

TOWN OF BRISTOL, RHODE ISLAND

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION



Historic District Commission Meeting Minutes

Thursday, November 6, 2025

at 7:00 PM

Town Hall - 10 Court Street, Bristol Rhode Island

Written comments may be submitted to the Historic District Commission via regular mail addressed to:

Historic District Commission, Bristol Town Hall, 10 Court Street,
Bristol RI 02809 or via email to ntoth@bristolri.gov

1. Pledge of Allegiance

The meeting was called to order at 7:00PM, and the Pledge of Allegiance was promptly recited afterwards.

In attendance: Lima, Bergenholz, Page, Allen, Millard, and Church

Also in attendance: Assistant Town Solicitor Goins, and Toth

Absent: Ponder, and O'Loughlin

2. Review of Previous Month's Meeting Minutes

2A. Review of Special Meeting of October 15, 2025

The Commission reviewed the minutes of the special meeting of October 15, 2025. Member Allen noted the word "muntin" was misspelled on page 3 and should be corrected. Chairman Lima asked if anyone else had any corrections or questions and then asked for a motion to accept the minutes.

Motion made by Church to accept the minutes of the special meeting of October 15, 2025 as corrected; Seconded by Allen.

Voting Yea: Allen, Lima, Church, Bergenholz, Millard, and Page

2B. Minutes Review of minutes of the September 29, 2025 meeting.

The Commission reviewed the minutes of the regular meeting of September 29, 2025. Member Church noted the following corrections: Page 8, 3rd paragraph, it should read, "above the flood plain" and not "on the flood plain". Page 18, 4th paragraph, she asked for clarification regarding Mr. Brooks stating it was a "glass house". Mr. Brooks, who was present at the meeting this evening, clarified to Member Church that it was a glass greenhouse-style structure. Member Church continued with the correction of the minutes: page 29, 1st full paragraph, 5th line, it read, "The Commission stated asked if Mr. Pacifico" and it should read "Member Church asked if Mr. Pacifico". On page 31, 1st paragraph, 4th line up from the bottom, "Ause" should be spelled "Ayous". Page 31 and page 32, since "Ambara" is brand name it should read "Ambara Ayous wood". Chairman Lima asked if any other members had any corrections, comments, or questions. With no other comments or correct, Chairman Lima asked for a vote to accept the minutes as corrected.

Motion made by Allen to accept the minutes of the September 29, 2025 meeting as corrected; Seconded by Page.

Voting Yea: Church, Allen, Page, Lima, Bergenholz, and Millard

3. Application Reviews

3A. 25-48: 276 High St, Timothy Finucane Discuss and Act on replacement of select windows, doors, and porch.

Victoria Finucane present.

A discussion commenced between Mrs. Finucane and the Historic District Commission. Mrs. Finucane brought more information the Commission had requested. Mrs. Finucane stated the Commission did a site visit to the property to inspect the windows and their request to replace the windows was denied. She said she was before the Commission to discuss her request to replace doors and a porch with materials in kind. Nick Toth directed her to hand out the information to the Commission members. Chairman Lima marked it as Exhibit 1. Mrs. Finucane directed the Commission members to the first page of the packet which showed the current state of the porch to be rebuilt, which they also saw during their site visit. She was requesting the porch to be replaced with in-kind materials which her contractor specified would be Fir wood. Mrs. Finucane stated that the railings would need to be adjusted by a few inches in height to meet Building Code standards. She also wanted to add one more stair to make the elevation more comfortable and currently the stairs were 9

inches, and she would like to reduce them to 7 inches stairs to meet code. Mrs. Finucane would like the front façade to be covered with a vertical wood plank. She asked the Commission if anyone had questions.

Commission Member Allen asked if the profiles of the porch, stairs, and railings would remain the same and Mrs. Finucane assured him they would be. Commission Member Church asked if the columns were going to be replaced, and if they were going to be all wood. Mrs. Finucane said that only the one column to the left by the stairs needed to be replaced and it was going to be all wood. She said that the other 2 columns were going to be repaired. Commission Member Bergenholz asked if Mason Philips was her contractor and Mrs. Finucane said, yes. Member Church asked if the reconfiguration of stairs meant that they would be taken in. Mrs. Finucane said that the current stair rise was 9 inches and it was going to be shortened to 7 inches to meet code, and the treads would be a little shorter as well, and the railings would need to be at 36 inches to meet code as well.

Member Allen asked Mrs. Finucane about the covering on the concrete. Mrs. Finucane stated that the façade had concrete blocks underneath and she wasn't sure if it was going to be replaced. She did note that it would be covered so only the wood would be visible, which would be true to original style of the porch. Member Allen asked if she found any pictures of the porch and Mrs. Finucane indicated that she hadn't looked for any, but she would.

Next, a discussion was had regarding the replacement of the doors. Mrs. Finucane started with the front door and said that the pictures the Commission Members were looking at were of the original door. Member Church asked if the door was all wood and Mrs. Finucane indicated it was fiberglass and it was compromised. Nick Toth stated that the front and back doors had both been forced open at some point and neither were salvageable. Member Allen asked what the current door looks like. Mrs. Finucane directed the Commission to a small picture on page 2 of the packet featuring a quarter light. Member Church asked her if she would want more light on the new door. Mrs. Finucane said that she was okay with the size of the light on the door as there are side lights as well. Member Bergenholz asked Mrs. Finucane if she wanted lights in the door or just a solid door configuration. Mrs. Finucane said that the door had a quarter light and she was happy with it. Member Church asked if the door was already installed and Mrs. Finucane said it was. Member Church asked who approved the installation of the door and Mrs. Finucane said no one approved it, but it was necessary. Chairman Lima

stated it was an emergency. Nick Toth said that no one approved it. The door had been compromised as someone tried to break in. Mrs. Finucane said she had asked Nick about it before it was replaced and he stated that replacing it in kind would be appropriate since it was fiberglass already and not an original wood door to the home. Member Church asked if the storm door was replaced as well and Mrs. Finucane said it was as it was compromised as well. Member Church asked if it was aluminum on the exterior and not vinyl. Mrs. Finucane said it was a wood core but covered in vinyl, not aluminum, but the original door was aluminum. Nick Toth said that typically it was something that would not have been approved and they would usually only approve wood or aluminum storm doors. Mrs. Finucane stated that if the storm door needed to be replaced, she would do so. He said it could be done administratively unless the Commission was fine with it. Member Church asked if it was done already and Mrs. Finucane said yes, and she could get the Commission more information on the door. Chairman Lima said this portion of the application could be continued and Mrs. Finucane could come back another time.

Mrs. Finucane continued on to discuss the rear door which was on the 3rd page of the packet. She stated that the rear door, which was also compromised, was a wood door, and asked for it to be replaced with fiberglass door. She said that the specifications were shown in picture.

Member Bergenholtz asked if the door pictured was the one she wanted and Mrs. Finucane said yes. Member Church asked if the rear door and the storm door had already been installed and Mrs. Finucane said the new back door had not been installed, but the storm door was installed. Member Allen asked if the new storm door was vinyl as well. Mrs. Finucane said she believed it was vinyl but would provide more information in it. Member Allen stated they could do that administratively as well.

