

TOWN OF BRISTOL, RHODE ISLAND

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION



Historic District Commission Meeting Minutes

Monday, October 24, 2022

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 james@bristolri.gov

1. Pledge of Allegiance

The meeting was called to order at 7:01 PM, and the Pledge of Allegiance was promptly recited afterwards.

2. Review of Previous Month's Meeting Minutes

2A. Review of the August 4, 2022 meeting minutes.

To accept the minutes from the August 4th meeting, as presented.

2B. Review of the September 1, 2022 meeting minutes.

Susan Church found that the title of the document needed to be fixed. "Meeting Agenda" should be changed to "Meeting Minutes."

To accept the minutes from the September 1st meeting as amended.

3. Application Reviews

3A. #22-016-B: 1200 Hope Street, Kyle Ritchie. Progress report on renovation of 1200 Hope Street, Certificate of Appropriateness #22-016.

To continue this application to November meeting.

- 3B. #22-068, 250 Metacom Avenue, Mount Hope Farm Trust.
Continued from August 4, 2022 meeting: Stair railing
at Cove Cabin at Mount Hope Farm.

Chris Ponder discussed that their appearance may not be necessary. He explained that he, Jonathan Ames, and the applicants were in communication and that they will continue to review this under Ponder's responsibility as Project Monitor to ensure compliance with the Rhode Island Historic Preservation & Heritage Commission's recommendation regarding this project. The applicants said they will change the hand railing from plastic.

- 3C. #22-087: 464 Hope Street, Citizens Bank. New
elevations, facades, canopy, and signage for 464
Hope Street.

Olivia Cervasio, architect, presented. Explained they were here in September for a concept review and changed their plans according to the Commissioner's comments.

They reduced the size of daisy-wheel signage, non-illuminated on the State Street side, from 6' to 5'. The flagmount sign will now be perpendicular to the wall with symbols. They provided specifications for planter - color and size of planter - height to prevent people from sitting. At the lowest point it will be 4'2" off ground. It will fiberglass reinforced lightweight concrete, eco-friendly.

Ory thanked the applicant for their diligence and accommodating the building's history, Commissioner's recommendations, and balancing the Bank's needs with the Town's needs.

Motion:

To approve application #22-087, 464 Hope Street, Citizens Bank, as presented, to include answers to questions from the September 2022 concept review meeting.

Secretary of Interior's Standards:
#9, #10

Project Monitor:
Sally Butler

Motion made by Allen, Seconded by Butler.
Voting Yea: Allen, Butler, Church, Lima,
Millard, Ponder

3D. #22-099: 601 Hope Street, BayCoast Bank. Equipment screen to cover mechanical equipment atop elevator tower.

Robert Shaker, the project manager, presented.

After meeting in June, when Mr. Costa spoke with Wallace regarding visibility of mechanical equipment, they agreed to come up with some sort of screen to hide the mechanical equipment. Their design was meant to resist wind and water damage. The posts are made of a pvc-lumber, light, maintenance free, blank separated by inch and quarter, allow wind to go through and prevent from falling over on anyone.

Allen asked if this covers only two sides and was concerned about visibility from the Thames Street side. Shaker answered it covers three. Only the water side open to allow wind to get through and in. The applicants feared that enclosing it would act like a sail and create pressures on the structure and damage the tower. Shaker continued, explaining that he would be amenable to changing the design and coming back with a new design.

Lima suggested that if a new design can't work, perhaps the south side could remain open. Allen suggested that this could be left to the Project Monitor's discretion.

Ponder was concerned that the Thames side is very visible, that it would look most industrial if left open, and would prefer all four sides closed.

Millard considered how what difference it would make to open it more; it would make the equipment more visible. Ponder suggested a compromise, to open the slates more on one side; he likes the project

idea generally but would like for the Project Monitor have some input. Shaker seemed amendable to that idea.

Church asked about the paint finish - matte or shiny? Shaker confirmed that it would not be shiny, will be somewhere between flat and eggshell, like a plastic pipe.

Allen wants a sample to be provided for the Project Monitor. Millard and Cabral are the Project Monitors, for color and construction respectively.

Motion:

To accept application #22-099, 601 Hope Street, to install and equipment screen as presented to cover mechanical equipment, with final design and materials to be approved by the project monitor.

