

TOWN OF BRISTOL, RHODE ISLAND

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION



Historic District Commission Meeting Minutes

Thursday, May 7, 2026

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 7:05PM, and the Pledge of Allegiance was promptly recited afterwards.

In attendance: Lima, Church, Millard, Page, Bergenholtz, and Camara

Also in attendance: Town Solicitor Teitz, and Toth

Absent: Ponder, Allen, and O'Loughlin

2. Staff Report

2A. Staff Report

3. Review of Previous Month's Meeting Minutes

3A. Review of minutes of the March 30, 2026 meeting.

The Commission reviewed the minutes of the March 30, 2026 meeting. Member Church's corrections were as follows: page 17, last paragraph, 7th line, the sentence read "Member Allen and it looked good". It didn't make sense and it needed to be fixed. On page 34, 2nd paragraph, line 9, Dr. Zipf was speaking and the sentence read "since it looked like the, then perhaps Mr. Ferreira". The sentence didn't make sense and needed to be fixed. With no further comments or corrections, Chairperson Lima asked for a motion to accept the minutes.

Motion made by Alternate Member Camara to accept the minutes of the March 30, 2026 meeting as amended;
Seconded by Member Page.

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

Opposed:

Motion carries.

4. **Application Reviews**

4A. 26-19: 70 Griswold Ave, Michael and Constance LaFlamme Discuss and act on construction of pool house, pergola, barn, pool, outdoor kitchen, new entry gates, installation of gas meter, condenser units, hardscape, and pool equipment, Demolition of existing shed.

Jessalyn Jarest and Jake Grover were present.

Member Bergenholtz stated that Catherine Zipf asked the homeowner to document the interior of the shed with photographs and asked if that was done. Mr. Grover stated that the homeowner had taken a lot of photographs. Member Bergenholtz asked if Dr. Zipf had taken the photographs or was it done by the homeowner. Mr. Grover stated it was only done by the homeowner.

A discussion commenced between Mr. Grover, Ms. Jarest, and the Commission. Mr. Grover gave an overview of the project using the site plan visual. (Shows site plan to the Commission.) He said there was a current existing barn on property which was in bad shape which was sitting on cinderblocks and large stones. Mr. Grover said the profile was very low and left very little head room. He said they were looking to replace it with a bigger barn which would be in keeping the look of the existing one. The new one would give them a more functional space. Mr. Grover stated the homeowner weren't sure if they may have animals in the future or would be allowed to do so, maybe miniature horses or a chicken coup. He said it also would have a hay loft. Mr. Grover showed drawings of the potential barn along with elevations. He stated it was to have a metal roof, PVC exterior, with custom wood barn doors, and ultimate wood Marvin windows. He said it was

within the zoning right of 24x22 for an ADU and it was at the 20ft height which was allowed.

Member Bergenholtz asked if the Commission had done a site visit. Chairperson Lima said it had been done a long time ago. Member Page asked Mr. Grover what year the barn was built. Mr. Grover didn't know when the barn was built exactly but guessed it was from the 50s or 60s. He said there was no foundation except for cinderblocks which he dated back to the 60s. Member Bergenholtz thought the barn looked really charming and felt a lot of people would love to have it on their property in a rural setting. He thought that it predated the 50s. Member Bergenholtz asked Mr. Grover if he researched the Sanborn maps and Mr. Grover said he had not done so, but that it was a good idea.

Mr. Grover said the homeowner waited until this point to bring up the pool house, barn, and pool because they didn't have enough land at the back of the house to do it. The homeowner went through a process with a neighbor to do a land swap which was finally completed. Using the site plan to show the Commission, Mr. Grover explained to the Commission there was a strip of land at the back of the property the homeowner wanted to gain and then gave up a piece of land to the neighbor which gave the neighbor access to Griswold. This was eventually approved and the land was resurveyed. The change has now allowed the homeowner to create the pool house and pool area.

Member Bergenholtz stated he didn't feel comfortable voting on it now without more documentation of the building. Member Millard asked Mr. Grover about the use of PVC materials. Mr. Grover said it was to be used on the board and batten, but they were open to making it wood. Member Millard stated the Commission wouldn't vote for PVC. Mr. Grover understood. Member Church asked if the Commission had a list of materials. Mr. Grover said it was on the drawings. Member Bergenholtz thought it was premature as he was curious about the barn. Member Church was curious about the stones which were part of the foundation of the barn. Chairperson Lima asked where the barn was located on the site map. Mr. Grover showed the location on the site map.

Chairperson Lima asked him if the Commission could continue the issue with the barn and do a site visit.

Nick asked everyone to schedule a date certain now to make it easier for everyone. Member Bergenholtz said that was a good idea. Chairperson Lima said the Commission would discuss the rest of the application, but the barn issue would be done separately.

Mr. Grover continued the discussion with the Commission on the rest of the project. Member Church asked about the materials of the pool house. Mr. Grover directed the Commission to look at page A2 of pool house. He said it was to be built using cedar shingles and clapboards, PVC trim, and architectural asphalt roof shingles. Mr. Grover stated that all of the doors would be wood doors, of which a couple were Marvin Ultimate wood and the other would be custom wood doors. He said the windows were also wood which would be Marvin Ultimate wood windows. Mr. Grover said the pergola would be wood wrapped in PVC, as well as the outdoor shower. Member Church asked if the homeowner was willing to substitute the PVC materials for real wood and Mr. Grover said yes. Member Church said that it would be all natural materials on the pool house with asphalt shingles. Member Bergenholtz said Marvin Elevate windows were wood on the inside and clad with materials on the outside and Mr. Grover said they were all wood windows. Member Church said they were all wood. Member Bergenholtz said the Commission had approved Marvin Elevate before and he thought they were wood interiors with cladding. Mr. Grover said if that was an option, then yes.

Chairperson Lima asked about yellow area on the site plan. Mr. Grover stated it indicated the main house area.

Mr. Grover stated there were mechanical condensers that had been approved and were to be located behind the existing garage. He stated the mechanical subcontractor said it was too long of a run for the condensers and would prefer to have them closer, so they were proposing them in a different location which he showed on the site plan. He showed the location on the site plan and indicated that it would have landscape screening around it to cover it. Mr. Grover stated that the gas meter will be there as well with screening. Chairperson Lima asked if they would be visible from any streets and Mr. Grover said no as the landscaping would hide them. Nick noted that it was an unusually facing house on the

property. He stated the front of the house facing the neighbor rather than the street frontage.

