

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MINUTES

March 25 , 2021 Meeting

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

Present: Matthew McGeorge, Vice-Chair; Erinn Calise, Gregory Maxwell, Andrew Barkley, Neal McNamara, and Edward Quinlan.

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

Mr. Matthew McGeorge, Vice-Chair of the Commission, and Acting-Chair of the Commission started the meeting at 6:30 p.m.

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

Historic District Commission Hearings

- 1. East Greenwich Cove Builders, LLC
11 Lion Street; Map 85 AP 1 Lot 395**

Proposed Work: Complete Demolition of Structure - FIRST HEARING - REVOTE regarding the historical significance of the subject structure & finding the application complete. (Continued from the December 9, 2020, January 13, 2021, and February 10, 2021 meetings)

- 2. East Greenwich Cove Builders, LLC
11 Lion Street; Map 85 AP 1 Lot 395
Proposed Work: Complete Demolition of Structure - SECOND HEARING**

Attorney William Landry, representing East Greenwich Cove Builders, LLC requested a continuance for 11 Lion Street.

Motion by Mr. McGeorge to continue the application to the following month. Seconded by Ms. Calise.

Roll Call Vote: Ms. Calise: Yes, Mr. Maxwell: Yes, Mr. McGeorge: Yes, and Mr. McNamara: Yes, and Mr. Quinlan: Yes. (VOTE: 5 - 0).

- 3. 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 - Review of Revised CONCEPTUAL**

Ms. Hitchen stated the Applicant has requested to withdraw the application.

Motion by Mr. McGeorge to withdraw the application. Seconded by Mr. McNamara.

Roll Call Vote: Ms. Calise: Yes, Mr. Maxwell: Yes, Mr. McGeorge: Yes, and Mr. McNamara: Yes, and Mr. Quinlan: Yes. (VOTE: 5 - 0).

**4. 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**

Mr. Barkley joined the meeting at 6:50 PM.

Mr. Thomas Clayton of Touchdown Realty Group, LLC represented the application. He explained that he found historical data that dated the building to c.1784 not c.1875. Mr. Clayton argued that due to this finding of fact, the installed 4/4 windows are more appropriate to the c.1784 architectural period compared to the 2/2 configuration that was originally approved. A structure built in 1784 would align with Federal style architecture (1780-1820) which generally had small multi-pane sash windows (usually 12/12, 12/8, 9/9, or 6/6 that abut the eaves on the second story). An 1880 early Republican/Greek Revival style building windows might be similar to the Federal style in that they are typically wood double-hung sash with 6/6 panes. In late Greek Revival buildings the windows gradually developed into a 2/2 configuration.

Mr. McGeorge did not think the 4/4 configuration was not inappropriate as long as the shadow line and depth created on the exterior of the window was visible. He did acknowledge generally speaking if the spacer bar is omitted a window would not be approved however given the windows in the subject property have been installed; given the majority of the windows on the street side are above the street elevation the level of scrutiny could be forgiven in this particular case but a precedence should not be set for future applications. Mr. McGeorge commented the windows located along the street level are of super importance, therefore any opening observed at the pedestrian level should have a true-divided light.

Ms. Calise appreciated the level of effort that went into researching the history of the property. She did find the installed windows to be of much better quality than the previous vinyl windows but was uneasy

about setting a precedence with approving a true-divided light window then having an Applicant install something of lesser quality and asking for forgiveness. Ms. Calise reminded the Applicant the issue was brought to their attention before all the windows were installed by Staff yet all the windows were continued to be installed on a very prominent structure. She had a tough time getting past that.

Mr. McGeorge found that the amount of investment and positive contribution that is being infused to the district and community as a whole for this project is quite valuable. Due to the shadow lines being maintained on the upper floors he found sufficient in this case, Mr. McGeorge would vote to allow the windows to remain with the caveat the ground floor windows be replaced with a more appropriate window.

Mr. Maxwell agreed with Mr. McGeorge's comments; he was uncomfortable as to how everything unfolded over the last couple of months but was willing to agree with a compromised solution. Mr. Maxwell was of the assumption the original windows were most likely a 6/6 configuration but considering there is no official record he was willing to accept a 4/4 configuration. He could confirm there have been significant changes to the subject property over the years and the proposed modifications to the building are a vast improvement compared to the current state of the structure. Mr. Maxwell also noted that at the street level it is important to have a true-divided light with a spacer bar with an applied interior and exterior grille for a more robust sash.

