

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MINUTES
October 12, 2016 Meeting
Town Council Chambers – 6:00 PM HDC meeting

Present: Kim Balkcom, Chair, Matthew McGeorge, Vice-Chair, Erinn Calise, Kristen Carron, Gregory Maxwell, 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. Paula Maddalena**
53 Castle Street; Map 85 A.P. 1 Lot 129
Minor Modification/Alteration – FINAL

Ms. Balkcom stated Commission Standard #4 applies to the application. Standard 4 states 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.

Ms. Maddalena, owner of the property, represented the application. She verified she does not have a contractor to date.

Mr. McGeorge commented that the proposed fypon and azek materials do not meet the standard, however, based on the material choices, this particular homes characteristics, the asbestos siding, a possible later Gambrel style addition, he did not have a fundamental problem with the proposal or materials.

Mr. Maxwell questioned if the brackets and trimboard would be painted or left natural. Ms. Maddalena said her intention is to leave have the overhang remain white, whether it be to leave white or to paint white.

Ms. Balkcom verified that the “front” door actually does not face Castle Street. Ms. Maddalena provided the history; the front door did face the front street in 1910 but the street was ultimately abandoned around 1970 and the property became the abutting neighbors parcel.

Mr. Maxwell queries about existing and proposed light fixtures. Ms. Maddalena advised that she plans to remove the side fixtures and would like to have one light suspended from the canopy.

Mr. Barkley indicated that the condition of the submitted rendering has a very different pitched roof than the reality of what it will look like constructed on the home as the scale of roof canopy and detail is very different – the scale and proportion as submitted will make it look as though the canopy was not part of the original home. Mr. Barkley suggested detailing it completely different and recommended showing a ceiling plan, fascia and roof plan for the proposed overhang.

Mr. McGeorge asserted that conceptually there are no problems with the proposal it is just a little unresolved at this point; it needs a fascia detail as it is not a realistic depiction of what will eventually be constructed. He suggested continuing the application or refereeing based on seeing the fascia profile and pictures of the brackets.

Ms. Balkcom indicated she was also of the same mindset with conceptually approving the project and refereeing the fascia and brackets. She explained to

the Applicant the referee process as well as exactly what in particular the Commission was looking for.

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

Ms. Carron made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by Paula Maddalena.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 53 Castle Street.
- 3) The structure in question is a contributing building; it is representative of a c.1930 early Twentieth century Colonial 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 Ms. Carron to approve the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 53 Castle Street for a minor modification (hood over front door). This is consistent with Commission Standard #4.

Seconded by Mr. Maxwell.

Mr. McGeorge and Mr. Maxwell volunteered to referee the fascia and bracket portion of the application.

VOTE: 6 – 0.

2. Sherry L. Integlia
442 Main Street; Map 75 A.P. 3 Lot 104
Minor Modification/Alteration – FINAL

Ms. Balkcom stated Commission Standards # 2 and 4 apply 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.

Ms. Sherry Integlia, trustee for the Warren B. Finn Revocable Trust, represented the application.

Ms. Balkcom commented the only issue she has with the project is the material, that it being vinyl which is not acceptable and is nowhere near appropriate. Ms. Balkcom said she understood that the existing material is old and a pressure treated material there are other means than a vinyl railing.

Ms. Integlia explained the roof has to be replaced because it is a rolled rubber roof; in order to replace the roof properly, the railing should come down for the rolled rubber roof to go over and down the drip edge. She added the contractor can do it with the existing railing but it is ugly as it was installed in the 1980s.

Mr. McGeorge noted the solution does not meet Standard #4. He felt as though a composite product or definitely another wood product would work in the Applicant's favor. Ms. Integlia asserted the railing is located on the rear of the building if that makes a difference. She explained the vinyl product has a steel interior column that is lag bolted to the deck; with it being a safety issue this was why she went with this product.

Mr. Barkley indicated that it appears the existing railing has been secured into the fascia. Ms. Integlia confirmed the existing railing will last for another 10 years, but that is not the issue, it is the rubber rolled roof that needs replacing – by removing the existing railing it will make installation of the new rubber roof easier.

Ms. Carron asked if other materials, other than vinyl, were researched. Ms. Integlia stated no because if the HDC denied her she would just leave the “beautiful” railing because that is the easiest thing to do.

Ms. Balkcom verified with the Applicant that in her view it is either the vinyl railing or leave the existing wood railing. Ms. Integlia said correct.

Mr. McGeorge noted there are several ways to accommodate what the Applicant is trying to accomplish without using a vinyl railing system that are equally durable and equally as strong and will not have water infiltration.

