



Historic District Commission Minutes

Wednesday, February 08, 2023 Meeting

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

Present: Matthew McGeorge, Chairman; Gregory Maxwell, Vice Chair; Karl Megules, Erinn Calise, Hannah Zangari, Andrew Barkley and Neal McNamara (Entered at 6:36 p.m.).

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

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

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

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

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

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

Historic District Commission Hearings – 6:30 PM

1. Walter Martish

42 Marlborough Street; Map 085 AP 001 Lot 040

Proposed Work: Replace all windows, install new roof shingles, new cedar siding and trim– FINAL

PROPOSAL: The Applicant is requesting to install new roof shingles, new cedar siding with trim to match the existing details and to add corner boards and water coursing as well as new Andersen 400 Series Woodright double hung windows to replace the existing windows. The windows sizes and locations will remain. Additionally, new doors and gutters will be installed.

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. 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 #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.

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.

Andrew Barkley recuses himself for the application at 42 Marlborough Street.

Chairman Matthew McGeorge introduced the project.

Mrs. Pamela Unwin-Barkley represented the applicant and advised that the owner, herself and the builders are working to improve the home by replacing the “replacement windows” with Anderson 400 Series Woodwright windows that have black frames and a 2/1 configuration, noting that the sizing of the windows will match the existing fenestration. Mrs. Unwin- Barkley states that the red cedar clapboard finger jointed siding with a 4-inch exposure will replace the existing dilapidated cedar siding and all of the existing trim details will be replaced in-kind as needed. In addition, the applicant is looking to add corner boards and water course trim boards to improve the transition between the sidewalk and the surrounding base of the building. Mrs. Unwin-Barkley goes on to state that the front and side doors are wood but are in pretty rough shape and appear to be the Home Depot version of this type of door. Although color does not play a part in the application, the plans are to paint the home a gray on gray – historic color scheme.

Chairman Matthew McGeorge inquires about the condition of the existing shingles. In which Keith Fontenault (Builder) replies, that the existing shingles need to be replaced and they do not appear to be original to the home.

Gregory Maxwell then asks the applicant to give more information on the side door. Mr. Keith Fontenault goes on to state that the door does not appear to be original, and the portion of the home where the side door is appears to be an addition.

Matthew McGeorge goes on to state that the proposed materials are appropriate and that it is commendable that the applicant will be using cedar siding.

Bruce Lofgren asks the board members to review the exterior light and whether it needs to be commented on. Mrs. Unwin-Barkley states that there is an existing light there now and they will be updating that to a much better quality. Gregory Maxwell states that the light appears to be a replacement light and it is pseudo typical to change out the lighting with a project like this. He also states “One thing we didn’t touch on is the trim around the windows, is that being replaced or is it good to go?” Keith Fontenault says it has the original window frames with the vinyl replacement in them. So, when we replace the vinyl windows with construction windows we will be removing the existing sill. The trim will be all replaced with cedar.

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

A motion was made by Gregory Maxwell and seconded by Matthew McGeorge to approve the application as submitted. Also, Gregory Maxwell stated that the proposed project meets the relevant standard 1, 2, 7, & 8, apply to this application.

The motion was passed unanimously 6-0.

2. Joshua & Mikayla Culpo

112 Mawney Street; Map 074 AP 002 Lot 182

Proposed Work: Install new siding and adding sliding glass doors to back of the house– FINAL

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 the cedar shingles. However, if the cedar shingles underneath are 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.

Mr. Andrew Barkley enters back in for the remaining applications.

Chairman Matthew McGeorge introduced the project.

Josh Culpo and Mikayla Culpo, the applicants were present and reiterated the proposal. Mr. Culpo states that the existing siding is aluminum with some hardie board mixed in, and that underneath the existing siding, there is some cedar board but they are unsure of the condition. Gregory Maxwell asks “What areas of the house have the hardie board right now?” In which Mr. Culpo replies, “The front porch and the upper part of the addition in the back.” Mrs. Erinn Calise asks when the addition went on and Mr. Culpo states that the addition went on in the 70’s and the second story of the addition went on about 15 years ago.

Gregory Maxwell mentions that the location of the proposed doors does not appear to be visible from the street.

Matthew McGeorge asks whether it is cedar siding or shingles? Josh Culpo responds that they are cedar shingles.

Neal McNamara suggests that the applicants put in French doors and that they are preferable over sliding glass doors.

Matthew McGeorge comments that the application does not mention anything about the transition or a deck. Josh Culpo mentions that the plan is to put in a stone patio and that there would be a step down from the door. Mr. McGeorge comments that he sees no issue with the fenestration change but will need more information or details on the transition from the door to the patio.

A motion was made by Chairman Matthew McGeorge and seconded by Andrew Barkley to approve the fenestration change but to continue the rest of the application to March 8, 2023 for additional information on the transition from the door to patio, and for the applicant to come back with an option for French doors.

The motion was passed unanimously 7-0.

3. Wayne and Pamela Johnson
74 Division Street; Map 085 AP 001 Lot 269
Proposed Work: Replace windows– FINAL

PROPOSAL: The Applicant is proposing to replace and install windows with Andersen 400 Series Double-Hung windows.

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.

Chairman Matthew McGeorge introduced the project.