Member Church went on to ask Mrs. Finucane if she was going to discuss the windows and Mrs. Finucane stated that she was not for now. Nick Toth asked Mrs. Finucane if she wanted to ask to replace the 2 windows that were not original and she said not at this time. Member Church reminded Mrs. Finucane that she needed to take pictures of each side of the home and number each window.

Member Bergenholtz went back to the matter of the concrete portion of the porch. Mrs. Finucane approached Member Bergenholtz to look at the picture of the porch together. He advised Mrs. Finucane that the base meeting up to the column should be highlighted so it is broken up so it didn't look

like a solid piece of wood. Member Bergenholtz said that it would look better architecturally to which Mrs. Finucane agreed.

Chairman Lima asked if there was anyone in the audience who would like to speak for or against the application. She asked if a Member of the Commission wanted to make a motion. Member Church asked if the Commission could approve the porch and continue the doors because she would not be able to approve vinyl storm doors. Member Allen stated the doors were going to be continued anyway. Mrs. Finucane asked if the motion could specify that it was just the storm doors that were being continued. Member Allen said that the front door was already replaced, but the back door had not been, and Mrs. Finucane said yes, but she was happy to replace it if necessary. Member Allen said that since the back door was not visible from the street, he was okay with it, as was Member Church, but it was the vinyl storm doors that were at issue. Nick Toth said that if the Commission wasn't comfortable with vinyl storm doors and Mrs. Finucane was willing to replace them with aluminum doors, it could be done administratively. Member Church stated the Commission could approve replacing the storm doors with aluminum doors only and Member Allen stated that the Project Monitor could approve the storm door. Mrs. Finucane asked if she needed to come back with the alternative door. Member Allen stated that she would need to provide the Commission with the cut sheet containing all of the specifications for the door to be added to the record. Chairman Lima asked for a motion to approve the application.

Motion made by Allen to approve application 25-48 to replace the porch as presented with all in kind materials with the same configuration. The concrete block to be covered with wood and column footings will be differentiated from the concrete block wood covering. The front door which has already been installed is approved as presented, and the installation of a back door as presented. The approval of the installation of aluminum storm doors for both the front and back doors, but applicant will need approval from the Project Monitor, and applicant will need to come back to the Commission to provide the cut sheets for the aluminum doors; Seconded by Bergenholtz.

Voting Yea: Allen, Bergenholtz, Millard, Lima, Page, and Church

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9

Project Monitor: Ben Bergenholz

Chairman Lima reminded Mrs. Finucane that when the Certificate of Appropriateness was available, she was to place it in the front of the house in the window were visible, so the neighborhood knew she had approval from the HDC.

3B. 25-125: 55 Constitution St, BRIAN LOVETT Discuss and act on replacement of door.

Michael Tirpak on behalf of Brian Lovett.

A discussion was held between the Commission and Mr. Tirpak regarding the approval of the replacement of a back door. Chairman Lima asked Nick Toth if there was a letter from the homeowner giving permission for Mr. Tirpak to appear on his behalf. Nick Toth said he would check for an email, but he had verbally heard from Mr. Lovett. Member Church asked who John Dudley was and Mr. Tirpak stated that Mr. Dudley was the owner of United Home Experts, who is the subcontractor on the project. Mr. Tirpak stated that there was a back door that was not working and the homeowner needed to get it operational for the tenants in the building. He said the replacement door was going to look like the existing door with the same 6 light configuration. Mr. Tirpak said it was going in pre-primed so it could be painted to match, and the interior trim was going to be light pine, and the exterior trim was going to be flat PVC to fit. He also advised the Commission that the permits had already been pulled, and they were just seeking approval from the Commission. Member Bergenholz asked if it was just being replaced in kind and Mr. Tirpak said yes. Member Bergenholz asked why it couldn't be approved administratively. Nick Toth stated that he didn't have the authority to approve non-wood doors not on street frontage. Member Allen asked if it was a back door and Mr. Tirpak said it was. Member Bergenholz stated that it was a back door with PVC. Mr. Tirpak said it was a steel back entry door which would be replaced with fiberglass, which is identical in terms of look and structure, it's just different materials. Member Church asked if he was changing the trim around the door. Mr. Tirpak said yes. Member Church asked if the trim was wood and Mr. Tirpak said yes and they were going to change it to PVC trim, unless the Commission said it needed to be wood. Member Allen and Member Church both stated that it needed to be wood. Mr.

Tirpak said that it would be fine and they would use pre-primed pine.

Chairman Lima asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to speak for or against the application. She then asked for a Member to make a motion of approval.

Motion made by Church to approve application 25-125 for the replacement of a rear door with a new 6 light fiberglass door as shown to match the existing door. Any trim that is replaced will be wood; Seconded by Allen.

Voting Yea: Church, Lima, Page, Allen, Millard, and Bergenholz

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9

Project Monitor: Robert Page

3C. 25-126 - 1237 Hope St, David Manocchio Discuss and act on installation of bulkhead, and changes to the approved foundation.

John O'Donnell on behalf of David Manocchio present.

A discussion commenced between the Commission and Mr. O'Donnell for the approval of the installation of a bulkhead and changes to the foundation configuration which had been previously approved by the Commission. He advised the Commission that Mr. Manocchio had previous approval for a separate structure with a full basement and an addition at the rear of the house. Mr. O'Donnell stated that Mr. Manocchio has decided to not go forward with the separate structure but is going forward with the addition to the house. He said that Mr. Manocchio wants to add a full basement to the addition instead of the crawlspace that was originally proposed since the other structure was not being eliminated. He said that the space would be unfinished and utilized as an exercise/weight room for Mr. Manocchio. Mr. O'Donnell stated that a bulkhead was also being requested for access to the basement. Member Church asked if it would raise the height of the addition. Mr. O'Donnell said that it wouldn't be because Mr. Manocchio wanted the existing interior floors to stay on the same plain as the rest of the house. Member Church asked if there were going to be any windows in the basement. Mr. O'Donnell said it was hard to

determine how small the window would be due to grading, but Mr. Manocchio wanted small basement windows for ventilation which would be the Anderson 400 series to match the rest of the house. Chairman Lima asked if it would be located on the front or back of the house. Mr. O'Donnell stated it would be on the north side which was the back of the house. Mr. O'Donnell showed a drawing and cut sheet for the window to the Commission.

Chairman Lima advised Mr. O'Donnell that he needed to make copies of the drawing and cut sheet and bring both to Nick for the file. Chairman Lima also asked Nick Toth if there was written or verbal approval from the homeowner giving permission to Mr. O'Donnell to represent him and Nick said yes. Mr. O'Donnell showed the Commission the additional window position on the drawing. Member Church noted that the window would be on the north side and not visible at all. Member Allen asked where the bulkhead would be located. Mr. O'Donnell said it would be on the west side and not visible. Member Allen said that there was a clamshell style door and a Bilko door in the packet and asked Mr. O'Donnell what the preferred choice was. Mr. O'Donnell said Mr. Manocchio preferred the clamshell door. Member Allen asked if it was fiberglass and Mr. O'Donnell said he believed it was. Member Allen said it looked better than the metal door. Mr. O'Donnell said that the clamshell door was more money but lasted longer. Nick Toth said that no one could see it. Member Allen said it was fine.

Chairman Lima asked if anyone in the audience wanted to speak for or against the applicant. She then asked if a Member could make a motion for approval.

