



Historic District Commission Minutes

Wednesday, March 8, 2023 Meeting - DRAFT

Town Council Chambers, 125 Main Street, East Greenwich, RI
HYBRID IN-PERSON & REMOTE MEETING VIA ZOOM

Present: Matthew McGeorge, Chairman; Gregory Maxwell, Vice Chair; Karl Megules, Erinn Calise, Hannah Zangari, and Neal McNamara (Left at 8:35 p.m.)

Staff: Bruce Lofgren, Assistant Town Planner; Christina Marseglia, Planning Analyst, Andy Teitz, Legal Counsel.

Mr. Matthew McGeorge, Chairman of the Commission, started the meeting at 6:30 p.m.

Mr. Matthew McGeorge read the procedures into the record as follows: Each person addressing the Commission will state his/her name for the record. Although the Commission does not generally swear in applicants or their representatives, all witnesses are responsible for providing the HDC with true, accurate, and complete information. The applicant or the applicant's representative shall present the request before the Commission along with arguments and material in support of the application. HDC members will then have the opportunity to discuss the proposal and ask questions which are pertinent to the application. All other persons wishing to speak in favor of or against the application will then be asked to do so. All speakers are asked to avoid repetitive comments and confine their comments to those which are relevant to the application at hand. Cross examination by the general public may be allowed only if the Commission feels it would be appropriate and useful. All questions from the floor will be directed through the Chair only. After all of the relevant facts have been heard, the Chair will call for a motion. Once the motion has been made and seconded, the HDC only will discuss the motion followed by the Chair's call for a vote. Only active members of the Commission shall vote. The alternate will sit as an active member with full voting rights only when a regular member is unable to serve at any meeting. During the discussion among voting members, no further testimony from the floor will be accepted unless specifically requested by a Board member. Every effort will be made to render a decision this evening. The minutes of this meeting will be on file in the Planning Department within 14 days. Certificates of Appropriateness granted this evening will be available in the Planning Department within two (2) days of this hearing. The hearing of any HDC application which has not yet started before 10:30 p.m. will not be heard this evening and a special hearing date will be scheduled. This rule, however, may be waived by a majority vote of the Commission. All decisions of the HDC are final and legally binding under the authority of Article XI of the East

Greenwich Zoning Ordinance and Article 45, Section 24.1 of the RIGL. All decisions of this Commission may be appealed to the Zoning Board of Review.

Mr. Matthew McGeorge added the HDC considers local standards as well as Federal guidelines when reviewing applications and noted this is a collaborative process between the Board and the applicant. Mr. Matthew McGeorge explained the sequence for review of applications and its helpfulness to understand how the process works before the Board hears the applications. He noted each application is reviewed in of itself; the Commissioners receive the applications prior to the actual meeting in order for each Board member to review the content. The Board members identify properties and character defining features and historical and architecturally significant to the district that are taken into consideration. When applicants come before the Board there is a discussion in order to better understand the project at hand and answer questions that arise. The Board determines the standards that apply; hearing applications in this type of forum allows the Board to discuss alternatives, offer suggestions and provide support for the applicant to hopefully have a successful outcome and possibly save money.

Mr. Matthew McGeorge introduced the Board members and Staff present and read the application items into the record.

Historic District Commission Hearings – 6:30 PM

1. Thomas Gerald LLC; Jerry Zarrella, Jr.

67 Queen Street; Map 085 Plat 001 Lot 117

Proposed Work: Redevelop the site into a multi-family condominium complex containing two structures – CONCEPTUAL

PROPOSAL:

The Applicant has submitted a Comprehensive Permit application to redevelop the site into a multi-family condominium complex containing two structures with twelve (12) one-bedroom units, three (3) two-bedroom units, and one (1) one-bedroom penthouse. This is a conceptual application and the applicant is looking for feedback from the HDC regarding the design. No set list of materials has been submitted at this time, but will be required at final HDC review.

STANDARDS:

Commission Standard #5 is applicable to this application. It states 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.

Matthew McGeorge introduced the project and stated that this application has been through a lot of previous review including site visits and was deemed demolition appropriate.