The Commission explained they would want the four street level windows specifically on Main Street to have the full-divided light windows and were willing to let the windows on Spring Street (north elevation) remain without the spacer bar.

With no further comments, Mr. McGeorge opened the hearing for public comments. No public comments. He then asked for a motion.

Mr. Maxwell made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by Tom and Kelly Clayton of Touchdown Realty Group, LLC.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 319 Main Street, on the corner of Main Street and Spring Street.
- 3) The property in question is a significantly contributing structure, being a c.1780s Federal style 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 to retain the installed 4/4 simulated divided lite windows with the stipulation the sashes on the Main Street pedestrian level will be replaced with true-divided light windows with the spacer bar and fixed grilles on the interior and exterior of the four specified windows. This is consistent with Commission Standard #4 and 8. Seconded by Mr. McNamara.

Roll Call Vote: Ms. Calise: Yes, Mr. Maxwell: Yes, Mr. McGeorge: Yes, Mr. McNamara: Yes, Mr. Barkley: Yes, and Mr. Quinlan: Yes. (VOTE: 6 - 0).

**5. 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" - FINAL**

(Mr. Barkley recused himself from the application.)

Mr. McGeorge 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, stated that he has not made any changes since the re-conceptual review. The application has since received the necessary dimensional relief for the height modification from the Zoning Board.

As Mr. McGeorge noted at the conceptual meeting, he reiterated the new design is superior to the previous garage design.

With no comments from the Commissioners or public Mr. McGeorge made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by Robert and Amy Coates.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 30 West Street.
- 3) The property in question is a contributing structure, being a c.1850 Greek Revival style.
- 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. McGeorge to approve the application, specifically modification to the final approve plan dated November 10, 2020 - change the roof pitch of the detached garage to match that of the primary structure which will increase the height to 17'-11 ¾". This is consistent with Commission Standards #4 & 5. Seconded by Mr. Maxwell.

Roll Call Vote: Ms. Calise: Yes, Mr. Maxwell: Yes, Mr. McGeorge: Yes, Mr. McNamara: Yes, and Mr. Quinlan: Yes. (VOTE: 5 - 0).

**6. David Purvis for Anthony Italiano
5 Pearl Street; Map 85 AP 2 Lot 127
Proposed Work: Replace Front Door - FINAL**

Mr. McGeorge stated Commission Standard 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. David Purvis, contractor for the project, represented the application. He explained the homeowner would like to replace the existing original wood traditional style front door containing a detailed **glass arch with four panels with a Simpson brand wood 6-lite with ¾”** double hip-raised vertical panels. Mr. Purvis asserted the existing door does not lock and none of the features work anymore along with weather-stripping that has deteriorated and is very drafty. The intent is to remove the storm door.

The Commissioners were of the opinion the proposed door is a craftsman style door which does not match the style of the house but were not opposed to the door being replaced since the existing door did not seem to be original nor was the geometry appropriate. Mr. McGeorge was also not opposed to installing a new door that had a squarer configuration.

Mr. McGeorge recommended finding a more appropriate door from a glazing and panel standpoint considering the storm door will be eliminated which will make the door more prominent. He suggested a single row of 4-lites or a single panel on the bottom; he was of the opinion another door spec option could be refereed.

Mr. Barkley was also of the opinion the existing door was not original. He also provided several options as to a more appropriate door that would suit the house.

With no further comments from the Commissioners or public Mr. McGeorge asked for a motion.

Mr. Maxwell made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by David Purvis, owned by Anthony Italiano.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 5 Pearl Street.
- 3) The property in question is a contributing structure, being a c.1930 Colonial Revival building.
- 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 the front door but not with the submitted craftsman style door. Commission members Mr. Maxwell and Mr. McGeorge will referee a more traditional style door. This is consistent with Commission Standard #4. Seconded by Mr. McNamara.

Roll Call Vote: Ms. Calise: Yes, Mr. Maxwell: Yes, Mr. McGeorge: Yes, Mr. McNamara: Yes, Mr. Barkley: Yes, and Mr. Quinlan: Yes. (VOTE: 6 - 0).