Motion made by Allen to approve application 25-126 to change an approved crawlspace to a full basement and add a clamshell style bulkhead door and window. Applicant will provide a cut sheet for the Andersen 400 series window, the clamshell style door, and to provide a description of the basement project; Seconded by Page.

Voting Yea: Allen, Page, Millard, Church, Lima, and Bergenholtz

Opposed: None.

Motion carries.

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9

Project Monitor: Robert Page

Chairman Lima advised Mr. O'Donnell to place the Certificate of Appropriateness in the front of the house where visible.

3D. 25-131: 19 Byfield St, Elena Bao Discuss and act on addition of chimney.

Member Bergenholtz recused.

Chris Cloutier for Elena Bao present.

A discussion commenced between the Commission and Mr. Cloutier for the addition of a chimney. Mr. Cloutier advised there was previous approval from the previous month's meeting and the homeowners wanted to add a wood-burning fireplace to the rear of the building to be located in an existing door opening. He said that the chimney would be surrounded by a brick masonry veneer and would extend above the roofline as was shown in the renderings. Mr. Cloutier stated that the existing stone staircase that serviced the previous door would be repurposed and utilized for the rear entrance to the addition. Member Allen asked if there was a flue inside of the chimney and Mr. Cloutier said yes. Member Church said it was going to be a wood burning fireplace. Member Allen asked if the chimney was going to be tall enough. Mr. Cloutier said it was going to go up past the roof line. Member Church said that the last drawing showed the chimney only going up to the peak and asked if this was approved by the Building Inspector. Mr. Cloutier said it was.

Mr. Cloutier then stated that the homeowners wanted to shift the stairs on the side porch so it would be running parallel to the driveway toward the rear of the property. He said the stairs would be done in wood and painted white and using the same metal handrails that they currently have. Chairman Lima asked where it was in the packet and Mr. Cloutier stated that it was on view 3 on the right side. She told Mr. Cloutier to provide the Commission with a new drawing for the record. Member Allen asked where the stairs were located originally. Mr. Cloutier said the stairs currently run perpendicular to the porch and run into the driveway. Chairman Lima asked if the materials were the same. Member Church asked if the Board could do that even though it was not on the application. Attorney Amy Goins stated that the agenda said discussion and act on addition of chimney and with that description on the agenda the Commission was really limited to the chimney. She said that it made more sense to continue the discussion on the stairs for notice purposes. Nick Toth stated that he did not realize the applicant wanted to discuss the stairs as well. Member Church said the

Commission could approve the chimney and continue the stairs. Chairman Lima said they could put it on the agenda for next month and put it on to be discussed first.

Chairman Lima asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to speak for or against the project. She then asked if any Member wanted to make a motion.

Motion made by Allen to approve application 25-131 for the installation of a chimney as presented; Seconded by Page.

Voting Yea: Allen, Page, Church, Lima, and Millard

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

Motion made by Church to continue application 25-131 to the December 4, 2025 meeting for further discussion regarding the reconfiguration of the stairs; Seconded by Page.

Voting Yea: Allen, Page, Church, Lima, and Millard

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9

Project Monitor: John Allen

3E. 25-139 - 79 Constitution St, Ralph M DeFelice Discuss and act on removal of elements from porch, replacement of door with window, replacement of bulkhead, replacement of bay window with window, changes to existing addition, removal of fire escape, changes to garage door and window, replace and repair clapboard and trim, replace and repair roof.

Vincent Fauci, Architect, and Beth DeFelice present.

A discussion commenced between the Commission, Mr. Fauci, and Beth DeFelice regarding the removal of some features on the porch and portico, the removal of a secondary door and storm door on the front which was not part of the original house which will be changed to a 2 over 1 window which will match in kind with the existing house, the removal of a fire escape, and the replacement of a bay window with a 2 of 1 bay window. Chairman Lima suggested to go through each request one at a time.

Chairman Lima asked to start with the elements on the porch. Mr. Fauci stated that for the front porch and side portico, the homeowners would like to remove spindles that are on the top. He directed the Commission to look at page 5 of the packet, photo 3. Member Allen asked how long the spindles had been on the house and Mr. Fauci was unsure since the house was built in 1855, so they were not physically original to the house. Member Allen said he couldn't speak for the entire Commission but removing them may be destroying a historical part of the house. Member Church felt the same way as additions over time become part of the fabric of the house especially since they've been there for such a long time. Member Allen said they looked like they've been there for a while, and he was against it. Chairman Lima polled members. Member Bergenholtz was against it. Member Page was okay with removing them. Member Allen was against it. Chairman Lima was against it. Member Millard didn't love the spindles but was against it. Member Church wanted to see them stay as well. Mrs. DeFelice asked if they could replace them with something that was true to the period of the architecture. Chairman Lima asked Member Church her thoughts on that idea. Member Church stated that she would prefer the spindles to remain.

Mr. Fauci said they were going to exclude the removal of the spindles and move on. Next, the discussion moved to the removal of the secondary wood door and storm door on front of the house. He said it was an additional door separate from the main door. Mr. Fauci directed the Commission to look at page 5, photo 4 which showed the door. Chairman Lima asked if it was the door on the High Street side. Mrs. DeFelice said that the house was a doctor's office for a period of time and there were a lot of strange pieces that were not original to the house, and the door was one of them. Member Church stated that Mrs. DeFelice meant the door on the front porch way to the right. Mrs. DeFelice said that the door was located on the Constitution Street side of the house as there were 2 doors on the porch. Mr. Fauci proposed a 2 of 1 window to replace the door which will match the rest of the house.

The next item of discussion was the removal of a fire escape on the west façade. Mr. Fauci stated that fire escape is no longer needed since the home is going to be a single-family home again.

Mr. Fauci went on to discuss the replacement of the bay window on same side as the fire escape. He said the bay window will be replaced with a 2 over 1 window. Mr. Fauci said that all of the windows that are to be replaced will be

replaced with solid wood windows. Chairman Lima asked if he had the cut sheets for the windows. Nick Toth stated the cut sheets started on page 157 in the packet. Mr. Fauci also talked about the removal of the wooden doghouse style bulkhead enclosure which was to be replaced with a low-profile wooden double pullup door. Chairman Lima asked if there was a drawing for the bulkhead and asked which side of the house it was on. Member Allen said it was on the back of the house. Mrs. DeFelice said that it was the west side of the house. Member Bergenholtz asked why they would remove the bay window. Mrs. DeFelice said that it leaked and jetted out into the yard and made the interior awkward and wasn't original to the house. Chairman Lima stated that it was not visible from the street.

Mr. Fauci continued on with a discussion regarding the reconfiguration of the bump out on the west façade. He said it was a small addition that had 2 windows and a door. They were proposing to have 1 window and the door swap places. Mr. Fauci said that it was located on page A3.01 and A3.02 of the plan which showed the two sides which are to be modified. Mrs. DeFelice said that the only possible change to it that they were discussing was the stairs. She said the stairs were currently going to the south and they may switch them to go to the north. Mr. Fauci said that on page A3.02 the stairs looked the same, but they were going in the opposite direction.

