



# Historic District Commission Minutes

Wednesday, April 12, 2023 Meeting

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

Present: Gregory Maxwell, Vice Chair; Karl Megules, Erinn Calise, and Hannah Zangari

Staff: Al Ranaldi, Planning Director; Christina Marseglia, Planning Analyst, Andy Teitz, Legal Counsel.

---

Mr. Gregory Maxwell, Vice Chair of the Commission, started the meeting at 6:30 p.m.

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

### **Historic District Commission Hearings – 6:30 PM**

#### **1. Ronald Kaplan**

**83 Friendship Street; Map 075 AP 002 Lot 216**

**Proposed Work: Validate the installation of 14 new windows - FINAL**

**Architectural Style: c. 1950 mid-Twentieth Century**

**Relevant Standards: # 1, 2, 8**

**(Continued from February 8, 2023 meeting)**

**UPDATE: At the prior meeting, the Commission requested that the Applicant modify the existing windows to resemble full divided lights. The application was continued, but was required to be heard within the next two months. The Applicant has since provided a sample of the proposed windows with an interior and exterior grille. The width of the muntin profile is approximately 7/8”.**

**PROPOSAL:** The Applicant is proposing validation of the unauthorized removal of 14 double hung windows and replacing them with 14 Polar Guard II size for size white replacement windows with energy star glass and 6/6 column grids.

**STANDARDS:** 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.

Mr. Gregory Maxwell introduced the project.

The applicant had notified Mr. Ranaldi via email that she would be unable to attend the April 12, 2023 meeting as a result of a last-minute business trip. Mr. Al Ranaldi requested that the board take into consideration a motion for a continuation.

A motion was made by Greg Maxwell and seconded by Erinn Calise to continue the application to May 10, 2023.

The motion was passed unanimously 4-0.

**2. Joshua & Mikayla Culpo**

**112 Mawney Street; Map 074 AP 002 Lot 182**

**Proposed Work: Install new siding and add sliding glass doors to back of the house - FINAL**

**Architectural Style: c. 1920 early Twentieth century/Colonial Revival structure**

**Relevant Standards: # 1, 2 & 7**

**(Continued from February 8, 2023 meeting)**

**UPDATE: The Applicants have since stated that cedar shingles are salvageable and would like to proceed with the repair and replacement (as-needed) of the existing shingles. Secondly, Mr. Culpo is proposing to install granite steps for the transition from the door to patio. It is anticipated the Applicant will provide further details on the transition at the meeting.**

**Additionally, the Applicants are requesting to proceed with the A Series Gliding Patio Doors proposed on February 8, 2023.**

**PROPOSAL:** The Applicant is proposing to remove the existing aluminum siding and depending on the condition of the cedar shingles underneath the aluminum, they would like to proceed with the installation of cedar shingles. However, if the cedar shingles underneath is not salvageable, the applicant is requesting to replace it with Hardie Board. The applicant is also requesting to install two Anderson sliding glass doors to the back addition of the home.

**STANDARDS:** 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 #7 is applicable to this application. It states that 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.

The project was introduced by Mr. Maxwell.

According to Joshua Culpo, some of the aluminum siding was recently removed, and the cedar shingles underneath appear to be in good condition. He proceeded to express that they would like to proceed with the initial proposal of sliding glass doors.

Mr. Maxwell asked about the transition from the door to lower level. Mr. Culpo answered that it would be raised paver patio with a 7-inch step down from the door to patio and then two more 7-inch steps down to the driveway. The applicant was then asked if he had any drawings or specifications with him. In response, Mr. Culpo said he could draw something and would send it to the planning department.

Mr. Maxwell stated that the area of the proposed patio will be is part of a later addition to the historical part of the home and that the sliders are not seen from street view.

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

A motion was made by Erinn Calise and seconded by Karl Megules to approve the application with the condition that the patio transition will be refereed by Karl Megules and Greg Maxwell. Also, Erinn Calise stated that the proposed project meets the relevant standard 1, 2 & 7, apply to this application.

The motion was passed unanimously 4-0.

**3. Laura Ernst**

**23 Somerset Street; Map 085 AP 001 Lot 330**

**Proposed Work: Replace gutters and repair side porch - FINAL**

**Architectural Style: c. 1920 Early Twentieth Century Style Home**

**Relevant Standards: # 1 & 2**

**PROPOSAL:** The Applicant is proposing to replace all gutters in-kind and replace the rotten boards on the side porch with meranti wood.

**STANDARDS:** 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.

Greg Maxwell introduced the project.

According to Ms. Ernst, all of the gutters on the house will be replaced in kind; the only difference will be a leaf guard because the house is surrounded by large trees. She continued by stating that she would like to replace some of the rotting boards on the side porch with meranti. It will be painted to match the decking that's already there.

No members of the public were for or against the application.

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

The motion was passed unanimously 4-0.

**4. Shaun Wallace**

**72 Spring Street; Map 085 AP 001 Lot 321**

**Proposed Work: Install (16) roof-mounted solar panels - FINAL**

**Architectural Style: c. 1996 Gambrel (Noncontributing)**

**Standards: #4 & 5**

**PROPOSAL:** The Applicant is requesting to install a roof mounted 6.40kW DC, 4.64 kW AC Solar array system consisting of sixteen (16) modules onto the North and South facing roof of 72 Spring Street.

**STANDARDS:** Commission 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.

Commission 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.

Greg Maxwell introduced the project.

Marcus Alexander spoke on behalf of the applicant and gave a brief description of the work that needed to be done.