Secretary of Interior's Standards:
#9

Finding of Fact:

That normally plastic is not permitted, but may be appropriate here because this is on a new addition, not on the street, and behind the building and higher up.

Project Monitor:
Mary Millard

Motion made by Ponder, Seconded by Allen.
Voting Yea: Allen, Butler, Church, Lima, Millard, Ponder

3E. #22-103: 22 Burnside Street, Herreshoff Marine Museum. Add steel plates to workshop entrance.

Chris Ponder recused himself. Scott Chase presented. He wants to install a diamond plate to protect entrance and make it easy to load and unload equipment and goods to and from the workshop. He explained that the steel plates in waiting are currently painted black, but that they want to paint a yellow trim or some yellow lines, along the edge

to make the plates more visible for pedestrians.

Lima asked if these will be flat on ground and if it will be placed in front of the wooden doors. Chase confirmed that they will be on the ground, in front of the wooden doors.

Allen asked if this was a DPW issue. Andy Teitz recommended Chase talk to Ed Tanner about the property line, whether this would be on town property or their own property. If it is located on the town's property, Teitz recommended he talk with the town about getting a license on the right of way and that he get some indemnification from the town. Chase explained that he is only a tenant, and that the museum would have a better idea about the property boundary. Either way Chase explained that he was not adverse to talking to Ed Tanner.

Church asked about the number of plates on the ground. Chase explained that there would be two, as shown in the application, that would remain when the doors are closed. Church explained that she would object to entire sheet being yellow.

Allen asked whether it would it be open at both ends? Chase explained it would remain on that one side, with grout put underneath it so it wouldn't be hollow and bent from forklift use. There would be an inch and a half on one side, tapered on another.

Tietz repeated the necessity of a differently colored edge for visibility and safety.

Motion:

To accept application #22-103, 22 Burnside Street, for the addition of diamond plates, two panels, painted black with yellow stripes. This approval is conditioned on approval from the City Planner's office regarding a question of town and private property borders.

Secretary of Interior's Standards:
#9

Project Monitor:
John Allen

Motion made by Allen, Seconded by Butler.
Voting Yea: Allen, Butler, Church, Lima,
Millard, Ponder

3F. #22-104: 577 Hope Street, Jim & Virginia Davis.
Replacing single-glazed storefront windows and
aluminum sash with clear, tempered glass with
aluminum sash.

Don Collard, from Herald Glass, presented. He explained that the property owner would like to replace the old, drafty, leaky storefront, single glazed windows with something more energy efficient. Currently they have an old fashioned seal and sash, and are looking to replace it with a something similar, but with a 1-inch thick glass.

Church had a question about window surround. Collard explained that normally this would have a 2-inch framing, but implied he is going to accommodate to meet the Commission's requirements.

Butler asked whether the new windows would sit in the previous footprint. Collard affirmed. Butler further explained that although the building is dated to 1900, the current window looks dated to mid-century; implying that they are not original to the structure anyway.

Motion:

To approve application #22-104, 577 Hope Street, to replace glass storefront with similar materials to what currently is in place.

Secretary of Interior's Standards:
#9

Finding of Fact:

That this building was built in 1900, the glass is not original to the structure, and therefore is not a character-defining feature.

Project Monitor:
Chris Ponder

Motion made by Butler, Seconded by Ponder.
Voting Yea: Allen, Butler, Church, Lima,
Millard, Ponder

3G. #22-107: 825 Hope Street, Barbara Beer. Repair and replace what windows, clapboards, and gutters that have survived the July 2022 fire in-kind.

Barbara and Robert Beer presented. Their contractor, Gary Balleto, presented with them. They explained that they recently purchased the property and hoped to fix it up after the July 2022 fire. They want to repair the house and move in quickly. They intend to replace all surviving features in kind.

Allen asked if they will be replacing double hung windows with double hung windows, Barbara confirmed. Allen explained that it seems there are some vinyl clad wooden windows here, that some Andersen clad vinyl-wood windows were previously approved in the district in the past, but only under certain circumstances.

