

## **HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MINUTES**

**February 10, 2021 Meeting**

**VIRTUAL – Convened at 6:30 PM via the ZOOM Remote Meeting Platform**

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

Staff: Lea Anthony Hitchen, Assistant Town Planner and Andrew Teitz, Town Solicitor.

---

Ms. Kristen Carron, Chair of the Commission, started the meeting at 6:30 p.m.

Ms. Carron 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. Carron 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. Carron 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. Carron introduced the Board members and Staff present and read the application items into the record.

#### Historic District Commission Hearings

- 1. Pamela Unwin-Barkley for John & Andrea O'Connor  
93 Prospect Street; Map 74 AP 2 Lot 191  
Proposed Work: Partial demo of existing rear porch; Complete  
demo of detached garage; New Construction; Replace the Existing  
detached garage with a 2-bay Attached Garage – CONCEPTUAL**

(Mr. Barkley recused himself from the application.)

Ms. Carron stated Commission Standards 4, 5 and 9 apply to this 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. *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. *Standard 9* states demolition – either partial or total – shall only be acceptable provided it would significantly benefit the Town, would serve the greater interest of the community as a whole, and there are no available alternatives to demolition. Demolition shall not result in a significant threat to or loss of an historic and or architectural resource to the Town, State, or Nation.

Ms. Pamela Unwin Barkley, architect, and Mr. John O'Connor, represented the application. Ms. Barkley explained that together she and Mr. O'Connor are seeking conceptual approval to add to the northwest corner of the structure to meet the needs and lifestyle of the family. The proposal at hand requests to demolish the existing detached garage along with a portion of a rear located porch to make way for a two-story addition in the northwest location of the structure. The new construction will consist of an attached two-bay garage, first floor guest room with exterior doors to the side (Prospect Street) yard, adding a workshop to the rear side of the new garage, adding a second floor room to accommodate a home gym or bonus room. Additionally, the side porch will be expanded in depth and steps will be added to connect to the side yard. All new construction is planned to match the materials on the existing home. There are existing mature trees along the west property line that are planned to be removed to accommodate the new addition. Ms. Unwin Barkley noted she is attempting to maintain the existing massing of the home while also creating an outdoor gathering space in front.

Ms. Unwin-Barkley pointed out the application will require dimensional relief from the Zoning Board of Review and is scheduled to be heard later this month.

Mr. McGeorge noted he did not have any fundamental issues with the application and had no objection with the accessory structure being demolished. He noted the organic expansion is not fundamentally flawed but requested more information on the massing of the addition itself as he thought the massing was excessive and should be simplified. He had concerns about the dormers penetrating the multiple eave lines but in fine tuning the resolution and massing

and compromising the raising and lowering of details it would speak better to the original building.

Mr. Maxwell was also concerned about the overall mass of the project as it appears to double the size of the house and would be a substantial change to the property coupled with a handful of trees being cut down. He asked if there have been any design studies down that would not encroach as much onto the property line as the subject design does. Ms. Unwin-Barkley stated it is pretty tough relating to the 2-car garage and driveway relative to how tight the building sits to the property line. Being that the intent is trying to obtain occupiable bedroom space for in-laws it is difficult to elbow square footage into the yard.

When questioned how big the addition will be, Ms. Unwin-Barkley stated the first floor will encompass 1,432 square feet while the second floor will be 625 square feet.

Mr. Maxwell inquired about the proposed workshop behind the garage and questioned if it could be jogged in in order to reduce the massive appearance. Ms. Unwin-Barkley said she could definitely look into that aspect of the design.

Ms. Calise asked how many mature trees would require to be removed to make way for the addition. Ms. Unwin-Barkley noted three trees would be cut but a landscape plan calls for a new arborvitae screen wall to be installed.

Overall Ms. Carron did not have any problems with the conceptual application. From her perspective it appears the scale is the only issue at play and it is a massive project which can have a huge impact if not done correctly. The Zoning Board has to play its course and Mr. McGeorge trusts the resolution will get further developed as time goes on.

