

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MINUTES
September 12, 2018 Meeting
Town Council Chambers - 6:00 PM HDC meeting

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

Absent: Andrew Barkley.

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

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

Ms. Carron read the procedures into the record as follows: Each person addressing the Commission will state his/her name for the record. Although the Commission does not generally swear in applicants or their representatives, all witnesses are responsible for providing the HDC with true, accurate, and complete information. The applicant or the applicant's representative shall present the request before the Commission along with arguments and material in support of the application. HDC members will then have the opportunity to discuss the proposal and ask questions which are pertinent to the application. All other persons wishing to speak in favor of or against the application will then be asked to do so. All speakers are asked to avoid repetitive comments and confine their comments to those which are relevant to the application at hand. Cross examination by the general public may be allowed only if the Commission feels it would be appropriate and useful. All questions from the floor will be directed through the Chair only. After all of the relevant facts have been heard, the Chair will call for a motion. Once the motion has been made and seconded, the HDC only will discuss the motion followed by the Chair's call for a vote. Only active members of the Commission shall vote. The alternate will sit as an active member with full voting rights only when a regular member is unable to serve at any meeting. During the

discussion among voting members, no further testimony from the floor will be accepted unless specifically requested by a Board member. Every effort will be made to render a decision this evening. The minutes of this meeting will be on file in the Planning Department within 14 days. Certificates of Appropriateness granted this evening will be available in the Planning Department within two (2) days of this hearing. The hearing of any HDC application which has not yet started before 10:30 p.m. will not be heard this evening and a special hearing date will be scheduled. This rule, however, may be waived by a majority vote of the Commission. All decisions of the HDC are final and legally binding under the authority of Article XI of the East Greenwich Zoning Ordinance and Article 45, Section 24.1 of the RIGL. All decisions of this Commission may be appealed to the Zoning Board of Review.

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

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

Historic District Commission Hearings

**1. East Greenwich Yacht Club
10 Water Street; Map 85 AP 1 Lot 1
Complete Demolition of the Chapman Cottage - Conceptual**

(Ms. Carron recused herself from this application and left the dais.)

As the acting-chair, Mr. McGeorge read into the record that an application has been submitted by the East Greenwich Yacht Club requesting to completely demolish the Chapman Cottage located at 10 Water Street. He questioned if there was any new testimony that has not been heard at the prior six demolition requests. He further asked counsel if there are grounds to make a motion to dismiss the application since the Commission has already established on the record that demolition of the Chapman Cottage would not be supported.

Atty. Teitz noted there is a rule where if an application is denied it cannot come before the Commission for one year - this was not the case in this circumstance since it was not actually denied but it was determined in May the Board agreed to move the cottage instead of demolishing it. Atty. Teitz recommended the Commission hear from the Applicant if there have been any change in circumstances.

Mr. Jason Dittelman, Commodore of the East Greenwich Yacht Club, represented the application. He thanked the Commission for allowing the demolition of the Steward's building and the ability to move the Chapman building to the northern edge of the property. He also appreciated Staff's help with the zoning variance; however after permission was received from the HDC the EGYC delved into the costs of moving the building and putting it onto a foundation - the sobering truth is it will cost about \$85,000 to move a 20'x20' building that in the Yacht Club's belief is not a historic building - it was an office, he did not see where it was historic and requested the HDC please reconsider.

Atty. Teitz queried if Mr. Dittelman had documentation regarding the \$85,000. Mr. Dittelman said he did not have it with him but he could forward the estimates. Ms. Hitchen asked to breakdown the \$85,000.

Mr. Dittelman said it will cost between \$34,000-\$35,000 to pick up and move the building to a foundation and do nothing with it which is what the Commission and Club agreed to then deal with it later but it does not really help because it is still not being demolished by neglect - it is going to rot in a different spot. He added that to properly restore the building the right way and make it look beautiful (put on a new roof, new windows, basically everything) repairs came in at \$50,000 - that was the sobering point where we decided to go back to the HDC and plead our case. Mr. Dittelman said the EGYC is spending a lot of money on the waterfront, we feel we are being good stewards in East Greenwich - we want to maintain a very large portion of the waterfront, we are good stewards to the Fire Department and everyone. He went on to say he just did not see where the Commission cannot see it in your hearts to look at this building for what it is.

