

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MINUTES
May 11, 2016 Meeting
Town Council Chambers – 6:00 PM HDC meeting

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

Absent: Lauren Drury.

Staff: Lea Anthony Hitchen, Assistant Town Planner.

Ms. 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. Stephen McGinn for Dante's Kitchen
315 Main Street; Map 85 A.P. 1 Lot 195
Signage – FINAL**

Ms. Balkcom read the standard that applies to this application. Lettering and graphics on awnings is considered signage and must be reviewed by the full HDC. Signs are considered a type of new construction and must comply with Commission Standard Number 5 which states "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. Stephen McGinn of the Awning Factory represented the applicant, Dante's Kitchen.

Mr. McGinn explained the owner of Dante's Kitchen is requesting to install a retractable awning with "Dante's Kitchen" and address inscribed on the removable valence; it will completely roll up.

Mr. Maxwell inquired if the awning will be mounted above or below the brackets/frieze detail. Mr. McGinn confirmed the awning will be hung below the dentil detail. Mr. Maxwell thought the awning would look great once installed.

Ms. Carron asked if there will be an 8' clearance from the bottom of the awning to grade. Mr. McGinn said yes.

Mr. Maxwell inquired if the awning will span the entire length of the building. Mr. McGinn asserted the awning will cover the width of just Dante's Kitchen, not the apartment entrance located to the left.

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 Stephen McGinn of the Awning Factory.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 315 Main Street.
- 3) The structure in question is a contributing building; it is representative of a c. 1875 late Victorian/Second Empire.
- 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 315 Main Street to install an awning with signage as submitted. This is consistent with Commission Standard #5.

Seconded by Mr. Barkley.

No discussion on the motion.

VOTE: 6 – 0.

2. Becky J. Berman
5 School Lane; Map 75 A.P. 2 Lot 217
Replace Windows, Roofing, Replace In Kind - FINAL

Ms. Balkcom read into the record the standards that apply to the application, those being #2 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 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.

Ms. Becky Berman, owner of the property, represented the application.

Ms. Balkcom noted the roof work is replacement in kind and has already been started. Ms. Berman confirmed the shingles have been delivered to the house and work will start soon.

Ms. Carron inquired if the integrated gutter system will be kept. Ms. Berman said yes but there are some areas that have to be replaced.

Ms. Berman asserted the existing windows are simulated divided lite windows. She requested blanket approval to replace the existing non-original 2/2 windows with the Anderson Architectural Series windows. The A-Series windows will retain the 2/2 double-hung sash and be a true divided light. The Commissioners commented the “A-Series” are a great window.

Ms. Berman said she is working with an architect with interior changes which may modify the window sizes, specifically in the kitchen. She would like to retain the sizes if possible.

Ms. Berman informed the Commission that other small exterior improvements include removing the electric lines going along the exterior of the home that were used to wire the electric baseboards on the second floor; paint the exterior of the home; remove the bench seating on the existing back deck and replace with railing; repair the existing shed & fence; repair the wobbly back stairs leading to rear entry door and improve the landscaping.

The Commissioners felt small changes would make large improvements to the structure.

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 Becky J. Berman.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 5 School Lane.
- 3) The structure in question is a contributing building; it is representative of a c. 1885 late Victorian/Second Empire.
- 4) The building does contribute to the historic and architectural significance of the district.
- 5) The work proposed by the applicant would not affect and improve the character defining elements of the existing building.

Motion by Mr. Barkley to approve the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 5 School Lane to replace windows, roofing, and replacement in kind as submitted. This is consistent with Commission Standard #2 and 8.

Seconded by Mr. Maxwell.

VOTE: 6 – 0.

Historic District Commission Business

1. *Preliminary Review & Recommendation to Town Council of Town Hall Roof Replacement*

The Commission was emphatic that the Town be a shining example and use the appropriate roof materials – real slate, not synthetic slate. Ms. Hitchen explained the Town has hired consultants to assess and report back on the current roof situation; at this point the Town is in the preliminary stage of figuring out what avenue to take. At this point it appears the original roof of the original building needs to be replaced, not the new addition. Staff is anticipating of applying for RIHPHC grants that will become available in late May that can go towards a roof replacement. At this point Staff does not know if or how many of the existing slates can be reused; hopefully the consultant analysis will provide that detail.

The Commissioners suggested a fundraiser, “Sell-A-Slate,” in which people could buy unusable old slates and/or “buy a new slate, put their name on it for it to be installed on the new Town Hall roof.

Once the roof assessment comes back, Staff will provide the details to the HDC in order to provide a more detailed recommendation to the Town Council.

2. MINUTES: Action on the minutes of the April 13, 2016 meeting.

Tabled until the next meeting.

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.

Staff informed the Commission the Science Academy/Olney House, located on Church Street had approvals for an ADA outdoor rear located ramp in March 2006. The owners are at the point now of installing the ramp but would like to flip the configuration of the ramp. Staff asked the Commission if they had any

issues with that idea. Commissioners had no objection to repositioning/reversing the ramp for it to be parallel with the house. Mr. Maxwell is interested in joining the local Tree Council.

Motion to adjourn by Ms. Calise. Seconded by Mr. Maxwell. Adjourn at 7:00 p.m.

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

Lea Anthony Hitchen, Assistant Town Planner