Jessalyn Jarest came up and discussed with the Commission the landscaping and hardscaping design elements of the site plan. Ms. Jarest advised the Commission that the homeowner was unable to make to the meeting, but her son was there. She stated 2 curb cuts were being proposed on Griswold Avenue, along with a cobblestone apron between the pillars at each entrance. Ms. Jarest said that 1 curb cut would be larger to designate the main entrance and the other curb cut would be smaller. She said both openings would have new gates. Ms. Jarest stated the gates would be constructed out of wood and be modeled after gates she had seen at the blue garden in Newport. She said the main gate would be motorized with a call box and the other gate would remain locked if the homeowner desired. Ms. Jarest showed the location of the entrances and gates on the site plan. Member Bergenholtz asked if the stone pillars were to remain. She said the wood posts would receive the gates and the stone pillars wouldn't be touched.

Ms. Jarest said the driveway would be made of pea stone with cobblestone edges and she created a new cobblestone apron at the existing garage, along with framing out a parking court for guests. She said the pathway was extended to get to the existing garage. Ms. Jarest said there was a gate leading to the pool enclosure and the pool would have an automatic cover. She stated that all of the materials were natural materials like fieldstone or blue stone steppingstones and then a stone terrace for the pool. Ms. Jarest said there were images of what was being proposed for the pool enclosure fencing, that being a welded wire mesh fence with wooden or metal posts. She stated that the same was being used at Coggeshall Farm and Mt. Hope Farm. Ms. Jarest said the pool equipment location was to be determined as she wanted to work with the pool contractor to figure out where exactly it needed to go. She would be happy to appear again to review the location of the pool equipment, but it was something she needed to do through shop drawings with the pool contractor. Chairperson Lima suggested that it could be something that the Project Monitor could approve it rather than have her come back and that could be part of the motion at the end.

Ms. Jarest went on to talk about outdoor grill area. She stated it would be built using prefabricated cabinets that were marine grade stainless steel with a powder coat finish that would look more traditional. She showed the Commission images of what was being proposed. She also said there was going to be a stone countertop which would be outside.

Chairperson Lima asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to speak for or against the application. Dr. Catherine Zipf came forward.

Dr. Catherine Zipf came forward to discuss the barn situation. She asked if the decision was to demolish the building was made at the site visit, that it be documented. She stated she would send Nick some guidelines on how to document it and what standards to do it at and would provide help with it. Member Bergenholtz stated that the Commission asked the homeowner to do just that. He said they also asked about documentation of the interior because at the last meeting, there was a concern that it may have been slave quarters. He asked if the homeowner has been in touch with Dr. Zipf. Dr. Zipf said that they had not been in touch with her. She asked if there was any concerns about it. Ms. Jarest said there were a lot of photographs taken and the photographs would be provided to Dr. Zipf. Dr. Zipf said she would love the opportunity to walk around. Member Bergenholtz thought that was already agreed upon. Dr. Zipf said photographs are great to have but would like the opportunity to see it for herself. She said there needs to be an effort to document the outbuildings.

Chairperson Lima said the Commission was going to try to do a site visit and asked if that was open to the public. Nick said the meeting itself was open to the public, but entry to the property was at the discretion of the homeowner. Dr. Zipf said the concern was whether existing plans would disrupt any archaeological remains and perhaps the way to handle it would be to get a survey. Member Bergenholtz said that his understanding was that the homeowner agreed to have Dr. Zipf could go in there and take photographs. Chairperson Lima asked Nick to go through the minutes and see if that was documented anywhere in the minutes. Nick said he would review the minutes. He said asked Attorney Teitz if the Commission could require the homeowner to get documentation of the interior. Attorney Teitz believed

it was agreed upon that the homeowner would provide documentation. He said that the Commission wanted to see the documentation and be given the details. Attorney Teitz was still concerned about which part of the house was the older part of the house and why they connected them at the odd levels the way they did. He said the idea was to at least get the documentation for it and the Commission wanted to see them. He said the other question was if the public wasn't going to be allowed to walk the barn, then the Commission wanted to see the photographs of the interior of the barn which would justify their position that it was from the 1960s. Mr. Grover said they could look at the aerials. Attorney Teitz said the state aerials go back to 1931 and the Sanborn maps to back to the 1800s.

Dr. Zipf said there seemed to be 3 issues in play; that being, the interior of the historic house, the archeology of the land that may or may not exist, and the other be the barn. Member Church asked if the interior had been demolished. Mr. Grover said the homeowner took pictures of the interior. He stated it had been taken down to the studs. Dr. Zipf said that was disappointing. Nick said the Commission couldn't regulate the interior. Attorney Teitz said that the Commission could regulate it in the sense that it was a condition of the approval of the alterations that were allowed in changing the roof line of the house that they were to document the existing conditions first. He said it was very important to make sure it was validly done otherwise it was a violation of the condition of approval. Ms. Jarest said knowing the client, she would not have invited Dr. Zipf to the site if that was the condition.

Chairperson Lima said the Commission was going to do a site visit and they also wanted to make arrangements for the photographs to be available. Dr. Zipf wanted to know where the information was to be kept for the future. Chairperson Lima said the photographs would be submitted to Nick as part of the record and then the record would be open to the public.

Member Church asked about the archeological survey and wouldn't the homeowner have to find something first. Attorney Teitz said if the property was under the jurisdiction of CRMC or something like that, they may have required it, but the only jurisdiction here was the HDC. He asked Dr. Zipf what evidence there was that

slaves could have been on the property. Attorney Teitz asked if there was a Will listing slaves or anything to that effect. Dr. Zipf stated to the best of her knowledge there wasn't any evidence but there might have been. She said it was a DeWolfe property and it had the unique wrinkle of the fact that John DeWolfe lived so long and died in 1849 which was 29 years after the last enslaved person was documented in Bristol. She said the information that there were enslaved people living on the property was highly likely as the maximum number of slaves the DeWolfes owned was 6. Dr. Zipf said it was foolish to assume that there weren't enslaved people living on the property. She said that many people in Bristol owned enslaved people, especially on farms. However, since the land had been farmed repeatedly, she wasn't sure what was realistic to expect if a survey of that nature was done. Dr. Zipf said it was highly likely that there were enslaved people living on the property. The question was whether there was any evidence that remained and whether the construction of the pool, pool house, and other landscaping would disturb any remains. She suggested hiring someone like Public Archaeology Lab to do a survey and then the Commission could decide what would happen next.