Ms. Calise said what it is is historic; it is an established historic building and is over 80 years old at a minimum.

Mr. Dittelman questioned it that makes it valuable. He simply calls it an old building.

Atty. Teitz pointed out this is why the Commission had people from RIHPHC come to review the structure last time and determine its condition. The point is there was a determination by outside experts. He was more concerned about the procedure at this point. Atty. Teitz was confident there was no way the Board can move forward this evening based on not submitting any new evidence; the Applicant does not have people present who provided the estimates to present testimony. He was of the opinion it is up to the Board whether it should wait a year from May 2018 or continue the hearing to next month.

Mr. McGeorge commented that based on the record and because this application has been before the Commission numerous times and we have already been through all the procedural issues with multiple hearings, investigations, testimony from architects, from RIHPHC staff - if we were to wait to hear additional testimony or evidence to support the demolition, in his opinion it would simply be going through the motions and ultimately be voted down.

Atty. Teitz suggested to the Commission making a determination that the HDC's action in May was the equivalent of a denial of the demolition and therefore the Applicant will have to wait a year before they can come back for another application.

Mr. Dittelman the EGYC has been trying for 10 years, one more year is not going to hurt but he does not understand the Commission's stance. He totally disagrees and the Commission is completely disregarding what the EGYC is doing for the Town.

Ms. Calise pointed out that Mr. Dittelman's statement is not a factor in the decision making process.

Atty. Teitz added that Mr. Dittelman can disagree all he wants by saying it is not a historic building while he can say all day long that it is a historic building - that does not matter. What matters is there is argument with expertise which includes members of the community, outside experts including RIHPHC staff which made the determination. He added if the EGYC wants to challenge that you need to present evidence; this Board cannot see fit in their heart to do a favor to the Yacht Club. This Board must apply the Secretary of Interior Standards for Historic Preservation & Restoration to the application before them. If you want them to change it you have to provide argument with expert witness/evidence that they can rely on to change their mind. It doesn't matter if you run a yacht club or a homeless shelter - the Commission has to apply the same standards. Atty. Teitz went on to say you have to provide evidence that is different from previous applications over the last 10 years.

Mr. Dittelman appreciated the comments and for the sake of argument he will call the building "historic," however the cost to rehab this is catastrophically high that it becomes a situation that forces him as Commodore of the Yacht Club to come back and request a demolition again; no disrespect. Mr. Dittelman reassured the Commission he did not realize it was going to cost upwards of \$85,000 to move and restore a 20'x20' building. He questioned at what point does it become a very serious factor in an HDC decision. It may be historic but the kind of money the Yacht Club is basically being forced to...we can

move it for \$34,000, not rehab it and stick it in a corner but where are we? He asked if the Town is any better off.

Atty. Teitz asked if any other parties have been contacted about moving the building off site in the last four months. Mr. Dittelman claimed the Yacht Club had talked to about five different people. Atty. Teitz again asked who the Yacht Club has talked to recently.

Mr. Dittelman explained the Yacht Club spent a tremendous amount of time with the Town trying to get Jim Cullen (Town Harbormaster) to take the building over as a harbormaster office which he thought was going to be the best plan in the whole world and it would be repurposed - the Harbormaster would have an office and it would be a win win situation. Mr. Dittelman believed the Town decided that the idea was not economically feasible just like the Yacht Club not finding the idea feasible.

Ms. Hitchen interjected stating that was not completely true. She said the Town wants to incorporate the idea of turning the building into a harbormaster office into our waterfront plan which is temporarily on hold. She reminded those present that the Town Council, Ms. Cienki, members of the Yacht Club, Planning Board and Cove Commission all thought it was a fantastic idea but the plan is on hold for now until the Council defines the waterfront plan's scope - the Town realizes it may be expensive but there has never been a definitive no to the idea.

Mr. Dittelman was getting the impression the HDC was going to deny his request but he wants to do it right or not at all. He suggested that if the HDC says the Yacht Club has to spend \$34,000 to move the cottage and put it in the corner it will essentially rot and the club simply does not have the funds.

