unique and is excited to see the final project.

With no further questions, Ms. Balkcom asked for a motion.

Ms. Calise made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by Travis Lescarbeau for Andrew and Cara Roos.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 40 Division Street.
- 3) The building is a contributing structure; it is representative of a c. 1785 Federal style building.
- 4) The building does contribute to the historic and architectural significance of the district.
- 5) The work proposed by the applicant would repair and not affect the character defining elements of the existing buildings.

Motion by Ms. Calise to approve the application at 40 Division Street for demolition of the rear ell and rear addition as the later rear ell has a deteriorating foundation and framing issues and is not structurally sufficient for a new addition. This is consistent with Commission Standard #4, 5 and 9.

Seconded by Ms. Carron.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

**4. Joe Yammine of Yamdon Properties, LLC  
5 Church Street & 155 Main Street; Map 85 AP 1 Lot 222  
Roof replacement & siding replacement (5 Church St.) – FINAL  
Blanket Window Replacement (155 Main St.) – FINAL  
Alterations to First Floor Front Façade (155 Main St.) -  
CONCEPTUAL**

Ms. Balkcom stated Commission Standards 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, and 8 apply to this application. *Standard 1* states original materials and architectural features shall be maintained or repaired whenever possible, rather than replaced. *Standard 2* states if existing materials have deteriorated beyond repair, the new materials shall match the original in composition, design, texture, and other visual qualities. *Standard 3* states replacement of missing architectural features shall be based on researched knowledge of their original appearance, substantiated by historical photographs, drawings, or other evidence. *Standard 4* states that all proposals for additions and architectural changes shall be appropriate to the original design of the building or to later changes which have historic significance of their own. *Standard 7* explains exterior siding must be appropriate for the building to which it is applied. Vinyl and other modern composition sidings which may damage historic buildings are not appropriate and shall not be approved. 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.

Mr. Joe Yammine of Yamdon Properties, LLC represented the application.

Ms. Balkcom said that essentially the request to replace the asphalt roof and siding replacement can be considered replacement in kind. Mr. Yammine confirmed the siding will be wood clapboard siding.

Mr. Maxwell inquired as to whether there were any cornerboards underneath the asphalt siding. Mr. Yammine said everything was stripped, he will keep the window casings the same and replacing just the rotted pieces as he is trying to keep the project as simple as possible.

Mr. Barkley commented that the pictures that Ms. Hitchen took and sent to the Commission are astounding. Ms. Balkcom agreed and noted that she had no idea prior to reading the staff report that the original house had been moved back from Main Street by 40 feet which is why the front door faces the rear of Normans Restaurant in the fashion that it does.

Mr. Yammine commented that speaking of that door he wants to close it up because the steps are so high making it very unsafe to access. Ms. Hitchen pointed out that a modification like that will require HDC approval upon a future application since it was not requested on the application being reviewed this evening.

Mr. Maxwell asked for any details regarding trim, corner boards, water table, etc. Mr. Yammine said he plans to use 1x6 corner boards which is what was there.

Mr. Barkley was interested to know what is behind the “fish scale.” Mr. Yammine noted it was wood siding.

Moving on to the request to replace the existing windows at 155 Main Street with the Anderson 400 Series, Ms. Balkcom said she did not necessarily have any objections to the request.

Mr. McGeorge also did not take issue to the request as long as the window is a 2/1 double hung to match the existing and he would only approve for the second floor and south side, not the front façade.

Ms. Hitchen inquired as to why the Building Official asked the property owner to have a structural analysis done on 155 Main Street. Mr. Yammine said it was due to a fire that happened inside the building and there will be a report issued soon.

Ms. Hitchen questioned whether the windows that are in the 5 Church Street property were installed prior to the Applicant purchasing the property. Mr. Yammine confirmed he did not install the windows. Ms. Hitchen pointed out that there are two remaining original windows at 5 Church Street and questioned the future plans regarding those windows. Mr. Yammine said he plans to remove the windows and match the windows with the rest of the house, which are vinyl.

