

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MINUTES

March 9, 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: Aaron Lindo, Planning Assistant.

Ms. Kim Balkcom, Chair of the Commission, started the meeting at 6:05 p.m and introduced the members of the Commission. There were three applications on the night's agenda.

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.

1. Ross DiSegna
74 Cliff Street; Map 75 A.P. 3 Lot 40
Signage, Minor Modifications – FINAL

Before proceeding, Mr. McGeorge recused himself being the architect of the project.

Standards 4, 5, and 8 were applicable to the project. Mr. DiSegna had no additional details for the approval but presented better pictures for the Commission. Comments of approval were unanimous among the Commission.

Mr. DiSegna commented that the signs are made out of metal and is supposed to look rusted. There is a sign in the front and one in the back because it can be seen from Main Street. The back sign is not lit because there is a bright security light that illuminates it. The sign in the front is lit with an LED light strip that will shine down.

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 Ross DiSegna.

- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 74 Cliff Street.
- 3) The structure in question is a noncontributing building; it is representative of a c. 1970 late twentieth century commercial 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 Ms. Carron to approve the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 74 Cliff Street for new signage and final plan approval for minor modifications and window replacement. This is consistent with Commission Standard #4, 5, and 8.

Seconded by Mr. Barkley.

No discussion on the motion.

VOTE: 6 – 0.

2. Catherine Gorham
75 Main Street; Map 85 A.P. 1 Lot 235
Signage – FINAL

Ms. Balkcom stated *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.

After review of the application, there were comments of unanimous approval. In regards to the proposed mural, the HDC does not have purview over what it looks like.

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 Catherine Gorham.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 75 Main Street.

- 3) The structure in question is a contributing building; it is representative of a c. 1870 Victorian, Second Empire style 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 Mr. McGeorge to approve the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 75 Main Street for new signage. This is consistent with Commission Standard #5.

Seconded by Mr. Barkley.

No discussion on the motion.

VOTE: 6 – 0.

3. Daniel Messier
21 Revolution Street; Map 85 A.P. 1 Lot 380
Window Replacement – FINAL

Ms. Balkcom 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.

Mr. Messier, property owner, represented the application. He explained 1st floor approval of the same project was approved in 2005/2006. The same identical windows are to be installed in the 2nd floor.

Mr. McGeorge made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by Daniel Messier.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 21 Revolution Street.
- 3) The structure in question is a contributing building; it is representative of a c.1885 late Victorian Shingle Style home.
- 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. McGeorge to approve the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 21 Revolution for window replacement on the 2nd floor of the home. This is consistent with Commission Standard #8.

Seconded by Ms. Carron.

No discussion on the motion.

VOTE: 6 – 0.

Historic District Commission Business – After Hearings

1. MINUTES: Action on the minutes of the February 10, 2016 meeting.

The minutes from the 2/10/16 meeting were continued until April.

2. Commissioner Comments/Other:

Ms. Carron mentioned that a group in the Hill and Harbor District had formed a Hill and Harbor Neighborhood Association and would like to have discussions with the HDC and DPW about sidewalks.

Meeting adjourned at 6:30