Mr. McGeorge commented the Yacht Club agreed to do just that, now the club is reneging on a negotiated compromised decision.

Mr. Dittelman stated he was returning to the Commission because he did not realize it was going to cost an additional \$50,000. He added that every member of the Board has seen and been through the

building; it is in such disrepair and he is surprised it is still standing. In Mr. Dittelman's own opinion the building needs everything replaced, even the foundation is cracked. He thought it was questionable as to whether it could be moved although he has seen plenty of TV shows where lighthouses are moved so he assumed a 20'x20' building can be moved. Mr. Dittelman added that nothing good is going to come out of this; it is rotting in the middle of our parking lot or it will be rotting in the corner because the Yacht Club does not have the funds. He pointed out there will be major renovations to the Yacht Club and a seawall needs to be replaced that will cost \$1million - this is money the club does not have and will have to borrow.

Ms. Drury acknowledged that the difference is that if the cottage is moved it will not be destroyed so that down the line if the funds are there to rehab it or if someone else takes over the land it hasn't destroyed history.

Mr. Dittelman appreciated the comments but the fact however was nobody was going to buy the property because the Yacht Club is owned by 400 members and is not for sale; it will be owned by the EGYC forever.

Mr. McGeorge asked for clarification as to whether financial hardship can be discussed.

Atty. Teitz said financial hardship is not part of the conversation. Mr. Dittelman financial hardship is a huge part of the conversation to him. Atty. Teitz understood that but it is not part of the preservation law equation that would apply as well as the fact that none of that is before the Commission now because it is hearsay testimony, including the discussion about the Town. He reminded the Applicant that their job is to prepare their case and meet the burden of proof which requires submitting evidence and documents and presenting the information as well as bringing the appropriate people to testify. It is not enough to come to a meeting and say 'we are good people let us do it.' Atty. Teitz added the HDC is a quasi-judicial body.

Atty. Teitz was inclined to recommend the May action was the equivalent of a denial. The EGYC has the option to leave the cottage

where it is or move it; there is always time between now and next spring when items can be added to the capital budget; the Town's budget cycle and perhaps something can be done collaboratively. He suggested that if the Applicant returns next May they return with timelines, a detailed list indicating who they spoke with and at what time and regarding what. Atty. Teitz recommended the Applicant has to be able to convince the Commission that efforts were made because that is what the law requires - that there is no other alternative including a willing buyer to get the property before demolition can be allowed. It is spelled out in the guidelines as well as in the staff report.

Mr. Dittelman opined that the EGYC has advertised the building. Atty. Teitz asked when. Mr. Dittelman said he did not have the records with him but it was about 6-8 months ago and was listed on Craigslist for a period of time. He assured the Commission that he has aggressively been trying to deal with the cottage since he has been commodore for the last three years.

Again, Atty. Teitz reminded the Applicant that those are the things he should be submitting for the record; an actual printout of the Craigslist advertisement.

Mr. Dittelman inquired if the hearing can simply be continued in order for him to obtain the advertisement.

Ms. Calise pointed out the submitted application is one page and essentially says nothing; zero effort was put into the application.

Mr. McGeorge asserted the record speaks for itself - the Commission has a lot of data to not support this evening's application. Procedurally speaking he is inclined to make a motion that the May hearing was the equivalent finding of a denial and the same application cannot be submitted again until May 2019. Ms. Drury supported the motion.

Ms. Hitchen confirmed it was May 9, 2018 the HDC approved the relocation of the Chapman Cottage while it was at the June meeting the HDC approved the demolition of the Steward's building.

Mr. Dittelman thought it was unfair that the Board would make him wait a year just because he did not bring some estimates to the meeting.

Mr. McGeorge said it is not a matter of fairness - it is a legal and procedural issue and the Commission cannot ignore the laws that we have all sworn to uphold. He added that it is not a personal issue either but the Commission is trying to do our job which many of us have been doing for years. He pointed out in this particular case the Commission worked together with the Yacht Club to get a compromise that everybody was happy with at the time and now that is being completely ignored and turned on its head which we cannot abide by.

