



Historic District Commission Minutes

Wednesday, November 9, 2022 Meeting

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

Present: Matthew McGeorge, Chair; Gregory Maxwell, Vice Chair; Hannah Zangari; Andrew Barkley.

Staff: Bruce Lofgren, Assistant Town Planner; Albert Ranaldi, Planning Director; Christina Marseglia, Planning Analyst, Andrew Teitz Legal Counsel.

Mr. Matthew McGeorge, 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 – 6:30 PM

- 1. PFR Acquisitions, LLC representing Alan Shoer
24 Mawney Street; Map 85 AP 2 Lot 175
Proposed Work: To replace 6 (six) third floor windows. – FINAL**

PROPOSAL: The Applicant is proposing to remove and replace six (6) third floor windows. The windows proposed are Pella 250 Vinyl series double hung windows. The proposed windows have a two over two light pattern that would be consistent with the other windows in the structure. The grill patters are Pella’s Grilles-between-the-Glass which have aluminum grills that resemble divided light windowpanes.

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 also applies 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 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.

Chairman Matthew McGeorge introduced the project.

Mary Shoer, Applicant states that the windows cannot be repaired and when opening the window, dowels must be placed within to keep the window from coming back down. She states the windows must be kept open for ventilation in the spring, summer, and early fall. She also mentions that it is a safety concern as she is assuming guardianship of her brother with down syndrome, it is a play area for children, and her dog has fell out of the window and onto the roof previously.

The applicant called Pella who previously installed wood windows on the 1st and 2nd floor in the home. She states that they would only install the Pella 250 Vinyl series double hung windows as it is a safety concern to them. Matthew McGeorge advised that that is not a true statement. Andrew Barkley advised that they make a new line of fiberglass windows that are matching historic profiles. The Applicant states she will call the representative at Pella again to discuss further.

Matthew McGeorge offers to continue the meeting to the following month to give the applicant more time for research or agree to referee on the windows.

Matthew calls for a motion to referee the project with a true divided light window.

A motion was made by Gregory Maxwell and seconded by Andrew Barkley to approve the application with the following condition: The windows must be refereed by a member of the Historic District Board. Also, Gregory Maxwell stated that the proposed project meets the relevant standard 1, 2 and 7, apply to this application.

The motion was passed unanimously 4-0.

- 2. East Greenwich Cove Builders representing Thomas Gerald LLC
67 Queen Street: Map 25, AP 1, Lot 117
Proposed Work: Demolition of the house, garage, and shed. – FINAL**

PROPOSAL: The Applicant would like the HDC to review the demolition of the existing garage and dwelling. At this time the Applicant is not proposing any structures on the site and is asking the HDC to just review the demolition.

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

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

DEMOLITION CRITERIA: Demolition of any historic structure constitutes an irreplaceable loss to the historic district and the Town of East Greenwich. The Standards & Guidelines and zoning ordinance clearly spell out the procedures for a demolition application as noted below.

§ 260-64 Demolition.

A. Standards for decision.

(1) If the Commission is presented with an application for the removal, relocation, alteration or demolition of a structure and finds that the approval of such an application would pose a significant threat or total loss to the Town, state or nation, it shall endeavor to work out with the owner an economically feasible plan for the preservation of the structure.

(2) Applications for demolition shall require proof that the retention of the structure would constitute a public safety hazard (as defined by the Rhode Island Building Code)**[1]** which cannot be eliminated by any economic means available to the owner.

If the Commission remains unconvinced that retention is a hazard, the Commission shall forward its rejection of the application for demolition to the Building Official.

B. External considerations. If any of the following conditions apply, the Commission may approve the application for a certificate:

(1) Preservation of such structure is a deterrent to a major improvement program which will significantly benefit the Town.

(2) Preservation of such structure would cause undue or unreasonable financial hardship to the owner, taking into account the financial resources available to the owner, including the sale of the structure to any purchaser willing and able to preserve such structure.

(3) Preservation of such structure would not be in the best interest of the community as a whole.

C. Alternatives to demolition and removal.

(1) When considering an application to demolish or remove a structure of historic, cultural, architectural or archaeological value, the Commission shall assist the owner in identifying and evaluating alternatives to demolition.

(2) In addition to any other criteria, the Commission shall also consider whether there is a likelihood that some person or group of persons other than the current owner is willing to purchase, move and preserve such structure or accessory and whether the owner has made continuing, bona fide and reasonable efforts to sell the structure to any such purchaser.

