

**HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MINUTES**  
**February 11, 2015 Meeting**  
**Town Council Chambers – 6:00 PM HDC meeting**

Present: Kim Balkcom, Chair; Matthew McGeorge, Vice-Chair (arrived at 6:25 pm), Kingston Fallon, Kristen Carron and Lauren Drury.

Absent: Erinn Calise and Andrew Barkley.

Staff: Lea Anthony Hitchen, Assistant Town Planner.

---

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

Ms. Balkcom read the procedures into the record as follows: Each person addressing the Commission will state his/her name for the record. Although the Commission does not generally swear in applicants or their representatives, all witnesses are responsible for providing the HDC with true, accurate, and complete information. The applicant or the applicant's representative shall present the request before the Commission along with arguments and material in support of the application. HDC members will then have the opportunity to discuss the proposal and ask questions which are pertinent to the application. All other persons wishing to speak in favor of or against the application will then be asked to do so. All speakers are asked to avoid repetitive comments and confine their comments to those which are relevant to the application at hand. Cross examination by the general public may be allowed only if the Commission feels it would be appropriate and useful. All questions from the floor will be directed through the Chair only. After all of the relevant facts have been heard, the Chair will call for a motion. Once the motion has been made and seconded, the HDC only will discuss the motion followed by the Chair's call for a vote. Only active members of the Commission shall vote. The alternate will sit as an active member with full voting rights only when a regular member is unable to serve at any meeting. During the discussion among voting members, no further testimony from the floor will be accepted unless specifically requested by a Board member. Every effort will be made to render a decision this evening. The minutes of this meeting will be on file in the Planning Department within 14 days. Certificates of Appropriateness granted this evening will be available in the Planning Department within two (2) days of this hearing. The hearing of any

HDC application which has not yet started before 10:30 p.m. will not be heard this evening and a special hearing date will be scheduled. This rule, however, may be waived by a majority vote of the Commission. All decisions of the HDC are final and legally binding under the authority of Article XI of the East Greenwich Zoning Ordinance and Article 45, Section 24.1 of the RIGL. All decisions of this Commission may be appealed to the Zoning Board of Review.

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

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

#### Historic District Commission Hearings

- 1. First Baptist Church of East Greenwich  
30 Peirce Street; Map 85 A.P. 1 Lot 232  
Signage – FINAL**

Ms. Balkcom stated that Commission Standard number 5 applies to this application as signage is a type of new construction; 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.

Ms. Mary Karn and Ms. Heidi Toppel, members of the church, represented the application. They explained the signs are being improved upon on the Church House only, not the actual Church. The first change includes the contrast of the existing letters on the sign on the outside wall of the Church House which will be painted black. Secondly, there will be a small projecting sign to read "Church Office" on the Montrose Street side located next to the entry door to the lower level of the Church House where the office is located. Third, Ms. Toppel explained the Church would like to remove the black marquis sign at the corner of Montrose and Peirce Streets and install banner flags which will be changed seasonally. Finally, they would like to use a sandwich board sign on the day of an event on Main Street.

Ms. Hitchen reminded the Commission they do not have purview over sandwich board signs but read the definition into the record: Any double-sided portable sign designed as an "A" or "T" frame, typically hinged or joined at one or more points. One such sign shall be permitted per business and shall be located so as to provide a public passage of a minimum of 3 feet on any public right-of-way. Each face of the double-sided sign shall not exceed 6 square feet in area. No driveways, doorways, walkways or handicap ramps may be blocked by the sign. Sandwich board signs shall not be attached to any public structure or street furniture.

Other than some minor questions for clarification the Commissioners did not have any objections about the application.

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

Mr. Fallon made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by First Baptist Church of East Greenwich.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District.
- 3) The structure in question is a noncontributing building; it is representative of a c. 1955 modern structure.
- 4) The building does not 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 Mr. Fallon to approve the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 30 Peirce Street for signage. This is consistent with Commission Standard #5.

Seconded by Ms. Drury.

