

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MINUTES
April 13, 2016 Meeting
Town Council Chambers – 6:00 PM HDC meeting

Present: Kim Balkcom, Chair (arrived at 7:12 pm); Matthew McGeorge, Vice-Chair, Gregory Maxwell, Erinn Carron (arrived at 6:19 pm), Lauren Drury, and Andrew Barkley.

Absent: Kristen Carron.

Staff: Lea Anthony Hitchen, Assistant Town Planner.

Mr. Matthew McGeorge, Acting-Chair of the Commission, started the meeting at 6:05 p.m.

Mr. McGeorge 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.

Mr. McGeorge 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. Mr. McGeorge explained the sequence for review of applications and its helpfulness to understand how the process works before the Board hears the applications. He 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.

Mr. McGeorge introduced the Board members and Staff present and read the application items into the record.

Historic District Commission Hearings

- 1. Devin Baccari**
77 Prospect Street; Map 75 A.P. 2 Lot 192
Minor Modification, Replace Window, Modification of Final Plan
FINAL & CONCEPTUAL

Ms. Hitchen read the 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, owner of the property, represented the application.

Mr. Maxwell inquired as to whether all the projects were final and/or conceptual projects. Ms. Hitchen explained there are four different projects the Applicant is requesting approval for and she is at different levels of submittal unless she is more prepared to submit additional information at this point.

As far as the window selection is concerned, Ms. Baccari informed the Commission she is not prepared to discuss this evening and will hold off until the fall - she just is looking for ideas.

Starting off with the proposed garage door, Ms. Baccari is requesting a new carriage house style door with handles and hinges in lieu of the traditional door that was approved in November. She was not happy with the style door was approved by the Commission and would prefer the carriage style instead.

Mr. McGeorge and Mr. Maxwell both agreed there are larger issues to contend with on this property and do not have issues with this proposed door. Mr. McGeorge noted specifically with this particular building (being a shed) and under these circumstances he did not have a problem with the carriage style door being installed. Ms. Drury also agreed to allow the carriage style door.

Moving on to item three, the addition of a decorative privacy lattice gate on the left side of garage in order to stow bikes, trash barrels, etc., Mr. Maxwell inquired as to whether that was just lattice. Ms. Baccari confirmed the area is an eyesore and she simply wanted to screen the area.

Mr. McGeorge asked if the lattice can be approved administratively. Ms. Hitchen considered plain lattice to be site work and exempt but fences and gates are eligible for staff review. Since the details were limited on what the Applicant

wanted to do, Ms. Hitchen explained she made the decision to put it forward for a full Commission review.

The Commissioners and Applicant discussed whether the lattice was actually a screen to be on hinges, posts, or to be attached to the garage. The Commissioners all agreed that if the lattice was connected to posts they did not have any issues with it.

A hinged fence panel may look better than a lattice; a hinged lattice is also fine according to Mr. McGeorge. The recommendation was made to approve the lattice conceptually and have the Applicant prepare a plan set drawn by the contractor which then can be refereed. Mr. McGeorge and Mr. Maxwell volunteered to referee the lattice fence screen project.

As for the front window, Ms. Baccari explained the window will not be a bow window; it will be a flat window to fit the same size opening. Mr. McGeorge noted the existing front window is not contributing; he would conceptually approve replacing the front window. Mr. Maxwell added there has to be conditions such as the window has to have muntins inside, outside and a spacer bar – it cannot just be divided between the glass.

Ms. Baccari commented that some of the windows in the house do have the divider between the glass. Mr. Maxwell would like to see a submittal of the exact window that will be replaced.

Mr. McGeorge suggested three equal unit double hung windows. Mr. Maxwell recommended having the proposed unit be drawn into the elevation.

Ms. Baccari decided to withdraw the window portion of the application until she had additional details. In the meantime the Commission conceptually approved the idea of replacing the existing front window.

Moving on to enhancing the flat/shed front porch to a gable roof, adding bulkier square columns and handrails and covering the existing cement front stairs and porch with a wooden overlay and lattice frame. Mr. Maxwell inquired as to who provided the drawings for the front porch. Ms. Baccari excitedly said “Pat” the contractor who does “fabulous work.” The proposal includes building right over the existing material. She had Liberty Cedar provide quotes for the

lumber – dark red moranty for the decking, cedar lattice to be painted, and pine for the trim, railing and stairs.

Mr. Maxwell had a few concerns regarding the porch, noting all the porches in the neighborhood have hipped roofs, as opposed to the proposed gable roof which is a massive improvement to what is there. Ms. Baccari explained she has asbestos siding and wanted to install a hipped roof in front of the entire house but simply cannot afford it.