Chairperson Lima asked Attorney Teitz what the next step should be. Attorney Teitz stated it was at the discretion of the Commission. He agreed that there should be an acknowledgment of it being a DeWolfe property and the connection that they were a major slave trading family, and that Mr. DeWolfe was a major financier of slave trading voyages. So, that was the connection as to the likelihood of the remains of enslaved people being on the property. Attorney Teitz said the question of the slave quarters remains. He asked if the pool house was going to be on a slab. Mr. Grover said it would be on a slab with footings in the ground. Attorney Teitz said it wasn't cheap for an archeological survey to be done, and this situation was a 50/50 possibility. He felt the real disturbance would come from the pool construction. He suggested a test pit in the area where the pool was going to be located as that would be the majority of the disturbance of the land to be done since the pool house would be built on a slab.

Chairperson Lima asked who would do the survey company. Attorney Teitz stated the applicant would have to hire someone like Public Archeology Lab who would know what to

look for while digging a test pit. Chairperson Lima suggested continuing the application if it was okay with the family since there were so many questions the Commission didn't have the answers to and given the DeWolfe history. Jake LaFlamme understood and agreed as he didn't want to disturb any remains.

Ms. Jarest asked for a continuance and make notes of the Commission's decisions. She preferred not to schedule a site visit tonight because the clients were not present to state what dates would work for them. Chairperson Lima said they could give a series of dates that might work. Nick stated he was only suggesting getting dates now, so he didn't have to play email tag. Attorney Teitz suggested picking a date before the next meeting date. Ms. Jarest agreed.

Member Bergenholtz asked Ms. Jarest if the pictures that were taken could be submitted to the Commission. Ms. Jarest said yes. Dr. Zipf suggested the use of ground penetrating radar. She said that Salve Regina had one with a faculty member who was knowledgeable to use it. She said that if there is a finding, the applicant could relocate the pool or excavate the remains. Dr. Zipf further advised the applicant that if remains were found, the police needed to be called as that's the law.

Nick suggested Friday, May 15th at 9:00 a.m. for a possible site visit. Mr. LaFlamme said that would work. Member Church, Member Camara, and Member Lima were available. Member Millard, Member Bergenholtz, and Member Page were not available. Member Church reminded the applicant to provide the Commission with a list of materials. Nick asked Mr. LaFlamme if Dr. Zipf could attend the meeting and go onto the property. Mr. LaFlamme said she could attend. Dr. Zipf agreed. Member Bergenholtz reminded Nick to pull the minutes from the previous meeting.

Motion made by Member Church to continue application 26-19 to the June 4, 2026 meeting; Seconded by Member Bergenholtz.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

4B. 26-25: 474 Thames St, Daniel Brooks Discuss and act on approval of installation of shed.

Daniel Brooks present.

A discussion commenced between Mr. Brooks and the Commission. Mr. Brooks advised the Commission of his desire to install a shed located in the rear yard. Member Church stated there was no materials list. Nick stated it was all wood and it was mentioned in the Staff Report. Member Church noted that it needed to be in the application as well as it just listed treated T111. Mr. Brook said T111 was wood. Member Bergenholtz asked if the structure was pre-assembled and Mr. Brooks said it was. Member Church asked if the roof was constructed with asphalt shingles and Mr. Brooks said yes. Mr. Brooks had provided some renderings from the vendor. Member Church asked Mr. Brooks where it was located in relation to the house. Mr. Brooks provided a plot plan showing the location. Alternate Member Camara asked if there was a fence in the backyard and Mr. Brooks said there was a wire mesh fence which an arborvitae had grown through from his neighbor's side. He stated there was fencing on both the rear and the right side of the property lines.

Member Page asked Mr. Brooks how the shed aligned with the patio and stairway in the back. Mr. Brooks stated there was no patio just a deck. Mr. Brooks asked Member Page if he meant did the shed run parallel or not, and Member Page asked if it was to the north or east of deck. Mr. Brooks said it was to the east of the deck in the grass area. Member Church asked how tall the shed was. Mr. Brooks stated it was approximately 8ft. Member Page asked if it was visible from the street. Mr. Brooks said it could not be seen.

Chairperson Lima asked if anyone in the audience wanted to speak for or against the application. With no one coming forward, a motion was made.

Motion made by Member Bergenholtz to approve application 26-25 for the installation of a shed located in the rear yard presented; Seconded by Member Page.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9 and 10

Project Monitor: Chris Ponder

4C. 26-26: 8 Constitution St, John Marshall Discuss and act on approval of sliding door and potential rail to render door non-egress.

Nick informed the Commission that the issue was resolved at a site visit.

4D. 26-35: 248 Hope St, Derek Rogers Discuss and act on installation of shed, enlargement of sky light, and installation of solar tunnel.

No one was present.

Motion made by Member Church to continue the application to the June meeting; Seconded by Member Page.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

4E. 26-43: 101 Ferry Road, Blithewold, Inc. Discuss and act on reconstruction of greenhouse and installation of signage on property.

Karen Binder, Executive Director, and Dan Christina, Director of Horticulture, were present.

A discussion commenced between the Commission, Ms. Binder, and Mr. Christina. Ms. Binder advised the Commission they were seeking approval for the

reconstruction of the palm and rose house which were the original greenhouses which had been taken down in the 1930s. She stated that they could be built by the same contractor that did the original greenhouse reconstruction. Ms. Binder said the whole greenhouse complex was built in 1908. She showed the Commission photographs of the original greenhouses which are to be rebuilt. She stated the materials would be aluminum frame, steel, and tempered glass and were the same materials that had been used with each phase of the project. Ms. Binder said that they were going to be reusing some of the original doors that were stored in the barn area and they had raised \$1,500,000.00 of the \$1,700,000.00 necessary to start the project.

Nick wanted to make a note in the record that the applicant was also applying for signage elsewhere on the property. Ms. Binder stated the only change was located on page 3, which showed signs instead of being located on the frontage of the stone walls, the sign was to be placed behind the stone walls on posts.

Chairperson Lima asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to speak for or against the application. With no one stepping forward, a motion was made.

Motion made by Member Page to approve application 26-43 for the installation of the greenhouse and installation of signage as presented; Seconded by Alternate Member Camara.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

Secretary of Interior Standards: 2, 9

Project Monitor: Robert Page

Chairperson Lima advised the applicant that Nick would provide them with Member Page's information, or they could contact Nick with any questions.

4F. 26-45: 721 Hope St, Mosa Al Zoweilei Discuss and act on construction of additional stories on existing garage.

Mosa Al Zoweilei, Olivia Spence, and Ben A. Cerilli, Jr., Esquire were present.