Motion by Mr. McGeorge that the application cannot be submitted again until on or after May 9, 2019. Seconded by Ms. Calise.

The motion is based on the following findings: There has been no additional testimony, evidence or testimony what so ever that counters all of the information that has been submitted and put into the record to date including the RIHPHC correspondence and the decision on May 9, 2018 was the equivalent of a denial of the application to demolish which originally had been filed.

VOTE: 5 - 0.

Mr. Dittelman queried if there was an appeal process. Atty. Teitz noted there is an appeal process with the Zoning Board sitting as the Board of Appeals. Ms. Hitchen will be able to assist with any of that filing.

2. Kate Jackson
44 Brayton; Map 85 AP 1 Lot 280
Window Replacement - FINAL
(Continued from the August 8, 2018 meeting)

Ms. Carron stated Commission Standard #8 applies to the application. 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 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.

Ms. Kate Jackson, property owner, represented the application. She explained that her application requests to install the Anderson 200 Series windows but is now modifying the application and requesting to use the Anderson 400 Series which is a better window system and has the true divided light which the 200 Series does not provide. Furthermore she noted her intent is to have a black exterior which the 400 Series allows.

Mr. Maxwell was enthused with the windows being changed to the 400 Series and questioned the window alterations to the south side of the structure. Ms. Jackson explained the reasoning is purely to get more light into the house - that portion of the home is a later addition and her plan is to renovate the inside to make it a kitchen and eating area for additional south light to shine into the home. The windows will be mulled together and the sill and head heights will match. Mr. Maxwell asserted that he would typically ask for additional documentation but this request is pretty clear and a simple project. Mr. McGeorge agreed noting the change to the 400 Series is great and the alteration to the south side of the home is a later addition of the house and has no objections to the application.

Ms. Jackson also pointed out that the original window configuration was 2/2 and that is the pattern she will be installing.

With no further questions from the Board Ms. Carron asked for a motion.

Ms. D'Amato made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by Kate Jackson.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 44 Brayton Street.

- 3) The property in question is a contributing structure; it is representative of a c. 1902 late-Victorian structure.
- 4) The building does contribute to the historic and architectural significance of the district.
- 5) The work proposed by the applicant would repair and improve the character defining elements of the existing buildings.

Motion by Ms. D'Amato to approve the application at 44 Brayton Street window replacement and south side window modification. This is consistent with Commission Standards #8.

Seconded by Mr. McGeorge

VOTE: 6 - 0.

3. Jeffrey Lynch
68 Friendship Street; Map 75 AP 2 Lot 214
Addition of Covered Front Porch - Conceptual

Ms. Carron stated the following Commission standards apply to the application, those being #4 and 5. 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 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.

The Commission queried as to why the application notes "final" approval while the staff report indicates "conceptual" approval. Ms. Hitchen explained Mr. Lynch's proposed project requires a dimensional variance as the front porch extends into the front setback. She acknowledged the submission is extremely detailed and worthy of being a "final" plan versus a "conceptual" plan.

Mr. McGeorge agreed noting he was willing to possibly approve the application for final contingent upon zoning approval. Ms. Hitchen asserted that procedurally when zoning relief is required the HDC can bless the application but it typically has to return to the HDC for final after zoning approval but from her perspective it is a well-conceived, well developed and detailed plan. Mr. McGeorge agreed.

Mr. Lynch commented that the intent was to add a well-proportioned front porch, not monstrous but just enough which he thought a 6'x17' porch was the perfect sized addition. He explained the new porch will be constructed entirely with pressure treated lumber No.1/No.2 southern yellow pine while the decking will be a 1'x6' composite material. The guardrails will have a 36" height from the deck surface and the balusters are to be 2"x2" and spaced at 5" on center. There will be new concrete stairs with a stone veneer applied on all exposed faces. Additionally, the porch roof will have a 3:12 pitch while the new front portico will have a 5:12 pitch roof. The roofs will have asphalt shingles to match that on the existing house and cedar shingles will be applied and painted to match accordingly.