Mr. McGeorge did not understand why a hipped roof could not be installed in the same spot as the gabled roof. Mr. Barkley asserted the front part comes toward you. He sketched it out for Ms. Baccari so she saw for herself what Mr. Maxwell was talking about. The Commissioners asked the Applicant to take the idea back to “Pat.”

A gable end on porch like this will appear very odd once constructed opined Mr. McGeorge. There is still a pitch on a hipped roof noted Mr. Barkley.

We will need to see an accurate drawing from the contractor and/or architect suggested Mr. Maxwell regarding the new porch.

As for the columns Mr. Maxwell asked if the project includes leaving the metal posts and wrapping them. Ms. Baccari said yes. He also noted that most of the houses of that vintage have brackets. Ms. Baccari said she wanted brackets but was trying to keep it simple.

Mr. Maxwell withdrew his comments regarding the brackets. His biggest concern was the hipped roof.

Mr. McGeorge suggested the Applicant go back to the drawing board and get dimensions, materials, redesign the front porch with a hipped roof and resubmit for the Commission to approve. He added that conceptually Ms. Baccari is well on track to getting approval.

In summary, the lattice fence will be refereed once a plan is submitted to Staff; the window replacement is approved conceptually and the hipped roof and front elevation plan will be re-reviewed once the plan is redesigned.

With no further questions or comments, Mr. McGeorge asked for a motion.

Ms. Calise made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by Devin Baccari.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 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 would not affect the character defining elements of the existing building.

Motion by Ms. Calise to approve the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 77 Prospect St. to replace the existing shed/garage door with a carriage style garage door as submitted. This is consistent with Commission Standard #4.

The garage fence is to be refereed by Mr. McGeorge and Mr. Maxwell. The front window has been conceptually approved. There is to be a hipped roof in lieu of a gable end front porch; this portion has been continued for further shetches/drawings.

Seconded by Mr. Maxwell.

No discussion on the motion.

VOTE: 5 – 0.

2. David J. Molusis
77 Greene Street; Map 75 A.P. 3 Lot 2
New Construction, Addition, Minor Modification, Replace in Kind
FINAL

Ms. Hitchen read into the record the Commission standards that 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.

Mr. David J. Molusis owner of 77 Greene Street represented the application. He explained he received approval from the Zoning Board of Review on March 22nd for the necessary variances including relief for construction within the side yard setbacks and in increase in maximum allowed lot coverage.

He asserted there have been no changes or alterations to the plan since it was reviewed at the conceptual hearing.

Mr. McGeorge complimented the very detailed plan; noting this is the type of plan the HDC should use as an example for future submissions.

With no further questions or comments, Mr. McGeorge asked for a motion.

Mr. Maxwell made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by David Molusis.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 77 Greene Street.
- 3) The structure in question is a contributing building; it is representative of a c. 1929 early Twentieth century/Bungalow style.
- 4) The building does 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. Maxwell to approve the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 77 Greene St. for a rear addition, minor modifications, new garage, and replacement in kind as submitted. This is consistent with Commission Standards #4 and 5.

Seconded by Mr. Barkley.

VOTE: 5 – 0.

3. Raymond Keough
34 Rocky Hollow Road; Map 75 A.P. 3 Lot 299
Modification of Final Plan – FINAL

Ms. Hitchen noted Standard 4 applies to the application. *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.

Mr. Curren Keough, project manager for the property, represented the application.

Ms. Hitchen noted Mr. Raymond Keough, the property owner, had received Final Plan approval a couple of months ago to restore the exterior of the structure. Part of the renovation included reopening the enclosed rear porch. The Applicant has started the interior renovation and found the washer/dryer to be located in the kitchen is too tight and would like to turn the reopened back porch into a mudroom and location for a stackable washer/dryer. Ms. Hitchen included both the original approved plans as well as the new desired proposed plans.

Mr. C. Keough confirmed the area in question was originally going to be a deck, now it will be a mudroom. The original enclosed porch has been demolished completely as it was hodgepodge together.

After some clarifications with the site plan, Mr. Keough noted there will be stairs to grade with a small deck leading to an enclosed mudroom.

With no further questions or comments, Mr. McGeorge asked for a motion.

Ms. Drury 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.
- 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 Ms. Drury to approve the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 34 Rocky Hollow Road for modification of Final Plan (enclose rear porch with small deck, no railing required). This is consistent with Commission Standard #4.

Seconded by Mr. Barkley.

VOTE: 5 – 0.

**4. D & M Metro, Inc.
591 Main Street; Map 75 A.P. 3 Lot 82
Signage – FINAL**

Ms. Hitchen read into the record Standard #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. Dorian Perlorca, owner of D & M Metro, represented the application. She explained she was not aware the building was in the historic district which is why the signs were installed without prior permission. Ms. Perlorca asserted that although she is requesting final plan approval there is some impending construction on the front façade of the Friendship Street and Main Street sides of the building so the signage may change.