Attorney Cerilli appeared on behalf of the applicant and a discussion commenced with the Commission. He appeared on behalf of Mr. Zoweilei and was supportive of the project. He reviewed all of the documents and work that had been done and felt Ms. Spence did a wonderful job. Mr. Cerilli stated it complied with the spirit of an ADU. He stated that Mr. Zoweilei had met with the Zoning Official. The applicant felt the concept meeting was very helpful. Ms. Spence took the suggestions from that meeting and made changes. She presented the Commission with 3 different options.

Olivia Spence addressed the Commission next. Ms. Spence went over the project, that being a single-story 2-car garage on the property that Mr. Zoweilei wished to put addition on it to create an ADU for him to live in. She stated that due to the parking restrictions on the lot and because of zoning, the existing 2-car garage had to stay so the proposal was for a 2-story addition above the existing garage. Ms. Spence presented a couple of renderings for the Commission's consideration. She said they would have to go in front of zoning to a variance. Ms. Spence said currently where the addition was proposed it was within the setback which was approximately 5ft from the existing edge of the garage. To stay within the setback, there's a small portion that they would like to utilize as a flat roof deck. Ms. Spence stated that in either case because they would be they would be adding stories above, they would have to expand the footprint by a minimum of 3ftx6ft to get stairs from the ground floor up to the addition. She said in one scenario that was as big as a footprint change, they were asking for and in other scenarios they were looking to add a 6ft extension in the form of a cantilever over the driveway to gain some additional living space.

In last meeting, Ms. Spence presented the design on page B1-1 and B1-2, a 2-story addition, gabled roof, and a 6ft cantilever. In the concept review a couple of requested were made to change the window style which was adjusted to 6 over 6. She said the window would possibly be a Marvin Elevate window with wood interior and a clad

exterior. Ms. Spence stated that they would like to do an all-wood trim on the exterior and siding. She showed a shingle on the outside and while she thought it would be great to match the exposure of the shingles on the existing property, she believed the existing property had asbestos shingles with an 8 or 9 inch exposure and wasn't sure if that could be achieved with a modern cedar shingle. Ms. Spence said the alternative would be clapboard as there was wood clapboard on the existing garage and on later additions of the home. Ms. Spence also reduced the ceiling heights of the building. She also provided some street view scaled perspective of what the project might look like. For the concept that was presented the last time with the 6ft cantilever, Ms. Spence presented 2 roof options and street views for the Commission to view. One had a gable roof, and one had a flat roof to keep height down. The third rendering was new which did not have the 6ft cantilever but had the same 2 roof options.

Chairperson Lima asked the Commission for their comments. Member Bergenholtz asked when the concept meeting was and Ms. Spence stated it was in April. Member Church stated that she found the scale overwhelming for the area. Member Bergenholtz was surprised by the cantilever. Ms. Spence stated the cantilever wasn't received well at the concept review. She stated that ideally, they would have been able to expand the whole footprint to avoid a cantilever, but it was the best option to get additional square footage. Member Page said having walked the area, the concept with a flat roof would fit in with what's already in the area.

Member Bergenholtz asked Mr. Zoweilei if he owned both buildings. Mr. Zoweilei bought the house and the tenant wanted to stay and he respected that. He wanted to move into the addition. Member Bergenholtz asked if there was a plan to take off the asbestos shingles at some point. Mr. Zoweilei stated not in the short term, but he was doing his best to maintain the property. Member Church suggested eliminating the garage and making the first floor a living space. Nick stated it wasn't possible because it was in a flood zone. Ms. Spence said by adding the ADU they would need 5 parking spots. There were currently 4 spots on the site, 2 in the garage and 2 in the driveway. She stated by adding the unit, they were able to maintain it. Member Bergenholtz thought additional parking wasn't necessary in the downtown area.

Attorney Teitz said it wasn't necessary for a commercial building, but it was necessary for a residential building.

Alternate Member Camara said he preferred the flat roof style as it helped with the sight line in the area. Member Bergenholtz felt it was too tall. He preferred a gabled roof with dormers. Member Church agreed with Member Bergenholtz. Member Bergenholtz felt a gabled roof with dormers would be a more natural progression. Ms. Spence asked with something like a gabled roof and dormers, could it essentially be a 2-story structure with an applied gable to look like dormers, but the dormers would essentially be the footprint of the second floor. Member Bergenholtz said he would have to see a rendering, but he would feel more comfortable with it.

Member Church said a gabled roof with dormers would be good. Member Millard agreed. Chairperson Lima agreed as well. She also felt it was a little big for the space. Member Church suggested stepping back the shed dormer from both the sides and edge of the roof. Chairperson Lima ask suggested giving the Commission a couple of renderings. Ms. Spence said by doing so the height might not necessarily come down, but it would look better. Member Bergenholtz said to try to get it down as much as they could. Attorney Teitz said they wouldn't be able to keep the mass the same, as having it with dormers wouldn't have the same mass. Member Page said with the flood zone, they were going to see more buildings going upward.

Chairperson Lima said the Commission would make a motion to continue the application to the next meeting if that would give them enough time. Ms. Spence agreed.

Motion made by Member Church to continue application 26-45 to the June 4th meeting; Seconded by Alternate Member Camara.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

4G. 26-46: 19 Byfield St, Elena Bao & Heath Robbins

Discuss and act on changes to carriage house including new doors, new windows, and other renovations, addition of bulkhead to primary residence.

Daniel Cusmano, Elena Bao, and Heath Robbins present.

A discussion commenced between Mr. Cusmano and the Commission. Mr. Cusmano presented an updated elevation sheet and a few renderings to the Commission. He stated the homeowners want to revisit the repair and renovation of the existing carriage house which was previously proposed and approved in 2025. Mr. Cusmano said it would be mostly similar to what was previously presented except a little be simpler. He stated in addition to the repair and replacement of the existing dilapidated structure and siding, the 4 windows on the 1st, as well as the 2 windows on the 2nd floor would be replaced with Marvin Elevate double hung windows. He said the entrance would be a Marvin Elevate in-swing French door on the south façade, as well as the installation of 2 carriage doors where the existing garage door was currently on the west façade. Mr. Cusmano said the homeowners were looking to construct the carriage doors from repurposed wood from the existing 2nd floor of the carriage house. He said both entries would have small overhung metal roofs. In addition to that work, he stated there was a few small design changes on the work to be done on the house which would include putting back the bulkhead access to the addition crawlspace in the rear yard. Mr. Cusmano said the new veneer on the new zero-clearance fireplace and chimney, which was originally a thin brick veneer, would now be shingled to match the house and addition. He said the metal pipe railing that was proposed for the new front porch stairs was now going to be a wood railing painted white to match esthetic of the existing railing on the porch.