VOTE: 4 - 0.

**2. 564 Main Street, LLC**  
**564 Main Street; Map 75 A.P. 3 Lot 112**  
**Minor Modification – FINAL**

Ms. Balkcom stated Commission Standard 4 applies to the application which states all architectural changes shall be appropriate to the original design of the building or to later changes which have historic significance of their own.

Mr. Michael Kent represented the application. He explained the building does not have a basement and storage is limited and is looking to extend the existing metal walk-in cooler by an additional 8' to 14'x16' in size (length would stay the same, depth would double). He commented the rear of the building looks awful; he plans on adding cedar shingles to the rear of the building as well to match the other elevations (he anticipated just painting the back elevation).

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

Ms. Carron made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by 564 Main Street, LLC (Michael Kent).
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District.
- 3) The structure in question is a noncontributing building; it is representative of a c. 1970 commercial structure.
- 4) The building does not contribute to the historic and architectural significance of the district.

- 5) The work proposed by the applicant does not affect the character defining elements of the existing building.

Motion by Ms. Carron to approve the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 564 Main Street for a minor modification (increase size of rear located cooler). This is consistent with Commission Standard #4.

Seconded by Mr. Fallon.

VOTE: 4 - 0.

**3. Joshua & Jill Brumberger  
38 Peirce Street; Map 85 A.P. 1 Lot 233  
Window Replacements – FINAL**

Ms. Balkcom read Commission Standard #8 into the record which applies to the 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. Joshua Malinowski, contractor for the homeowner, represented the application.

For clarification purposes, Ms. Hitchen explained the prior owner, Cecelia Hallahan, received prior approval for new windows for the basement windows only – this application requests new windows for the entire first and second floor.

Mr. Malinowski commented the company that was used for the basement windows has since gone out of business (Bonneville). He noted the proposed window is a Harvey Majesty, simulated divided lite, wood interior and aluminum clad exterior, to be used in 16 window openings. Mr. Malinowski added the homeowner will use a cream color to match the existing colors.

Mr. McGeorge commented his original thought was not to approve the window due to the importance of the house and the prior homeowner had gone through

a lot of hard work to restore the structure. He did not realize the basement windows had been replaced.

Mr. Fallon asked what type of window is in the existing opening. Mr. Malinowski said the original windows are currently there but they are totally inoperable; he claimed the windows to be nailed shut and only three windows to be operational.

When asked if the prior owner had requested approval to use the Bonneville window for the entire house, Ms. Hitchen noted Ms. Hallahan had requested the Bonneville window be used only in the basement windows. The Commissioners were pretty sure Ms. Hallahan never would have replaced original windows.

Mr. McGeorge commented that he would rather see the Harvey Majesty installed than a storm window even though it does not necessarily meet the standard.

Ms. Carron asked about the grill configuration. Mr. Malinowski stated it will be a 2/1 configuration and will match the existing 5/8" muntins as close as possible.

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

Mr. Fallon made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by Joshua and Jill Brumberger.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District.
- 3) The structure in question is a contributing building; it is representative of a c. 1865 late Greek Revival structure.
- 4) The building does contribute to the historic and architectural significance of the district.
- 5) The work proposed by the applicant does not affect the character defining elements of the existing building.

Motion by Mr. Fallon to approve the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 38 Peirce Street for window replacement on the first and second floors. The Harvey Majesty windows are approved conditional on

interior and exterior spacer bar and grille muntin to be 5/8” as submitted by the Applicant. This is consistent with Commission Standard #8.

Seconded by Mr. McGeorge.

VOTE: 5 - 0.

**Historic District Commission Business**

- 1) MINUTES: Action on the minutes of the November 12, 2014, December 10, 2014 and January 14, 2015 meetings.

Minutes tabled to March meeting.

Motion to adjourn by Mr. Fallon. Seconded by Mr. McGeorge. Adjourn at 7:45 p.m.

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

Lea Anthony Hitchen, Assistant Town Planner