Mrs. Pamela Johnson was present for the application and reiterated the proposal. She comes forth with new photos showing the condition of the existing windows.

The frame work on the windows are shot and several windows throughout the home have broken ropes and chains and are no longer functioning. The replacement windows will be in-kind 2/1.

Members of the board asked that Mrs. Johnson confirm that the windows will be full divided light with the contractor.

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

The motion was passed unanimously 7-0.

4. Daniel Keesing and Niko Tracksdorf
132 Division Street; Map 085 AP 002 Lot 115
Proposed Work: Replace (2) windows– FINAL

PROPOSAL: The Applicant is proposing to replace two windows, neither original to 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 #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.

Chairman Matthew McGeorge introduced the project.

Niko Tracksdorf was present and briefly discussed the conditions of the windows.

Members of the HDC had no further questions or comments for the applicant.

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

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

The motion was passed unanimously 7-0.

5. Ronald Kaplan

83 Friendship Street; Map 075 AP 002 Lot 216

Proposed Work: Validate the installation of 14 new windows– FINAL

PROPOSAL: The Applicant is proposing to replace two windows, neither original to the home. The Applicant is proposing validate 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.

Karl Megules recuses himself from the application at 83 Friendship street.

Chairman Matthew McGeorge introduced the project.

John DiMauro of Ocean State Home Improvements, Inc., represented the applicant. He goes on to explain that the original windows had a wood sash with aluminum tracks.

Erinn Calise states that if this application had come before the board prior to the work being completed on the house, that this is not something that would be approved.

John DiMauro comments that it was his mistake and he did not realize it was in the Historic District, the permit was pulled after the work had been done, which alerted him that it needed Historic District Approval.

Matthew McGeorge asks if it is possible to remove the grilles from between the glass. In which John DiMauro states that it is possible, but proposed the idea of adding an exterior grid to the glass.

Matthew McGeorge requests that the applicant provides a sample, photo evidence of the applied product, or request a site visit once the supplies have been obtained and applied.

A motion was made by Chairman Matthew McGeorge and seconded by Neal McNamara to continue the application for no more than two months, allowing time to obtain the products from the manufacturer. The applicant may provide a sample, apply the product to the windows and provide photo evidence, or request a site visit. Also, the applicant is to provide updates to the Planning Dept. during this time.

The motion was passed unanimously 7-0.

6. East Greenwich Yacht Club

10 Water Street; Map 085 Plat 001 Lot 387

Proposed Work: Remove three doors and replace with 2 doors and two windows- Final

PROPOSAL: The Applicant is proposing to remove 3 existing French doors on the rear side of the building. In their place, the applicant is seeking to install 2 Pella Reserve doors and two bar windows with PVC trim.

STANDARDS: 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 # 5 is applicable to this application. It states that New construction includes substantial additions or modifications to the exterior of existing buildings. The design of new construction need not be an exact or modified copy of historic styles and could be totally different in concept. However, all proposals for new construction shall be compatible with the surrounding buildings in size, scale, materials, and siting, as well as with the general character of the historic district.

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.

Neal McNamara recuses himself at 7:26 p.m.

Karl Megules enters back in for the remaining applications.

Chairman Matthew McGeorge introduced the project.

John Mollicone and Christopher Velleca, owner of Federal Hill Group Architects, represented the applicant.

Christopher Velleca, Architect states that the scope of the work is currently on the rear ocean side of the facility where the existing bar is (the side furthest from the street) and the area where the work will be performed was modified in the 1990s. He comments that there are three sets of French doors running along with a small wall in between. Currently in construction, is the indoor-outdoor bar which will replace the French doors to the left and right. In their place, the applicant is proposing (2) single pane doors of the Pella variety which will swing out for egress. In the center – because the bar is seasonal, they will be using a tilt out window (simulated divided light) which acts as a hopper or running window. Mr. Velleca also comments that there will be adding stained wood shingles to match the rest of the structure where the prior openings were. He also goes on to state that the Staff Report picked up on the PVC trim and stated that they will be happy to use wood trim instead of the PVC trim to keep up with the Historic District standards and guidelines.

Matthew McGeorge comments that he does not have any problems with the application as submitted and Gregory Maxwell states that they are essentially replacing modern work with modern work and there is nothing historically being affected by this.

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

A motion was made by Gregory Maxwell and seconded by Andrew Barkley to approve the application as submitted. Also, Gregory Maxwell stated that the proposed project meets the relevant standard 2, 5 & 8, apply to this application.

The motion was passed unanimously 6-0.

Historic District Commission Business - After Hearings

1. Minutes: Review and approval of the January 11, 2023 Meeting.

A motion was made by Matthew McGeorge and seconded by Karl Megules to approve minutes January 11, 2023.

The motion was passed unanimously 6-0.

2. The Historic District Commission asks to briefly discuss administrative review of solar panels.

All members present voted to direct staff to work with legal counsel to prepare amendments to the zoning ordinance, broadening the categories in which administrative approvals may be allowed and to continue the discussion at a later meeting.

3. The Historic District Commission asks to add a brief discussion on the preservation of historic trees in the district, in terms of guidelines and standards.

All members present voted to discuss the preservation of trees in the district at a later meeting.

Adjourn 7:45 p.m.

For additional information, please contact the Planning Department.