

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MINUTES
November 18, 2015 Meeting
Town Council Chambers – 6:00 PM HDC meeting

Present: Kim Balkcom, Chair; Matthew McGeorge, Vice-Chair, Gregory Maxwell, Kristen Carron, Andrew Barkley and Lauren Drury.

Absent: Erinn Calise.

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. Paul & Judith Cullinane
13 Prospect Street; Map 85 A.P. 2 Lot 201
Replace Windows & Minor Alteration – FINAL**

Ms. Balkcom read the applicable standard into the record, being commission number 4 and 8. *Standard 4* states that all proposals architectural changes shall be appropriate to the original design of the building or to later changes which have historic significance of their own. *Standard 8* states original window sashes can usually be repaired and retained. In the event that a window sash must be replaced the replacement shall match the original in size, operation, materials,

configuration, number of lights, muntin width and profile. Window manufacturers today offer a wide variety of factory made windows appropriate for installation in historic buildings. Storm windows of appropriate design are also available and should be installed to be as unobtrusive as possible.

Mr. Paul Cullinane, property owner and Mr. David Rignanese, of DLR Dimensions, Inc., represented the application. Mr. Cullinane explained he would like to remove the rear (east) double hung window and replace with an Anderson gliding door, the remainder of any opening will be filled with clapboard. On the north side an existing casement window (located in the kitchen area) will be replaced with like casement window and an existing door will be completely removed and filled in with clapboard. On the south side (along the driveway) the Applicant would like to replace three existing breezeway windows and one bathroom window which were added during a renovation project prior to him purchasing the house.

Mr. Rignanese noted the stairs to the basement which will be removed altogether will be reconfigured to another interior location in the home.

Considering the casement already exists the Commission would allow that particular window to be replaced in kind.

Mr. Barkley suggested trimming the casement window like the other existing double hung windows.

When questioned by Mr. Rignanese the HDCs preference with regard to a rear French door or gliding door the members noted either one is fine but a gliding door would accommodate more room which is what the homeowner desired and it is located on a later addition to the house. As for the door configuration the HDC noted the divisions are not necessary.

Ms. Drury questioned the date of construction for the rear of the home. Mr. Cullinane said that based on his research the home was originally constructed in the early 1900s while the back section which currently contains the kitchen and bath was added in the 1940s/1950s therefore being a later addition. Ms. Hitchen passed out pictures of what the home used to look like prior the 1980s home renovation.

Mr. Cullinane asserted the windows installed in the 1980s are not energy efficient and that area of the home gets very drafty during the winter.

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

Mr. Barkley made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by Paul & Judith Cullinane.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 13 Prospect Street.
- 3) The structure in question is a contributing building; it is representative of a c. 1900 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 not affect the character defining elements of the existing building.

Motion by Mr. Barkley to approve the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 13 Prospect Street as submitted subject to providing exterior casing around kitchen casement window. This is consistent with Commission Standard #4 & 8.

Seconded by Mr. McGeorge.

No discussion on the motion.

VOTE: 6 – 0.

2. Robin Barrett Wilson
175 Main Street; Map 85 A.P. 1 Lot 219
Signage – FINAL

Ms. Balkcom read the applicable standard into the record, being commission number 5. Signage is a type of new construction and thus must comply with Commission Standard Number 5. It states that such work must be compatible with the surrounding buildings in size, scale, materials and siting, as well as with the general character of the historic district.

Ms. Robin Barrett Wilson, owner of Robin B. Clothier, explained she is requesting approval to install a double sided hanging sign to be hung on the existing black iron bracket outside the southerly storefront doorway. The sign measures 36"x18" and is 3/4" PVC panel with raised PVC graphics. She noted it is a unique design, being white, blue and gray coloring; much understated and will meet the 8' clearance to the ground.

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

Mr. McGeorge made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by Robin Barrett Wilson.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 175 Main Street.
- 3) The structure in question is a contributing building; it is representative of a c.1893 late Victorian mixed use building.
- 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. McGeorge to approve the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 175 Main Street for new signage. This is consistent with Commission Standards #5.

Seconded by Ms. Carron.

VOTE: 6 - 0.

**3. Paul DiSegna
68 Cliff Street; Map 75 A.P. 3 Lot 39
Replace Windows & Doors, Minor Modifications, Fencing &
Roofing – FINAL**

Mr. McGeorge recused himself from the application as he is the architect for the project.

Ms. Balkcom read the applicable standards into the record, those being Commission Standards 4 and 8. *Standard 4* states that all proposals 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.

Mr. Paul DiSegna, property owner, and Mr. Matthew McGeorge, architect for the project, represented the application. Mr. McGeorge realized there was most likely zoning relief that would need to be obtained which would require this to be a conceptual hearing but wanted to make this application as final as possible and see if he could obtain a Certificate of Appropriateness this evening.

Mr. DiSegna and Mr. McGeorge explained that the intent is to restore the dilapidated apartment building and convert the interior to a mixed use with commercial/leasable space on the first floor with an apartment on the second floor (which already exists). The plan is to replace the existing 2/2 double hung windows with Anderson 400 Series windows and the existing front door unit will be replaced with a Jeld-wen 5201 wood glass panel door.

Mr. DiSegna asserted that the previous owner had started replacing the original windows with replacement windows therefore some of the original windows have been removed from the property. Mr. McGeorge added that the hope is to enclose the back porch which will need new windows anyway. Mr. DiSegna confirmed the replacement windows will be replaced with better quality Anderson 400 Series windows. He also noted he has worked with restoration contractors to restore the original windows but his only concern is the original windows are single paned but he would have to add storm windows.