Ms. Calise questioned if the existing railing can be reused. Ms. Integlia said yes, the contractor will flash around the railing; it will not be taken off while the new rubber roof is applied.

Ms. Balkcom asked if the Applicant would like to withdraw the application considering if the HDC were to deny the current petition the same request cannot be submitted for one year.

Ms. Integlia agreed to withdraw the application.

Mr. Barkley suggested using wood pickets to make the railing system look better. Ms. Balkcom reminded the Applicant that replacement-in-kind, is wood for wood, however if the configuration is changed, i.e. balusters change from rectangular to round in shape, that will still require HDC approval, even if it is still a wood material. If it is changed exactly the way it is now with wood then it does not require HDC approval.

Mr. McGeorge advised he was getting tired of making compromises on the standards; before the Commission knows it the district will be plastic.

Ms. Integlia reiterated that she will withdraw the application.

**3. Peter & Jennifer Carney
30 Reynolds Street; Map 84 A.P. 2 Lot 155
Addition – CONCEPTUAL**

Ms. Balkcom stated 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. Balkcom noted there was an approval for an addition back in the 1980s but this request is for a different addition. Staff indicated that was correct; this addition is to the rear of the house.

Ms. Hitchen verified the first part of application is conceptual and Ms. Carney will amend the application to also request final approval for 13 windows to be replaced.

Ms. Jennifer Carney, owner of the property, represented the application.

Mr. Maxwell questioned if there was any specific reason to deciding on a flat roof for the addition. Ms. Carney explained she had originally decided on a roof to match the existing house but thought it was unappealing so she looked at other homes in the district and saw the flat roof with railings which she liked and saw the standard to which an addition could be totally different in concept.

Mr. Maxwell commented that the issue he has is that the submitted photos of examples in the neighborhood are quite nice but totally different than what is being presented for this subject property, i.e this property is 1-story and 1-story versus a 1-story and 2-story and there are conflicting roof lines.

Ms. Balkcom mentioned it is a world of difference when a homeowner works with an architect.

Mr. Barkley said technically the drawing is completely inaccurate and the addition will not conjoin correctly – the flat roof addition will not properly join with a gable roof and has a huge potential for leaking, that is reality when one forces two forms together it simply will not work.

Ms. Carney and the Commission agreed the 1980s addition has a quirky and awkward layout which makes the proposed addition difficult yet doable. Ms. Carney admitted it was the 1980s addition that attracted her to the home.

Mr. McGeorge indicated he was not opposed to the rear addition and fundamentally do not have any problems with the addition but as soon as Mr.

Maxwell started speaking to the issues he was actually going thru his list of issues that would be problematic with a flat roof addition.

Mr. Barkley suggested continuing the roofline up. Mr. Maxwell recommended turning it sideways; either way would work better than a flat roof. Mr. McGeorge said there was a lot of potential to add skylights, add a porch on the north side of the addition and create the roof's character of its own.

Mr. Barkley commented on the area that would be encompassed by the 1980s and new addition as "dead dog" space which he referred to as a courtyard and insinuated that would be a great area for a new patio. Ms. Carney agreed which was her notion to marry that space.

Ms. Balkcom commented that she understood why the Applicant at this phase did not want to hire an architect but this is also when it is super important to have one; she recommended talking to the Stroud's architect.

Mr. McGeorge asserted conceptually the project is fine, the roof line just needs to be tweaked as the mass is strange but the proposed materials are acceptable.

Ms. Carney confirmed that after moving in just four weeks ago she and her husband realized that 13 of the 36 windows had to be replaced due to an assortment of issues: some not having storm windows, being single paned, being able to squeeze a finger between the sash, cracked, etc. She requested to replace the 13 windows with Pella Architect Series windows with historic bonded grilles to match the existing windows that have deteriorated beyond reasonable repair.

Mr. McGeorge attested the Pella Architect Series window is a great product. Ms. Balkcom suggested blanket window approval for the entire house if and when windows in the future need to be replaced the same Pella Architect Series window can be used without having to come before the Commission again.

Ms. Carney explained her submitted window application and will have the same 2/2 black sash window configuration.

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

Mr. Maxwell made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by Jennifer & Peter Carney.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 30 Reynolds Street.
- 3) The structure in question is a contributing building; it is representative of a c.1890 late-Victorian, Homestead 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.

Motion by Mr. Maxwell to approve the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 30 Reynolds Street for blanket window replacement (Pella Architect Series windows) except “unique” originals. This is consistent with Commission Standard #8.