Mr. McGeorge asserted that the addition is compatible and is perfectly fine. He added that in this particular case the Commission has all the information on the materials and details than half of the applications we receive for final plan approvals. He would consider the application to be complete and the Applicant does not have to submit anything additional for the final plan.

**4. Gaspee Real Estate Partners
50 Main Street; Map 85 AP 1 Lot 54
Replace 27 Windows, Replace 3 Existing Doors, Replace Fire
Escape, and Replace Awnings - FINAL**

Ms. Carron stated Commission Standards 1, 2, 4 and 8 shall apply. 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 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 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.

The application was represented by Christopher Needham and Stephen Hardy of Gaspee Real Estate Partners. Mr. John Mills was also present representing Venture Window Company. Mr. Hardy explained he and his partner Mr. Needham recently purchased the property about a month ago and have thoroughly gone through it to determine what needs to be replaced; first and foremost the windows need replacement as most were replaced 25 years ago with inappropriate white vinyl windows. Mr. Hardy noted the intent is to have a new restaurant on the first floor with their own office and other office space on the second floor and they also want the building to be as presentable as possible. He has researched the history about the building as they want to bring it back to what it was as humanly as possible. As for work to be performed on the building Mr. Hardy noted he would like to replace the windows with a 2/2 window configuration and will need to do some CMU repair on the back portion of the building where there is a walk-in freezer/cooler on the first floor (this is in the vicinity where previously located windows have been boarded up) and they plan to install new CMU and properly block up the window openings. The only issue that has not fully been resolved at this point is the fire escape as they would like to make that more of a primary egress and are in the process of looking for a cost effective way.

Mr. Mills explained the proposed windows are from Trim Line Industries and are used in various RI historic districts. The window is wood material with an aluminum clad exterior and will have a black colored exterior as well. The grid pattern will be a simulated divided

light composition with a grid on the exterior, spacer bar between the glass and permanent fixed wood grid on the interior of the window.

Mr. Maxwell was impressed with the proposed window and thought it was a tremendous upgrade. He inquired if the window will also be installed with the same configuration for the masonry section of the building.

Mr. Mills said that is open for discussion; the only requirement the Applicant desired was to have operable windows. He asserted the Applicant is proposing a 2/2 grid pattern on the front and side elevations and did not have a reason to do something different to the rear located windows but the HDC preferred something different that is up for discussion.

Mr. Maxwell inquired if the windows could be designed to have a 6/3 pattern to recreate the existing 9-lite fixed window. Mr. McGeorge was in favor of the 2/2 patter for the street elevation.

Mr. Mills reminded the Commission that the scale in the rear is quite large and the existing windows are fixed (do not open); the proposed windows are a double hung style. Mr. McGeorge asked if a casement window could be an option. Mr. Mills said anything beyond a double hung window is more expensive and he wants the project to remain cost effective for Gaspee.

Mr. Maxwell thought the overall project request is so strong and will enhance the building that he was inclined to grant the 2/2 window pattern.

Mr. McGeorge agreed noting if the building were a significant industrial style building then he would have preferred to see a different style proposed but because it is not significant in that regard he is willing to approve the 2/2 grid pattern.

Mr. Maxwell stated that the 2/2 configuration is a good compromise and it is also functional for the owner. Mr. McGeorge suggested a universal blanket approval for the windows.

Moving on to door replacement, Mr. Mills explained there is a request to replace three existing doors being the front entry door as well as a side door and rear located door. **The front façade door is currently a black modern paneled with etched glass door.** The proposed front door is a wood grain ponderosa pine door with a $\frac{3}{4}$ lite sash door with a 12 lite over 1 panel design. The side and rear doors also need replacement due to deterioration. The rear located door will be a Pioneer heavy duty steel door with a half glass lite while the side door will have two vision panels. Mr. Mills compared the new front door to be very similar to the existing Besos front door in that it will be wood.

Ms. Calise noted the front door submission is very similar to what Staff provided as being the original front door and is more in the spirit of the building; she had no objections to the proposed front door.

Ms. Carron asked about the changes to the exterior stairwell. Mr. Hardy explained this portion of the renovation is still unclear at this point but it will definitely be used as a primary entry, not as a fire escape per se. He would also like to have it covered.