The HDC put the Applicant on notice about taking out original windows without first asking for HDC permission at a future meeting.

Ms. Hitchen asked the Applicant to explain the roof material for 155 Main Street. Mr. Yammine explained that it is EPM, hot tar. Ms. Carron noted if the Applicant plans to replace the roof at 155 Main Street using a rubber roof, hot tar, EPM material that would be considered replacement in kind.

Ms. Calise pointed out there is a unique looking skylight on 155 Main Street and queried the Applicant's intent of the existing skylight. Mr. Yammine said he plans to eliminate it since it is leaking and was the source of the fire; there is a hallway under the skylight now.

Again, Ms. Carron noted the skylight is not part of this evening's application therefore a future application will have to be submitted requesting to remove the skylight. Mr. McGeorge highly recommended not removing the skylight in the meantime. He would like to see details and specifications for membrane or treatment itself, a gutter system and proposed wood trim around the entire perimeter of the skylight as well as a proposed demolition or repair plan; repair being the preferable option.

Mr. Yammine felt as though the skylight had no character and is not visible unless in the building behind it. Mr. Maxwell disagreed noting that it can be seen walking down the street and from abutting structures.

In order to prepare the Applicant for future meetings, Ms. Drury explained that in order to remove the skylight the Applicant must submit a comprehensive application showing the costs to repair versus replacing in kind or the Commission will most likely not approve it without showing the necessary work.

With regard to altering the front first floor façade Mr. McGeorge said he was 100 percent amenable to restoring larger openings but suggested more research be done on historic storefronts and possibly finding an old photo of the building – large plate glass windows would be appropriate but not those that would go all the way to the ground while adding doors into the fenestration.

Mr. Maxwell questioned the Applicant's thought process with the change to the front façade. Mr. Yammine said he would like to have a new door installed that

faces Church Street but he has already looked at Main Street Coffee and LaMasseria for inspiration.

All of the HDC members were open to the idea of modifying the store front as it will be more welcoming and they believe the prior owner had modified it at some point.

With no further questions, Ms. Balkcom asked for a motion.

Mr. Maxwell made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by Joe Yammine of Yamdon Properties, LLC.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 155 Main Street and 5 Church Street.
- 3) The buildings are contributing structures; 155 Main Street is representative of a c. 1925 early-Twentieth century commercial building while 5 Church Street is representative of a c.1771 Georgian Colonial building.
- 4) The buildings do contribute to the historic and architectural significance of the district.
- 5) The work proposed by the applicant at 5 Church Street would improve the character defining elements of the building, particularly the siding; the work proposed by the Applicant at 155 Main Street would be an improvement to the existing building.

Motion by Mr. Maxwell to approve the application at 5 Church Street to replace the asphalt roof in kind, remove the asphalt siding and replace the underlying wood clapboard with wood clapboard. Additionally the existing windows at 155 Main Street can all be replaced with Anderson 400 Series windows with the exception of the first floor front façade. Additional information is needed on the existing skylight before the roof can be replaced at 155 Main Street. This is consistent with Standards #1, 2, 3, 4, 7, and 8.

Seconded by Mr. McGeorge.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

**5. Paul Vespia of Hill & Harbor Design & Build  
11 Duke Street; Map 85 AP 1 Lot 33  
Blanket Window Replacement – FINAL**

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.

Mr. Paul Vespia represented the owners, Cara Vera and Jen Padilla.

Ms. Balkcom requested clarification as to whether the Applicant wanted to use full divided light or simulated divided light windows. Mr. Vespia said the windows will have the exterior and interior muntin with spacer bar in the middle.

Ms. Balkcom applauded the Applicant on the renovation work at the subject property; the before and after pictures are amazing.

Mr. Vespia explained that he attempted to restore some of the windows when he started renovating the home last year but the tenant had trouble opening the windows and some of the windows were cracked. He recently sold the house and the new owners have a small child so for safety issues they preferred to have new windows.