Lima asked if the windows in the tower are wood, and if any others are wood or are all vinyl. The Beers confirmed that the windows in the tower are wood, but the rest are vinyl. Balleto explained that there are ten windows in the tower, five are known to be wood, the remaining are missing or destroyed. He also explained that the windows on the first floor of the tower are weighted and older, could very well be historic, and could be salvaged and refurbished.

Lima explained that she was not comfortable with changing the windows on the first floor, but knows that the second floor windows cannot be saved. Lima also asked if all the vinyl windows were going to be replaced. The Beers and Balleto affirmed. Lima asked about the possibility of a site visit to check the windows. Butler expressed concern about how close in appearance the second floor windows will be to the older windows on the house. Ponder explained that he would approve replacing the second floor windows because they're so damaged by the fire, and that a site visit would be necessary to determine which windows would be salvageable. He then recommended the Commission bifurcate the vote to decide work on

the fire-damaged windows first, then leave the remaining to be determined at a later site visit.

Allen asked if the tower windows had counterweights, because if they did that would be evidence that those windows are historic. Balleto was unsure if the windows had counterweights. Millard asked if the first floor windows had muntin bars, the Beers confirmed that they did not. Millard suggested that those windows might not have been original then.

Church asked if the windows on second floor would be larger than those on the first floor. Ponder explained that they may have been that way originally. Balleto explained that they were, they were the same width and a little taller.

Lima explained that the Commission will vote on the second floor windows tonight, so they may begin work, and then organize a site visit to inspect and vote on the first floor windows then.

Motion:

To continue discussion of the first floor windows at 825 Hope Street, 9 AM on Thursday, October 27th.

Motion made by Lima, Seconded by Ponder.

Voting Yea: Allen, Butler, Church, Lima, Millard, Ponder

The Commissioners then moved onto the re-roofing, the siding, and doors. Because there was no cut-sheet for the door or the roof shingles, the Commissioners could not decide anything for the roof other than acknowledging that it "will be done by separate contractor and a separate permit will be pulled" (per the application).

Butler asked the applicants to confirm that the cedar clapboard, shingles, trim board, soffits, fascias which need to be replaced will be replaced with wood. The applicants confirmed as such.

Motion:

To approve application #22-107, 825 Hope Street, as

presented.

Finding of Fact:

That the first floor tower windows are not original to the house, and that the house was added to the district when the district was expanded circa 2010. That the door and roof will be continued to a later date when the applicants can provide a cut-sheet.

Secretary of Interior's Standards:

#9

Motion made by Lima, Seconded by Ponder.
Voting Yea: Allen, Butler, Church, Lima,
Millard, Ponder

- 3H. #22-108: 450 Hope Street, Custom House Square, LLC.
Repair roof on building's facade and rear, either to replace with new, similar slate or repair with appropriate asphalt shingles.

Joe Brito Jr. and Frederick Stachura presented. Brito introduced Stachura as a preservation consultant who will provide expert testimony. Brito then handed out a copy of Stachura's resume and entered such as Exhibit A. He then called Stachura as an Expert Witness.

Stachura explained how Brito has maintained the Customs House Building and his work combining federal and state tax credits with his Unity Park adaptive reuse development. Stachura entered the 450 Hope Street property tax card as Exhibit B, showing that it is one plat of land with two structures connected by a connecting hallway.

Stachura explained that the maintenance of the slate roof is paramount to protect from rain, water, wind damage, that Brito has been diligent in maintaining the structure over years, and that the current condition of the roof is not a self-created condition on Brito's part. He explained that, according to the Secretary of Interior's Standards, that if the slate roof is so damaged and incurs moisture and leaking, then complete roof replacement

must be undertaken. He then submitted the September 12, 2022 letter from Avon Roofing and Construction ("the Letter") as Exhibit C. The Letter recommended that immediate slate removal and replacement with asphalt shingle is necessary to prevent injury and harm.

Stachura presented the question; whether reinstallation of new slate, in-kind, is required, or if an alternate material is allowed? He pointed out how the Commission seems to address properties on a case-by-case basis and has permitted asphalt shingles on other properties along Hope Street. He discussed how an asphalt roof was installed on the southern structure (the YMCA building) in 1995 by Alan Berry. He also discussed how the proposed asphalt is of "premium quality" with an appropriate color to match the previous slate. He also discussed how slate roofs are more prominent on public buildings, which can be distinguished from the privately-owned property at hand. As well, Stachura explained that the roofline of 450 Hope seems to be secondary to the prominent dormers and pediments and that the roof isn't noticeable from the elevated sidewalk below.