Member Bergenholtz asked if they planned on staying with the 2 over 1 configuration for the windows. Mr. Fauci said that was correct. He said that the bump out had 2 over 2 currently and they wanted to remove them. Member Bergenholtz said that the house would have had a 6 over 6 configuration originally. Member Church asked what the condition of the windows were and Mrs. DeFelice said they were in good condition. Member Millard said that the windows were a lot later than the house. She said that a 6 over 6 window would make the house more interesting. Chairman Lima said that they would have to change every window. Mr. Fauci said they may consider it at a later date.

Mr. Fauci then discussed some restoration and repairs regarding the wood trim, clapboards, as needed which would be in kind, as well as the roof which would be repaired and replaced as needed. He said that homeowners want to replace the single garage door with 2 garage doors without lights in more of a craftsman style. Member Allen asked if there was a cut sheet for the garage door. Mr. Fauci did not have a cut sheet for the door. Member Allen asked what the materials were for the garage door and Mr. Fauci said it was solid

wood. Chairman Lima stated that the Commission needed the cut sheet for the garage door. Member Bergenholz said that it was going to look much better. Chairman Lima asked if the garage was going to be utilized and Mrs. DeFelice said that was the plan. Mr. Fauci said on the side of the garage, they wanted to replace an octagonal window with a square fixed 4 light solid wood window that would match the house better. Lastly on the garage, Mr. Fauci stated that the outside is currently cinderblock and the homeowners want to install clapboard siding so it would match the house. Member Allen asked what kind of wood they would use for the siding. Mrs. DeFelice said that they haven't decided yet. Member Allen said that the Commission would need to know that as well.

Chairman Lima asked if there was anyone in the audience wanted to speak for or against the application. Dr. Catherine Zipf approached to object to the removal of spindles and the removal of the bay window as they were significant features of the home.

Member Allen suggested polling the Commission about the bay window. Member Bergenholz was strongly against the removal of the bay window as it has become part of the history of the house. Member Allen agreed with him. Member Page felt that the bay window didn't belong and should be removed. Member Millard felt the same as Member Page. Member Church said that again it's an addition that showed the changes over time and even though she didn't like it, it shouldn't be removed. Chairman Lima felt the same as Member Millard and Member Page, so the polling was 3 to 3. Attorney Goins said that unless there was a majority vote, it wasn't going to go forward. She said the Commission was at the point of either discussing it further or having the applicant come back. Chairman Lima suggested that the Commission vote on the majority of the items now and continue the bay window item for another time so as to not impede the applicant's progress.

Member Millard said people have been putting bay windows in homes around Bristol for years. She said the house was originally built around 1852 and then some construction was done in 1880. She felt that some of the fancier things were put on the porch around that time as porches were also being placed on homes in the 1880s. Member Millard felt a house in Bristol should not look like a coat that had all kinds of buttons on it. Member Church agreed. Member Page suggested that the other Commission Members should go by the house and look at the bay window. He felt it looks worse than an extra button and didn't belong. Member Bergenholz asked if Member Page could see it from the street and Member Page said yes.

Member Page said everything was visible from the street as the house is located on a corner lot. Member Bergenholtz was then more strongly against any removal of character defining features since it was on a corner lot.

Chairman Lima stated the Commission would continue the issue of the bay window to the December meeting and encouraged the Commission Members to walk by the house to look at the bay window. She then asked for a motion.

Motion made by Page to approve application 25-139 for the removal of the second front door, removal of the fire escape, removal of the wooden doghouse style bulkhead enclosure and to be replaced with a low-profile wooden double pullup door, reconfiguration of the bump out on the west façade, replacing wood trim in kind, replace roof in kind, replacement of the single garage door with 2 wood garage doors, replacement of the octagonal window on the garage with a square fixed 4 light solid wood window, the addition of clapboard siding on the garage as presented. The removal of the spindles on the porch is denied. The discussion of the removal of the bay window is continued to the December 4, 2025 meeting; Seconded by Allen.

Voting Yea: Bergenholtz, Page, Lima, Millard, Allen, and Church

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

Secretary of Interior Standards: 2, 3, 4, & 9

Project Monitor: John Allen

Chairman Lima advised Mr. Fauci and Mrs. DeFelice to put the Certificate and Building Permit in the front where visible.

3F. 25-140: 574 Hope St, Bristol Warren Regional School
District Discuss and act on installation of memorial bench and concrete pad.

Danielle Carey, CFO, present.

There was a discussion between the Commission and Ms. Carey regarding the installation of a memorial bench to be located at the Andrews School to honor the passing of a Kindergarten teacher.

Chairman Lima stated that the Commission needed to have something to say that they only wanted one memorial bench in the area, so it did not start looking like Independence Park. Attorney Goins said they could put it in the decision, but it wouldn't prevent someone from coming to the Commission in the future for a similar request. However, it would give out a signal that the Commission wanted to limit it. She suggested that the Commission incorporate some language in their decision to the effect that future applications for additional memorial benches at this site are discouraged, but long term, the Commission may want to put it in the HDC guidelines. Attorney Goins said that there aren't many institutional type properties that it would apply to as a homeowner wouldn't want one. Chairman Lima stated that there was one in front of the Veteran's garden. Member Church suggested attaching memorial flags to more than one bench as a solution. Member Bergenholz agreed with Chairman Lima. Nick Toth said that it would be going down a path of limiting public seating and it's something that should be discussed with the Planning Department and the Parks and Recreation Department. Chairman Lima agreed.

Member Bergenholz questioned the design of bench as it looked like an old-time style bench and were other design options considered. Ms. Carey thought that one was chosen because it was what has been used historically in the past and to just conform to what's been approved in the past. Member Bergenholz said the benches on Hope Street look like surfboards and weren't sure who approved of those.

Chairman Lima asked if anyone in the audience wanted to speak for or against the application. She then asked for a motion.

Motion made by Church to approve application 25-140 for the installation of a memorial bench as shown on the Exhibit on page 184, item 6; Seconded by Page.

Voting Yea: Church, Page, Millard, Lima, Allen, and Bergenholz

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

Secretary of Interior Standards: 10

Project Monitor: Mary Millard

3G. 25-144: 474 Thames St, Daniel Brooks Discuss and act on replacement of porch, relocation of gas meter, replacement of lighting fixtures.

Daniel Brooks present.

A discussion commenced between the Commission and Daniel Brooks for the replacement of a 2-story deck at the back of the property, relocation of the gas meter, and replacement of light fixtures.

Mr. Brooks stated he wanted to replace the rear 2-story deck which was not visible from the street. At the last meeting, there was a discussion about the ability to do a pressure treated frame with Trex composite decking and rails, and the roof joists would be wrapped with Azek composite. He was also in process of trying to figure out the best way to heat both properties most efficiently with rebates and energy consumption. Mr. Brooks may want to relocate the gas meters or go full electric on the property. He wanted to have the ability to be permitted to relocate the gas meters if he decided to do it. He advised that they were in questionable condition and located inside a crawlspace basement. He wanted to bring them up to code which would require them to be visible from road to the right of main door near the picture window in between the bulkhead and the door. If he chose gas as a primary heat source, he would need to do so.

Mr. Brooks then went on to discuss the light fixtures which were noted during the last meeting. His wife walked around State Street and took photos of fixtures she liked. He found Kichler coach lights in matte black that matched the look for the left and right of the doors. Member Church asked if the lights were metal or plastic and Mr. Brooks stated they were metal.