- 7. Pamela Unwin-Barkley representing Christopher Feisthamel
24 Bicknell Avenue; Map 85 AP 1 Lot 357
Proposed Work: Exterior Renovation with Addition to include
the demolition and rebuild of roof by increasing the overall
height with addition of Two Front Dormers; Rebuild of the Side
Entry; and Rebuild of Rear Side and Sun Porch - FINAL**

(Mr. Andrew Barkley recused himself from the application.)

Mr. McGeorge stated Standards 2, 4, 5 and 9 apply to the 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. 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 partial 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. Demolition shall not result in a significant threat or loss of an historic and/or architectural resource to the Town, State or nation.

Ms. Pamela Unwin-Barkley, architect for the project represent the application. Also present was Mr. Chris Feisthamel and Ms. Michelle Place, homeowners. Ms. Unwin-Barkley explained the how the project developed over the course of the last year. Before the Commission is a plan that calls for raising the roof, adding two front shed dormers; demolition and rebuilding the side entry along with the demolition and rebuilding the rear side and sun porch. The plan still calls for replacing the front wooden stairs/porch with a bluestone porch and right facing step system minus the metal roof which encroach at maximum 6' onto Town property. Additionally, the proposal includes removing the existing shingle siding to expose the original underlying clapboard siding. The renovation and addition will essentially reconfigure the entire interior of the house, provide functionality of the interior floor plan while increasing square footage in an efficient way, provide much needed head space and will comply with current building codes which the existing home lacks.

Mr. McGeorge pointed out that there is significant precedence for the evolution of what was once a modest structure. He was of the opinion the architect did a great job of managing the eave lines, massing and composition right down to keeping the ridge line off of the rear slightly below the ridge line of the existing house. Mr. McGeorge found the

submission to be a solid application and well considered project. The only minor suggestion he could think of was a different lite configuration for the new addition but it was not something he would condition upon approval.

Mr. Maxwell echoed Mr. McGeorge's comments in that he could see the amount of work and time that went into the project design and appreciated that the new addition was being added towards the back and away from the front elevation. He saw nothing but improvements towards the property, found it to be consistent with the fabric of the neighborhood even though a lot of work is happening.

Mr. McGeorge found the proposal to be an exemplary project and the architect and homeowner should be proud of their work.

With no further questions or comments from the Commission, Mr. McGeorge opened the hearing for public comments. No public comments.

Mr. McGeorge asked for a motion.

Ms. Calise made the following findings of fact:

- 1) A written application has been submitted by Pamela Unwin-Barkley on behalf of Christopher Feisthamel.
- 2) The property in question is located within the East Greenwich Historic District, specifically 24 Bicknell Avenue.
- 3) The property in question is a contributing structure, being a c.1835 Colonial/Transitional Federal Greek Revival home.
- 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 Ms. Calise to approve the application as submitted which includes an exterior renovation with an addition to include the demolition and rebuild of roof by increasing the overall height with addition of two front dormers; rebuild of the side entry; and rebuild of

the rear side and sun porch. The materials are approved as noted on plans dated March 1, 2021. This is consistent with Commission Standards #2, 4, 5, and 9. Seconded by Mr. McNamara.

Roll Call Vote: Ms. Calise: Yes, Mr. Maxwell: Yes, Mr. McGeorge: Yes, Mr. McNamara: Yes, and Mr. Quinlan: Yes. (VOTE: 5 - 0). (Mr. Barkley recused.)

**8. Paul Vespia of Hill & Harbor Design+Build representing
Chester & Arlene Salomon
27 Rector Street; Map 85 AP 1 Lot 275
Proposed Work: Demolition of existing South side sunroom to
make way for a 20 'x20 one-story Master Suite addition;
Addition of a 22 'x24' attached garage on the north side of the
home; and Replacement of the Second-floor vinyl windows to
match the first floor Pella Windows - CONCEPTUAL**

Mr. McGeorge stated Commission Standard 4, 5 and 8 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. 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. Paul Vespia of Hill & Harbor Design+Build, represented the property owner, being Chester and Arlene Salomon. Mr. Vespia explained the plan includes demolish the existing left side sunroom to make way for a 20'20' first floor master suite. Additionally, the request is to add a 22'x24' attached two-vehicle garage on the right side of the

home. Finally, there are existing second floor vinyl windows the Applicant would like to replace to match those on the first floor, being Pella replacement windows. He noted the garage addition will require dimensional relief from the Zoning Board.