As with all HDC applications, demolition requests are reviewed on a case-by-case basis but the procedure is very specific. Staff has laid out the following procedures for a demolition application. The Applicant must make a good faith effort to demonstrate that all alternatives to demolition have been evaluated (including rehabilitation, adaptive reuse and relocation of the structure), and to provide both architectural and financial data to support a conclusion that demolition is the only feasible solution.

The review process for a demolition application consists of at least two public meetings, and is structured to give ample time to the community, the Applicant and the EGHDC to obtain information and study the proposal thoroughly. The first preliminary public meeting is held to determine the architectural and historic significance of the structure and its contribution to the Town, and to determine whether to accept the application as complete. The Applicant and/or property owner shall attend the meeting and present the project and public comment will be taken.

The HDC shall first determine whether the structure proposed for demolition is:

- 1) Contributing to the significance of the district, and valuable to the Town, State or Nation;
- 2) Contributing to the significance of the district, and valuable for the period of architecture it represents, or to the district;
- 3) Non-contributing to the significance of the district.

The HDC will use its own judgement in making determinations of architectural and historical significance, and may call upon expert witnesses. Applicants may also present testimony as to the significance of the structure.

Next, the HDC shall determine whether sufficient information has been submitted with the application to allow thorough review, and whether all alternatives to demolition have been considered. If the HDC finds that the documentation is complete and all alternatives to demolition have been considered, it will vote to accept the application and schedule the application for review at the next regular meeting. If the application cannot be accepted because additional information is needed, then the preliminary meeting will be continued until the next regular meeting or such time as the additional information can be submitted. The application is considered formally accepted as of the date of the vote to accept.

The second public meeting is held at the next regular meeting following the vote to accept the application, to review the application in light of the Review Criteria. The criteria vary depending on whether the structure was determined to be a contributing or non-contributing structure. The Applicant and/or property owner shall attend, and public comment will be taken. If the structure is contributing, the HDC votes whether the proposal meets the primary review criteria. If so, then the application will be reviewed in light of the secondary review criteria. If the application is consistent with both the primary and the secondary review criteria, then it may be approved, either as submitted or with conditions. If not, the application may be denied. If the structure is non-contributing, the HDC votes whether to approve, approve with conditions, or to deny the application for demolition, using the secondary review criteria. At the second meeting the HDC may review any claim of economic hardship.

If the structure is deemed **contributing**, the HDC shall consider whether the application meets the following primary criteria:

- 1) If the structure is deemed valuable to the Town, State or Nation, such that its loss will be a great loss to the Town, State, or Nation, then in order for the HDC to approve demolition, the structure must constitute a hazard to public safety, which hazard cannot be eliminated by economic means available to the owner, including sale of the structure to any purchaser willing to preserve the structure.

2) If the structure is deemed valuable for the period of architecture which it represents, or to the district as a whole, then at least one of the following requirements must be met in order for the HDC to approve demolition:

- a. Retention of the structure constitutes a hazard to public safety, which hazard cannot be eliminated by economic means available to the owner, including the sale of the structure on its present site to any purchaser willing to preserve the structure.
- b. Preservation of the structure is a deterrent to a major improvement program that will be of substantial benefit to the community.
- c. Preservation of the structure would cause an undue and unreasonable financial hardship to the owner, taking into account the financial resources available to the owner including the sale of the structure to any purchaser willing to preserve the structure.
- d. Preservation of the structure would not be in the interest of the majority of the community.

If the primary criteria have been met, then the HDC may consider any or all of the following secondary criteria in deciding whether to approve or deny the application:

The merit of the structure to be demolished.

The effect of the demolition on the surrounding buildings.

The effect of the demolition on the historic district as a whole and general area.

The value or usefulness of the proposed replacement structure to the community, and the appropriateness of its design to the historic district and neighborhood.

If the lot is to be left open, the impact of open space in that location and on that area as a whole.

The effect of the demolition on the general economy.

Whether the demolition will foster civic beauty.

Whether the demolition will stabilize and improve property values in the neighborhood.

The effect of the demolition on safeguarding the heritage of the Town, State or Nation.

The effect of the demolition on promotion of the district and its outlying properties for the education, pleasure and welfare of the citizens of the Town of East Greenwich.

If the structure is deemed **non-contributing**, the HDC may consider any or all of the secondary criteria in deciding whether to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition.

A written decision must be provided within 15 days of the vote to approve or deny the application, describing the HDC's decision and the reasons behind it. Any conditions of approval must be met before a Certificate of Appropriateness is issued and a demolition permit obtained. If an application is denied, a new application for demolition of the structure may not be submitted for a period of one (1) year from the date of the written resolution.