Seconded by Mr. McGeorge.

No discussion on the motion.

VOTE: 6 – 0.

4. Sara Doherty
50 Somerset Street; Map 85 A.P. 3 Lot 261
Addition – CONCEPTUAL

Ms. Balkcom stated 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. Sara Doherty, property owner, represented the application.

The Commission commented that the plans are very defined and complete. Staff commented the plans are conceptual due to the addition requiring a dimensional variance from the Zoning Board.

Mr. Maxwell asserted the submission is an excellent set of plans/drawings and the proposed design resolves a lot of issues with the current setup of the house.

Mr. McGeorge agreed, stating the plans are very well conceived. Mr. Maxwell added the addition is a very good resolution although the one issue he has is there is one very long west wall which is very blank with no openings – no windows and thought it was very unusual for the district but it does face shrubbery.

Ms. Doherty agreed and explained the design was purposely done that way due to the home facing shrubbery and existing vegetation but noted the next door neighbor will not see it.

Mr. McGeorge thought the 7'x35' addition is a great plan and should be conceptually approved. He noted that the Applicant should discuss further with the contractor the idea of in lieu of constructing an entire foundation wall to pour a series of concrete piers which may save a lot of money.

The HDC unanimously approved the conceptual plan.

5. Alan Tonkover
249 Main Street; Map 85 A.P. 1 Lot 207
Replace Door, Signage – FINAL

Ms. Balkcom stated the project must comply with Commission Standards #4 and 5. *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. Signage is a new type of 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. Alan Tonkover, proprietor of Harbour Galleries, represented the application.

Ms. Balkcom asked the Commission members if anyone had any issues with the sign considering the sign had previously been approved by a prior HDC board. Staff noted the sign had been approved by the HDC in 1983. With no comments or questions with the sign portion of the application the Commission moved on to the door replacement.

Mr. Tonkover commented that he would like to have steel door for security reasons, being that it is a jewelry store, but was not set on a specific door. He highlighted three doors which he liked and submitted for the Commission to comment on. The Commission agreed to the ½ lite, 1-panel door as the building has a modern storefront.

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

Ms. Calise made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by Alan Tonkover.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 219 Main Street.
- 3) The structure in question is a contributing building; it is representative of a c. 1773 early-Republican 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 219 Main Street for signage and door replacement. This is consistent with Commission Standard #4 & 5.

Seconded by Ms. Carron.

No discussion on the motion.

VOTE: 6 – 0.

6. Andrew Stone
16 Somerset Street; Map 75 A.P. 3 Lot 7
Replace Door – FINAL

Ms. Balkcom asked if the door was already replaced. Mr. Stone said yes.

Mr. Andrew Stone, property owner, represented the application.

Ms. Balkcom stated the project must comply with Commission Standard #4. *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.

Ms. Balkcom commented that HDC approval is required before a door is replaced; from what she understood there was a disagreement as to what constitutes replacement-in-kind. She verified this is definitely a situation that required approval because even though the Applicant replaced a wood door for a wood door its properties are completely different than what was there. With that being said, Ms. Balkcom said asked if the original door is “no longer with the family.” Mr. Stone said that is correct.

Ms. Balkcom pointed out that prior to the Applicant purchasing the home a prior owner had replaced the original windows with vinyl windows – the fact that the original windows have been removed, the home is of a simple design, and now the door is gone. She did say the new door was not bad in appearance.

Mr. Maxwell opined he has seen the original door on several homes in the neighborhood. Mr. Barkley stated the original door is his own front door.

Mr. Stone confirmed the original door was not functional noting the door was not replaced for the sake of replacing a door; it was broken in multiple places. He had talked to someone about getting it repaired but it was a longshot to get it functional and to retain its integrity.

Mr. Barkley was adamant that the original door was a significant style door and had a distinct appearance; the new door is nowhere near as close. If he was

going to replace a door due to damage then one goes to a salvage shop or antique dealer; this type of door can also be replicated. Mr. Barkley advised the new door selected is nowhere close to that.

In his defense, Mr. Stone said his interpretation of “in-kind” was that it was a wood door and that he did not change the egress while still maintaining the glass within the door. From his point of view, he researched the website, there was much more content regarding windows, doors were hardly mentioned – his interpretation was he did not need a permit. Mr. Stone went ahead and replaced with what he thought was in-kind since he was not seeking a tax credit. He noted it was not his intention to be in front of the HDC after the fact.

Mr. McGeorge commented the new door reads more like a storm door. Mr. Barkley noted it appears of a southwest style door. Mr. McGeorge asserted the fact that the original door is gone does not mean the door cannot be replicated.

