

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

Present: Kim Balkcom, Chair, Matthew McGeorge (arrived at 6:20 pm),
Vice-Chair, Gregory Maxwell, Erinn Carron, and Kristen Carron.

Absent: Lauren Drury and Andrew Barkley.

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. Brian & Bethany Warburton
79 West Street; Map 84 AP 2 Lot 98
Addition – CONCEPTUAL**

Ms. Balkcom noted the project must comply with Commission standards # 4 and 5. Standard 4 states all proposals for additions 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 at this point the Applicant may not need zoning relief; waiting for a survey to be performed. The bulkhead located on the north side may be moved if it is found to be within the setback.

Ms. Balkcom explained the conceptual hearing process.

Mr. Maxwell commented the proposal adds a lot of benefit to the house. He did feel that many homes in the district have received additions that can be distinguished from the original structure. In this particular case it appears the addition is extending upon the existing house and erasing the original form/appearance of the home. Mr. Maxwell did not feel the home was architecturally significant which can be taken into consideration.

Ms. Warburton noted she and her husband bought the home when it was in distress and did not think it was historically significant and it borders on the historic district boundary.

Ms. Warburton informed the Commission she was originally under the impression her home was outside of the district because a town staff member told her she was out of the district and let her replace the original windows with vinyl.

Ms. Balkcom commented the Dutch colonial house has relatively been untouched and can still receive a complimentary addition. She did second the comments Mr. Maxwell alluded to in that an addition can often tell a story to the home. Ms. Balkcom provided some good and bad examples of additions in the district.

Ms. Balkcom had concerns about the dormers and the window between them – it does not appear to be the same house. It appears the dormers try to replicate the side of the house.

Ms. Warburton thought it would be a nice design as the existing double windows cannot stay.

The Commissioners felt as though the proposed window schedule could be reconfigured.

Mr. McGeorge thought the addition was a natural evolution and was respectful of the massing and form but agreed with Mr. Maxwell that the round topped window should be removed. Ms. Balkcom commented there appeared to be a lot of different window styles all together in the front – too many pane configurations. She would continue the same window style throughout the home. If the windows were more consistent it would not look too busy.

Mr. McGeorge thought the proposed dormers appear fine. He commented to keep the same proportion and detailing throughout.

Ms. Warburton noted the back/side deck will be wood material not brick. Mr. McGeorge suggested a natural wood product for the final plan submission.

As for the doors, the Commissioners will want to see specifications or “cut sheets” of the actual door that will be installed for the final plan submission. Ms. Balkcom and Mr. McGeorge commented a French door is a better option versus a slider door.

In terms of siding, Ms. Warburton questioned the Commission as to their preference as she is thinking of ripping off all the siding and installing new cedar siding. The Commissioners noted either cedar shingles, clapboards if they are underneath. Mr. McGeorge suggested researching the Maibec shingle. Mr. Maxwell advised that the submitted rendering must show the type of material to be used.

Ms. Warburton asked for advice regarding a roof replacement. Mr. McGeorge said an architectural asphalt shingle roof replacement would be sufficient on this structure and would be a huge improvement as it is currently a 3-tab shingle.

In summary Ms. Warburton will discuss further with her architect about the windows and consistency on the sill line and header line and little window becoming a casement.

2. Matthew McGeorge
18 Dedford Street; Map 85 A.P. 1 Lot 331
Replace Window & Fencing - FINAL

(Mr. McGeorge recused himself from his submitted application.)

Ms. Balkcom stated the project must comply with Commission standards # 5 and 8. Standard of Review #5 states that new construction (i.e. fencing) 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 of Review #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 and profile.

Mr. McGeorge noted there are two parts of his application. He would like to replace one non-original casement kitchen window with a new casement window located at the rear of the house due to a kitchen renovation. The new window will be an Anderson CN23, full divided light grilles (permanent exterior, permanent interior with spacer bar). The window will remain in the same location as existing. The second project is the request for the approval of a cedar post with horizontal cedar board fence. The fence location is half along the parking on Dedford Street and half along the rental towards Main Street. The new fence replaces an existing chain link fence. The new cedar fence will meet the zoning requirement in that it must remain under 7' in height; this fence's maximum height will be 6'-8" at its highest point. He commented the fence can only be seen from the abutting parking lot.

Ms. Balkcom liked the style fence and had no issues with the window replacement.

Mr. McGeorge advised the existing window is a single pane; he is simply installing a higher efficiency window while renovating the kitchen which will fit the same window opening.

Mr. Maxwell commented the fence looks nice and also had no issues with the window replacement.

With no further questions or comments, Ms. Balkcom asked for a motion.

Ms. Calise made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by Matthew McGeorge.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 18 Dedford Street.
- 3) The structure in question is a contributing building; it is representative of a c. 1870 late Victorian, Italianate style structure.
- 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 Ms. Calise to approve the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 18 Dedford Street to replace one casement window and install fencing as submitted. This is consistent with Commission Standards #5 and 8.

Seconded by Ms. Carron.

No discussion on the motion.

VOTE: 4 – 0.

Historic District Commission Business

1. MINUTES: Action on the minutes of the June 8, 2016 meetings.

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.

The following observations were made by Commissioners: work being performed on 20 Division Street, Music Store vinyl windows installed without HDC approval, 34 Rocky Hollow Road vinyl lattice underneath front porch, 48 Bridge Street windows, railing/post system at 137 Peirce Street.

Staff would look into the observations.

Ms. Hitchen informed the Commission the Town Council wants to move forward on the replacement of a slate roof as opposed to an asphalt roof.

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

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

Lea Anthony Hitchen, Assistant Town Planner