Mr. Kevin Hill, of 78 Mawney Street, had concerns about the addition, specifically as to why the addition could not be further back from the property line and have a two-bay garage existing off of Prospect Street the way it used to be. In his own opinion he felt the proposal at hand was a massive project and appeared very condominium like. Mr. Hill also preferred to have the Applicant meet the 15' setback and push the addition out to the Prospect Street side.

Ms. Unwin-Barkley stated she was trying to nest the addition off of the back side of the house and the flow and logic was based upon how the family currently uses the house now. She was also trying to make the side yard a nice functional space as the flow of current space is the driving point.

Mr. McGeorge finalized the discussion by noting the Applicant may want to massage the design with a more modest application but the application as presented is not without precedent as there are examples of historically larger structures in the district.

**2. Robert & Amy Coates  
30 West Street; Map 85 AP 2 Lot 110  
Proposed Work: Modification to Final Approved Plan, dated  
November 10, 2020. Request to change roof pitch of detached  
garage to match that of the primary structure which will increase  
the height to 17'-11 ¾" – CONCEPTUAL**

(Mr. Barkley recused himself from the application.)

Ms. Carron stated Commission Standard 4 and 5 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. Standard #5 states new construction includes 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.

Mr. Adrien Mercure, project architect, explained that he was returning to the Commission seeking a modification to the final plan approval that was approved last fall. Mr. Mercure noted his client received both HDC and Zoning Board approval in October and November 2020 to expand upon the existing 16'x33' detached garage. Specifically, approvals were granted to increase the garage to 22'x33' with an 11'-2"x21'-8 ½" carport added to the left side. The main purpose for the garage expansion is to accommodate a recreational trailer which will require the plate height to be increased and a larger overhead garage door to be installed. The overall height of the structure would be 14'-10 ½" and remain

under the 15' accessory structure height limit. The new siding for the detached garage will also be the James Hardie fiber cement shingle siding due to the structure being less than 5 feet from a neighbor's garage and a fire rating safety issue. Mr. Mercure pointed out his client was reluctant to install windows due to a nut producing tree nearby which has been known to crack existing glass windows but the homeowners said they would take into consideration the HDC's recommendation of adding some fenestration to the structure. Other key points the Commissioners suggested was they leaned toward the approval of the Hardie product for the garage, there was no precedence in the district for curved arched overhead garage doors and the carport columns appears slender.

Mr. Mercure explained his client is requesting to revise the Final Approved Plan, dated November 10, 2020 which called for the existing detached garage to be expanded with a total height of 14'-10 1/2". The request is to change the roof pitch from an approved 4/12 pitch back to a 7/12 pitch which is the same pitch as the existing garage. Due to the pitch adjustment the garage height will increase to 17'-11 3/4" which will allow for room to add back a front window but will require additional relief from the Zoning Board of Review. He noted the height relief is docketed for the February 23<sup>rd</sup> Zoning Board meeting.

Mr. Maxwell commented that he preferred this design much better than the prior garage proposal noting the roof line looks much better and matches the primary home.

Mr. McGeorge also finds the new design superior to the previous garage design. Ms. Carron agreed with the previous statements and found the subject project a big improvement as well as having the front window brought back into the overall design. Ms. Carron noted once the Applicant has obtained the necessary zoning relief they can return for a certificate of appropriateness.

**3. Joseph Colaluca dba Blue Star Realty, LLC  
104 Duke Street; Map 85 AP 1 Lot 415  
Proposed Work: Complete Renovation and Extensive Structural  
Repair/Replacement of Building – FINAL**

(Mr. Barkley recused himself from the application.)

Ms. Carron stated Commission Standards 1, 2, 4, 7, and 8 apply to the application. *Standard 1* states original materials and architectural features shall be maintained or repaired whenever possible, rather than replaced. *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 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. *Standard 7* states exterior siding must be appropriate for the building to which it is applied. Vinyl and other modern composition sidings which may damage historic buildings are not appropriate and shall not be approved. *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.