Ms. Balkcom said she would be more inclined to have the original door back.

Mr. Maxwell inquired if the Applicant plans on having any more exterior work done. Mr. Stone indicated there has been discussion about the possibility of constructing a front porch but other than that no.

Ms. Balkcom asked if there is any work going on currently. Mr. Stone said there is no work going on now.

Mr. McGeorge said this is a particularly hard application because the Commission is empathetic with the process but there are standards to follow and precedent and this was based on an observation. Mr. Stone noted this application was based on a complaint of which he was not sure what in particular it said; the reason he knew about this was because he was notified by the Building/Zoning Official.

Ms. Balkcom implied that it was based on an observation. Ms. Carron explained that someone noticed that the door had been changed and in turn had notified the Building/Zoning Official; he looked into it. Ms. Calise was quick to say that people in the district definitely notice change and are sensitive to it.

Ms. Balkcom queries the Applicant if he would consider replacing the new door with one that looks like the original. Mr. Stone said if he had the option he would not.

Ms. Balkcom confirmed that the reason why the door was replaced was due to functionality. Mr. Stone affirmed the door was broken in three places (lower left, lock was hanging on by a thread and glass was loose).

Ms. Balkcom could not understand why the Applicant would not attempt to find the same exact door or a closer resembling door to the original.

Mr. Stone said again he prefaced the change as though it was in kind and that it had glass and be wood. He added that part of the home does not get a lot of light so we did get a door with a larger lite.

Mr. McGeorge commented if the HDC were to reject the application the Applicant has the opportunity to appeal the decision to the Zoning Board but the Commission would at least be upholding the district's standards and doing our jobs and the Applicant has recourse.

Mr. Stone understood the sentiment the Commission has on the integrity of the door relative to the historic component but he felt as though he was an innocent bystander trying to do the right thing – he went to the website researching what permits were required for a door change – the website is not that clean and concise. He reiterated that he thought he was doing the right which the process has led him in front of the Commission which he found disappointing.

Ms. Balkcom pointed out Mr. Stone mentioned earlier he was not sure if a permit was required; the proper way to find out would have been to contact DPW, they would have indicated yes as well as approval from HDC. Mr. Stone said that was not true, in actuality he went on the town website where there is no reference of doors. His point was that he was not changing the egress at all, simply changing the door in the casing – from his perspective he bought a wood door, not a steel or fiberglass door. He did admit the only difference is the glass is much larger than the previous door.

Ms. Balkcom opined it is a completely different door. Mr. McGeorge stated the new door is different in style and period. He completely understood how

frustrating it is for the Applicant and he was reluctant to deny the application but he as a Commissioner has standards to uphold and if the precedent slides then that can be a problem. Mr. McGeorge acknowledged the appeals process if the Applicant wished to take that route.

Mr. Stone questioned if he appealed what would he be appealing if anyone even knew.

Ms. Hitchen stated the Applicant would be appealing based on a procedural error.

Mr. Stone questioned the clarity and enforcement issue. Mr. McGeorge noted that does not fall with the HDC purview.

Ms. Hitchen acknowledged Mr. Pimental did not issue a zoning violation but sent an email notification instead informing the Stone's of the door issue. She added that as soon as the Stone's were contacted by Mr. Pimental, he was allowed to inspect the door for building code compliance and they were cooperative and complied with filing an HDC application.

Mr. Maxwell questioned if all residents receive a design guideline manual. Ms. Balkcom said not necessarily. Mr. Stone said he never received one. Ms. Calise commented that realtors are not often forthcoming about homes being located in a historic.

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 Andrew Stone.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 16 Somerset Street.
- 3) The structure in question is a contributing building; it is representative of a c. 1870 Victorian building.
- 4) The building does contribute to the historic and architectural significance of the district.

- 5) The work proposed by the applicant would remove the character defining elements of the existing building.

Motion by Ms. Carron to deny the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 16 Somerset Street for door replacement. This is consistent with Commission Standard #4.

Seconded by Ms. Calise.

Ms. Balkcom asked for a discussion on the motion.

Ms. Carron questioned had Mr. Stone submitted a proper and timely application prior to the door being replaced with the specific door that is now in the building would the HDC have approved this particular door.

Mr. McGeorge stated that based upon the style of the door it is not compatible with the architecture and time period of the structure.

VOTE: 6 – 0 to deny the application.

7. Edward T. Gallucci
110 Main Street; Map 85 A.P. 1 Lot 60
Window Replacement – FINAL

Ms. Balkcom stated 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. Edward Gallucci, property owner, represented the application.