Matthew McGeorge introduces the project.

Jerry Zarella, Jr., Applicant was present for the meeting.

Matthew McGeorge asks the question "Do you have anything to add to the application or any updates to the conceptual plan or is this the same strategy that we heard before?" In which the Applicant replies "The only update I can provide at this point is that we started with the road abandonment and the project has turned to a public right away improvement."

Chairman McGeorge adds that there were a couple of different site plan options and all were appropriate and consistent with the adjacent development. If there was any significant deviation from that in the future, it would be some concern for the HDC. However, the property does not provide any historic value to the town or country.

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

The applicant adds "The focus of what we are doing on the public right away is to continue to beautify the neighborhood obviously but also, there has been a need for parking not only that side of town but also this side of town. There are only two spots on 60 ft right of way and we can do better than that. This is being funded by myself for public improvement."

Matthew McGeorge calls for a motion to approve the application.

Gregory Maxwell reiterates that the subject property meets the standards for demolition and does not have any historical value.

A motion was made by Gregory Maxwell and seconded by Andrew Barkley to approve the demolition of the property. Also, stated that the proposed project meets the relevant standard 9, apply to this application.

The motion was passed unanimously 4-0.

3. Finn Properties, LLC

430 Main Street; Map 75 AP 3 Lot 103

Proposed Work: To replace the front door, modifications to the front entryway, and construction of a front patio. – FINAL

PROPOSAL: The Applicant is proposing to remove the existing front door with a solid “Dutch door” that would be similar profile to the existing. The applicant is also proposing to repair/replace the brick landing and remove the existing iron railings. The front steps are proposed to be configured into an L-shape that would provide access stairs on the front and left side of the entryway. A stone patio is also proposed in the front yard and the front-yard fence will be replaced in-kind.

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.

Condition 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 introduces the project.

The applicant was present for the meeting and reiterates the proposal. He mentions that the current door is made of steel and would like to rectify that with a wood door. He also mentions that the bricks are being replaced in-kind. but with a slightly larger footprint on the north facing side of the steps which would go down to a patio.

Gregory Maxwell asks the question “Will you be replacing the rail on the right-hand side?” In which the applicant replies that they will be replacing it with wrought iron and will be custom fabricated by a family member out of Pennsylvania.

Matthew McGeorge adds that he would like to referee the door type.

The applicant states that the fence will be proposed at a later date and will not be part of this application in which Chairman McGeorge states that a member of the planning board may be able to administratively approve the application for a fence at a later date.

Matthew McGeorge calls for a motion to approve the application.

A motion was made by Gregory Maxwell and seconded by Matthew McGeorge to approve the replacement/repair of the door, wrought iron railings, and brick landing/patio on the property. Also, stated that the proposed project meets the relevant standard 4 & 5, apply to this application with the following condition: The door type is to be refereed.

The motion was passed unanimously 4-0.

**4. Adam Park representing Lucas Wilbur
33 Marlborough Street; Map 85 AP 1 Lot 47
Proposed Work: Replace existing siding and trim with PVC trim and
Hardie siding. – FINAL**

PROPOSAL: The Applicant is requesting approval to remove the existing wood cedar shingles and clapboard underneath and the trim. In its place, the Applicant is proposing PVC trim and Hardie board siding on the entire structure.

STANDARDS: Commission Standards 1, 2 and 7 and apply to the application. Standard 1 state that original materials and architectural features shall be maintained or repaired whenever possible rather than replaced. Standard 2 also applies 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. Standard 7 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.

Matthew McGeorge introduces the project.

Adam Park, Applicant is present for the meeting and reiterates the proposal.

Adam Park states that he would like to replace the current cedar shingles and clapboard with a Hardie Board siding. He states that there are thousands of holes in the clapboard.

Gregory Maxwell states that the material choice for the older homes in the district would not be appropriate and Hardie Board siding is only accepted for new construction or to match the texture or certain qualities.

Adam Park proposes a pre- primed wood instead.

Matthew McGeorge calls for a motion to approve the application conditional on the material being changed from a PVC/ Plastic Material to pre- primed wood or wood composite for both siding and trim.

A motion was made by Andrew Barkley and seconded by Matthew McGeorge to approve the removal of the existing wood cedar shingles and clapboard underneath and the trim. Also, stated that the proposed project meets the relevant standard 1, 2, & 7, apply to this application.

The motion was passed unanimously 4-0.