Mr. McGeorge found the submitted application extremely detailed and thorough and found it necessary to applaud the Applicant right out of the gate given the history and effort made to rehabilitate the structure in addition to the materials selected are all appropriate.

Mr. Eric Engle of RGB Architects explained the previous approvals the project has obtained thus far and discussed the comprehensive summary of exterior façade work to be completed in phases. Upon completion the structure will contain a total of four (4) residential units: Unit A being 1,697 s.f.; Unit B being 1,821 s.f.; Unit C being 506 s.f.; and Unit D being 506 s.f. There will be a total of six (6) angled on-site parking spaces with an associated enclosed trash area and landscaped areas along the north and east property lines. Phase One consists of work to be performed on the primary two and a half story section of the building while Phase Two is work to be done on the single story section, being the later addition ell. Much of the restoration was addressed in the conceptual iterations back in February and October 2020 - there will be an extensive structural repair/replacement of the first floor walls, replace in kind of the first floor exterior cladding and trim, all of the existing windows will be replaced with Anderson 400 Series Simulated Divided Light (interior/exterior muntin with NO spacer bar) 6/6 configured windows. All of the existing shake siding and trim will be repaired/replaced as required, new Rogue Valley wood exterior doors (4 lites/4 panels) will be installed and the entire building will be painted.

The north side elevation has been revised since the conceptual review – the second level porch will be removed in its entirety including the stairs, deck, and railing; this was modified to due to having an adequate amount of space for a dumpster along with a sufficient parking design. The later addition ell will be demolished in its entirety and rebuilt in kind but with a 8:12 roof pitch to match of the primary portion of the structure. The downspouts and gutters will be replaced in kind. Additionally, the fire escape will be removed just as the original proposal called for. In lieu of the shed dormers from the original application the proposal now calls for skylights on the north roof elevation.

Mr. Maxwell asked if there have been any changes to the note details since the last meeting. Mr. Engle pointed out there have been minor changes in the note details such as the removal of the second-floor porch due to changes in parking and trash design.

Mr. Maxwell found the submission a strong design and liked the material choices, he would be voting in favor of the application. Ms. Carron also found the application well put together and will be a great addition to the neighborhood. Ms. Calise noted given the diligence of the Applicant she will be voting in favor of the Applicant.

Commission members discussed the proposed windows, noting the simulated divided light as opposed to a true divided light. Given the amount of renovation work to take place at the property, they were comfortable allowing the Applicant to use the SDL in lieu of mandating a spacer bar.

Ms. Carron asked if there were any public comments. No public comments.

Motion by Ms. Carron to mark the Staff Report and Submitted plans as Exhibits 1 and 2 for the record. Seconded by Ms. Calise.

Approved by Mr. Maxwell, Ms. Calise, Mr. McGeorge and Ms. Carron. (VOTE 4-0 in favor of the motion).

Also noted for the record were those present for the May 20, 2020 site visit of 104 Duke Street, those being the following: Ms. Carron, Mr. Maxwell, and Ms. Calise (Commission members), along with Atty. Teitz and Ms. Hitchen, Ms. Bourbonnais and Mr. Lindo (Planning Staff).

With no further comments, Ms. Carron asked for a motion.

Mr. Maxwell made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by Joseph Colaluca of Blue Star Realty, LLC.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 104 Duke Street.
- 3) The property in question is a contributing structure, being a c.19<sup>th</sup> century mixed use structure.
- 4) The building does contribute to the historic and architectural significance of the district.
- 5) The work proposed by the applicant would improve the character defining elements of the existing building.

Motion by Mr. Maxwell to approve the application for complete renovation and extensive structural repair/replacement of the building. Plans and materials must comply with RGB Plan Set “104 Duke Street Residential Rehab,” dated 1/28/21”. This is consistent with Commission Standard #1, 2, 4, 7, and 8. Seconded by Ms. Calise.

Roll Call Vote: Ms. Calise: Yes, Mr. Maxwell: Yes, Mr. McGeorge: Yes, and Ms. Carron: Yes. (VOTE: 4 – 0).