Member Bergenholtz said the chimney wasn't brick. Mr. Cusmano said it was a zero-clearance fireplace which allowed it to be supported by wood framing, so the brick would be a veneer on the exterior of it. He said they were changing it to a shingled veneer. Member Bergenholtz said there was nothing like that in the district and did they have to do it like that. Mr. Cusmano said since it was a wood burning zero-clearance fireplace and it did need a flue and a chimney.

Member Church asked if there was a drawing for the railing for the stairs. Mr. Cusmano said it should have been on the proposed addition elevations of the house which was in the original application. Member Church said all she had was the metal pipe rendering. Chairperson Lima asked for the page number. Mr. Cusmano said it was on page A2.01. Member Church said it was just a simple wood railing.

Member Bergenholtz asked for an explanation about the decision-making process around the overhangs on the carriage house. Mr. Cusmano said they were for protection from elements. He said they were simple metal roofs with a slate grey finish. Member Bergenholtz asked about the brackets for the metal roof overhangs. Mr. Cusmano said they added the brackets as a decorative element instead of it being simple. Member Bergenholtz asked why they went for an arts and crafts style. Mr. Cusmano said it was more aesthetically pleasing, but they were open to suggestions.

Member Millard said she loved the way the back yard looked and asked about the 3 steps leading to the back door. She felt rectangular steps with a railing would be safer. Mr. Cusmano said those steps were going to be replaced and repurposed. He said it was previously presented on the application for the addition and was approved. Heath Robbins came up and stated the steps were going to be made rectangular and could install a railing.

Member Bergenholtz asked Mr. Robbins if he was married to the arts and crafts bracket or if he was willing to change it. Mr. Robbins said it was just a design element, but if an L bracket worked better, they would change it. He said the doors themselves were being built out of materials from the barn and he could build the brackets out of the beams. Member Bergenholtz suggested doing a 90-degree angled bracket. Mr. Robbins agreed.

Chairperson Lima asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to speak for or against the application. With no one coming forward, a motion was made.

Motion made by Alternate Member Camara to approve application 26-46 for the restoration of the carriage house including the change of the style of the brackets

over the doors, the addition of a bulkhead, and all other changes as presented; Seconded by Member Millard.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

Secretary of Interior Standards: 2, 9

Project Monitor: John Allen

4H. 26-48: 15 Burton St, Tom Dawson Discuss and act on construction of new shed.

Tom Dawson was present.

The Commission and Mr. Dawson had a discussion regarding Mr. Dawson removing a small old shed and replacing it with a bigger shed on the back of his property. Mr. Dawson included photographs of the old shed and photographs of the proposed shed. Chairperson Lima sked if the new shed would be in the location and Mr. Dawson said yes. Member Church asked if it was preconstructed and if there was a materials list. She also asked what was Duratemp. Mr. Dawson stated that Duratemp was a type of Douglas Fir veneer with a plywood inner core wood product. He said it did not contain any plastic, and it was made by the Amish. Member Church asked if it had an asphalt shingled roof. Mr. Dawson showed an image of the shed he wanted and stated that he had seen it in person and that it was very well made. Member Church asked about the height. Mr. Dawson said it was approximately 10ft in height. Member Church asked if it was visible from the front. Mr. Dawson said it was partially visible from the common driveway, but he was also doing some new landscaping in the back which would include some screening and plantings to give it more privacy which was already approved. Member Church stated that Mr. Dawson had already been doing some renovations and Mr. Dawson presented a photograph showing the renovations. Member Bergenholtz stated that he was the Project Monitor and that Mr. Dawson was doing a really nice job.

Chairperson Lima asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to speak for or against the application. With no one coming forward, a motion was made.

Motion made by Member Church to approve application 26-48 for the removal of an existing 8x10 storage shed and the installation of a new 12x16 storage shed as shown in the application. Finding of fact that the existing shed has no historic importance to the district; Seconded by Alternate Member Camara.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

Secretary of Interior Standards: 10

Project Monitor: Ben Bergenholtz

4I. 26-49: 1303 Hope St, Christopher Giampietro Discuss and act on change of window configuration and installation of new window.

Christopher Giampietro was present.

The Commission had a discussion with Mr. Giampietro regarding the change of a window configuration and installation of a new window. Mr. Giampietro advised the Commission that he wanted to install 1 new window and remove 3 existing windows. Member Church asked if the new window was going to be all wood or wood-clad. Mr. Giampietro wasn't sure what she meant, and Member Church explained that wood-clad windows meant it was a wood frame with either a vinyl or other material wrapped around the outside of it. Mr. Giampietro said he preferred an all-wood window. He said if it had to be clad, and was there a material the Commission preferred. Member Church asked Mr. Giampietro if he had looked into any windows. Chairperson Lima said they were located on page 231 which gave manufacture options of Andersen, Jeld Wen, and Pella. Chairperson Lima asked Mr. Giampietro which window he was referring to and showed Mr. Giampietro a picture of the back of the house. Mr.

Giampietro showed Chairperson Lima which windows he was referring to. He wanted to remove the 2 windows located at the back door (1 pictured with the air conditioner in it and the 1 next to it). Mr. Giampietro said the new window structure would go in between those 2 windows.

Member Church asked if it could be seen from the street. Mr. Giampietro said it could be seen from Tobin Lane. Chairperson Lima said that someone probably couldn't see it from Tobin Lane.

Member Church asked Mr. Giampietro which window he would prefer, and he said he would prefer the bow window or the other two windows. Alternate Member Camara said the bow window might be an issue with his basement access due to it sticking out as the doors might not be able to open all the way as they opened like barn doors. Mr. Giampietro asked the Commission if there was a preferred architectural style of bowed window or double hung window. Chairperson Lima said it was not up to the Commission to decide. Member Church suggested to Mr. Giampietro to get the product sheets of windows with the dimensions that would fit in the space as he was asking the Commission to design it for him and that's not what they do.

Chairperson Lima suggested they could approve the window installation and then the Project Monitor could work with the homeowner in terms of what would be a common choice since it's in the back of the house. Mr. Giampietro said that was fine. Member Church asked Mr. Giampietro if he was doing the whole kitchen and he said yes.

Chairperson Lima asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to speak for or against the application.

Dr. Catherine Zipf came forward. Dr. Zipf didn't object to the application but asked if Mr. Giampietro could save the sashes. She cautioned him since the house was very old and no one knows what could be found in the walls. She asked him to make sure he had a very skilled contractor. Mr. Giampietro said the reason why they were doing it was due to a prior leak and parts of the interior wall had been ripped up and replaced and nothing was found. Dr. Zipf said to be careful.