Mr. McGeorge found the pitched roofs of the new additions compliment the existing primary home as well as the additions being subservient to the primary house. He was concerned about the proposed 9/9 window configuration on the south side addition but overall as a conceptual review did not have any major issues. Mr. Vespia noted the 9/9 window grille was in error and will be modified come final plan review.

Mr. Barkley pointed out the elevation and proportion differences in the renderings and construction drawings which made it difficult to interpret exactly what was going on. He asserted the proportion and scale is very important and the plans do not clarify key points.

Mr. Maxwell was of the opinion the additions appear to be bulky, particularly the garage addition with the proportions being large on both sides. He suggested a smaller sized addition.

Ms. Calise echoed Mr. Barkley's comments noting she found it hard to understand the actual size and proportion of the additions in comparison to the primary house; she did not want to approve something out of scale.

The Commissioners conceptually had no objections to the idea of adding an attached garage and master suite to the home yet it will come down to final dimensions and details as well as window and door fenestration along the back.

**9. Paul Vespia of Hill & Harbor Design+Build for property owned by David & Samantha O'Neil
One James Street; Map 84 AP 2 Lot 264
Proposed Work: Construction of a New Single-Family Residence - CONCEPTUAL**

(Mr. Barkley recused himself from the application).

Mr. McGeorge stated Commission Standard #5 applies to this application which 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.

The Applicant has submitted renderings of a conceptual house design to be constructed on the vacant lot. The proposed house is about 100' wide and about 24' deep and is positioned on the parcel to fit in the building envelope. The first floor of the home will include a two-vehicle garage, gym, full bathroom, playroom/great room, family room and combined kitchen and dining room on the first floor. The second floor will contain the master suite along with three guest bedrooms, an office, laundry room, two full bathrooms and storage area above the garage.

The Applicant only submitted the front elevation of the design which incorporates the use of large gaged windows, paneling, possibly clapboard, a steep pitched roof, recessed front entry, with the combination of an asphalt and metal seam roof.

Mr. Paul Vespia stated he purchased the property from the O'Neil's back in December; it is a very tight building envelope in which they are trying to make it fit for their family needs.

Ms. Katie Vespia asserted the proposal appears large because of the length of it. She referred to 158 Division Street, pointing out it is 3700 square feet and 144 Division Street is 4400 square feet while the subject home is poised to be 3280 square feet. The overall length of the proposed home is about 100 feet in length inclusive of the garage.

Mr. Vespia noted the proposed design is a "modern Tudor" type look with a lot of paneling but also trying to be consistent with the district by installing clapboard siding. Mr. McGeorge asked if the Applicant could point to a single home precedent for a Tudor style in the historic

district. Mr. Vespia said he could not but a lot of the elements are present like the sweeping roofs such as the Empire style homes which are very similar.

Mr. McGeorge commented that he did not have a problem with modern architecture and though the siting of the proposed building was impeccably done given the constraints of the lot but he found the design confusing with many competing elements. He was of the opinion the design needs some reassessment with there being no precedent for Tudor given the Applicant trying to replicate a style that does not exist in the district. Mr. McGeorge preferred to see a 100 percent contemporary style home that uses appropriate materials.

Mr. Vespia noted the owner of the vacant lot had the request that the new home could not be ultra-modern because of the lot size and the aesthetic of their home.

Ms. Calise also voiced her concern with the size of the home noting she has seen similar sized and style homes in upscale county club settings of New York.

Mr. McGeorge suggested attempting to communicate limited visual impact of the structure because given the greater context and scale and opportunity to buffer views you almost want to make it in a way while still celebrating the architecture which is a challenge. Ms. Vespia agreed it has been a challenge considering the homes on West and Eldredge Streets have a mix of styles of homes.

Mr. McNamara stated he was concerned with the scale of the proposed house; not with respect to the homes behind it on Division Street but with respect to the homes it will face on West and Eldredge Streets as it appears the proposed house is much larger in scale and mass. He also found the Tudor look simply does blend in well and does “look” right in terms of the current style of the neighborhood.