The applicant, Jerry Zarrella, Jr. and Ron Stevenson, architect was in attendance and reiterated the proposal. The applicant stated that the discussion will be in regard to medium density housing, missing middle housing, which is a range of house scales, buildings, multiple units that fit in the fabric of the community, both in scale and form to detach single-family houses that they surround. He also commented that this style housing solves three problems...East Greenwich housing stock, growing demand for walkability, and to meet the different incomes and generational needs.

Jerry Zarrella explained that Phase 1 of the project has already been completed and the 2nd phase is a comprehensive plan consisting of 16 units, 19 bedrooms, 1 parking spot for every bedroom on site and additional parking within the public right of way as an improvement funded by the applicant. The 66ft public right of way in front of the home currently has 2 parking spots.

Ron Stevenson, Architect added that Phase 1 sits higher than the Phase 2 property and, in some cases, 15 feet lower on Phase 2 than Phase 1 and at no point will Phase 2 be higher than Phase 1. He also commented that the project will be similar to Phase 1 in terms of specs with the exception of stucco, board and batten and a stone base.

Matthew McGeorge commented that the stair detailing needs some resolution, or other rails, walls with scuppers instead, something like that.

Gregory Maxwell suggested the removal of one floor which would give it more parking spaces.

Matthew McGeorge asks if anyone from the public had any questions or comments. Several members of the public spoke. Jeanine Freitas, living in Phase 1 of the current project stated she and several neighbors feel as though Phase 2 is highly over developed for the area and not in character with any of the homes around it. Cheryl Parody, another resident of Phase 1 that she agreed with the first neighbor and the project is ginormous for the small lot. She also commented that over the years she was informed that Phase 2 would be another building with 2 units and then it exploded into something larger. Charlie Hackett had questions about the density. He

asked if the density reported was Phase 1 and Phase 2 or if it was just Phase 2 because it looked like it included Phase 1 which doesn't seem to be an accurate representation of the new plan proposed. Jerry Zarrella, Jr. stated that in talking about density he likes to talk about bedrooms. Phase 1 had 25 bedrooms and Phase 2 is proposing 19 bedrooms.

Matthew McGeorge commented that the proportions of the ceiling, the massing, the siding, all of that is good and stated he would be open to being swayed on the mass of the largest building if the commission felt that it should be reduced in scale, whether it is horizontal or vertical in some way. Karl Megules stated that he loves the works but it's large. Neal McNamara stated that a reduction in scale would be good.

2. East Greenwich Yacht Club

10 Water Street; Map 085 Plat 001 Lot 387

Proposed Work: Change window material from wood to vinyl and add 7 Double-Hung Vinyl Windows- FINAL

PROPOSAL: The Applicant is proposing to change the window material on the NE side of the building from wood to vinyl due to wood rot. Wood windows were originally approved at the February 9, 2022 Historic District Meeting.

STANDARDS: Commission Standards #1 #2 and #8 apply to this application.

Commission Standard #1 applicable to this application. It states that original materials and architectural features shall be maintained or repaired whenever possible rather than replaced.

Commission Standard #2 is applicable to this application. It states that if existing materials have deteriorated beyond repair the new materials shall match the originals in composition, design, texture and other visual qualities.

Commission Standard #8 is applicable and 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.

Matthew McGeorge introduced the project.

John Mollicone, Applicant and Rob Hamlin were present. John Mollicone stated that the current large pane windows are Anderson wood windows, but they are rotted that they have been there since 1989. Rob Hamlin stated the building is non-conforming and that they have vinyl in other portions of the building. Matthew McGeorge stated that he has no problem substituting wood but the vinyl precedent, there are many other options available. Greg Maxwell asked if it was a wood window with a clad on it? John Mollicone stated No, the inside of the window will have a wood finish. The window itself has a very narrow profile as far as the frame of the window.

John Mollicone went on to state that the old photos depict a 2/1 configuration but the current windows are a 1/1 double hung window that have wood sashes where the sills are rotting. Greg Maxwell asked the applicant to consider using a 2/1 configuration in place of the proposed 1/1 double hung windows. John Mollicone replied that it's not an issue at all to change the proposal to a 2/1 configuration. Greg Maxwell also asked the applicant whether the company makes a double hung window with a grille attached to the interior and exterior. The applicant responded it can be raised on the outside or put on the inside.

Matthew McGeorge stated that it's a unique situation. The building has evolved and most of the elements are not original or historically contributing.