Chairperson Lima asked for a motion.

Motion made by Member Bergenholtz to approved application 26-49 for the removal of 3 windows and the installation of 1 new window as presented. The style of the new window will be left up to the discretion of the Project Monitor; Seconded by Member Page.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9

Project Monitor: Ben Bergenholtz

Chairperson Lima told Mr. Giampietro that they would get Member Bergenholtz' contact information to him when he was ready to go.

4J. 26-51: 43 Church St, Debra Merrill Discuss and act on construction of deck and installation of fence, replacement of stairs.

Member Bergenholtz recused.

Kerry Bonner was present.

A discussion commenced between Mr. Bonner and the Commission. Mr. Bonner advised the Commission that he wanted to install a white picket fence with a gate in the backyard which would be built with cedar wood to match the rest of the house. He also wanted to build a 10x16ft deck which was just a little bit beyond the house. Chairperson Lima said it was going to be 6 inches above the ground surface. Mr. Bonner said it was going to line up with the bottom stairs and was going to be built from cedar wood with pressure treated underneath which would be in contact with the ground. Mr. Bonner said the application stated that he was going to knock out the cement, but what he wanted to do was attach the railing to the existing cement because he didn't like the squares underneath. He said he would still do the balusters and the posts which would be made out of cedar and attached to the cement. Chairperson Lima asked Nick to have the

record reflect that on the application it stated, "new white painted cedar to replace existing cement staircase, flat panel wood to cover side" and that wasn't going to happen.

Alternate Member Camara asked if there were any other changes. Mr. Bonner stated that he was not removing the cement or rebuilding the stairs.

Chairperson Lima asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to speak for or against the application. With no one coming forward, a motion was made.

Motion made by Alternate Member Camara to approve application 26-51 for the addition of a 10x16 ground wood deck, new picket fence, and cedar railing on the existing concrete pad; Seconded by Member Page

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

Secretary of Interior Standards: 2, 9

Project Monitor: Robert Camara

Chairperson Lima said if Mr. Bonner had any questions he could contact Nick. Also, when the certificate was ready to please display it in the front where visible.

4K. 26-52: 82 Thames St, William Doherty Discuss and act on replacement of windows.

William Doherty was present.

Mr. Doherty and the Commission had a discussion regarding the replacement of 7 windows. Mr. Doherty stated that 4 of the windows were located on the front façade, 2 on the right façade, and 1 on the left façade. He said prior to submitting the application the windows were reviewed by an expert contractor and came to the conclusion that the condition of the windows were not in great shape and most likely not the original windows. Mr. Doherty wanted to

improve the efficiency of the windows and improve the historical design of the home. He said there were pictures in the packet. He stated that several windows appeared to be improperly installed along with evidence of water intrusion. Mr. Doherty also said that the previous owner had replaced all of the additional windows in the home that were not street facing windows. He said the goal was to try and modernize the how for efficiency while maintaining the historical character of the home. Mr. Doherty proposed a wood interior clad with aluminum but if that wasn't acceptable to the Commission then he would go with a full wood window.

Member Bergenholtz asked if the window was a 2 over 2 configuration and Mr. Doherty said it was. Chairperson Lima asked if anyone on the Commission had toured the house. Member Church said that she did. Member Bergenholtz stated that the original window would have had a 6 over 6 or 9 over 9 configurations originally and asked him if he would be opposed to doing a 6 over 6 or 9 over 9. Mr. Doherty said that all of the windows were 2 over 2. Member Page said that the current windows were not the original windows. Member Millard asked what type of windows were in the back of the house. Mr. Doherty said there was a back door and a small deck and windows. Member Page asked Mr. Doherty if he was willing to go with all wood and Mr. Doherty said it was his second choice, but he was willing to do it.

Chairperson Lima asked if anyone in the audience wanted to speak for or against the application.

Dr. Catherine Zipf came forward and asked where in the house were the windows located. Mr. Doherty said that 4 were facing the street, 2 were on the left, and 1 was on the right. Dr. Zipf stated the window sashes butted up against the exterior trim and asked if it was going to be disturbed. Mr. Doherty said he was not going to touch the exterior trim.

With no one else coming forward to speak, Chairperson Lima asked for a motion.

Motion made by Member Page to approve application 26-52 for the replacement of 7 existing windows with the same 2 over 2 configuration to match the rest of the house. The replacement windows will be the Marvin Ultimate all wood

windows which were indicated as item #11; Seconded by Alternate Member Camara.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

Secretary of Interior Standards: 2, 9

Project Monitor: Robert Page

Chairperson Lima advised Mr. Doherty when he received his certificate to display it in the front where visible so everyone would know he received the Commission's permission.

4L. 26-53: 224 Hope St, Gregory Leonetti Discuss and act on Addition of shutters, installation of brick to one chimney, refurbish cement stair with stone, addition of basement bulkhead door.

Gregory Leonetti present.

A discussion commenced between Mr. Leonetti and the Commission. Mr. Leonetti advised the Commission that he wanted to do 4 additions and repairs to do: 1) the addition of wood shutters on each window, 2) repair of a brick chimney which had stucco on it, 3) repair the cement stairs in the front of the house, and 4) the addition of a Bilko bulkhead door. Mr. Leonetti wanted to place wood shutters on each window which would be black. Member Bergenholtz said the shutters would be all wood and Mr. Leonetti said yes and they would be unpainted as he would paint them himself. Member Bergenholtz asked if the dimensions would match what was supposed to be there and Mr. Leonetti said the dimensions would match the window length and the width option was either 16 or 18 inches. Member Bergenholtz was referring to the width of the shutters so they would function and close. Mr. Leonetti said yes, but the only issue was with the windows in the front being closer together, the shutters may overlap a bit when fully opened. Member Bergenholtz stated that happened all the time.

Member Bergenholtz stated that he installed shutters on his own home and to be careful of cedar wood as they didn't last long.

Member Church asked Mr. Leonetti how he was going to attach them to the house. Mr. Leonetti said he was going to leave it up to the contractor. Member Church said it was a brick house and asked if they would be attached to the woodwork around the windows. Mr. Leonetti was unsure. Chairperson Lima said they could continue the shutter portion of the application. Attorney Teitz asked if there was any evidence of being on the house previously. Mr. Leonetti said not to his knowledge. Chairperson Lima said that would be creating a false sense of history which the Commission was not in favor of. She suggested that Mr. Leonetti check into the history of the house to see if it ever had shutters because if there weren't his putting them up was creating a false sense of history and the Commission wouldn't approve of it.