Mr. McGeorge asked about the color of the interior jamb. Mr. Vespia said the interior jamb liner is gray and fairly close in color to exterior.

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

Ms. Carron made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by Paul Vespia for Cara Vera and Jennifer Padilla.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 11 Duke Street.
- 3) The building is a contributing structure; it is representative of a c.1889 late 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 buildings.

Motion by Ms. Carron to approve the application at 11 Duke Street blanket window replacement. This is consistent with Commission Standard #8.

Seconded by Mr. McGeorge.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

**6. Aaron and Jennifer Rannenberg  
44 Mawney Street; Map 85 AP 2 Lot 177  
Second story Addition, Remove & Replace Side Porch, Replace  
Doors, and Repair/Replace Siding - CONCEPTUAL**

Ms. Balkcom noted Commission Standards 1, 2, 4, 5, and 7 apply to this application. *Standard 1* states original materials and architectural features shall be maintained or repaired whenever possible, rather than replaced. *Standard 2* states if existing materials have deteriorated beyond repair, the new materials shall match the original in composition, design, texture, and other visual qualities. *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 5* states new construction includes substantial additions or modifications to the exterior of the existing building. 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 7* explains exterior siding must be appropriate for the building to which it is applied. Vinyl and other modern composition sidings which may damage historic buildings are not appropriate and shall not be approved.

Mr. Aaron Rannenberg and Ms. Rannenberg, property owners, represented the application. Mr. Rannenberg explained the current setup of the second floor, noting there are three bedrooms except that that the third bedroom is essentially

a closet and he is essentially looking to add additional square footage to the second floor. He added there is also an existing bathroom that is extremely small and would not pass any building code requirements which also needs to be expanded upon. Mr. Rannenberg noted the home had a rear addition built in the 1970s which has a flat roof and is where the new addition will be added; the intent is to not touch the original portion of the structure but construct a master bedroom above the later addition and reconfigure the upstairs pointing out that the front of the house will not change in appearance. Mr. Rannenberg explained the project to be a modest addition to the back of the house noting that the request also entails replacing the existing side porch as it was constructed without footings and has resulted in rot and needs to be rebuilt which will be done in kind.

Mr. Eric Costantino, contractor, affirmed that the rebuilt porch will be used with wood materials and will be rebuilt to look as close to the existing as possible.

Mr. McGeorge questioned the ceiling height of the original house. Mr. Costantino said the ceiling height is very low which is why the new addition roof line is higher but thought there could be a way to adjust slightly. Mr. McGeorge suggested that the new addition should not over power the original home and recommended pulling back the addition by 8"-12" which would make a big difference aesthetically.

Mr. Maxwell inquired about the window schematics. Mr. Rannenberg noted one existing rear window will be lost due to the addition but new windows are included in the new addition; windows on the first floor will remain and are not affected.

Mr. Barkley commented the left elevation of the new addition is blank and was curious to know why. Ms. Rannenberg commented that she wanted several options of where to place the bed but is open to suggestions.

Mr. Maxwell pointed out there is 15' of space to work with which is ample room for windows on each side of a bed; having a blank wall on a new addition appears odd does not sit well with him and adding some sort of fenestration will help.

Mr. Costantino said he was trying to keep the cost down as much as possible; adding windows, particularly divided light windows, will add money to the project. Mr. McGeorge asserted new windows do not have to match the existing and could potentially be a 1/1 double hung as to not create fake history since the windows will be located in the new addition. Mr. Barkley suggested adding either a transom window style or awning windows, smaller windows than double hung windows but will still allow light into the room.

With no other comments the Commission felt the Applicant did not necessarily have to obtain an architect to make suggested modifications since the project was fairly small and changes were minor in scale.

**7. Brian and Karen Kortz**  
**24 Liberty Street; Map 75 AP 3 Lot 90**  
**Replacement of five (5) Windows – FINAL**

(Mr. McGeorge recused himself from the application.)