Mr. Maxwell asked if the “East Greenwich” part of the sign, located only on the Friendship Street side is to be removed. Both he and Mr. McGeorge found that part of the sign to be weird and odd with a seagull image on it and assumed it was part of a previous sign.

Ms. Hitchen was recently informed by the Building Official of what was formerly the East Greenwich Chamber of Commerce sign, whom had been a tenant at this property at one point. The Chamber had long moved out but left the sign attached to the building; executive directors changed and the new executive director of the chamber was not aware there was a sign at this property until recently. Considering the Chamber of Commerce is no longer there and there is a section of the EG sign ordinance that prohibits signs that advertise any business or service no longer conducted on the premises for more than 90 days, Staff feels that should be removed.

Mr. McGeorge and Mr. Maxwell did not have any issues with the signs and agreed the seagull portion of the E.G. Chamber sign should definitely be removed.

Ms. Hitchen recommended as a condition that the East Greenwich Chamber of Commerce sign definitely be removed and be given back to them in as best condition as possible.

With no further questions or comments, Mr. McGeorge asked for a motion.

Ms. Calise made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by D & M Metro (Dorian Perlorca).
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 591 Main Street.
- 3) The structure in question is a noncontributing building; it is representative of a c. 1950s modern style.
- 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. Calise to approve the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 591 Main Street for signage. This is consistent with Commission Standard #5.

Seconded by Mr. Maxwell.

VOTE: 5 – 0.

5. Mario Gianfrancesco
591 Main Street; Map 75 A.P. 3 Lot 82
Minor Modifications/Alterations, Window Replacement – FINAL

Ms. Hitchen read into the record the Commission standards that apply to the application, those being #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 for 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.

Mr. Mark Rapp, architect for the project, and Mr. Anthony Gianfrancesco, property owner, represented the application. Mr. Gianfrancesco noted he and his brother purchased the property back in 2008; the original structure (Victorian home) was in dismal condition which he renovated. As for the commercial portion of the building, Mr. Gianfrancesco noted it is the same as it was the day that it was purchased with the exception of paint color and now is the time to invest in the façade restoration.

Mr. Maxwell asserted that he liked the drawings – they simply state what you're trying to do. Mr. McGeorge commented that the proposal does not detract from what is currently there.

Mr. Rapp explained the type of stone veneer that will be applied to the façade. He noted the large existing storefront plate glass windows will be replaced with

smaller 2'x4' aluminum framed insulated 1" glass windows. New PVC fascia with decorative moldings will be incorporated to give the unattractive building some character under the parapet.

Ms. Carron inquired as to whether filling in the door on the side of Friendship Street will violate any building/fire codes. Mr. Rapp confirmed that will not be an issue.

With no further questions or comments, Mr. McGeorge asked for a motion.

Mr. Barkley made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by Towanda Realty (Anthony Gianfrancesco).
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 591 Main Street.
- 3) The structure in question is a noncontributing building; it is representative of a c. 1950s modern style.
- 4) The building does not contribute to the historic and architectural significance of the district.
- 5) The work proposed by the applicant would improve and not affect the character defining elements of the existing building.

Motion by Mr. Maxwell to approve the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 591 Main Street for façade modifications/alterations and window replacements. This is consistent with Commission Standard #2, 4, 7, and 8.

Seconded by Mr. Maxwell.

VOTE: 5 – 0.

**6. The Division Group
1727 Division Road; Map 79 A.P. 12 Lot 86
Complete Demolition– FINAL**

Ms. Hitchen explained to the Commission that the applicant was going to request to continue the application again. Ms. Balkcom pointed out that it appears from Mr. McGovern's email that a lot of research has been conducted so they should have information to present so they either buying more time or haven't done anything. Ms. Hitchen commented that Mr. Noel was not able to be present tonight but they will follow through with a new application later this spring or early summer. There was a unanimous approval to accept the withdrawal.

Historic District Commission Business

1. MINUTES: Action on the minutes of the February 10, 2016 and March 9, 2016 meetings.

Motion by Ms. Drury to approve the February 10, 2016 minutes as written. Seconded by Mr. Maxwell. Approved 5-0.

Motion by Ms. Drury to approve the March 10, 2016 minutes as written. Seconded by Mr. Maxwell. Approved 5-0.

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.

The Commission briefly discussed the Hill & Harbour Neighborhood Association.

Ms. Balkcom inquired about the "garage doors" at 48 Bridge Street in that the doors do not appear to be the doors the HDC approved. Staff would look into the matter.

Motion to adjourn by Mr. Maxwell. Seconded by Ms. Carron. Adjourn at 8:15 p.m.

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

Lea Anthony Hitchen, Assistant Town Planner