Member Church asked Mr. Leonetti to find out how the shutters would be attached to the house. Attorney Teitz stated that the shutters shouldn't be attached to the brick because of the danger of damaging the brick. The Commission is concerned with things being reversable. If Mr. Leonetti puts the shutters into the wood, they would be reversable. However, if he puts them into the brick then he would be permanently damaging old brick. Attorney Teitz said he needed to come back with those details.

Chairperson Lima asked the Commission Members their opinion on the shutters. Member Page said if there was no history of shutters being on the house then he wouldn't be in favor of it. Member Bergenholtz said he was fine with shutters because it probably had them at one point. He said that he would have to go into the brick somehow.

Member Bergenholtz asked Mr. Leonetti why the window casing was proud of the brick as it was never like that before. Mr. Leonetti approached the Commission to look at the photographs to see what Member Bergenholtz was referring to. Member Bergenholtz said the window casing stuck out from the brick, and it shouldn't have done so. Mr. Leonetti stated it was a construction thing with the size of the windows as they were replacing them in kind.

He said all of the windows were custom made to match the existing size. Member Bergenholtz stated it was done wrong and they should be set back. Member Millard said the fastener was installed in the brick and the shutters were installed in the wood. Alternate Member Camara was fine with it, but the preference was to connect to the wood. Member Church said the shutters were okay as long as they were attached to the wood. She said she didn't mind if there weren't shutters previously, but it would be better if Mr. Leonetti could document if there were shutters there before.

Mr. Leonetti went on to talk about the repair of brick chimney. He said it had previous water damage which had been sealed off with some sort of stucco. Chairperson Lima asked if it was the north chimney and Mr. Leonetti said that was correct. Mr. Leonetti wanted to have the chimney match the existing chimney. He said the material would be a natural kiln clay veneer which would match the color and style.

Chairperson Lima asked Attorney Teitz if the Commission should do a motion to continue the shutters and then move on to the other items. Attorney Teitz said that would be a good idea. Chairperson Lima asked for a motion.

Motion made by Member Church to approve application 26-53 for the repair of the brick chimney as presented;
Seconded by Alternate Member Camara.

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

Opposed: None.

Motion carries.

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9

Project Monitor: Robert Page

Mr. Leonetti said that he was looking to match the foundation style to the best of his ability. He said the stairs were right up against the sidewalk and he was looking to do 3 stones, probably weathered beach rounds as well as a mosaic veneer of natural stone with a granite step on top. Mr. Leonetti said he would keep the existing shape of the stairs and his hope was to

revitalize the existing iron railings. Member Church asked if he was putting the stones on the face of the stairs. Mr. Leonetti said that was correct. Alternate Member Camara said that Mr. Leonetti was not replacing the stairs, but adding the stones and Mr. Leonetti said that was correct. Mr. Leonetti said the mason stated the structure of the stone was good in most spots. Member Church asked if the stairs had the stone mosaic before and Mr. Leonetti wasn't sure. Member Church asked what it was now and Mr. Leonetti said it was just cement.

Member Bergenholtz said he was against the stone veneer and that the stairs should be made of something like brownstone. Member Church agreed with Member Bergenholtz. Member Millard asked the condition of the foundation. Mr. Leonetti said it was a ragged rock foundation and the problem with it was the front steps went up against the sidewalk and they wouldn't be able to replicate it. Member Millard suggested painting the concrete to match the house as it didn't need to be brought out visually and as far as the foundation goes, get a power washer to clean it. Mr. Leonetti said it was clear that the Commission wanted either brownstone or to paint the foundation. Member Millard suggested a grey color on it. Attorney Teitz stated that the foundation is made up of those stones and the stairs weren't built of those stones and that's why it would be a false sense of history if Mr. Leonetti put the veneer on it. Mr. Leonetti asked if it would have been cement. Attorney Teitz said no, it might have been solid stone or possibly brick. He said there may be something else under the cement, but that was the concern.

Member Church asked Mr. Leonetti if he wanted to withdraw that part of the application. Mr. Leonetti asked if he could continue that portion of the application. Attorney Teitz stated that's why the Commission suggested painting it.

Mr. Leonetti went on to discuss the installation of a bulkhead which was to be located on the rear of the house farthest from Hope Street. Chairperson Lima asked if there was a bulkhead currently there. Mr. Leonetti said there wasn't one but there was a window there that was damaged. Chairperson Lima asked about the condition of the basement. Mr. Leonetti stated that he spent a lot of money renovating the basement to make sure it was structurally sound.

Chairperson Lima asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to speak for or against the application.

Dr. Catherine Zipf came forward and asked Mr. Leonetti if he was going to be cutting into the brick or foundation for the installation of the bulkhead. Mr. Leonetti said he would be cutting into the foundation. Dr. Zipf was not in favor of stone on the front steps. She didn't have an issue with the chimney. Dr. Zipf stated regarding the shutters if Mr. Leonetti was going to drill, he should drill into the mortar and not the brick for installation purposes. Dr. Zipf agreed with Member Bergenholtz about the trim around the windows that it was a disaster and it was a maintenance problem that was going to be an issue later on. She stated the reason he had the flat lentils, the ones that went out on a diagonal, and then the wood that went flush underneath which is not what was happening currently, was to help push the water away from the windows. She said the sill helped push the water away as well. Dr. Zipf said there were many YouTube videos showing explaining how and why it worked and why the formula was the formula back in the day. She stated the trim needed to be recessed into the brick, otherwise Mr. Leonetti was going to get water behind it, and it was going to be bad for the trim and the brick. She said the work is awful and encouraged him to get it fixed. Dr. Zipf said it was more than just an aesthetic issue; it was a functional issue. She said that installing a bulkhead may be opening a can of worms as cutting into a fieldstone foundation had its dangers. Dr. Zipf asked Mr. Leonetti who the contract was and he stated it was Mike Martins.

Member Bergenholtz stated that the Commission didn't approve of the trim the way it was installed. Chairperson Lima asked Mr. Leonetti if the contractor indicate why the windows were not flush with the brick. She stated it was going to cause problems with water, ice, and the like as time went on. Mr. Leonetti wasn't sure. Chairperson Lima said they were going to continue the shutters so Mr. Leonetti could contact the contractor about the issue. She advised him to tell the contract that was not what the Commission had approved. Attorney Teitz asked Mr. Leonetti if the contractor has been paid. Mr. Leonetti stated that the contractor was paid in full. Attorney Teitz said that Mr. Leonetti might want to have

an architect check it. Member Bergenholtz said it was not correct. Attorney Teitz said the concern was more for the preservation of the brick. Member Bergenholtz stated it wasn't supposed to be flush but rather set back from the brick.