Ms. Balkcom reviewed the new information that had been submitted by the Applicant, that being Jeld-wen aluminum-clad wood window replacements for the five window openings in bronze color.

Ms. Balkcom did not have major opposition to the proposal.

Mr. Maxwell questioned if the Jeld-wens will have the permanent bar inside with the muntins outside and inside the glass. Mr. Gallucci confirmed yes.

Ms. Balkcom confirmed that the existing vinyl windows will be replaced with the Jeld-wens within one calendar year. Mr. Gallucci said hopefully early spring and for the record he completely respects what the HDC does.

Although the Commission does not have purview over color, they recommended the “chestnut bronze” finish.

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 Edward Gallucci.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 110 Main Street.
- 3) The structure in question is a contributing building; it is representative of a c. 1876 late Victorian building.
- 4) The building does contribute to the historic and architectural significance of the district.
- 5) The work proposed by the applicant would improve but not affect the character defining elements of the existing building.

Motion by Mr. Barkley to approve the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness at 110 Main Street for Jeld-wen aluminum clad window replacement. This is consistent with Commission Standard #8.

Seconded by Mr. McGeorge.

Ms. Balkcom asked for any discussion on the motion.

Ms. Carron read into the record a letter submitted by the Applicant, Mr. Edward Gallucci, of Gallucci Properties, LLC which states the following: The windows at 110 Main Street on 4 King Street will be replaced with a simulated divided

light window aluminum clad with the original grill pattern. Upon approval of the HDC the windows will be replaced within one year of the final approval. A brochure and diagram of the grill pattern will be provided by the window company.

VOTE: 6 – 0.

Ms. Balkcom stated she was very happy the Commission and Mr. Gallucci were able to find a resolution with the windows.

8. Donald & Suzanne Carcieri
83 Friendship Street; Map 75 AP 2 Lot 216
Window & Door Replacement – CONCEPTUAL

Ms. Balkcom stated the project must comply with Commission Standard #4. *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. Commission 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. Hitchen noted the application is conceptual due to the fact the Applicant submitted less than 48 hours ago, therefore the Commission cannot act on it but can review it conceptually.

Mr. Donald Carcieri, property owner, represented the application. He explained he purchased the home originally intended for his mother-in-law back in 1980. Mr. Carcieri requested to replace the front entry door with a more appropriate style door. He said the door will be replaced with a Smooth-Star S151 series half oval lite with 2 panels. He added the petition also calls for replacing the rear double hung bathroom window with a 24"x16" casement window for improved privacy and circulation. Mr. Carcieri noted lastly three (3) existing storm door will be replaced with full lite glass storm doors which is exempt from HDC review but wanted to inform the Commission of his full intent.

The Commission had no issues with the petition and conceptually approved. The Applicant will submit a final plan for the November docket.

Mr. Stone returned to the HDC meeting and questioned the historic survey of his home by asking what makes the Commission so confident the door that was on the home was original since the survey write-up is fairly vague and does not mention anything about a front door having glass.

Ms. Balkcom commented that just because the survey does not comment about the door not having glass does not necessarily mean it is not the original door.

Mr. Stone pointed out that he is not 100 percent confident that the door he removed was the original door. He understands that his new door does not meet the style or is compatible with the style architecture of the home.

Ms. Balkcom reminded the Applicant that the door removed from the home was appropriate to the architectural style of the structure and the time the house was built - if he did his own survey he would have noticed a lot of homes have the same exact or very similar styled doors. Ms. Balkcom added that when the survey was performed in 1984 it was literally someone walking from property to property making quick observations.

Ms. Balkcom asked Mr. Stone if he would agree that based upon the age, wear and tear of the old door it could have been as old as the house. Mr. Stone agreed.

Mr. Barkley explained how residents “swap out” doors, mantels and other features once it has “worn out” but stay within the time-frame.

Ms. Balkcom reverberated that it was not that the Commission did not like the door, she said it was not appropriate to the structure, it is called “the Nantucket” for a reason.

Historic District Commission Business

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

Staff apologized but June and July minutes were already approved and posted. 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.

Staff noted there was one particular window company who had made contact with her asking to make a small presentation to the Commission. The Commission did not think that was appropriate as each structure is reviewed on an individual basis and does not want to give any window dealer the impression that blanket approval would be granted for the entire district even if it may be a great quality window.

Motion to adjourn by Mr. Barkley. Seconded by Ms. Calise. Adjourn at 8:10 p.m.

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

Lea Anthony Hitchen, Assistant Town Planner