Stachura continued, focusing on the reasonableness standard of the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and related Code of Federal Regulations. To support the project, Stachura emphasized the the unavailability of materials by sharing his discussion with New England slate and their four-to-six week lead time. He emphasized the unavailability of skilled craftsmen by sharing their difficulty finding a roofing company that can work with slate on this scale. He also emphasized the inherent flaws of the original materials by sharing slate's varying life span. Lastly, Stachura emphasized that he believes that the Federal Code requires the change from slate to asphalt because it is being made to protect the structure from further water and ice damage. He repeated that Code of Federal Regulations states that the standards are to be applied in a reasonable manner, taking economic and technical issues into consideration.

Stachura argued that this proposal is only extending the work previously approved by the Commission. He

explained that slate weighs up to four times as much as asphalt and that there would have to be some structural work done to be sure to support slate with an 8,015 square foot roof. He also explained that the cost would be prohibitive, at about \$80 per square foot of slate, and the weight of the slate would far exceed that of asphalt. Stachura argued that lack of prominent privately owned slate-roofed buildings and the reasonableness standard in the related Code of Federal Regulations would lean in favor of the proposal.

There was a question about the building, that the southern structure predates the northern structure and the two were not connected prior to 1995.

Stachura explained some the photographs he submitted for the application. He explained that the first photo was of the southern structure with its asphalt roof shingles installed in the 1990s. The second and third photos were street elevations illustrating that the roofline is not prominent, but is instead the extended gable, timber framing, and chimney. The fourth photo was that of the storefront. The fifth photo illustrated the juxtaposition of St. Michel's church and the Masonic Lodge, showing mansard slate roofs previously replaced with asphalt shingles. The sixth and seventh photos were examples from other historic district commissions showing buildings with asphalt where there was once previously slate. He also shared how this type of work has been done with historic buildings in Providence.

Stachura then closed by re-emphasizing emergency nature of the project, that this was not a self-created circumstance by the property owner, that the opinion letter of the contractor shows the health hazard the old slates were, and the Building Inspector had granted him a conditional, special permit to remove the slate on the condition they return back to the Historic District Commission. He again emphasized the reasonableness standard of the Secretary of Interior's Standards, the technical problems met, and the desire to arrive to an expeditious and cost-effective solution.

He ended by explaining that although asphalt is not ideal to replace slate, that he believes the

replacement is appropriate here. He closed his testimony.

Lima asked how long has the applicant owned the building? Joe replied over twenty years.

Andy Tietz provided some historical information for the record, that the current property were initially built as two separate structures in the nineteenth-century, that the northern building was built in 1898, and the southern building was built in 1899. Allen explained that he has some historical photographs he could lend to the Coordinator for records. Joe insisted that is irrelevant because they are no currently on one property lot and are connected as one structure, and that the southern building had already had asphalt shingles approved by the HDC.

Stachura insisted they focus on keeping the structure weatherproof. Allen expressed some concern about how this all came to fruition, and Stachura explained that he did not intend to overwhelm the Commissioners but only meant to address the urgency of the emergency at hand.

Ponder explained that he understand this is significant, but also understands that it is difficult to install a slate roof today. He explained that he would be more against if the southern building was not already changed to asphalt. He would like to see sample of the asphalt but would hesitantly approve of the project. Millard agreed with Ponder. She explained that slate roofs have a lifetime and discussed how the barn at Linden Place was completely worn out, leaking, and damaged. She would have some misgiving, but would approve of the project. She thinks that it may not be so noticeable to the public.

Church explained that she would like to see slate replaced and asked how long will asphalt last? Stachura explained that it would last about fifty years but comes with warranties and guarantees, and explained that newer materials are usually built of

better and stronger materials. Church explained that she wouldn't vote against asphalt, but also feels apprehensive about how this came to fruition. Church asked if federal historic tax credits are available. Stachura explained that they may be, but the matter at hand is more about time than it is about money.