Mr. McGeorge left the meeting while Mr. Barkley rejoined the meeting.

**4. East Greenwich Cove Builders, LLC  
11 Lion Street; Map 85 AP 1 Lot 395  
Proposed Work: Complete Demolition of Structure – First Hearing**

Ms. Carron stated Commission Standard of Review Number 9 states, “Demolition shall only be acceptable provided it would significantly benefit the Town, would serve the greater interest of the community as a whole, and that there are no alternatives to demolition available. Demolitions shall not result in a significant threat or loss of an historic and/or architectural resource to the Town, State or nation.” In addition to the local standard; the Federal Department of the Interior’s “Secretary’s Standards for Rehabilitation” guide notes that the following are **NOT** recommended:

- Removing or relocating historic buildings or landscape features, thus destroying the historic relationship between buildings, landscape features, and open space;
- Removing or relocating historic buildings on site – thus diminishing the historic character of the site or complex;
- Failing to maintain site drainage so that buildings and site features are damaged or destroyed;
- Permitting buildings and site features to remain unprotected so that plant materials, fencing, walkways, archeological features, etc. are damaged or destroyed;
- Failing to provide adequate protection of materials on a cyclical basis so that deterioration of building and site features results;
- Failing to undertake adequate measures to assure the preservation of buildings and site features.

In addition to stating the standard Ms. Carron fully explained the process involved for a demolition request as well as noting demolitions are reviewed on a case by case basis. The Applicant must make a good faith effort to demonstrate that all alternatives to demolition have been evaluated (including rehabilitation, adaptive reuse and relocation of the structure), and to provide both architectural and financial data to support a conclusion that demolition is the only feasible solution. The review process for a demolition application consists of at least two public meetings, and is structured to give ample time to the community, the Applicant and the EGHDC to obtain information and study the proposal thoroughly. The first preliminary public meeting is held to determine the architectural and historic significance of the structure and its contribution to the Town, and to determine whether to accept the application as complete. The Applicant and/or property owner shall attend the meeting and present the project and public comment will be taken. The HDC will use its own judgement in making determinations of architectural and historical significance, and may call upon expert witnesses. Applicants may also present testimony as to the significance of the structure.

Attorney William Landry, represented the applicant, being Jerry Zarrella Jr. and Sr. Atty. Landry reviewed the state laws regarding demolition and questioned if there is the subject structure is a hazard to public safety or if there is an economically feasibly means for the owner to remedy the situation. From Atty.

Landry's perspective not, every case meets every standard but this is one case that really does in our opinion – the structure has done nothing but get worse over the years.

Atty. Landry explained how prior owners tried to renovate the structure to no avail then the current owner tried to develop it as four units which might have been financially feasible but was also daunted by a denial by the Zoning Officer and the need for 12 zoning variances. The numbers simply do not add up and there have been no buyers and the owners have offered it to the Town; nobody wants to take a stab at rehabilitating the structure. It will take years of zoning pursuit to make anything out of it. Atty. Landry went on to say the building is uninsurable. Although he did not participate in preparing the application Atty. Landry did submit exhibits to Ms. Hitchen he would like to introduce at some point during the discussion so he can explain why the standards for demolition have been satisfied in this case.

Atty. Teitz explained to the Commission the first hearing is dedicated for the Commission to decide the contribution and significance of the structure and then to determine if the application is complete. He also pointed out the Commission held a site visit of the structure which is very important.

Atty. Teitz confirmed from Atty. Landry for the record that his client never submitted a zoning application for a variance to obtain a 4-unit on the subject property. Atty. Landry said there was an application filed but was withdrawn based upon the theory that there was no chance of it passing. Atty. Teitz pointed out the determination was made by the Applicant – for the record the only matter the ZBR/ZBA heard was for an appeal of a nonconforming use.