A motion was made by Greg Maxwell and seconded by Hannah Zangari to approve the application with the following condition...that the (7) single double hung window be changed to a 2/1 configuration and will have muntin bars applied to the interior and exterior permanent grilles. Also, Greg Maxwell stated that the proposed project meets the relevant standard 1, 2 & 8, apply to this application.

The motion was passed unanimously 6-0.

3. Christopher Lane

20 Marlborough Street; Map 085 Plat 001 Lot 187

Proposed Work: Solar Panel expansion and battery install- FINAL

PROPOSAL: The Applicant is proposing to expand the current solar system of 17 panels with the addition of 23 panels to be located on top of the detached garage.

STANDARDS: Commission Standards #4 and 5 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.

In addition to the general standards that apply, the Commission shall also apply Section 260-62(A)(4) Plan Review of Solar Panels, the HDC will consider building-mounted or building-integrated systems; ground-mounted systems are prohibited in the downtown historic district. Solar panels should be placed in areas that are least viewable to the public. Installations that would alter the characteristic features of a historic structure should be avoided. Panels should not be visible above the roofline and panels installed on flat -roof buildings should be set back from the edge. Where solar panels and other appurtenances will not be visible from any public way, they shall be eligible for Administrative staff review and approval (consistent with Section 260-62(c) of the Zoning Code) rather than a review by the full Historic District.

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation & Illustrated Guidelines on Sustainability for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings published in 2011 speaks to the use of solar technology. The table below provides examples of appropriate treatments versus examples that could negatively impact a building's character.

Chairman Matthew McGeorge introduced the project.

Christopher Lane reiterated the proposal and stated the detached garage is minimally visible. Mr. Maxwell asks if the panels will be on the East and West sides of the home. Mr. Lane confirms.

No one from the public was in for or against the application.

A motion was made by Erinn Calise and seconded by Neal McNamara to approve the application as submitted. Also, Erinn Calise stated that the proposed project meets the relevant standard 4 & 5, apply to this application.

The motion was passed unanimously 6-0.

4. Carson Cambre

17 Bicknell Avenue; Map 085 Plat 001 Lot 336

Proposed Work: Installation of 23 Roof Mounted Solar Modules- FINAL

PROPOSAL: The Applicant is proposing to install and wire 23 Rec Solar REC400NP3 (400W) roof mounted 9.20kWDC, 6.67 kWAC Solar panels onto the roof.

STANDARDS: Commission Standards #4 and 5 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.

In addition to the general standards that apply, the Commission shall also apply Section 260-62(A)(4) Plan Review of Solar Panels, the HDC will consider building-mounted or building-integrated systems; ground-mounted systems are prohibited in the downtown historic district. Solar panels should be placed in areas that are least viewable to the public. Installations that would alter the characteristic features of a historic structure should be avoided. Panels should not be visible above the roofline and panels installed on flat -roof buildings should be set back from the edge. Where solar panels and other appurtenances will not be visible from any public way, they shall be eligible for Administrative staff review and approval (consistent with Section 260-62(c) of the Zoning Code) rather than a review by the full Historic District.

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation & Illustrated Guidelines on Sustainability for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings published in 2011 speaks to the use of solar technology. The table below provides examples of appropriate treatments versus examples that could negatively impact a building's character.

Chairman Matthew McGeorge introduced the project.

Edgar Gonzalez with Rooftop Power represented the applicant at 17 Bicknell Avenue. He explained that the usable part of the roof is 488 sq. ft and they needed to compromise by putting additional panels on the roof of the porch. He stated that 4 of the 5 panels can be seen from the street front and that 4 panels closest to the street can be moved. Edgar Gonzalez commented that he can redesign the panels so they

are not on the front porch. Matthew McGeorge stated that he would like to see the 4 panels moved, relocated, or scaled back on the kW.

Matthew McGeorge called for a motion to approve the application conditional upon the low front porch panels being relocated. Both, Matthew McGeorge and Greg Maxwell agree to referee the new design.

A motion was made by Greg Maxwell and seconded by Matthew McGeorge to approve the application conditional upon the referee of the design of the solar array. Also, Greg Maxwell stated that the proposed project meets the relevant standard 4 & 5, apply to this application.

The motion was passed unanimously 6-0.

5. Charles Bowse
61 Reynolds Street; Map 074 Plat 002 Lot 148
Proposed Work: Chimney removal – FINAL

PROPOSAL: The Applicant is proposing to remove the chimney to accommodate a kitchen remodel and install a faux chimney.