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.

Mr. Brian Kortz, property owner, represented the application. He explained he is planning a kitchen renovation and will include the replacement of five existing windows which all have a 6/6 grille configuration. All five windows are not original to the house; two of which are vinyl windows.

The Commission members and Applicant discussed the window configurations in the house – second floor windows have a 6/6 configuration while the first floor windows are a 2/1 configuration except for the five kitchen windows which have a 6/6 configuration. Mr. Kortz added the second floor windows are also vinyl which he does plan on replacing any time soon.

Mr. Kortz asserted that his thought process was to use a 2/1 configuration to match the other first floor windows.

Ms. Hitchen commented the historic survey notes there is a 6/6 sash throughout the house which is an older pattern. Atty. Teitz commented that maybe the porch was enclosed at one point making the first and second floor windows have different configurations.

Mr. Maxwell said he was leaning towards a 2/1 window then after reviewing the rear elevation there will be 6/6 windows on the second floor above 2/1 windows on the same plane. Mr. Kortz confirmed all the first floor windows are 2/1 except for the five kitchen windows.

Ms. Carron agreed to change the 6/6 windows to 2/1 in order to stay consistent with the first floor windows. Mr. Maxwell agreed that was a logical point and the requested window is a big improvement in quality over the existing windows.

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 Brian and Karen Kortz.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 24 Liberty Street.
- 3) The structure in question is a contributing structure; it is c.1840 Greek Revival 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 Ms. Carron to approve the application at 24 Liberty Street for five kitchen window replacements. This is consistent with Commission Standards #8.

Mr. Maxwell added that the Applicant intends to use either the Anderson 400 Series or Pella 450 ProLine Series double hung windows. The grilles will be a true divided light, meaning an interior and exterior applied grille with spacer bar between the glass. He finds that either window is an acceptable window to use.

Seconded by Mr. Maxwell.

VOTE: 6 – 0.

**8. 620 Main Street Associates, LLC  
15 Castle Street; Map 85 AP 1 Lot 118  
New Construction of Five (5) Buildings (9 Total Residential Units)  
– FINAL**

Ms. Balkcom stated Commission Standard # 5 applies to this application. Standards 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. David Iannuccilli and Mr. Ian Manire of Union Studio, represented the application. Also present was Mr. Joseph Palumbo.

The Commission asked the Applicant to explain anything that has changed since the conceptual review. Mr. Iannuccilli stated the house was demolished in December 2017, there is now a clean site and is ready to be developed. The project consists of five buildings, four duplexes and one individual unit with each unit being roughly 1,200 square feet in size. Each unit will consist of two beds and two bathrooms and will be of a cottage style but will be larger than the Cottages on Greene project and will be spaced out more with more common area.

Mr. Manire noted the biggest change to the project since the HDC last reviewed it is the building in the lower left corner, being “Building E” which was reoriented to accommodate all parking on site. He added the plan is remarkably faithful to what was reviewed over one year ago. He pointed out the building footprints have changed slightly mostly in terms of the structure getting bigger and the porch getting smaller but everything else has simply been refined and coordination work has taken place among different disciplines. Mr. Manire felt the spirit and character is very much in line with the historic neighborhood. He

referred the HDC to the third sheet in submitted packet which is an elevation drawing that lists a materials list. (Marked as Exhibit A.)

Mr. Maxwell asked if the large maple tree was able to be saved. Mr. Manire said the large maple tree smack in the middle of the site would be in the common area and Building C so it will not be saved.

Mr. Manire said the priority and emphasis for the project has been massing, character, detailing, profiles while being simple reflecting the context is generally very simple then wanting the ability to build whatever proves the most durable.

Mr. McGeorge felt the project was well conceived, the scale was great and well-articulated. He said that considering the project is new construction and modern materials are being requested he felt the materials are being used in a responsible way which is a big difference between other applications and the subject application.

