

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MINUTES
September 14, 2016 Meeting
Town Council Chambers – 6:00 PM HDC meeting

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

Absent: Kristen Carron

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. The Riddle Room LLC
20 Water Street; Map 85 A.P. 1 Lot 403
Signage – FINAL**

Ms. Balkcom noted 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.

Mr. Byron Delmonico, owner of The Riddle Room, represented the application. He explained the business is an “escape room” where participants have to solve riddles and puzzles; to be located on the second floor of the building.

Mr. McGeorge commented the graphics on the proposed signage is great; his only negative reaction is there is one too many signs proposed on the northwest corner of the building and appears to be redundant. He suggested a single sign which would appear more powerful. Mr. McGeorge liked “Option C” as presented in the submittal.

Mr. Maxwell also thought the content, material and design were attractive and had no issues with the application.

With no further questions or comments regarding the application Ms. Balkcom asked for a motion.

Mr. Barkley made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by The Riddle Room LLC (Byron Delmonico).
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 20 Water Street.
- 3) The structure in question is a noncontributing building; it is representative of a c.1970 late Twentieth century 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 Mr. Barkley to approve the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 20 Water Street for signage with the condition one sign to be removed on the northwest corner of the building. This is consistent with Commission Standard #5.

Seconded by Mr. Maxwell.

No discussion on the motion.

VOTE: 6 – 0.

2. Don Pedder
164 Main Street; Map 85 A.P. 1 Lot 64
Signage – FINAL

Ms. Balkcom noted 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.

Mr. Don Pedder, owner of The Reform, represented the application.

Mr. McGeorge commented the sign proposal looks “awesome.” Ms. Balkcom added that it appears really cool.

Mr. Pedder explained his business is a men only hair salon and will be moving in around October.

Ms. Balkcom said she liked how pictures of the soffits were included in the application to show how and where the sign would hang.

With no further questions or comments regarding the application Ms. Balkcom asked for a motion.

Ms. Calise made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by Don Pedder for The Reform.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 164 Main Street.
- 3) The structure in question is a contributing building; it is representative of a c.1896 Greenwich Hotel.
- 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 164 Main Street for signage. This is consistent with Commission Standard #5.

Seconded by Mr. Barkley.

No discussion on the motion.

VOTE: 6 – 0.

3. Joseph Gelineau
88 King Street; Map 85 A.P. 1 Lot 2
Replace Doors – FINAL

Ms. Balkcom stated Commission Standard # 4 applies to this application. It 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.

Mr. Joseph Gelineau and his wife Ms. Elaine Gelineau represented the application. Mr. Gelineau explained there are two identical metal doors on the front façade now; the “main” entry door is located on the right while the “side” door is located on the left and is proposing to install two different doors. Considering he has spent a significant amount of money recently soundproofing the home, Mr. Gelineau noted he would like to change out the doors for something different - the left front door will be replaced with a Smooth-Star Fiberglass twin half lite-2 panel door. The right door will be replaced with a ³/₄ captured oval lite 2 panel door.

Mr. Gelineau added that the existing doors are entry level quality Home Depot doors and he would prefer a better quality door as the existing was installed almost 20 years ago and the sun has actually melted the doors.

Ms. Balkcom commented the doors are extremely different in terms of style but realized the subject home is not a traditional house either but thought the doors should have the same qualities. She did not necessarily have a problem with the doors being different from one another but to have an oval lite in one door and a rectangular lite in the other door did not mesh well together.

Mr. McGeorge described the home as being a Greek Revival structure with a Federal style pediment over the front right door with a proposed Victorian style oval door. He stated they are completely different styles that are being tossed together in one opening; for an architect it seems bothersome. Mr. McGeorge would rather see a door more colonial in style or full panel type of door for the main entry or something similar to what is there now. He advised that the geometry is the issue with the oval proposed pattern.

Mr. Gelineau reminded the Commission that for the soundproofing project earlier this year he had changed the east side door to a solid door so he did not want to continue with solid doors.

Mr. Barkley also suggested selecting a door with a colonial style pattern or paneled door if the Applicant did not prefer lites for the left front door. As for the main entry door, Mr. Barkley recommended a more lighted door but not with an oval.

