

**HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MINUTES**  
**February 10, 2016 Meeting**  
**Town Council Chambers – 6:00 PM HDC meeting**

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

Absent: Erinn Calise.

Staff: Lea Anthony Hitchen, Assistant Town Planner.

---

Ms. Dianne Potter, Deputy Town Clerk, jointly administered oaths to HDC members Kim Balkcom, Matthew McGeorge, Andrew Barkley, and Lauren Drury.

Ms. Kim 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. Raymond Keough (LCM Realty, LLC)  
34 Rocky Hollow Road; Map 75 A.P. 3 Lot 299  
Minor Modification, Replace Windows & Doors, Fencing, Siding,  
and Replace in Kind – FINAL**

Ms. Balkcom read the applicable standards into the record, being commission standards 2, 4, 7, and 8. *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 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* states 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. *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.

The HDC members reviewed what they approved at last month's conceptual hearing that being reopen the back porch, replace the windows, remove the asbestos siding throughout and replace with clapboards and shake shingles and replace the doors.

Mr. Raymond Keough, owner of the property, represented the application. When questioned about the type of railings will be on the front porch, Mr. Keough noted existing the cross railings will most likely be removed; although the plan indicates ballusters will be installed the porch is low enough where he technically does not have to install anything and will most likely take that route.

Mr. Barkley does not recall the criss-cross railing pattern being a unique feature.

Mr. McGeorge stated he does not have any issues with the application at all as it will be a significant improvement to the structure.

Mr. Keough questioned if the center chimney is a historical component of the home since he would like to have it removed.

Mr. Barkley recommended leaving the masonry part of the chimney on the exterior of the house up from the roof while framing within the attic for support while removing the remainder of the interior chimney to gain interior space. The

Commission did not take issue if the Applicant had to use new brick for the chimney.

Mr. Maxwell commented that he would like to see the chimney retained that is located off of the kitchen.

Ms. Hitchen queried if the owner had a land survey performed on the property. Mr. Keough asserted that a survey had not been done but noted it is a big property for the size of the house. He added that he has not figured out the landscaping yet but considering the house is about 1700 s.f. in size, it has to be on an attractive lot; he has to make sure the landscaping is superior to resell the property.

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 Raymond Keough.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 34 Rocky Hollow Road.
- 3) The structure in question is a contributing building; it is representative of a c. 1890 late-Victorian, Italianate structure.
- 4) The building does contribute to the historic and architectural significance of the district.
- 5) The work proposed by the applicant would replace and improve but not affect the character defining elements of the existing building.

Motion by Mr. Barkley to approve the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 34 Rocky Hollow Road to replace windows and doors, strip the asbestos siding, replace/repair underlying siding, retain chimney above the roof and retain chimney located off of the kitchen. This is consistent with Commission Standard #2, 4, 7, and 8.

Seconded by Mr. McGeorge.

No discussion on the motion.

VOTE: 6 – 0.

**2. David J. Molusis**

**77 Greene Street; Map 75 A.P. 3 Lot 2**

**New Construction, Addition, Minor Modification, Replace in Kind -  
CONCEPTUAL**

Ms. Balkcom confirmed this particular application is a conceptual review as it requires zoning approval. The applicable commission standards that apply are 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.

Ms. Hitchen noted there is no window replacement involved with this application.

As a conceptual review Mr. McGeorge stated he did not have any issues with the application considering it is a very comprehensive and detailed plan. He thought the plan was an overall improvement, proportionately scaled and looks great.

Mr. Maxwell agreed, noting the project is scaled well with the neighborhood and to the lot and the front porch renovation is a significant improvement.

Mr. Molusis commented that his goal, along with his architect, was to keep the addition and the new garage in line with the rest of the neighborhood. He noted the house is rundown and there are many materials, such as the molding, that need to be replaced.

Mr. McGeorge advised that there was really nothing left to the imagination as the plans were so detailed and he really thought the gable detail on the garage complemented the structure nicely.

The HDC approved the plan conceptually, noting the Applicant would have to return for final plan approval after receiving the necessary dimensional variances from the Zoning Board.

**3. Jeff Lynch & Janelle Byrnes**  
**68 Friendship Street; Map 75 A.P. 2 Lot 214**  
**Addition, Replace Windows - FINAL**

Ms. Balkcom read the applicable standards into the record, being #4, 5, and 8. *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. *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. Lynch, owner and applicant, represented the application. He explained that the request is to construct a 16'x24' 1-story addition to the existing home which will include a master bedroom and bathroom.

Mr. McGeorge indicated the project is very straight forward although most people would assume a garage has been converted to a master bedroom. He added the subject building is not the most contributing structure and is scaled just the way it should be as it has grown in a natural progression.

Mr. Barkley complemented the Applicant, noted he has done a nice job enhancing the house as it is much nicer than it was. He questioned why a house that is noncontributing to the neighborhood, has zero points for architectural

value, yet has four commission standards that it must adhere to. Ms. Balkcom asserted that the structure is located within a protected district and the building will eventually become historic; it is not just about the property itself, having everyone abide by these standards is extremely important.

Mr. Lynch was most concerned about the replacement windows as he wanted to replace the wood windows with simulated divided lights. Since his house was not “historical” he would be more than willing to replace the windows with a more appropriate window.

Mr. Maxwell asserted that even though the home does not have a huge historical impact the windows are the most important feature of the home. Ms. Carron added that if those windows were removed and simulated divided lights were installed there would be no dimension or profile and the home would have less character and architectural significance than before.

The Commission and Applicant went into further discussion about the importance of a full divided light versus a simulated divided light. The Commission persuaded the Applicant that considering he did not have many windows to replace, the Anderson 400 Series full divided light, would be a better option and fair compromise.

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 Jeff Lynch and Janelle Byrnes.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 68 Friendship Street.
- 3) The structure in question is a noncontributing building; it is representative of a c. 1950 mid-Twentieth century ranch structure.
- 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 building.

Motion by Mr. McGeorge to approve the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 68 Friendship Street to replace windows and construct addition. This is consistent with Commission Standard #4, 5, and 8 and conditionally on the windows being true divided lights.

Seconded by Mr. Barkley.

No discussion on the motion.

VOTE: 6 – 0.

### **Historic District Commission Business**

1. MINUTES: Action on the minutes of the October 14, 2015 and January 13, 2016.

Motion by Mr. McGeorge to approve the October 14, 2015 minutes as written. Seconded by Ms. Balkcom. Approved. 5 – 0.

Motion by Mr. McGeorge to approve the January 13, 2016 minutes as written. Seconded by Mr. Barkley. Approved 4 – 0.

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.

Ms. Hitchen questioned if the Commission had any issues with Mr. Allen Gammons, property owner of 74 London Street, who had originally requested to use wood balusters as railing material to change it to cable rail. The Commission had no issues with the material change.

Ms. Hitchen queried the Commission about historical cornerboards at 45 Prospect Street. The Commission thought the boards would be flat boards, less than 8”.

Motion to adjourn by Mr. Maxwell. Seconded by Ms. Carron. Adjourn at 7:10 p.m.

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

Lea Anthony Hitchen, Assistant Town Planner