Member Church said that the gas meters should not be located at the front of the property and should be out of sight. Mr. Brooks stated that they are not located at the front of 474 but they are in the front of 484. He had weighed the option of safety and compliance with code versus aesthetics. Member Church asked if the gas company wanted them in front. Mr. Brooks said the gas company is who brought it to his attention and the gas company wanted a letter from the Commission in order to put the meters on the front of the homes. He stated that the meters were difficult to work with which is why he was thinking about converting to electric heat. Member Page asked if the gas meters were located on the interior of the home and Mr. Brooks said yes. Member

Page said that was not up to code, so the meters needed to be moved to which Mr. Brooks agreed.

Mr. Brooks said that the gas company required him to go before the Commission to get permission to move the meters. Member Church stated that the Commission had a whole file on gas meters being moved to the front of homes, and they have not been approved in the past. Nick Toth said that he could approve them administratively if the gas meters are located on the side of a home, but since Mr. Brooks was requesting them to be moved to the front of the home, it needed to come before the Commission. Mr. Brooks said that putting the meter on the right side was not an option due to the trophy shop's staircase was located there. Member Church asked if it could be placed behind the staircase and Mr. Brooks said that it was inaccessible. Member Church said the meter could go in the rear of the house. Mr. Brooks said that it was not cost effective to do so. Member Church said that it would ruin the streetscape. Member Millard and Member Allen both said that Mr. Brooks could disguise it with some plantings. Mr. Brooks said that he was leaning towards converting to an electric heating system, but he just wanted to get permission for the relocation of the meter as an option.

Member Church said that she could not approve of the relocation of the gas meter. Chairman Lima said it was already there. Member Bergenholtz said that those boxes were internet and cable, not the gas meter.

Member Church asked Mr. Brooks about the titan pro composite railings. Mr. Brooks said it was vinyl with aluminum top and bottom rails along with the Trex decking on the back of house which was not visible from the street. Member Church advised Mr. Brooks that the Commission did not have a have a design for the deck. Mr. Brooks said that he was just replacing what was already there, but with composite materials. Member Church said that the Commission didn't have a design for the replacement deck. Mr. Brooks apologized because he was under the assumption since he was just replacing what was there, he didn't need a design. Member Church asked if it was going to look the same. Mr. Brooks said to be up to code it wasn't going to have lattice. Member Church said that it was going to look different than what was existing. Mr. Brooks stated that it was going to be the same layout and same size, but it would have code appropriate rails with vertical spindles and not lattice.

Chairman Lima suggested that the Project Monitor could give the final approval on the deck and railings. Member Bergenholtz stated that it was important that the Commission

signed off on what the addition to the back of the house would be as it was a significant change. Mr. Brooks understood. Member Church thought it was overwhelming to the house. Mr. Brooks agreed as it was improperly constructed without footings. Member Bergenholtz asked when the deck was constructed originally. Mr. Brooks did not know. Member Bergenholtz said that Mr. Brooks would be rebuilding the entire decking structure and Mr. Brooks said yes because it was very poorly constructed. Member Church said that the Commission should have a design. Mr. Brooks asked if it was required. Member Allen said it was going to be required for a building permit. Mr. Brooks said he could share it in the portal.

Chairman Lima asked Mr. Brooks when he was going to be starting the work. Mr. Brooks said as soon as he could get permission. Chairman Lima asked if he could come back with a design to the next month's meeting. Member Church asked if he thought about using wire railings on it. Mr. Brooks said he liked the idea of the wire railing, but since it was a 3rd floor, he felt that vertical balusters gave it a little bit more integrity. He also felt that it was a little bit too much of a modern look for the house. Chairman Lima said it would be in his best interest to give the Commission a design, and a list of materials. Mr. Brooks said if it was required of him, he would do so. Chairman Lima said that it wasn't considered in kind because he wasn't replacing wood with wood. Mr. Brooks said he thought it meant the same or better. Chairman Lima said it meant exactly the same and unfortunately the Commission couldn't vote on it now. Mr. Brooks said that's why his application specified composite material, but he would do a drawing. Member Allen advised Mr. Brooks that a drawing would be necessary for the Building Inspector.

Member Church asked Mr. Brooks about the chimney. Mr. Brooks said it was a cinderblock chimney attached to the back of the house. He said it was already discussed. Member Church asked him if he wanted to demolish the chimney and he stated it was already demolished. Nick Toth said the discussion was on a different deck. Mr. Brooks said decks for 474 and 484 were discussed. Nick said only 484 was approved. He said that the Commission's understanding was 484 was due to someone putting their foot through the decking. Mr. Brooks said that 474 was also discussed because it wasn't structurally sound. Nick said he would have to check the records, but only 484 was approved. Member Bergenholtz said the chimney wasn't original to the home, but upon reviewing the application it isn't complete and there needed to be a

visual proposal of the deck in order for the Commission to sign off on.

Mr. Brooks asked if he were to draw the deck essentially the size that it currently was and the size that he was looking to replace it with and specify the rails and deck; would that be sufficient for the Commission. Member Bergenholz advised that the Commission needed cut sheets for the products to be used for the spindles, railings, decking, and the style of the whole deck. Member Church said they needed a scale drawing. Mr. Brooks understood what the Commission needed from him. Chairman Lima said in order to get through Zoning, it was better for him to have more information rather than not enough. Mr. Brooks said that the Building Inspector only needed him to change the application to include the rear deck replacement, but he didn't ask for any drawings, so he didn't think the Commission needed any. Chairman Lima asked him when that was, and Mr. Brooks said that was about a month ago. Chairman Lima said she wanted to make sure he was just complying with the Commission, Zoning, Building, and everyone else he should be a lot more specific with what he was taking down and what he was replacing it with. She said that the Commission could approve of the demolition, but not the construction until he comes back with the design and cut sheets on the materials. Chairman Lima told Mr. Brooks to check with Zoning to see what he would need to present to them as well. Nick Toth stated that a replacement like this wouldn't require Zoning as Mr. Brooks wasn't expanding the footprint of the deck.

Chairman Lima asked the Commission what needed to be done. Member Page said they needed to vote on the lights, the demolition, and the meter. Chairman Lima said they could approve certain items and then Mr. Brooks would have to return for the other times. Member Bergenholz asked if the meter was in the description of the work to be done. Member Allen said that it was advertised. Member Bergenholz asked where the meter was currently located. Mr. Brooks said it was inside the basement and that the boxes that were outside of the house were the cable and communications boxes. Member Bergenholz said he didn't want to see the meter on the front. Mr. Brooks said there were regulations regarding the distance from windows 3ft or greater and doorways, electrical meters which ruled out the left side of the house and the right side is virtually inaccessible due to the proximity of the neighbor's foundation and stairs. Member Bergenholz asked if it could go on the left-hand side where the driveway was located. Mr. Brooks said there were too many windows and the updated electrical meter was going to be massive and the gas meter needed to be 3ft from every window. Member Church

asked how it could fit in the front. Mr. Brooks stated since it was a non-opening fixed window, it could be placed there. He didn't want to see a gas meter either, but he wanted a safe home which trumped everything, but he could mask it with plantings or something else. Member Bergenholtz said the sidewalk runs to front of his foundation. Mr. Brooks said he had a 4ft bed of room which had decorative stone in it currently. (Mr. Brooks approached the bench to look at a photograph with Member Bergenholtz.) Mr. Bergenholtz asked if that was the house in question and Mr. Brooks showed him where the 4ft bed with stone was located. Mr. Brooks advised the Commission that the gas company would not touch the meter which was currently located inside the home. Member Church asked what type of heat currently existed in the home and Mr. Brooks said there was no heat currently, but it was gas heat. Member Church said he might want to change to electric heat and Mr. Brooks said he was leaning that way.