Mr. McGeorge suggested continuing the staircase portion of the application as more information is needed before a decision can be made and for the Applicant to research the most cost effective option.

Ms. Carron pointed out the application also includes new awnings. Ms. Hitchen said as long as there is no text/graphics on the awnings can be approved administratively.

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

Mr. Maxwell made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by Gaspee Real Estate Partners.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 50 Main Street.

- 3) The building is a contributing structure; 50 Main Street is representative of a c. 1925 early Twentieth century, Colonial Revival building while the rear portion of the building is a later addition being non-contributing.
- 4) The building does contribute to the historic and architectural **significance of the district, particularly in the front façade.**
- 5) The work proposed by the applicant would improve the character defining elements of the building given the fact the deteriorated vinyl windows will be replaced with a better quality window and an existing inappropriate front door will be replaced with a better quality and more appropriate style door.

Motion by Mr. Maxwell to approve the application at 50 Main Street as noted above. This is consistent with Standards #1, 2, 4, and 8. The exterior staircase/fire escape is to be continued for further discussion.

Seconded by Mr. McGeorge.

VOTE: 6 - 0.

**5. Becky Berman for Justyn & Greer Charon
34 Liberty Street; Map 75 AP 3 Lot 89
Removal of Center Chimney - FINAL (Submission based upon
Zoning Violation)**

Ms. Carron informed the Commission and the public that Ms. Berman has requested the application be continued to the following meeting.

Ms. Carron motioned to approve the application be continued to the October 10th HDC meeting. Seconded by Ms. Calise. VOTE: 6 - 0.

**6. Sage Goodwin
70 Kenyon Avenue; Map 84 AP 2 Lot 69
Demolition of Well House - FINAL (Submission based upon
Zoning Violation)
Demolition of Greenhouse - FINAL**

Ms. Carron recused herself from the application.

Mr. McGeorge stated Commission Standards 1, 2, and 9 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 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.

Ms. Sage Goodwin of 70 Kenyon Avenue, property owner, represented the application. She realized the black and white photos she submitted of the well do not clearly show the detailed artesian design of it so she suggested she submit color photos from her cellphone.

Ms. Drury confirmed that public safety was not currently an issue. Ms. Goodwin explained the well is closed with a large rock on top of it.

Mr. McGeorge asserted that based on the staff report and submitted evidence he does not have any objection to the removal of the wellhouse since it is certainly not original. Ms. Goodwin asserted the former owner, Mr. Richard Friend constructed it. Additionally she submitted a picture in the application of the home and landscape with the former wellhouse before the hurricane of 1938 blew a tree over into the home, proving that the wellhouse that was removed was a later replacement.

Mr. Maxwell stated that he also had no problem with the wellhouse being removed. Mr. McGeorge noted that in this particular case it was a later ancillary structure that does not have a tremendous amount of significance of its own whereas the primary building does; it does not affect the character of the property as a whole in his opinion. He thought the plexiglass cover was a compelling idea and would consider it an art piece. Mr. McGeorge added that the architectural value of an

old traditional well provided it is engineered, certified, properly permitted and safe is compelling and tells a story of its own.

Ms. Goodwin agreed adding the stone that is around the perimeter of the well has the ability to be drilled into which is where the glass/plexiglass would be bolted into. Mr. McGeorge commented that by celebrating it as a well makes more sense than just putting a “band-aid” over it. Mr. Maxwell pointed out that this type of project is very reversible and a structure can always be constructed.

Mr. McGeorge felt strongly that the actual well is a historical structure in itself; someone built it and hand laid the stone in the well, it is not just a hole in the ground. Preserving evidence of the well is more important than the superficial wellhouse that was added much later.

Considering the applicant is technically requesting to demolish an already removed structure, Mr. McGeorge commented that procedurally a demolition requires two hearings and the Commission will therefore first need to determine if the application is complete and whether the structure is contributing.

Ms. Drury added there is also a request to remove the greenhouse. Mr. McGeorge stated that based on the photographic evidence and testimony provided paint a clear picture that the wellhouse which has since been removed was not a contributing structure nor was it original.