Mr. McGeorge acknowledged the existing front door is extremely inappropriate and needs to be changed. Additionally he noted the project calls to remove the existing failing rear back porch in its entirety while salvaging the decorative brackets for re-use in the new layout. The majority of the porch space will be converted to interior space while retaining a smaller back porch to be used as an

entrance to the second floor apartment. New cedar clapboard siding will be used and corner boards, water table and all fascia and trim profiles will be added to the enclosed rear area to match the existing. The new stairs will be rebuilt in kind and ipe wood material will be used for the back decking and stair treads with solid painted risers to match trim. All posts, handrails and balusters will be building code compliant.

Mr. McGeorge advised that other minor project changes include the removal of the central chimney as it is not historically significant to the building (the roof will be patched as required for a monolithic appearance). Mr. Barkley questioned the internal chimney and whether it should be removed. Mr. McGeorge commented that in his opinion if the chimney were connected to a significantly important fireplace then it should be kept but in this case it is not the situation and is no longer functional. Mr. Barkley agreed. Mr. McGeorge suggested that if anyone thought otherwise he could keep the chimney from the roof up. Mr. Maxwell thought the structure looked odd without the chimney. Mr. Barkley added that keeping the chimney from roof up is simply money and time.

Mr. Maxwell concluded his presentation by noting the existing bulkhead will be replaced and the cable dish will be removed. The building will also be prepped and repainted.

Mr. Maxwell thought the new windows would be a huge improvement to the property.

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 Paul DiSegna.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, being located at 68 Cliff Street.
- 3) The structure in question is a contributing building; it is representative of a c.1885 late Victorian.
- 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 Ms. Carron to approve the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 68 Cliff Street for new windows, new door, removal of chimney, rear porch enclosure and new roof. This is consistent with Commission Standards #4 and 8.

Seconded by Mr. Barkley.

VOTE: 5 – 0.

4. Devin Baccari-Fineout
77 Prospect Street; Map 75 A.P. 2 Lot 192
Replace Windows & Door, and Garage Door – FINAL
Architectural Style – c. 1875 early Victorian

Ms. Balkcom read the Commission Standards that apply to the application, those being #4 and 8. *Standard 4* states that all proposals 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.

Ms. Devin Baccari represented the application and stated the only approval she is requesting is to replace the garage door at this time.

Ms. Balkcom commented that the outbuilding is a very funky garage. Mr. Maxwell added that this is where the pigeons used to live.

Ms. Baccari requested to change the pullout detached door to an automatic carriage house style door. She explained she would like the overhead door to have panels with arched windows, similar to those garage doors at 65 Greene Street and 163 Spring Street.

Ms. Hitchen confirmed there is no historic information for the outbuilding when questioned by Ms. Balkcom.

Mr. Barkley commented the garage appears to resemble a prefab shed. Mr. McGeorge added that it has a hoist beam for hay.

Ms. Balkcom questioned whether a vehicle can fit in the outbuilding. Ms. Baccari confirmed the space is great in size and she can fit her car. Ms. Balkcom asked if a regular garage door would fit the opening. Ms. Baccari confirmed the doorway would have to be modified slightly.

Ms. Balkcom commented that she has always had an issue with faux hinges on garage doors as the proposed door has faux hinges. She added that if one of the proposed doors is added to the existing outbuilding her thought is that it would be too much. Ms. Balkcom suggested adding non-arched windows but keeping a square to a simple garage door. Both Mr. McGeorge and Mr. Maxwell agreed.

Mr. McGeorge suggested a square window with no hinges in order to remain simplistic in design.

Ms. Baccari commented she would like to have some hardware, the handles at a minimum.

Ms. Balkcom commented on the alteration to the front porch poles. Ms. Baccari said the change is just temporary as she did not like what the contractor did. Ms. Balkcom reiterated the fact that any exterior change has to be approved by the HDC.

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

Mr. McGeorge made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by Devin Baccari-Fineout.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, being 77 Prospect Street.
- 3) The structure in question is a contributing building; it is representative of a c.1875 early Victorian.

- 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. McGeorge to approve the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 77 Prospect Street for a garage door on the outbuilding. This is consistent with Commission Standard #4. This is conditional upon a rectangular or square light pattern, no faux hinges and handles are permitted.

Seconded by Mr. Barkley.

Mr. McGeorge stated the overall renovation and project is great; the Applicant should be proud of it and the HDC should highlight it and use it in a presentation as what owners should be doing.

VOTE: 6 – 0.

- 5. The Division Group**
1727 Division Road; Map 79 A.P. 12 Lot 86
Complete Demolition– FINAL
Architectural Style: 1789/1851 early Republican/Greek Revival
(PRELIMINARY MEETING)
(Continued from the September 9, 2015 meeting)

Motion by Ms. Drury to continue the hearing to the next scheduled meeting, being December 9, 2015. Seconded by Ms. Carron.

VOTE: 6 – 0.

Historic District Commission Business

1. MINUTES: Action on the minutes of the September 9, 2015 and October 14, 2015.

Motion by Ms. Carron to approve the September 9, 2015 minutes as written. Seconded by Ms. Drury. Approved 5 – 0. Mr. Maxwell commented the minutes were written to perfection!

October minutes were tabled until the next meeting.

2. Tax Credit Approval – 19 King Street

Ms. Balkcom approved and signed the tax credit application submitted for 19 King Street.

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.

Mr. McGeorge commented that the 404 Main Street renovation looks fabulous.

Motion to adjourn by Mr. Maxwell. Seconded by Ms. Drury. Adjourn at 7:30 p.m.

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

Lea Anthony Hitchen, Assistant Town Planner