Chairman Lima said that it was a good idea to postpone the decision on the meter at the current time since the Commission decision was a draw. Mr. Brooks understood.

Chairman Lima asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to speak for or against the application. She then asked for a motion.

Mr. Brooks also noted that the gas meter is going to be downsized to meet code and the service line is going to be updated as well which is why it will be on the outside. The line is going to be 5/8th verses 3/4th. He just wanted in on the record. Member Allen asked if he could get something in writing from the gas company regarding the regulations. Member Bergenholtz stated when the gas company did the meters on Church Street, they put all of the meters on the sides of the homes. Member Allen said not all of the meters were on the sides. He said there were some that went on the fronts as the gas company did appear before the Commission. Member Church stated the gas company came before the Commission and told them all of the ones they wanted to put on the outside and they had a big conversation that they needed to be located on the sides of the properties. Mr. Brooks asked for the definition of the "side". Member Church said "not the street view". Mr. Brooks said his was technically the corner of the foundation, but to the side.

Chairman Lima said that she could not see the meter on the front of 484. Mr. Brooks said it was on the front, but it was not on the application. He said it was on the corner, technically on the side of the house, but was visible from the street. Member Church asked if that meter needed to be

replaced. Mr. Brooks said he might choose to cap it, but he wasn't asking to do so now.

Motion made by Page to approve application 25-144 for 474 Thames with regard to the installation of lights, and approval of the demolition of the rear deck. The installation of a gas meter pending the feedback from the gas company on code to be continued to the December 4, 2025 meeting. The installation of the rear deck to be continued to the December 4, 2025 meeting pending the applicant providing a design and list of materials; Seconded by Allen.

Voting Yea: Page, Allen, Lima, Church, Bergenholtz, and Millard

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9

Project Monitor: Chris Ponder

3H. 25-145: 484 Thames St, Daniel Brooks Discuss and act on replacement of lights, doors, and side lights. Installation of gas meter.

Daniel Brooks present.

A conversation commenced between Mr. Brooks and the Commission regarding the replacement of lights and doors. Mr. Brooks said that at the last meeting, the front door was up for discussion. As they got into some of the trim on the house, some of the trim was not as bad. It's all the original trim in the entryway and he only found one little bit of decay which Mr. Brooks was going to repair. He was looking at replacing the current door with sidelights which was a steel JELD-WEN from the mid-90s unoriginal door. Member Bergenholtz asked if the sidelights were original. Mr. Brooks said they were not original, but he considered the trimmed out rough opening old enough to be called historic. He's going to preserve everything that isn't in the pre-hung steel door. Mr. Brooks was looking for approval to replace the steel door and sidelights. Member Bergenholtz asked if the proposed door unit was a singular unit with full-length sidelights and Mr. Brooks said yes with a quarter light as well. Chairman Lima showed him the picture that was supplied in the application and Mr. Brooks confirmed that was the door he wanted. Mr. Brooks said it was a JELD-WEN fiberglass door. Member Bergenholtz said that door aesthetic didn't

have the sidelights that went all the way down and replacing it with something like the one Mr. Brooks proposed was something he couldn't agree with. He said that the door is fiberglass and the framework is wood. Mr. Brooks reiterated that he would not be removing any of the historical trim or doing anything with the rough opening of the door, he was just going to remove the steel door and side lights. The new door would fit exactly in the rough opening of the doorway. He did picture putting some glass in the front verses a solid door. Member Allen asked what the door was that existed there currently and Mr. Brooks stated it was a solid steel door with side lights. He said that if the Commission was hung up on the quarter light issue, then he would do whatever the Commission wanted him to do. He thought it would be a nice improvement rather than a solid door.

Member Church asked Mr. Brooks about the photo and information regarding the door that he provided to the Commission. Mr. Brooks said it was the only photo and information he could get from the company showing one big unit. Member Bergenholtz said that it was changing what was there and Member Allen agreed. Mr. Brooks asked if that meant for the good or the bad. Member Allen asked if the company had side light that looked similar to what was in the home currently. Mr. Brooks did not believe so as he went through it with Pella and that was the option they had. Member Bergenholtz said there may be other companies out there with better options. Mr. Brooks said that he went to Harvey, Brosco, and Pella, and it has all been pretty much the same. He went with Pella because he used Pella for the windows and he wanted the materials to match. He asked the Commission for their thoughts on what door they felt would make sense to them without a window as he thought a 6 light window would be nice rather than an industrial looking door. He said the pictures of the home form across the street made it look like a nicer door than it really was. Chairman Lima asked Member Church her thoughts. Member Church didn't think the door choice was appropriate. Member Millard said she would prefer a solid door with side lights. Member Allen asked what kind of side lights would Member Millard prefer and she stated 2/3rds down. Member Page agreed with Member Millard. Chairman Lima, Member Allen, and Member Bergenholtz also preferred a solid door with side lights. Mr. Brooks was amenable to that. Chairman Lima asked Mr. Brooks to provide the information to the Project Monitor and asked the Member of the Commission if they were comfortable with that decision, which they were.

The other discussion was concerning the exterior lights which were to be the same lights as were discussed for 474 Thames. Chairman Lima said that those lights were fine.

Member Bergenholz clarified to Mr. Brooks that the side lights on the front door were to be 2/3rds. Member Church stated that meant 2/3rds from the top where the wood begins. Mr. Brooks reiterated that the door would be fiberglass and the side lights would be wood. Member Bergenholz asked if the side lights were original. Mr. Brooks said that since the house was gutted on the interior, there was plenty of evidence that the side lights were old but not original. Member Church said they appeared to be out of proportion. Member Bergenholz said it was unusual. Member Church said it was oversized. Mr. Brooks said that the house had been moved a long time ago and wondered if anyone had photos of the house being moved. Member Allen asked him if he checked around and Mr. Brooks said that he check with the Historic Society, Town Hall, and the library, but hasn't found anything.

Motion made by Allen to accept application 25-145 for 484 Thames Street for the replacement of the non-historic steel front door with a solid fiberglass door with the side lights to be replaced in wood with the same configuration with what is currently there with the approval from the Project Monitor. Further, the approval of the lights which will match the lights on 474 Thames Street which was also approved at this meeting; Seconded by Page.

Voting Yea: Page, Allen, Bergenholz, Church, Millard, and Lima

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9

Project Monitor: Chris Ponder

31. 25-146: 49 Church St, Nicki Ann Tyska Discuss and act on replacement of windows.

Nicki Ann Tyska present.

Member Page recused.

A discussion commenced between the Commission and Nicki Ann Tyska regarding the replacement of windows on the rental

property to make it lead compliant for the State lead tenant law.