Mr. Maxwell asked the Applicant to review the material list. Mr. Iannuccilli said at this point they will use either wood clapboard or Hardi siding and there will be a variation with vertical siding. Mr. Manire noted that composite board and batten products are very effective in terms of giving the appearance of authenticity. Mr. Iannuccilli said he prefers to use Hardi but it is also very costly.

Mr. Paulmbo asserted that they are at the point where they are costing the materials out – he would like the option of Hardi or wood clapboard as well as the trim work, noting it could be Hardi trim or a high end wood trim.

Mr. Maxweel said wood is always an acceptable material but in this case he would accept Hardi products due to it being new construction. Mr. McGeorge agreed with Mr. Maxwell as long as the Hardi used was not the embossed side.

Mr. Manire acknowledged that the Hardi wood textured side would not be used.

Mr. Barkley suggested the Boral siding as an alternative to Hardi since it is tapered. (Mr. Manire was familiar with the Boral product and was not opposed to using it.)

Mr. Manire said the proposed window is the Harvey Tribute simulated divided lite (SDL) all vinyl window with a small muntin profile; a high performance window with a high color range. He felt as though the Harvey Tribute window is a nicer window than the windows installed at Cottage on Greene.

Ms. Balkcom did not have objections to using the Harvey Tribute considering it is new construction. Mr. McGeorge agreed noting it is new construction, location, overall product is good and it is not being installed in a historic home.

Regarding the gutter system the HDC felt as though either option was satisfactory, being a half round gutter system in dark bronze or square option.

Mr. Manire noted the doors will be a Smooth-Star Therma-Tru and will be painted. He added the only material not to be painted include the cedar shakes which is intended to read as a natural material. Furthermore the fiberglass columns will be simple square columns and not be tapered.

Ms. Hitchen inquired with the Commission if they had a material preference for the siding. Mr. McGeorge said he preferred the Boral tapered product. Mr. Maxwell noted he was okay with the use of any of the three products as was Ms. Balkcom considering it is new construction. Mr. Barkely pointed out the Cottages on Greene has Hardi products; he would like to see Boral or real wood used over a Hardi product in his opinion.

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 620 Main Street Associates, LLC.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 15 Castle Street.
- 3) The property in question is new construction and is contributing due to its detailing and character. The project is representative of a cottage style development.
- 4) The buildings will contribute even though they are new construction due to the massing, texture, details which will be an improvement 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 site or the neighborhood.

Motion by Mr. Maxwell to approve the application at 15 Castle Street for the new construction of five (5) buildings (9 total residential units). This is consistent with Commission Standards #5.

Seconded by Mr. McGeorge.

VOTE: 7 – 0.

**9. Jeffrey Butler**  
**319 Main Street; Map 85 AP 1 Lot 194**  
**Alterations to First Floor Front Facade, Blanket Window**  
**Replacement, Remove & Replace Entire Roof Structure and**  
**Repair/Replace in Kind – FINAL**

(Mr. Maxwell recused himself from the application.)

Ms. Balkcom stated Commission Standards 4, 5 and 8 apply to the application. *Standard 4* states all proposals for 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* includes substantial additions or modifications to the exterior of the building which states 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.

Mr. Jeffrey Butler, property owner represented the application along with Mr. Thomas Lonardo, architect for the project.

Mr. Butler explained many portions of the project are in kind replacement – in terms of materials there is an existing dormer that has a rubber roof and will have asphalt shingles when complete.

Regarding the new windows Mr. Butler requested blanket approval for Anderson 400 Series 2/2 double hung sash – he noted although the front of the building has a 2/2 dhs the side and rear windows have a hodge podge of 6/6 and 1/1 windows and would like consistency throughout. Mr. McGeorge did not have any objection with the window request. As for the shed dormer modification, Mr. McGeorge thought the alteration was fine and was not a foreign type of revision to a structure of this stature. He also believed raising the roof a minimum 3/12 pitch is a technical requirement that will not negatively impact the overall mass of the structure and thought the steeper pitch is an improvement and more elegant solution.