**5. Adam Park representing Eric Christopher
33 Division Street; Map 85 AP 1 Lot 34
Proposed Work: Replace existing vinyl windows with new windows. -
FINAL**

PROPOSAL: The Applicant is requesting to replace twenty-five (25) windows on all sides of the dwelling. The Applicant states that the existing windows are vinyl and is proposing Anderson 400 Series Woodwright windows. The proposed windows will retain the 6 over 6 light pattern and will be simulated divided. There will also not be any fenestration change.

STANDARD: Commission Standard 8 applies to the application. It 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.

Matthew McGeorge introduces the project.

Gregory Maxwell asks the question “All the windows in the home have already been replaced with vinyl in the past?” In which the applicant responds, “Yes about 20-25 years ago.”

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

A motion was made by Gregory Maxwell and seconded by Andrew Barkley to approve the replacement of twenty-five (25) windows on all sides of the dwelling with Anderson 400 Series Woodwright windows that will retain the 6 over 6 light pattern and will be simulated divided. Also, stated that the proposed project meets the relevant standard 8, apply to this application.

The motion was passed unanimously 4-0.

**6. Touchdown Realty Group LLC
38 Exchange Street; Map 85 AP 1 Lot 88
Proposed Work: Renovation of existing dwelling and Accessory Unit,
demolition of shed, and installation of fence – FINAL**

PROPOSAL: The Applicant was before the Commission for Conceptual Review in June and August proposing to renovate the of existing 3-family dwelling. Proposed renovations include replacing existing vinyl siding with cedar wood clapboard, replacing vinyl windows with wood clad windows (Andersen 400s, 2/2 configuration), and to replace the roof, exterior doors. The applicant is also proposing an addition the southeast side of the 3-family dwelling and dormers on both the north and south side of the building. The lot also contains an existing standalone structure. The applicant originally proposed to renovate the structure, then decided to request demolition, but now wishes to retain the structure and renovate it. The applicant is also seeking permission to demolish the existing shed.

STANDARDS:

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.

Standard 7 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.

Matthew McGeorge introduces the project.

David Sisson, Architect was in attendance on behalf of the applicants.

David Sisson reiterates the proposal and states that application doesn't state that the standalone structure will need to be demolished. However, it may need to be completely rebuilt once they begin the work on it.

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

Matthew McGeorge calls for a motion to approve the application.

A motion was made by Andrew Barkley and seconded by Gregory Maxwell to approve the application. Also, stated that the proposed project meets the relevant standard 2, 5, 7 apply to this application.

The motion was passed unanimously 4-0.

7. A Gracious Soul

110 Main Street; Map 85 AP 1 Lot 60

**Proposed Work: Remove awning and frame and replace with a sign. -
FINAL**

PROPOSAL: The Applicant is proposing to remove a small existing awning frame and install a bracket and a 24" x 36" hanging sign. The sign would be located just to the north of the existing large awning on the front side of the building.

STANDARDS:

Signage is a type of new construction and must comply with Standard 5. Standard 5 that 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 introduces the project.

Brian Hennessey, Applicant was present for the meeting and reiterated the proposal. He states that the sign will be PVC and will hang from a bracket above the door.

Matthew McGeorge states the sign is removable and an appropriate design.

Chairman McGeorge calls for a motion to approve the application.

A motion was made by Gregory Maxwell and seconded by Matthew McGeorge to approve the application. Also, stated that the proposed project meets the relevant standard 5 apply to this application.

The motion was passed unanimously 4-0.

8. Beth Adams

43 Liberty Street; Map 75 AP 1 Lot 312

Proposed Work: Install 12 roof mounted solar panels. -FINAL

PROPOSAL: The Applicant is requesting to install a roof mounted 4.08kW Dc solar array system consisting of twelve (12) panels primarily on the north and east side of the dwelling.

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.

Matthew McGeorge introduced the project.

The applicant was present virtually for the meeting and reiterated the proposal.

Chairman and Vice Chairman found no issues with the application and Matthew McGeorge called for a motion to approve the application. He also states that the infrastructure for the solar, inverters, etc. should not be on the primary street façade.

A motion was made by Gregory Maxwell and seconded by Andrew Barkley to approve the application. Also, stated that the proposed project meets the relevant standard 4 & 5 apply to this application.

The motion was passed unanimously 4-0.

**9. Pamela Unwin-Barkley representing John and Deborah Lukens
31 Reynolds Street; Map 84 AP 2 Lot 151
Proposed Work: Construction of a new garage, an addition,
modifications to existing porches – FINAL**

Andrew Barkley recuses himself.