The Commission members then took a significant portion of time by going through the criteria in determining whether the subject property is a contributing structure. Ms. Carron noted the first preliminary public meeting is held to determine the architectural and historic significance of the structure and its contribution to the Town, and to determine whether to accept the application as complete. Additionally, the HDC shall first determine whether the structure proposed for demolition is:

- 1) Contributing to the significance of the district, and valuable to the Town, State or Nation.

Ms. Carron stated the structure is an 1820s Victorian structure known as Hart's Block and is a prominent structure in the town and the district and is one of the largest structures within the historic district which lends itself some significance architecturally and historically – very unique to the Town. She was at site visit and was well preserved structure; it is expected there would be expected rot issues since it has been abandoned. She was pleasantly surprised to see it in its existing condition as she was expecting much worse. Ms. Carron finds the structure to be contributing to the Town and to the neighborhood.

Ms. Calise pointed out the historic survey notes the building receives 20 out of 38 possible points for architectural value and 10 out of 14 points for importance to the neighborhood – it was a cold water flat used as worker housing for those that worked in the nearby mills.

Ms. Calise agreed with Ms. Carron's comments in terms of contributing to the Town and neighborhood.

Mr. Maxwell noted he too was at the site visit and found the structure to be in fairly decent condition given the amount of neglect.

Mr. Barkley recognized the subject building years ago as being special as it is plain and simplistic yet odd in context to the rest of the neighborhood. He also found the damage is far less than what he expected and the fact that it has been used as storage in many ways has saved the structure. Mr. Barkley added that he personally has seen other structures in worse condition. He is of the opinion the building is unique although simple and rudimentary the structure is salvageable it simply takes money and will; the age alone makes it significant.

Motion by Ms. Carron to accept 11 Lion Street as a contributing structure to the Town and the district and it contributes in its significance and it is valuable to the period of architecture it represents. Seconded by Ms. Calise.

Roll Call Vote: Ms. Calise: Yes, Mr. Barkley: Yes, Mr. Maxwell: Yes, and Ms. Carron: Yes. (VOTE: 4 – 0).

Motion by Ms. Carron to continue the application to the February 10, 2021 meeting. Seconded by Mr. Barkley.

Roll Call Vote: Ms. Calise: Yes, Mr. McGeorge: Yes, Mr. Barkley: Yes, and Ms. Carron: Yes. (VOTE: 4– 0).

Ms. Carron went on to explain the Commission needs to review if the Applicant has reviewed all alternatives to demolition have been considered and if the submitted application is complete.

Atty. Landry informed the Commission the property was listed with a broker and has a copy of the listing which was on MLS for a period time in which Mr. Santilli has maintained the listing for some time since his client obtained the property. It has been Atty. Landry's understanding that ever since his client obtained the property they have had it listed for sale.

Ms. Carron gave Atty. Landry the opportunity to present the evidence that all alternatives to demolition have been considered.

Atty. Landry noted the Applicant offered the property to the Town without a response in January followed by a gentleman who showed interest in purchasing the property but disappeared after a couple of days. The Applicant has looked at and evaluated for themselves, they made a request to the Zoning Official to grant a permit for a grandfathered use for four residential units but were told it was not a grandfathered use; it was a correct determination but was another punch in the gut but which required aggressive variances to get a use that one would not even break even on economically.

Mr. Craig Carrigan, P.E. of Carrigan Engineering noted he has been a registered structural and civil engineer for over 30 years. Mr. Carrigan explained he completed an inspection of 11 Lion Street and found the framing members supporting the first floor are extensively rotted due to insect damage and water damage in addition to support posts in the basement which are rotted. He added many sections of the sill plates have either broken due to shifts in the foundation or have rotted out in many areas. Given the current state of the structure it is Mr. Carrigan's opinion that the work would be deemed a significant improvement and the Building Code would require the entire structure be brought up to code; from a financial standpoint the structure should

be demolished. Mr. Carrigan's structural engineering report was submitted as Exhibit #1.

Mr. Jerry Zarrella Sr. explained he has been in the house construction business/excavation business for 55+ years – when you renovate something more than 50 percent you have to bring it up to code – “this thing has to go.”