STANDARDS: Commission Standards #1 #2 and #5 apply to this 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 originals in composition, design, texture and other visual qualities.

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.

Matthew McGeorge introduced the project.

Greg Maxwell stated that he appreciates that the applicant is keeping the original details.

A motion was made by Erinn Calise and seconded by Greg Maxwell to approve the application as submitted. Also, Greg Maxwell stated that the proposed project meets the relevant standard 1, 2 & 5, apply to this application.

The motion was passed unanimously 6-0.

6. Trio Jez, LLC

25 First Avenue; Map 075 Plat 003 Lot 042

Proposed Work: Construct 3 new dormers, replace existing entryway, enclose rear porch, replace of windows and doors. – FINAL

PROPOSAL: The Applicant is proposing to renovate the of existing structure and construct 3 dormers, enclose the rear porch, replace existing entryway on Clift Street, modify entrance on First Avenue, construct an ADA accessible ramp, and replace all existing doors and windows.

STANDARDS:

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 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 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 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.

Matthew McGeorge introduced the project.

Janet Goulart, the applicant and Nicholas Perrotti, contractor were present stated that she runs her business out of this property and stated that she would like to keep the current shingles on the home. However, the shingles are peeling and there are quite a few areas that are rotted. The goal is to keep the shingles where they can and replace them where they are needed. Also, being proposed is shutters, doors, and window replacement.

Matthew McGeorge commented that demolishing the rails, post, and concrete is no issue on the First Avenue side. Also, the brackets do not appear to be original. Matthew McGeorge stated he would like the railing and pennant to be a replacement in-kind. The contractor, commented that they would be replacing the concrete with stone veneer and a blue stone top. Matthew McGeorge stated that a bent wrought-iron would be nice as well.

Janet Goulart stated that current windows are vinyl replacements with a 6/6 light pattern. The proposed windows are a 6/1 light pattern in which Greg Maxwell stated that a true divided light 6/6 light pattern would be more appropriate. The fenestration size will change not width wise but length wise.

In terms of the shutters, Matthew McGeorge stated that the use of a real shutter with a hinge kit would be appropriate. The shutter does not actually have to function but it should have the appearance of a functioning shutter. Greg Maxwell agreed.

Erinn Calise asked the applicant whether the front door is original to the home. Both the applicant and the contractor did not believe the front door was original to the home but it is solid wood. The contractor stated that the wood is deteriorating and you can practically put a finger through the panels. The applicant confirms that all (3) doors side door, front door, and back door will all be replaced. Matthew McGeorge states that he would be okay with the side and back door being replaced with a single panel door. However, he would like to see 2 or 3 panels on the front door.

Greg Maxwell retreated back to the side elevation and asked whether the applicant plans to reuse or rebuild the cover. The applicant responded that she plans to rebuild it with a gable roof to match the dormers. He also asked whether the current door had sidelights because the proposal shows sidelights. The applicant responded that the current door does not have sidelights and she does not have a preference on whether

they are there or not. Greg Maxwell stated that the newly proposed door should not have sidelights.

Greg Maxwell asked the applicant whether she plans to replace the decking on the porch with wood and the applicant is proposing composite which is not visible from the street. He also inquired about the ramp material and the contractor stated it would be composite decking for wheelchair accessibility and limited mobility. The ramp would not be under a cover, it would be fully exposed, meaning it would be exposed to rain, snow, etc.

Matthew McGeorge provided a synopsis of what was discussed during the meeting. He stated that the 3-panel door in the front of the building, along with the front vestibule will be refereed but everything else will be approved as submitted.

No one from the public was present.

Matthew McGeorge calls for a motion to approve the application conditional upon 6/6 true divided light windows, First Avenue porch resolution being refereed – specific to materials such as metal handrails, wood handrails, stone steps and how they are detailed, and the brackets that will hold that roof up. Greg Maxwell and Matthew McGeorge to referee.

A motion was made by Greg Maxwell and seconded by Matthew McGeorge to approve the application with the conditions that the proposed windows are a 6/6 configuration true divided light, permanent grilles on the interior and exterior of the window with a spacer bar, the front door vestibule and steps will be refereed. Also, Greg Maxwell stated that the proposed project meets the relevant standard 1, 2, 4, 5 & 8, apply to this application.