Pamela Unwin-Barkley was present and mentioned that the zoning meeting was postponed and this hearing will be continued due to the lack of quorum.

Mr. Andy Teitz recommended that Pamela Unwin-Barkley discuss another date with the Planning Board.

This application has been continued to a later date.

**10. East Greenwich Historic Preservation Society
Multiple Locations in Historic District
Proposed Work: Installation of interpretive signs throughout Historic
District – FINAL**

PROPOSAL: The East Greenwich Historical Preservation Society is representing several Applicants in an effort to install twelve (12) interpretive signs at several locations throughout the district. 9 of the signs are on public right of ways and 3 are located on private property. The signs will be located on or in front of the following locations, Indigenous Path at Post Road (in front of town hall), courthouse and jail (in front of town hall), 1st R.I Regiment, Kentish Guards, The E.G Academy, the

Railroad, Scaloptown, Shipyard and Ropewalk, The Old Port, Textile Mills, Main Street Merchants, and Varnum Armory. The signs are proposed to be 24” x 36” and composed of laminate material. The signs will be mounted on double post black aluminum frames. All signs all are considered minor alterations and are considered new construction.

STANDARDS:

Signage is a type of new construction and must comply with Standard 5. Standard 5 that 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 introduces the project.

The applicant was present for the meeting and reiterated the proposal.

Andrew Barkley asked the applicant if they had spoken to the private property owners regarding the three signs on their property, in which the applicant responded that they had letters of support on those. A conversation ensued about the maintenance of the signs and the applicant stated that it has a 10 year no destructibility guarantee and any cleaning would be handled by a volunteer crew and a back up reserve fund for any damage.

Matthew McGeorge called for a motion to approve the application.

A motion was made by Gregory Maxwell and seconded by Matthew McGeorge to approve the application. Also, stated that the proposed project meets the relevant standard 5 apply to this application.

The motion was passed unanimously 4-0.

**11. Al Greer representing Linear Retail Properties
561 Main Street; Map 75 AP 3 Lot 84
Proposed Work: Replace exterior sign from -FINAL**

PROPOSAL: The Applicant is proposing to replace exterior sign from “Waterford Laundry” to the new name “The Laundry in the Plaza & Dry Cleaning too!”

STANDARDS: Signage is a type of new construction and must comply with Standard 5. Standard 5 that 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.

The Applicant was present for the meeting.

There were no concerns and Matthew McGeorge called for a motion to approve the application.

A motion was made by Andrew Barkley and seconded by Matthew McGeorge to approve the application. Also, stated that the proposed project meets the relevant standard 5 apply to this application.

The motion was passed unanimously 4-0.

Historic District Commission Business - After Hearings

1. Minutes: Review and approval of the March 9, 2022, April 13, 2022, June 8, July 19, 2022, August 10, 2022, and September 14, 2022.

A motion was made by Matthew McGeorge and seconded by Andrew Barkley to approve minutes March 9, 2022, April 13, 2022, June 8, July 19, 2022, August 10, 2022, and September 14, 2022

The motion was passed unanimously 4-0.

2. 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.

Andrew Barkley made a Motion and seconded by Matthew McGeorge to discuss 1727 Division Road. Andrew Barkley states that the home has been sitting and left to rot. The main roof structure on the front has collapsed the prior week. Attorney Andy Teitz that the only thing that can be done is to have the building inspection enforce

the building code ordinance. There is concern that they may try to develop the property and a curb cut could serve as access to the West Warwick property behind it. The West Warwick property would need to be a single-family home if they chose to use 1727 Division Road as a curb cut without a use variance.

Another Motion was made to discuss the Solar Rays at 132 Division Street. It appears that the new owners have put up Solar Rays without HDC approval and suggested they may not be aware that approval through the HDC is needed. Andy Teitz suggested that members of the Planning Dept look into this and possibly discuss solar being reviewed administratively rather than before the HDC.

The Planning Dept. requested that the HDC Board put together a list of any changes the HDC would like to see in the future. A recommendation from the Planning Dept was the “language” in regard to fences not be so “tight” or specific. In addition to this, Vice Chairman Gregory Maxwell mentioned he would like to see a requirement where any Applicant replacing windows has evidence stating that the window cannot be repaired. Andy Teitz mentioned adding Photos and/or Videos to show why the windows cannot be repaired. In which, the Planning Dept agreed.

A discussion ensued about 0 James Street and the height of the foundation out of the ground. The Board stated that they would like Staff to speak to the Building Official for further clarification.

The motion was passed unanimously 4-0.

Adjourn

For additional information, please contact the Planning Department.