Member Allen ask for help from Attorney Goins as it was the first lead law issue that has come before the Commission. Attorney Goins said that it was something for the Commission to consider with regard to their decision that the State was now taking heavier hand on enforcement. She stated it had to do with when the Commission asked an applicant if they had considered alternatives, it becomes more important for timing purposes because the applicant is trying to bring the property up to code and comply with the law. Further, it didn't change any part of the Commission's decision-making process, but it was important for the Commission to take note when an applicant was coming in to make it code compliant and not just because they were making the building more energy efficient.

Member Allen advised Ms. Tyska that typically the Commission would rather have the applicant repair than replace windows if they can be repaired. Ms. Tyska mentioned that she did have someone look at them. Member Allen mentioned that it was a very credible person and Ms. Tyska said yes. Member Allen said usually the Commission would do a site visit to determine the condition of the windows, but in this case, with the information from Bob Gagnetta, it sounded like windows were not repairable. Ms. Tyska said that was correct. Member Church agreed as Rob was a credible witness. Ms. Tyska did her due diligence as to what avenue she should take. She stated she went to Arnold and they gave her a wood window with aluminum. Ms. Tyska said the whole house was covered in vinyl siding, but since it was located in the Historic District, she wanted to keep everything up to District standards. Member Church asked if the replacement she was proposing was a wood window with an aluminum clad and Ms. Tyska said yes. Member Allen said those have been approved in the past. Member Bergenholz asked if the Commission has approved Andersen in the past and Member Allen said yes. Member Bergenholz said that Andersen has vinyl, not aluminum clad. Nick Toth said that 1237 Hope Street has Andersen windows, but some contractors don't like them and that's why Marvin windows are used more often.

Member Church asked Ms. Tyska if she was going to replace every window in the house. Ms. Tyska said yes, there were 32 windows to be replaced, some are basement windows which would be replaced with the same window that is there currently, and the rest are throughout the home. She said her contractor may have written it up for 32 regular windows and wasn't sure if he had broken it down and listed what the basement windows

were going to be, but she would give the information to Nick. Member Millard said the windows looked like they were mostly 2 over 2 and Ms. Tyska said yes. Member Millard asked if Ms. Tyska would be interested in a 6 over 6 windows. Ms. Tyska said it would depend on the cost as it was a big investment, but if it was something that wasn't a big difference in cost, she would be fine with it. She said that Bob mentioned the windows that exist now were considered ugly in the 1800s. She said that none of the windows function and they all had that the little brass piece and were a nightmare as far as lead and lead dust. Member Millard stated that if Ms. Tyska could get the 6 over 6 windows, it would be more appropriate for the home.

Chairman Lima asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to speak for or against the application. She then asked if a Member wanted to make a motion.

Motion made by Allen to approve application 25-146 for the replacement of 32 windows as presented. Applicant presented documented evidence from Robert Gagnetta, a restoration expert, stating that the existing windows cannot reasonably be restored through minor repairs and Mr. Gagnetta recommended the removal of the old windows and new windows to be installed per the State lead remediation laws; Seconded by Lima.

Voting Yea: Lima, Allen, Millard, Church, and Bergenholtz

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9

Project Monitor: John Allen

3J. 25-149: 30 Summer St, Celine Keating and Mark Levy
Discuss and act on demolition of outbuilding and shed.

Mark Levy present.

A discussion was had between the Commission and Mr. Levy regarding his request to demolish 2 existing structures located behind his home which can't be seen from the street. Mr. Levy said that his neighbors asked him to have the structures removed as they were in terrible shape. (Shows pictures to the Commission the front of the property.) He stated that any replacement buildings would be smaller in size than what's existing.

Chairman Lima asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to speak for or against the application. She then asked a Member to make a motion.

Motion made by Church to accept application 25-149 for the demolition of a workshop and tool shed located in the rear yard with the removal of debris and the restoration of the ground. Also, noting that the 2 structures are in a deteriorated state and that the removal of the 2 structures does not affect the historic character of the house; Seconded by Allen.

Voting Yea: Church, Lima, Allen, Page, Millard, and Bergenholtz

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

Secretary of Interior Standards: N/A non-contributing

Project Monitor: Susan Church

4. **Concept Review**

4A. CRHD-25-6: 56 Union St, Barbara Martin Discuss on replacement of windows.

Barbara Martin present.

A discussion commenced between the Commission and Ms. Martin regarding a concept review for the replacement of windows on 56 Union Street.

Ms. Martin stated she wanted to replace the windows in order to comply with the State lead remediation laws. She has also spoken to Rob Gagnetta with regard to restoring the original windows. The house was built in 1896, but the cost of restoration is prohibitive. She stated that removing the lead paint and reglazing the windows did not guarantee that all of the lead has been remediated. Ms. Martin added some information to the packet from the Providence Preservation Society which was an article that was written from last October in which Rob Gagnetta said that stripping a window is not sufficient, it can still fail. She said as a rental property owner, it puts everyone in a tremendous liability position by keeping the old windows as they could still fail.

Ms. Martin informed the Commission that she provided information in the packet regarding windows that she replaced in her rental property in Warren which was also a historical property. The windows that were put in were Colby fiberglass which were allowed by the Warren HDC. (Approached the Commission and showed pictures of the property.) She said the windows were located on the second floor on the side and front of the home. Ms. Martin said that no one could tell the difference. She stated that the replacement windows were installed from the outside, not inside. In preparation for the window replacement in Bristol, she had her contractor do an estimate for the windows on 1 floor using the same windows. Ms. Martin said there were 14 windows on 1 floor and 15 windows on another floor. After handing in application to Nick, Ms. Martin realized that there were other windows available that might be more appealing to the Commission, so she went to Humphries in Middletown and looked at Marvin windows which are wood on the inside and fiberglass clad on the outside. (Ms. Martin passed information out to the Commission.) She advised that they did an estimate for 1 window, not the whole project, and had pictures of what the window would look like.

Member Bergenholz said that the Commission had approved Marvin Elevate windows in the past and were very happy with them. Ms. Martin asked for the Commission's thoughts on the window as it would be placed in the home from the outside. She said that if it was placed from the inside, they would lose about 3 inches of glass. Member Allen stated that as Nick would have informed her, the Commission would not approve of vinyl if there was an existing wood window. Ms. Martin stated the replacement windows were not vinyl. Member Allen said the Colby windows were vinyl. Ms. Martin said the windows in Warren were fiberglass. Member Allen stated the Commission wouldn't approve fiberglass as they would want the windows replaced in kind. Ms. Martin said she wasn't aware of that as an option. Member Allen was surprised Warren approved it. Ms. Martin said they definitely said they wouldn't go for vinyl but there was an architect on the Commission and he mentioned fiberglass.

Member Church said that Warren was a volunteer Commission and not a legal entity, thus not part of the Town. Ms. Martin said it went from volunteer to not volunteer and now they have to go in front of them for anything that's done on a house. Chairman Lima clarified that although it's part of the Town, it's a voluntary situation whereas the Bristol HDC is under the Town Charter and have rules and regulations that they have to adhere to that Warren does not. She stated that the Commission has different standards that they have to

adhere to according to the State and the Town, but the Commission appreciated Ms. Martin for providing the information to the Commission. Ms. Martin was open to the fact that she now had the option of an all wood window. Chairman Lima said that a concept review is to provide feedback and the Commission was not going to vote on it.