Mr. Maxwell inquired as to whether or not an electrical system was being installed in front of the house and Mr. Alexander responded that any additional electric would be installed next to the existing utility meters, despite the fact that, to his knowledge, the meter was located on the side of the house.

Ms. Zangari wanted to know if there had been any effort to add more panels behind the house than in front of it.

Yes, according to Mr. Alexander, but there were vent and fan pipes, and they needed to follow fire setback regulations.

No one from the public was against or in favor of the application.

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

The motion was passed unanimously 4-0.

**5. Shiv RG LLC**

**239 Main Street; Map 085 Plat 002 Lot 208**

**Proposed Work: Replace signage on storefront - FINAL**

**Architectural Style: c. 1850 bracketed Greek Revival**

**Relevant Standards: #5**

**PROPOSAL:** The Applicant is proposing to replace the exterior sign from “PB Bistro & Bar” to the new name “Downtown Tilly Modern Deli and Bar”.

**STANDARDS:** Commission Standard #5 apply to this application.

Commission 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.

The project was introduced by Greg Maxwell.

Ty Cosgrove was in participation and expressed that they are replacing the logo on the existing sign.

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

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

The motion was passed unanimously 4-0.

**6. Janet & Pat Enright**

**82 Spring Street; Map 085 Plat 001 Lot 326**

**Proposed Work: Install (3) doors, replace all windows, install staircase and landings, replace siding, and remove chimney - FINAL**

**Architectural Style: c. 1875 Late Victorian, Mansard style structure**  
**Relevant Standards: # 1, 2, 5, 7, 8**

**PROPOSAL:** The Applicant is proposing to install (3) new doors, replace all windows, install staircase and landings on the side and back of the home, replace siding as needed, remove and replace non-working chimney.

**STANDARDS:** Commission Standards #1, 2, 5, 7, 8 apply to this application. Commission Standard #1 states original materials and architectural features shall be maintained or repaired whenever possible rather than replaced.

Commission 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.

Commission 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.

Commission 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.

Commission Standard #8 states original window sashes can usually be repaired and retained. In the event that a window sash must be replaced, the replacement shall match the original in size, operation, materials, configuration, number of lights, muntin width and profile. Window manufacturers today offer a wide variety of factory-made windows appropriate for installation in historic buildings. Storm windows of appropriate design are also available and should be installed to be as unobtrusive as possible.

Greg Maxwell introduced the project.

Janet Enright stated that they are planning to replace all windows because all of the existing are in terrible shape and the basement windows are vinyl replacements. She stated the rear door in the home does not match the time period for the home.



Janet Enright expressed that they are wanting to replace all windows since the existing are in poor condition. She also stated that the house's rear door does not correspond to its time period and they are looking to replace that as well.

Mr. Maxwell states for the record, that the applicant has provided images of the windows and they appear to be in very poor condition.

Ms. Enright stated that they are proposing two additional doors, one on the side and one in the rear.

Mr. Maxwell asked the applicant to confirm the material of the decking and Ms. Enright stated that they are proposing mahogany tops and painted white risers. On the side, there were vertical boards.

According to Ms. Enright, they will replace the chimney with a brick veneer-look faux chimney and replace some of the siding as needed.

No one from the public for or against the application.

A motion was made by Karl Megules and seconded by Hannah Zangari to approve the application as submitted. Also, Karl Megules stated that the proposed project meets the relevant standard #1, 2, 5, 7 and 8 applies to this application.

The motion was passed unanimously 4-0.

**7. Trio Jez, LLC**

**25 First Avenue; Map 075 Plat 003 Lot 042**

**Proposed Work: Install 6/1 windows, modification to Certificate of Appropriateness received March 8, 2023 - FINAL**

**Architectural Style: c. 1885 Late Victorian**

**Relevant Standards: #4, #5, #8**

**PROPOSAL:** The applicant is proposing to install Anderson 400 Series double-hung windows with a 6 over 1 light pattern.

**STANDARDS:** Commission Standards #4, 5, 8 apply to this application.

Commission 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.

Commission 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

Commission Standard #8 states original window sashes can usually be repaired and retained. In the event that a window sash must be replaced, the replacement shall match the original in size, operation, materials, configuration, number of lights, muntin width and profile. Window manufacturers today offer a wide variety of factory-made windows appropriate for installation in historic buildings. Storm windows of appropriate design are also available and should be installed to be as unobtrusive as possible.

Greg Maxwell introduced the project.

According to Janet Goulart, she had priced out the recently approved 6/6 windows, which entailed a roughly 30% price increase. She asked for a 6/1 configuration to be approved.

Greg Maxwell stated that he would be ok with a 6/1 configuration.

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

A motion was made by Erinn Calise and seconded by Karl Megules to approve the application as submitted. Also, Erinn Calise stated that the proposed project meets the relevant standard #4, 5, 8 applies to this application.

The motion was passed unanimously 4-0.

### **Historic District Commission Business - After Hearings**

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

A motion was made by Erinn Calise and seconded by Hannah Zangari to approve the minutes of March 8, 2023. The motion was passed unanimously 4-0.

2. Local Historic Tax Credit Applications:

Kimberly and Jeffrey Stevens, 114 Crompton Avenue; Map 075 AP 003 Lot 243

A motion was made by Karl Megules and seconded by Erinn Calise to approve the Historic Tax Credit Application.

Staff acknowledged application would be forwarded to tax assessor.

The motion was passed unanimously 4-0.

3. Commissioner Reports:

Erinn Calise stated that she noticed the sign/ bracket at the corner of Dedford and Main Street squished against the building.

4. Karl Megules made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Erinn Calise.

**Adjourn 7:45 p.m.**

For additional information, please contact the Planning Department.