The motion was passed unanimously 6-0.

Matthew McGeorge makes a motion to move Application # 7 to the end of the Agenda as he is representing the Applicant.

Neal McNamara leaves at 8:35 p.m.

8. Paul & Judith Cullinane

13 Prospect Street; Map 085 Plat 002 Lot 201

Proposed Work: Replace Main Door, Stair Treads, & Hand Railings – FINAL

PROPOSAL: The Applicant is proposing to remove the storm door and main door at the rear of home and replacing it with a Craftsman style door. Also, the applicant is proposing to remove the current stair treads and replace it with mahogany to match the porch in the front of the home. This includes replacing the railings and balusters.

STANDARDS: Commission Standards #1 #2 and #5 apply to this 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 originals in composition, design, texture and other visual qualities.

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.

Matthew McGeorge introduced the project.

Paul Cullinane stated that he is replacing the main door and taking away the storm door while also replacing the stairs.

Greg Maxwell inquired about the material being used for the steps. The applicant advised that he will be using Mahogany. He also asked whether the applicant if the door has a single light window or whether it is a divided light window. The applicant responded that it is divided light.

Erinn Calise and Matthew McGeorge commented that she questioned the appropriateness of the Craftsman style door on a Victorian home but noted that the door will be in the rear of the home and will be part of the addition that was not original to the Victorian home.

Greg Maxwell comments that the current door appears to be an interior door. The applicant states that the door is bubbling and you can see daylight through the panels.

A motion was made by Erinn Calise and seconded by Matthew McGeorge to approve the application as submitted. Also, Erinn Calise stated that the proposed project meets the relevant standard 1, 2 & 5, apply to this application.

The motion was passed unanimously 5-0.

9. Shiv RG LLC; Prutha Patel
239 Main Street; Map 085 Plat 001 Lot 208
Proposed Work: Replace Windows – FINAL

PROPOSAL: The Applicant is proposing to replace the existing windows with Harvey Majesty gliding wooden windows. The windows will have matching grids and the applicant intends to keep the exterior woodwork while adding a small stop that will be painted to match.

STANDARDS: Commission Standards #1 #2 and #8 apply to this application.

Commission Standard #1 applicable to this application. It states that original materials and architectural features shall be maintained or repaired whenever possible rather than replaced.

Commission Standard #2 is applicable to this application. It states that if existing materials have deteriorated beyond repair the new materials shall match the originals in composition, design, texture and other visual qualities.

Commission Standard #8 is applicable and 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.

Matthew McGeorge introduced the project.

Adam Park reiterates the proposal. He stated that the front (3) windows were replaced during the prior remodel with deadlight glass and 5/8th grids between the glass. Windows 1 & 3 are cracked and broken and windows 4 & 5 would have windows that open to provide another area for egress.

Matthew McGeorge commented “Just for clarity, the 2/2 is per sash. Effectively, the windows will be the same 4/4 look.”

Greg Maxwell asked whether the grilles will be between the glass and Adam Park states no it will be Simulated Divided with spacers and even the window in the front all the way to the right is a 6 light, has an external grid, not an internal grid. That will be duplicated with a 1 inch.

Matthew McGeorge commented “So, it’s just a sliding bypass, each sash 2/2 and Adam Park responded “Yeah, and the overlapping muntin is only an inch and a half so it’s not like the center will be 4 inches and then you have 1-inch grilles. It’s so close that it almost gives the idea that that center is another grille, it will look really natural. I think the idea is to have windows one through three operating in all the same direction.” Matthew McGeorge stated “The only thing I would say there is remain make it operationally in the front and if it’s different on the side, it doesn’t matter really.”

A motion was made by Greg Maxwell and seconded by Erinn Calise to approve the application as submitted. Also, Greg Maxwell stated that the proposed project meets the relevant standard 1, 2 & 8, apply to this application.

The motion was passed unanimously 5-0.