Atty. Landry discussed Exhibit #2, being Building Budget and Specifications for a 4-unit building versus a 2-unit building renovation versus a 2-unit specification for new construction. Mr. Zarrella Sr. stated it was his son, Mr. Zarrella, Jr. who prepared the building budget documentations and Mr. Zarrella Sr. found the numbers to be accurate.

Atty. Landry submitted Exhibit #3, being a proposed single-family unit, which would be allowed by right. Mr. Zarrella Sr. said this single-family home is a spec that he built on Block Island, but it would have to be built without the decks in order to conform with the setbacks. Mr. Zarrella said if he were able to construct the single-family home he would make a profit and be out from under the nightmare that he is dealing with now.

Ms. Carron motioned that the submitted application as presented, along with the supporting evidence that Atty. Landry submitted makes the application complete and the Commission will allow any other witnesses, including Mr. Santilli, to be heard at the second public hearing. Seconded by Mr. Barkley.

Roll Call Vote: Ms. Calise: Yes, Mr. McGeorge: Yes, Mr. Barkley: Yes, and Ms. Carron: Yes. (VOTE: 4– 0).

Ms. Hitchen confirmed the next public hearing will be docketed to the Wednesday, March 10<sup>th</sup> HDC meeting.

- 5. Tom & Kelly Clayton dba Touchdown Realty Group, LLC  
319 Main Street; Map 85 AP 1 Lot 194  
Proposed Work: Modification to Final Approved Plan, dated  
November 10, 2020. Original plan called for 2/2 tru-divided lite  
windows; request is to allow a 4/4 simulated divided lite window  
configuration – FINAL**

Ms. Carron stated commission Standards 4 and 8 apply. 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. 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. Tom Clayton explained the installed windows are Jeldwen 4/4 double hung windows with a permanent exterior muntin, removable interior muntin and no spacer bar. He requested to retain the Jeldwen 4/4 windows even though the original plan called for a 2/2 tru-divided lite. Mr. Clayton noted there was a mix-up in communication with their window representative and it was not intentional done.

Ms. Calise found the window change a major flaw, unacceptable and very disappointed. Ms. Carron also noted the subject building is too big of a structure immediately on Main Street to simply ignore and have this mistake.

Mr. Maxwell was of the opinion there were too many little lites and believed the 1/1 lites would be an improvement although the 4/4 lites are technically an upgrade to the former vinyl windows that were in place.

Mr. Clayton pointed out that he has records indicating the structure dates back to the 1700s versus the Town's records of the 1880s therefore indicating the 4/4 lites would be more appropriate. Mr. Clayton said he would make an effort to get a window company representative to attend the next meeting to explain their responsibility in fixing the problem.

Motion by Ms. Carron to continue the hearing to the March 10<sup>th</sup> meeting in order to have the window representative attend the meeting and/or find another solution with referees Mr. Maxwell and Ms. Carron before the next meeting. Seconded by Ms. Calise.

Roll Call Vote: Ms. Calise: Yes, Mr. McGeorge: Yes, Mr. Barkley: Yes, and Ms. Carron: Yes. (VOTE: 4– 0).

**5. Scott A. Clement**

**2 Prospect Street; Map 85 AP 1 Lot 327**

**Proposed Work: Replace a total of five (5) existing basement windows located on the south & east elevations and re-install three (3) basement windows on the north elevation – FINAL**

Ms. Carron stated Commission Standards 4 and 8 apply. 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. 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. Scott Clement explained over the last couple of years he had removed the shingle siding and repaired/replaced the underling clapboard found underneath. He is now requesting to replace a total of five (5) existing basement windows, four (4) being located on the south elevation and one (1) located on the east elevation next to the rear back entry door. Additionally, at some point in time there were three (3) basement windows on the north elevation (facing Spring Street) which were removed and cemented over. Upon closer look the outline or “ghost” of the original windows can be identified through the cement. The intent is to reopen the three windows using the same size opening that was originally in place. The petition calls to replace and reopen the windows using the Pella vinyl 250 Series with a 6/6 configuration, the same as the existing window configuration.