Member Allen questioned Ms. Martin about the configuration of the windows and stated that it looked like a 6 over 1 configuration. Ms. Martin said it was a crazy house and it was that way when they moved in. Member Allen asked if she was going to standardize them and she said she was going to replace them as they were and not change them. Member Page asked if she was going to replace all of the windows with Marvin windows. Ms. Martin said yes, over a period of time as the windows have to be replaced when a tenant moves out, but she would like guidance from the Commission as to what the next step would be as to what they would approve. She would then come back with a full estimate for the windows so the Commission could see each window. Chairman Lima said they do site visits to see windows and that could be a possibility for Ms. Martin. Member Church said she would like to see the windows be replaced in the exact same sizes and configurations. Ms. Martin said that meant the windows would be installed from the exterior and would be the same size.

Member Church asked if Ms. Martin had lead around the inside around the windows. Ms. Martin said that lead on the exterior of a home can be encapsulated with new paint. With the interior of the windows, it's friction, that's the problem and that's why new windows are needed. Member Allen asked if Bob Gagnetta talked to her about inserts. She called Sweet Lumbar and they had an insert which was not typically used for that type of job, but it could be cut down. Ms. Martin said that the inserts were 3/4 inches thick, but the windows needed to be shaved down on each side to fit which compromised the strength of the window which was not a suitable solution. She said the lead paint is absorbed into the wood so there would still be a possibility of lead dust and any rental property owner who was trying to comply with the lead laws would only be able to get rid of it by replacing the windows.

Ms. Martin asked the Commission what she would need when she comes back. Member Allen asked if the rest of the Commission was still considering a site visit. Member Bergenholz said site visits take up everyone's time and the Commission was going to be seeing a lot more of this type of issue because of the new state laws going really drastic practically

overnight. He said everyone was scrambling trying to figure out how to make their rental units compliant with the laws, not enough people are certified to test for the lead, and they won't test if there property owners have lead because they know it's going to fail. With rental properties, especially something that's not a landmark federal style house with the original federal windows Member Bergenholtz felt that the Marvin Elevate window in Ms. Martin's situation was a win for everyone. He believes it solved the problem. He said that the Newport Restoration Foundation was having a huge problem as 90 of their houses will now have to be compliant. He said they have dipped their windows and done everything they could to the windows and they still failed. Member Bergenholtz said it will cost their organization millions to replace the windows because of the state laws. Ms. Martin said the laws were done rather quickly without a lot of thought.

Ms. Martin asked if she should come back with an application for the windows with an estimate and the specifics for the windows. Member Allen said yes.

Member Church asked if it was a double pane true divided light window and Ms. Martin said yes. Member Church said that even if Ms. Martin came with an estimate for all of the windows, she wouldn't have to do all of the windows at once. Ms. Martin said that she would have to do an apartment when a tenant left. Member Allen stated the window was not true divided light, it was simulated divided light.

Dr. Catherine Zipf came up to offer her comments. She said it didn't represent the change in hazard as it was a legal issue and a compliance issue. She stated there were people working to get the laws changed as it was an extraordinary hardship on the rental property owners. Member Bergenholtz also stated that the new laws allowed tenants to withhold rent and put it escrow until the problem was resolved so technically someone could live there rent free.

Dr. Zipf said the laws were done in haste and the longer Ms. Martin could hold out, there might be some hope that the law could get changed. Ms. Martin didn't think that anyone at the State House was going to put their name on something that was going to reverse it and have a child get lead poisoning. The Commission agreed with Ms. Martin. Chairman Lima said that the laws needed to be redefined and clarified for everyone. Ms. Martin said since everything has gone up as far as costs, she didn't want to have to raise rents, which would prevent people from living in Bristol. She stated that

the new lead laws were creating hardships on property owners, but they have to abide by them.

Ms. Martin advised the Commission she would return with an application to get the proper approvals.

5. Monitor Reports & Project Updates

Member Bergenholz advised the Commission that there were plantings around the gas tank. Chairman Lima said that she would have to go look at it.

6. HDC Coordinator Reports & Project Updates

7. HDC Coordinator Approvals

8. Other Business

Nick Toth advised the Commission that they had to part ways with the HDC standards guy as the product he provided was copy-pasted from another community that he had written. He wasn't following the RFP. They kept telling him to add thing, but it wasn't getting done. He said they were going to find a new contractor.

He also advised the Commission that a draft 2026 schedule for HDC meetings has been circulated. Member Church suggested that July 2, 2026 should be changed. Chairman Lima agreed as it is a busy time of the year for Bristol with the 4th of July parade. Attorney Goins suggested June 30th. Nick said that could be a possibility due to other days being used by other boards/commissions and the Town Council. Chairman Lima suggested to have a limited schedule for June 30th. Nick suggested not having a meeting in July. Chairman Lima said to just limit the agenda to possibly the top 6 applications and Member Church agreed. Nick hoped 2026 would be a lighter year since 2025 was a heavy year. Chairman Lima said limiting it as opposed to not having one would make another month's agenda heavier, but making it limited would be worth a try, or doing it on a different Monday in July. She suggested looking at the trend and then decide in April. Nick said he needed to put something in the calendar and Chairman Lima suggested to put it as tentative for June 30th and limit the agenda to 5 or 6 applications. Nick agreed.

Chairman Lima made a suggestion regarding applications that come back month after month. She stated that with those applications, there should be notes in the applications indicating what has been done. Nick suggested something like a project update. Chairman Lima said so the Commission

didn't have to ask the applicant what's been done, they could just refer to the application notes and know what's going on and it makes the process go smoother.

Member Allen said he presented a list to Nick of projects that people had done or of things that people said they were going to do but didn't do, for example, the house at 1214 Bradford, and wanted to know if Nick had followed up on any of it. Nick said Bradford came in and said he was going to do something and hadn't followed up on it, but Nick would look into it. Member Allen said that people on Burton Street regarding posts next to the sidewalk that needed to be taken care of, or the stockade fence on Bradford. Member Page said that the City got ahold of the owner and the owner agreed to have it replaced and he was seeking a contractor for it. Chairman Lima asked Member Page if the homeowner had to come back to the Commission for the replacement of the fence and he wasn't sure. Nick said 37 Burton was the one that put up the fence and trying to get him to cooperate was like pulling teeth and Chairman Lima said he should be taken to court and be inconvenienced to get him to cooperate. Member Bergenholz agreed. Member Church said it was like woman with the doors at 276 High Street this evening. The Commission went to the house for a site visit, and she changed the doors anyway. She asked if there was a break in. Nick said that they had just bought the house and there was a break in and that's why the doors were replaced. Chairman Lima said to Nick that's what Building Officials were for to issue cease and desist notices. Member Church said the Code Compliance person also needed to be involved. Chairman Lima said stop work orders need to be issued as well. Catherine Zipf suggested fines as well. Nick said he wasn't going to fine people more than he already did.

Member Allen asked Nick to check the house next to Century 21 as they put a new landing/porch as it seemed what they did as opposed to what they submitted didn't seem like what the Commission actually approved. Nick said that was easy enough to check.

Catherine Zipf asked if anyone noticed that the County Cleansers sign had been taken down and Nick said they will be in next month. He spoke to them and an application has been submitted and a fine has been submitted.

9. Adjourned at 9:40PM