Mr. McGeorge was not 100 percent concerned about the scale per se but did think it needs further exploration. He was concerned about the style precedent in relation to the applicable standard.

With no further questions from the Commission Mr. McGeorge opened the hearing to the public.

Mr. Greg DeGroot of 38 West Street said he had a clear line of sight to the proposed project. He agreed with the proposed style being a mismatch to the current styles of homes in the neighborhood.

Ms. Calise asked for clarification regarding the “proposed structure” located in the northwest corner of the subject property. Mr. Vespa commented that it is a proposed future structure for maybe a pool house in the future.

Ms. Ann Millard of 144 Division Street said the proposed home is like shoving a large house onto a lot is counterintuitive to her. She often sits outside in her backyard and she could only imagine the large gables of the subject house would restrict sunlight into her backyard.

Mr. James Millard of 144 Division Street has lived in his house for 30+ years and has worked really hard at maintaining his historic house to which he has received various awards for. For him, he could visualize a bungalow style home or smaller home on the site but not the massive home proposed.

Mr. McGeorge noted again that downplaying the impact is very important for the Applicant. He suggested the Applicant prepare a sun study, sketch a model of a couple of blocks and show the massings and proportions of the structure relative to other structures. He explained to the Applicant that if you want to convince people this is a valid project you need to do a high level of work.

Ms. Joan Hertel asked the Applicant to compare the proposed house to those on West and Eldredge Streets, not just to Division Street.

Ms. Pamela Unwin-Barkley said she had no problem with modern architecture but the application needs due diligence with compatibility and there needs to be compatibility and scale with other homes.

Mr. Maxwell said he found the application difficult in that the lot is currently vacant and it is such a radical change. He pointed out there are many valid comments being made by both Commission members and the public. He would like to see the Applicant prepare a context study (3D study that puts the house in context with the surroundings) so everyone can have a better understanding of the overall scale. He also did not have any issues with a modern designed house, he felt the proposed windows were rather large. In wrapping the conversation up Mr. McGeorge commented that procedurally speaking the Applicant can simply keep working on the overall design then return for additional comments. Mr. Vespia confirmed that he would like to return to the Commission for a second conceptual application.

Historic District Commission Business

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

Minutes tabled to the following month.

2. HDC Elections
 - a. Chair

Mr. McNamara nominated Mr. McGeorge as Chair. Mr. McGeorge accepted the nomination and said he would do his best to perform the duties as Chair of the HDC.

Roll Call Vote: Ms. Calise: Yes, Mr. Maxwell: Yes, Mr. McGeorge: Yes, Mr. McNamara: Yes, and Mr. Barkley: Yes. (VOTE: 5 - 0). (Mr. Quinlin left the meeting earlier in the evening.)

- b. Vice-Chair

Mr. McGeorge nominated Mr. Maxwell as Vice-Chair. Mr. Maxwell accepted the nomination with the condition there would be new elections in the summer.

Roll Call Vote: Ms. Calise: Yes, Mr. Maxwell: Yes, Mr. McGeorge: Yes, Mr. McNamara: Yes, and Mr. Barkley: Yes. (VOTE: 5 - 0). (Mr. Quinlin left the meeting earlier in the evening.)

3. COMMISSIONER REPORTS: Commission members may report on cases where they have been appointed as Referee, and refer observations or possible violations that they have observed to staff. Any substantive discussion of any such Report shall require addition to the Agenda by motion.

Ms. Hitchen asked to add 104 Duke Street for discussion purposes only.

Roll Call Vote: Ms. Calise: Yes, Mr. Maxwell: Yes, Mr. McGeorge: Yes, Mr. McNamara: Yes, and Mr. Barkley: Yes. (VOTE: 5 - 0).

Ms. Hitchen noted 104 Duke Street was just listed on the market for \$399,000. The Commissioners summarized how the potential new owner can move forward with the recent approvals the existing owner obtained for the property.

Without any opposition to adjourn, Ms. Calise motioned to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Maxwell.

Adjourned at 8:47 pm.

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

Lea Anthony Hitchen, Assistant Town Planner