Mr. Maxwell made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by Scott A. Clement.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 2 Prospect Street.

- 3) The property in question is a contributing structure, being a c.1860 early bracketed Victorian.
- 4) The building does contribute to the historic and architectural significance of the district.
- 5) The work proposed by the applicant would improve the character defining elements of the existing building.

Motion by Mr. Maxwell to approve the application to replace a total of five existing basement windows located on the south and east elevations and re-install three basement windows on the north elevation – windows are to be the Pella vinyl 250 Series. Seconded by Mr. Barkley.

Roll Call Vote: Ms. Calise: Yes, Mr. Maxwell: Yes, Mr. Barkley: Yes, and Ms. Carron: Yes. (VOTE: 4– 0).

**6. Smartapp.com, Inc.**

**11 Main Street; Map 85 AP 1 Lot 242**

**Proposed Work: Complete Renovation of Building to include New Windows & Doors, Rooftop Terrace, Signage and Repair/Replace in Kind – CONCEPTUAL**

**Architectural Style: c.1934 early Twentieth century Colonial Revival**

**Relevant Standards: #1, 2, 4, 5, and 8**

Ms. Carron stated Commission Standards 1, 2, 4, 5, and 8 apply to the application. *Standard 1* states original materials and architectural features shall be maintained or repaired whenever possible rather than replaced. *Standard 2* notes if existing materials have deteriorated beyond repair the new materials shall match the originals in composition, design, texture and other visual qualities. *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. *Standard 5* specifies that 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. *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. Carron noted for the record Mr. Eric Zueno is a distant cousin but not a first cousin; she would file an ethics form for transparency purposes.

Mr. Michael Colapietro, owner of Smartapp.com and Mr. Eric Zueno, architect for the project from ZDS, Inc. represented the application. Mr. Colapietro explained his company noting it is a software technology company that has been in existence for 20+ years and is a growing global company. He pointed out his company was heavily recruited by former Governor Carceiri in 2009 and the RIEDC to relocate from Massachusetts to RI in order to bring his stemcentric company to RI. Currently the headquarters for Smartapp.com is based in West Warwick but he has the desire to continue the growth and expansion into East Greenwich. Mr. Colapietro said he purchased 11 Main Street knowing it needed a better second life with the vision of turning it into a vibrant office for his business.

Mr. Zueno commented the intent is to convert the building back to its original use, being office space and not doing anything extremely transformational. There will be lots of exterior cleaning with making sure the project exceeds expectations of the HDC. Mr. Zueno noted the proposed project requires multiple dimensional variances but is mainly due to legal nonconforming issues with the property. The exterior improvements call for new windows and doors, the addition of a rooftop terrace, extension of the existing patio, new signage and revised grading and parking layout. Additionally, plans include demolishing a detached shed to the rear to make way for a new garage door (loading dock area) and masonry wall. Large kitchen exhaust fans used in the former restaurant will be removed, the area to be patched and replaced with new aluminum clad windows to match the existing. Also to the rear is a proposed door for egress along with the repair/replacement of all damaged railings along the light wells. The whole exterior of the structure will receive a “deep cleaning” by cleaning and refurbishing the masonry, decorative work, cornice and banding. Finally, all the existing canvas awnings will be removed and replaced in various locations with the Smartapp logo.

Mr. Maxwell complimented the application as well as the architect for thorough submission and thought process that went into the design. He questioned whether there will be enough parking for the proposed use and if the company will ever outgrow the space. Mr. Zueno explained the company is a very forward think group with employees generally practice ride share programs and alternative vehicle methods, bike to work and use the public transit. Mr. Colapietro clarified that the 11 Main Street office will actually be an expansion with the intent to keep the West Warwick facility while allowing the company to attract world class talent and give folks a reason to relocate.

Mr. Maxwell pointed out the rooftop addition is very appropriate and has no issue in that it is a later addition and very sympathetic to the massing and scale and will be a great addition to the building.