Ms. Hitchen pointed out the Applicant would like to use clapboard siding while requesting to use PVC trim. Mr. McGeorge said the trim material will have to be changed and suggested using Boral since it is not PVC or Azak and it is not real wood either.

Mr. Lonardo suggested using Koma which none of the Commission members had heard of before. Mr. McGeorge had issues with using PVC material since it is not stable enough and weakens at the nail joints and is essentially a substandard material on a Main Street building. He recommended if the Applicant is going to install cedar siding then take the extra step and install cedar trim (for corner boards, water table, window trim, etc.). Mr. Butler had no objections to use cedar wood trim.

Mr. McGeorge said the only real portion of the project that stands out is the portico and door on the front commercial façade portion of the building. He and Mr. Barkley suggested the portico should be more of a bracketed shed roof, or a shallow hip roof instead of a gable roof.

Mr. Lonardo explained the reason for a gable roof portico was to divert water at the entrance and give it a distinguished entrance. Mr. Barkley thought it had a very residential look to it and it should look more commercial since it is on the first floor. As for the doors Mr. McGeorge recommended the entrance for the

residential units as well as the commercial units have consistent doors and all doors be the same.

Mr. McGeorge was of the opinion that the project met all the standards and will be a great building when complete.

Ms. Calise inquired as to whether the chimneys will be removed. Mr. Butler said one chimney has already been removed and the other is planned to be removed as it has been abandoned for years. Mr. McGeorge did not have any objection to removing the chimney as long as it was not connected to a functioning fireplace.

In summary Mr. McGeorge felt the storefront entrances look appropriate in the elevations but just need some additional details. Mr. Lonardo opined the storefront material will most likely be a composite material due to salt tolerance and can withstand the elements longer than wood. Mr. Barkley agreed with that statement.

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 Jeffrey Butler of Benter, LLC.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 319 Main Street.
- 3) The structure in question is a contributing structure; it is c.1880 early Republican Mixed-Use building.
- 4) The building does contribute to the historic and architectural significance of the district.
- 5) The work proposed by the applicant would improve the character defining elements of the existing building.

Motion by Ms. Carron to approve the application at 319 Main Street for the application as submitted with the exception of the storefront portion/ground floor entrances on Main Street and portico (windows, doors, paneling as HDC needs further details regarding materials, dimensions, etc). This is consistent with Commission Standards #4, 5, and 8.

Seconded by Mr. McGeorge

VOTE: 6 – 0.

(Mr. Maxwell returned to the dais.)

### **Historic District Commission Business**

1. Minutes: Review and approval of the May 9, 2018 Meeting Minutes.

Motion by Ms. Calise to approve the May 9, 2018 minutes as written. Seconded by Mr. Maxwell. Approved 7 – 0.

2. Election of Officers

- a. Chair

Mr. McGeorge nominated Ms. Carron for Chair due to great attendance record and knowledge of the standards and regulations.

Seconded by Mr. Barkley.

VOTE: 7-0.

- b. Vice-Chair

Mr. Maxwell nominated Mr. McGeorge for Vice-Chair.

Seconded by Ms. Carron.

VOTE: 7-0.

3. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS/OTHER: Commission members are invited to comment on any observations they have made within the District, ask questions about past approvals, request updates on violations, etc.

Atty. Teitz informed the Commission he will be putting on a Conducting Effective Land Use Reviews training workshop on June 18<sup>th</sup> and invited the Commission to attend – the workshop will be held at 175 Main Street, Pawtucket at 5:30-9pm.

Atty. Teitz updated the Commission with regards to the 16 Somerset Street door; essentially it is still pending, the Applicant has 120 days to install the door that the HDC approved and the Registry of Court is holding \$3500 until case is complete.

### **Adjourn**

Motion to adjourn by Mr. McGeorge. Seconded by Mr. Barkley. Adjourn at 8:50 p.m.

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

Lea Anthony Hitchen, Assistant Town Planner