Moving on to the request to remove the already demolished greenhouse, Ms. Drury got the impression from reading the staff report the greenhouse was also added by former owner Richard Friend. Ms. Goodwin confirmed the greenhouse was built by a Friend relative.

Mr. McGeorge felt that if the greenhouse had been a well-crafted significant conservatory of some kind it would have been a different story. Based on the pictures (Ms. Goodwin’s phone pictures) it looks like a premanufactured aluminum shed that is barely a structure at this point according to Mr. McGeorge.

Mr. Maxwell agreed noting he also interpreted the greenhouse to be a modern structure. Mr. McGeorge stated that the greenhouse was neither a contributing structure to the district, Town or nation. Unfortunately it has already been demolished but in order to follow procedure it will still require a second public hearing. He finds it to be a noncontributing structure, would allow it to be demolished and suggests continuing it to the 2nd hearing and finds the application complete.

Atty. Teitz suggested the Applicant submit the greenhouse pictures to Ms. Hitchen.

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

Ms. Drury made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by Sage Goodwin.
- 2) The property in question is an outlying property, located just outside of the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 70 Kenyon Avenue.
- 3) The HDC finds the submitted application complete.
- 4) The HDC finds both the wellhouse and greenhouse to be noncontributing structures to the district, Town and nation.
- 5) Finds the application appropriate to move to a second public hearing.

Motion by Ms. Drury to continue to a second public hearing. Seconded by Ms. Calise. VOTE 5 - 0.

7. ACC Holdings, LLC
111 Main Street; Map 85 AP 1 Lot 229
Window Replacement - FINAL (Submission based upon
Zoning Violation)

Ms. Carron stated Commission Standard 8 applies to the application. 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 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.

Ms. Arlette Cornwall, owner of the property, represented the application. She explained that unfortunately she was before the Commission because she replaced windows without prior approval. The older vinyl windows were replaced with new vinyl Pella 250 Series windows. She added that most of the windows have already been replaced and there are 9 more windows remaining that she is requesting to have replaced. Ms. Cornwall again asked to use the 2/2 configuration architectural style in keeping with the building. She seeks permission to continue the work and asks for forgiveness for doing the subject work without permission.

Ms. Drury queried if the existing windows are vinyl and will be replaced with a vinyl product. Ms. Cornwall confirmed that is the situation.

Ms. Carron felt essentially the request is a replacement in kind if it is a vinyl for vinyl material.

Mr. Maxwell commented that considering 111 Main Street and the carriage House (5 Court House Lane) are on the same parcel which the HDC granted approval to use the same window last month he did not have any objection to use the Pella 250 Series window in order for all the windows to match given the circumstances. He asked if the first floor commercial unit windows will get replaced or just the residential unit windows. Ms. Cornwall stated only the residential unit windows are to be replaced.

Mr. Maxwell asserted although the replacement is a vinyl window it is a better quality vinyl window than the former window unit.

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

Ms. Calise made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by ACC Holdings, LLC (Arlette Cornwall).
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 111 Main Street.
- 3) The building is a contributing structure; it is representative of a c.1875 late-Victorian, Second Empire 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 functionality of the building.

Motion by Ms. Calise to approve the application at 111 Main Street for window replacement. This is consistent with Standard #8..

Seconded by Mr. McGeorge.

VOTE: 6 - 0.

Historic District Commission Business

1. Minutes: Review and approval of the August 8, 2018 Meeting Minutes.

Minutes were continued to the following month.

2. 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.

Discussion about holding a joint workshop with the Bristol Historic District Commission. Ms. Drury offered to host the workshop at her office in Providence.

Commissioners asked if work being done at 108 Spring Street required HDC approval. Staff said work is replacement in kind.

A Commissioner noticed a front door had been replaced on Prospect Street; he would send Staff a picture.

The Commission and Staff discussed preparing and sending out a “welcome letter” to new residents upon purchase of a home in the district.

Adjourn

Motion to adjourn by Mr. McGeorge. Seconded by Ms. Drury. Adjourn at 7:40 p.m.

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

Lea Anthony Hitchen, Assistant Town Planner