Mr. Barkley also found the submission to be a nicely prepared package which will definitely work as an office use but has been tough to use as a restaurant over the years due to lack of parking and proper access. He found the proposal keeps the main elements of the structure while not affecting any of the character defining elements of the building while the proposed rooftop addition is new, contemporary and fresh. Mr. Barkley had no objections to the conceptual level application.

Ms. Carron agreed with all comments and added she was glad to see the building was not going to be another restaurant. She inquired about the existing “Welcome to East Greenwich” sign currently located at the corner of Division and Main Streets. Mr. Zueno commented the corner in questioned is intended to be used for Smartapp.com signage with the “Welcome to EG” sign relocated but he was willing to have additional conversations regarding the matter. Ms. Carron pointed out the sign is somewhat significant due to the property being the gateway to both the Town and the historic district which the sign reflects.

With no formal approval required for a conceptual application the Commission commented they were excited to see the final plan after the necessary variances were granted by the ZBR.

**7. Paul Vespia of Hill & Harbor Design+Build representing Rosario Navarro and Brian Inocencio  
47 Melrose Street; Map 85 AP 1 Lot 248  
Proposed Work: Modification to Final Approved Plan, dated  
November 10, 2020. Request is to install an exterior door in lieu of a  
window on the east elevation along with a hardscape stair profile -  
FINAL**

Ms. Carron stated Commission Standards #4 applies to this 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.

Mr. Paul Vespia of Hill & Harbor Design+Build, represented Rosario Navarro and Brian Inocencio, property owners. Mr. Vespia explained the project is currently under construction and he is looking to slightly modify the project by adding an egress door to the east elevation where a window was originally specified for access to the in-law apartment without going through the existing house. He added an associated set of stairs and landing for appropriate access will also be constructed. The stairs are composed to be of bluestone and other hardscaping materials to match that in the existing backyard.

Ms. Carron did not have any issues with altering the east elevation from a window to an access door along with the addition of hardscape elements. Mr. Barkley agreed the stonework appears to be a nice addition.

Ms. Calise made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by Paul Vespia of Hill & Harbor Design+Build.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 47 Melrose Street.
- 3) The property in question is a contributing structure, being a c.1930 neo-Colonial Revival home.
- 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 to install an exterior door in lieu of a window on the east elevation along with a hardscape stair profile. Seconded by Mr. Maxwell.

Roll Call Vote: Ms. Calise: Yes, Mr. Maxwell: Yes, Mr. Barkley: Yes, and Ms. Carron: Yes. (VOTE: 4– 0).

### **Historic District Commission Business**

1. Minutes: Review and approval of the October 14, 2020, November 10, 2020, December 9, 2020, and January 13, 2021 meeting minutes.

Motion by Ms. Carron to approve the October 14, 2020 minutes. Seconded by Ms. Calise.

Roll Call Vote: Ms. Calise: Yes, Mr. Maxwell: Yes, Mr. Barkley: Yes, and Ms. Carron: Yes. (VOTE: 4– 0).

Remaining sets of minutes were tabled to the following meeting.

2. Update/Discussion of “The Lido,” being 319 Main Street; Map 85 AP 1 Lot 194; specifically, the HDC refereed portion of the project by Mr. Barkley and Mr. Maxwell regarding the Main Street (east) elevation shed dormer and cheek wall.

Mr. Maxwell and Mr. Barkley noted they met with Mr. Clayton, owner of 319 Main Street, and made several recommendations to him on how to rectify the appearance of the cheek walls.

3. Update/Discussion of Bank of America, being 200 Main Street; Map 85 AP 1 Lot 66; specifically, the HDC refereed portion of the project by Mr. Barkley and Mr. Maxwell regarding the window jamb detail.

Mr. Barkley and Mr. Maxwell have reviewed the window jamb detail; their impression was that the Pella manufacturer could better replicate the existing jamb.

Motion to adjourn by Mr. Maxwell. Seconded by Mr. Calise. VOTE: 4 – 0

**Adjourned at 10:48 pm.**

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

Lea Anthony Hitchen, Assistant Town Planner