

**HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MINUTES**  
**June 8, 2016 Meeting**  
**Town Council Chambers – 6:00 PM HDC meeting**

Present: Matthew McGeorge, Vice-Chair, Gregory Maxwell, Erinn Carron, and Lauren Drury.

Absent: Kim Balkcom, Chair, Kristen Carron, and Andrew Barkley.

Staff: Lea Anthony Hitchen, Assistant Town Planner.

---

Mr. McGeorge, Vice-Chair of the Commission, started the meeting at 6:00 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. Bobby Bach d/b/a Twigs Florist  
187 Main Street; Map 85 A.P. 1 Lot 217  
Signage – FINAL**

Mr. McGeorge read the standard that applies to this application, being #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. Bobby Bach, owner of Twigs Florist, explained he is moving his business from 233 Main Street a few stores down to a new location, being 187 Main Street. He noted the proposed sign is an exterior sign has been located in the interior of the existing business; he would like to mount it to the side of the new building. It is a 68”x34” and will face the parking lot to the north.

The Commissioners had no questions for the Applicant and believed the sign was appropriate for the district.

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 Bobby Bach of Twigs Florist.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 187 Main Street.
- 3) The structure in question is a contributing building; it is representative of a c. 1887 Second Empire/Mixed-Use 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 Ms. Calise to approve the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 187 Main Street to install new signage as submitted. This is consistent with Commission Standard #5.

Seconded by Ms. Drury.

No discussion on the motion.

VOTE: 4 – 0.

**2. RSL Swan LLC/Richard Swanson  
130 Main Street; Map 85 A.P. 1 Lot 61  
Replace Windows, Roofing, Siding, Replace In Kind - FINAL**

Mr. McGeorge read the standard that applies to this application. 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 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 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. Richard Swanson, owner of the building, and Mr. Ted Grady, contractor, represented the application. Mr. Swanson explained that most of the proposed work is replacement in kind; the existing gutters will be replaced with new gutters, downspouts and conductors; the existing asphalt roof will be replaced with an architectural asphalt roofing system, the three skylights will be replaced in kind, and new fascia, soffits, trim corner boards and cedar clapboard siding to match existing conditions are part of the project.

Mr. Swanson also asserted that ten second floor double hung windows will be replaced with Marvin Integrity windows which are tru-divided lights and will have the same configuration. He would like to remove the rear second floor glass door where there is an existing safety bar and replace with three Marvin Integrity windows.

The Applicant displayed an example Marvin Integrity window which clearly showed the tru-divided light.

Mr. McGeorge noted the proposed project was great and had no objections; he thought the narrative was key and it was a solid application. He was happy to see the owner is maintaining the structure in the proper way.

Mr. Maxwell complimented the project and appreciated the fact that Applicant was installing the overhang on the rakes and dormers; the details exemplify a project.

Ms. Drury thought the application was one of the better submitted applications she has seen in a while.

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

Mr. McGeorge made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by RSL Swan, LLC/Richard Swanson.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 130 Main Street.
- 3) The structure in question is a contributing building; it is representative of a c. 1850 Greek Revival.
- 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 and would improve the character defining elements of the building.

Motion by Mr. Maxwell to approve the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 130 Main Street to replace windows, roofing, siding, replace in kind as submitted. This is consistent with Commission Standards #2, 4 and 8.

Seconded by Ms. Calise.

No discussion on the motion.

VOTE: 4 – 0.

**Historic District Commission Business**

1. MINUTES: Action on the minutes of the April 13, 2016 and May 11, 2016 meetings.

Motion by Ms. Drury to approve the April 13, 2016 minutes, seconded by Ms. Calise. Approved 4 – 0.

May 11, 2016 minutes tabled to the following month.

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.

No Commissioner comments.

Motion to adjourn by Ms. Calise. Seconded by Mr. Maxwell. Adjourn at 6:30 p.m.

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

Lea Anthony Hitchen, Assistant Town Planner