7. Jared and Natalie Burrows
1896 Middle Road; Map 049 Plat 015 Lot 006
Proposed Work: Two-Story Addition for new bedrooms- CONCEPTUAL

PROPOSAL: The new homeowner is looking to make the residence more user friendly and provide a ground floor guest suite for their aging parent. The sizes and configurations of spaces has been blurred over time, and little remains of the original interior integrity. The proposal seeks to demolish the non-contributing exit stair from the second-floor apartment and relocate the basement bulkhead. Part of the east facing elevation of the later addition is effectively being removed in its entirety to accommodate the new addition. The new addition will be set back from the south facing gable end to speak to itself as a later addition. The ridge of the proposed addition will also be slightly lower than the original structure, and the later addition. The intent is to match the corner board, water table, and fascia profiles in general, match the pitch of the existing roof, and match the general character of the fenestration pattern.

STANDARDS: Commission Standards #2 #4 and #5 apply to this application.

Commission Standard #2 is applicable to this application. It states if existing materials have deteriorated beyond repair the new materials shall match the originals in composition, design, texture and other visual qualities.

Commission Standard # 4 is applicable to this application. It 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.

Commission Standard #5 is applicable to this application. It states 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.

Matthew McGeorge recuses himself.

Greg Maxwell introduces the project.

Matthew McGeorge, represented the applicant and stated that there was an addition put on at a later date. The existing stairs on the inside is a combination of abandonment and infill. The stairs to the basement was infilled with floor, the stairs up to the second floor is a pantry that walks up to a ceiling so the floor on the second floor was infilled and then the stairs to the attic remains.

Greg Maxwell asked if the addition was modern and Matthew McGeorge stated that its dimensional lumber, 2 x 4 framing, and was gutted to create a studio apartment upstairs which is what the pressure treated stair addition access is.

Matthew McGeorge added that the owner recently bought the property and they have a mother that is living with them and would like to create a ground floor with a master bedroom for them, modify the interior layout, and restore the original stairs while infilling the attic stairs. He also went on to state that the front porch appeared to be a later addition and they had a discussion regarding the creation of a door from the living room out onto the porch.

Greg Maxwell commented that there does not appear to be a significant change to the exterior and that the homeowners are doing a lot to improve the condition overall. He also commented that there appears to be three roofs coming together. Matthew McGeorge stated that he needs to look at how he can potentially get the fascias to hit and create the valley.

Historic District Commission Business - After Hearings

1. Minutes: Review and approval of the February 8, 2023 Meeting.

A motion was made by Erinn Calise and seconded by Greg Maxwell to approve minutes February 8, 2023. The motion was passed unanimously 5-0.

2. Local Historic Tax Credit Applications:

- Kristie & Matt Stark, 56 Somerset Street; Map 085 AP 002 Lot 204

A motion was made by Matthew McGeorge and seconded by Greg Maxwell to approve the Historic Tax Credit Application. Mr. McGeorge signed off on subject tax credit application for 56 Somerset Street. Staff acknowledged application would be forwarded to tax assessor. The motion was passed unanimously 5-0.

- Maxwell & Brazier Trusts, 49 Marion Street; Map 085 AP 001 Lot 402

Mr. Maxwell recuses himself.

A motion was made by Erinn Calise and seconded by Matthew McGeorge to approve the Historic Tax Credit Application. Mr. McGeorge signed off on subject tax credit application for 49 Marion Street. Staff acknowledged application would be forwarded to tax assessor. The motion was passed unanimously 4-0.

- Laura Ernst, 23 Somerset Street; Map 085 AP 001 Lot 330

A motion was made by Matthew McGeorge and seconded by Erinn Calise to approve the Historic Tax Credit Application. Mr. McGeorge signed off on subject tax credit application for 23 Somerset Street. Staff acknowledged application would be forwarded to tax assessor. The motion was passed unanimously 5-0.

- Samuel Sinel Trust 2008, 12 Middle Road; Map 074 AP 008 Lot 001

A motion was made by Matthew McGeorge and seconded by Greg Maxwell to approve the Historic Tax Credit Application. Mr. McGeorge signed off on subject tax credit application for 12 Middle Road. Staff acknowledged application would be forwarded to tax assessor. The motion was passed unanimously 5-0.

3. COMMISSIONER REPORTS: Gregory Maxwell makes a motion to add the “Old Eldredge House” to the agenda and seconded by Matthew McGeorge regarding modifications to the home.

The motion was passed unanimously 5-0.

Bruce Lofgren states that the home in question is just outside the historic district.

4. Matthew McGeorge made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Erinn Calise.

Adjourn 9:08 p.m.

For additional information, please contact the Planning Department.