Ms. Balkcom suggested a solid door for the left side; she suggested downplaying the left door, making it simple, as if blending it to “disappear.” She advised the right “main” door could be dressier and more distinguished and no one would question which door is the main front door.

Mr. Gelineau liked the idea of a solid paneled door for the left side door.

Mr. McGeorge suggested refereeing the “main” right side door as long as the proposed door is not oval and has more of a square lite.

Mr. McGeorge and Ms. Balkcom volunteered to referee the right front door once Mr. Gelineau submitted new spec sheets to Staff.

With no further questions or comments regarding the application Ms. Balkcom asked for a motion.

Mr. Maxwell made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by Joseph Gelineau.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 88 King Street.

- 3) The structure in question is a contributing building; it is representative of a c.1853 Greek Revival 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.

Motion by Mr. Maxwell to approve the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 88 King Street for door replacement for the left side door only. This is consistent with Commission Standard #4. The right side front door will be refereed by HDC members Mr. McGeorge and Ms. Balkcom.

Seconded by Mr. Barkley.

No discussion on the motion.

VOTE: 6 – 0.

4. Edward T. Gallucci
110 Main Street; Map 85 A.P. 1 Lot 60
Window Replacement – FINAL
(Continued from the August 10, 2016 HDC meeting)

Ms. Balkcom read the standard into the record stating the project must comply with Commission standard #8 which 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. Gallucci said he looked at three different companies that the HDC recommended from last month in order to look at prices. He stated Custom Built does not make a wood window, he received an estimate for windows from National Windows without installation and another company did not return his call.

The Commission mentioned continuing the application again if that is the only information the Applicant has. Mr. Gallucci indicated the pricing he received from National Window was high and his goal would be to install a grate on the existing external windows. The HDC members in unison said no, that was not an option.

Mr. Gallucci pointed out other vinyl window units in the district. Ms. Balkcom reminded the Applicant the HDC reviews each application in of itself and not all structures are equally historically significant. She added this Board cannot speak to any vinyl windows prior to a certain time as this particular Commission has not approved vinyl windows in at least six years. Ms. Balkcom advised the facts remain is that the original windows were replaced and the new vinyl windows are completely unacceptable.

Ms. Drury recalled at last month's meeting discussing the HDC recommended obtaining pricing, returning with a timeline for when it would be financially feasible for the Applicant to replace the windows with something more appropriate; she added the Commission did not ask for the windows to be replaced in a month but asked the Applicant to come back with a timeframe that was financially agreeable for him.

Mr. Gallucci explained all the other work he had to invest into his property and why it may take up to three years before he could replace the vinyl windows with a more appropriate window. Ms. Balkcom asserted that the Applicant talked about wanting to put a lot of money toward preserving the building but then went ahead and installed five horrible windows on a hugely significant structure; it simply did not make sense.

The Commission made head way with the Applicant by allowing him as a compromise one calendar year to resolve/fix the window replacement considering Mr. Gallucci wanted to work with the Commission. The Applicant and Mr. Gallucci discussed in detail the type of window they would approve, cost not being a factor in their decision, with the Applicant having to perform the "legwork."

Mr. McGeorge suggested continuing the application one more month, noting Mr. Gallucci will have to provide documentation on letterhead stating that the work will be completed within one calendar year and will be recorded in land

evidence, and custom windows spec sheets to match original window profile will be submitted by next month's meeting.

The Commission unanimously agreed to continue the application to October 12th.

Historic District Commission Business

1. MINUTES: Action on the minutes of the June 8, 2016, July 13, 2016, and August 10, 2016 meetings

Motion by Mr. McGeorge to approve the June 8, 2016 and July 13, 2016 minutes as written. Seconded by Ms. Carron. Approved 6 – 0.

August 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.

Ms. Drury will not be in attendance at the October 12th meeting.

The following observations were made by Commissioners: 137 Peirce Street - new step railing; 206 Division Road – after receiving a violation the owner responded indicated they would be replacing in kind; 30 Main Street PVC railing attached to cement steps.

Motion to adjourn by Mr. Barkley. Seconded by Ms. Calise. Adjourn at 7:25 p.m.

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

Lea Anthony Hitchen, Assistant Town Planner