Butler explained that she was not only concerned about historical integrity, but that this might set a precedent. Stachura explained that he understands this concern but that the Commission could distinguish this project from others.

Lima asked Brito if he saved the slate. Brito explained that it was so brittle and poor that it was in a bad state and could not be saved. Lima asked if he would be amenable to later replacing the shingles with slate in a timely fashion. Brito and Stachura rejected the idea, explaining that they are not intending to create a temporary envelope but want to be sure the building is secure and watertight. Brito also explained that this would be difficult because he has to install ice clips onto the roof to prevent snow and ice from falling off the roof.

Andy emphasized two contrasting points: The first, it is reasonable for the HDC to conclude that there was approval granted for the work on the southern structure around 1995; and the second, that this is being presented continually as one building when it was built as two separate buildings, one from 1858 and one from 1899, connected later, with two different histories. There appears to be only twenty-five years where the building was connected.

Motion:

To approve application #22-108 as presented, to replace slate shingles with slate asphalt shingles, final approval of which will be left to the determination of the project monitor.

Finding of Fact:

That the roof on presented building is difficult to see from sidewalk and that south building has been approved in the past to have asphalt.

Secretary of Interior's Standards:
#9

Project Monitor:
Chris Ponder

Motion made by Ponder, Seconded by Millard.
Voting Yea: Church, Lima, Millard, Ponder
Voting Nay: Allen, Butler

- 3I. #22-109: 5 John Street, Zackary King. To replace 3 windows on the building's second floor.

Zack King, the owner of 5 John Street (Aidan's) presented. He wants to renovate the interior of Aidan's, but such renovation requires the addition of some windows. They want to make 1 bedroom into 2 bedrooms, but require more windows to meet the egress code.

They're hoping to replace non-historic wood windows with modern wooden windows, and will be the same color as the original windows they're replacing.

Motion:

To accept application #22-109, 5 John Street, to replace three windows as presented. Finding of Fact, that the windows need to be replaced to meet code for bedroom egress, and these are replacing non-historic windows.

Secretary of Interior's Standards:
#9

Project Monitor:
John Allen

Motion made by Allen, Seconded by Millard.
Voting Yea: Allen, Butler, Church, Lima, Millard, Ponder

- 3J. #22-110: 51 Church Street, Josh & Katherine Davidson. To replace rotting wooden gutters with fiberglass gutters, and existing aluminum downspouts with round aluminum downspouts.

Josh Davidson presented. He hopes to replace rotting wooden gutters in the rear of the property with fiberglass gutters, and existing aluminum downspouts with round aluminum downspouts. He explained that those wooden gutters failed quickly and anticipated only replacing sections of the gutters, but eventually decided to work with fiberglass instead.

He brought a sample of the gutters for the Commissioners to view. Allen expressed appreciation that Davidson brought in a fiberglass sample. The Commissioners were generally impressed with it as well.

Ponder asked about the downspouts. Davidson explained that 3" round spouts look a little better than the current rectangular one.

Motion:

To approve application #22-110, 51 Church Street, to replace rotten gutters with fiberglass gutters as presented, and replace downspouts with round downspouts as presented.

Secretary of Interior's Standards:
#9

Project Monitor:
John Allen

Motion made by Allen, Seconded by Ponder.
Voting Yea: Allen, Butler, Church, Lima,
Millard, Ponder

4. **Concept Review**
5. **Monitor Reports & Project Updates**
6. **HDC Coordinator Reports & Project Updates**
7. **HDC Coordinator Approvals**
8. **Other Business**

8A. re: #22-057: 15/17 John Street, Keith & Beverly McRae. Gas pipes on exterior of structure.

Beverly and Keith McRae presented. They explained that the exterior piping was supposed to help with

the new gas fireplace they wanted to install. They explained that they had trouble communicating with their general contractor all last summer and did not hear many updates from him until they were supposed to appear in-front of the Commission in August.

Millard explained that matching paint could easily hide the pipe in front of the house's exterior.

Motion:

To approve the installation of the gas pipe, for it to be painted in a similar color to the exterior walls of the house.

Motion made by Ponder, Seconded by Lima.
Voting Yea: Allen, Butler, Church, Lima,
Millard, Ponder

9. Adjourned