Chairperson Lima suggested continuing the matter out to the June meeting and in the meantime, Mr. Leonetti should contact someone that could help him find a preservation person or an architect who could help Mr. Leonetti go to the contractor and indicate that the work that was mandated by the Commission was not done properly. She stated Mr. Leonetti paid for what the Commission expected to see and he needed to get someone in the architectural field or an attorney or both to get the matter corrected.

Chairperson Lima said in terms of the bulkhead, instead of opening up the wall in the back of the house, it may compromise the structure. She said Mr. Leonetti should look into a way of installing it without compromising the structure. Attorney Teitz said the bulkhead should have a plan with measurements that showed everything including any cutting into the brick and how the bulkhead would be joined to the brick so the brick wouldn't get damaged in the future. Chairperson Lima said if Mr. Leonetti had any questions he should contact Nick. Nick said if there were any issues like the windows that they be brought up before the meeting.

Motion made by Member Church to continue application 26-53 to the June 4th meeting; Seconded by Member Millard.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

4M. 26-54: 244 Metacom Ave, Andrew Broten Discuss and act on hardscape, bocce court, hot tub, extending previously approved pool house seating area, changes to porch, demolition of stone building.

Andrew Broten was present.

A discussion was had between Mr. Broten and the Commission. Mr. Broten advised the Commission of a few changes to the hardscape that was previously approved including the addition of a bocce court, and a slab to install a hot tub in the future. Also, Mr. Broten stated that the porch area on the pool house was originally designed slightly too narrow to support a table and chairs so he asked the designer to enlarge it by 2ft to give it a bit more space, so it was easier to walk around a table to enter the building which changed the footprint slightly of the pool house. He said the larger changes were the addition of stairs for the original porch on the building meaning stairs going up to the front door. He was looking at putting stairs on the southeast side of the home as a second access point to the porch.

Chairperson Lima asked Mr. Broten if he had a design or materials list for the stairs and Mr. Broten did not have either one. Member Millard asked if the stairs were going to match the ones on the rear porch. Mr. Broten said they weren't trying to match the back porch stairs as the back stairs were going to be a blue stone. Chairperson Lima had Mr. Broten approach the Commission and show them on the site plan where the porch and stairs were going to be located. Mr. Broten showed the area near the mud room which had been approved previously. Chairperson Lima advised Mr. Broten that the Commission did not have any designs or materials lists for the additional stairs he was requesting. Mr. Broten stated that he would have to come back to the Commission at a later meeting for the stairs.

Mr. Broten went on to speak about the hardscape changes and discussed how Dr. Catherine Zipf brought up the history of the stone icehouse at the last meeting. It had also been a concern of Member Bergenholtz. He stated that Dr. Zipf brought up that there was no historical significance of the icehouse. Dr. Zipf corrected Mr. Broten that there was no historical documentation of the icehouse. Mr. Broten was looking to get approval from the Commission for the demolition of the icehouse. He said it was being held up by chains and wood, and it was a safety concern for children playing in the future.

Member Bergenholtz asked Mr. Broten how much research had been done on the history of the icehouse. Mr. Broten stated he had done the full historical plaque process which looked at all of the buildings on the property and

there were no records in the research report talking about the icehouse. Dr. Zipf stated the house was plaqued recently and Ray had done a whole chain of title. Member Bergenholtz asked if deed research had been done and Dr. Zipf said yes. Dr. Zipf stated there was no reference to an icehouse or a barn, which didn't mean there wasn't one, but there wasn't a reference. Member Bergenholtz asked if probates had been checked. Dr. Zipf believed Ray did a deep dive into the research and would asked him to take another look. She said the property was complicated by the association with the adjacent property which was the Issac Royal House/Mt. Hope Farm. She stated it was difficult to untangle both properties. Dr. Zipf asked Ray about barns and Ray didn't see any reference to barns. She didn't know about an icehouse. She said they could take another look but there wasn't much more they could do. Dr. Zipf said it was difficult as the Issac Royal family descended from Nathaniel Byfield was complicated in the sense that there was a generation that got skipped and then it was deeded back and descended again, so there was a circular decendency which made the probate search a little more difficult. Member Bergenholtz said it seemed like this portion of the land was carved out when it was divided. He felt that there was something very important about the icehouse.

Dr. Zipf felt the conversation was better suited for a different meeting. She stated this was another property that had enslaved people on it. Dr. Zipf suggested creating a policy for when properties of that nature came before the Commission so the Commission would know how to handle the situation in the future. She wouldn't normally have an issue with a landscaping project, but in a case such as this, it's a case of where a project might disturb archeological remains that should be delt with properly. Dr. Zipf stated there was a limit as to how much research she could put Ray on. Member Bergenholtz said that's why he asked about resources as her organization is limited. Dr. Zipf advised Mr. Broten that he might need to hire a consultant and referred him to Charlotte Taylor. Member Bergenholtz asked Attorney Teitz who the person was that did the resurvey work. Attorney Teitz said it was Cathy Cavanaugh. Chairperson Lima asked Nick if it was possible to check with someone at the State Preservation. Nick said he could check with the State to see who Mr. Broten should contact about an archeological resources. Chairperson Lima said that it

may be something to discussion with the Town Council as well.

Mr. Broten said that since the icehouse was in such a terrible state of repair, what was his obligation as a property owner to maintain the ruins of the icehouse. Chairperson Lima said the historical significance of the icehouse needed to be established first and then move on. The Commission didn't want to impose anything on Mr. Broten in order find out information in the icehouse. Chairperson Lima suggested that he shouldn't have a party near the icehouse to risk any injuries. Chairperson Lima said the Commission would assist to try to get the issue straightened out. She stated that if the building was not historically important and worth saving, then they would have to look for a solution. However, if it was historically important, then it was a whole different issue. Mr. Broten stated the concern was that if it was going to take months to years to figure out, was he going to have to hold it in place and wall the area off. Chairperson Lima said hopefully it wasn't going to take years and it might take a couple of months. She wasn't sure about timing and schedules, etc., but the Commission was going to ask him to come back in June for the stairs issue. Attorney Teitz said they were going to have to come back for the steps anyway so it should just be continued for now. He said there were 2 steps: 1) figure out if the icehouse was historically significant, and 2) figure out what level of historical significance, if any found, it is, that being is it historical to the nation, a structure that is important to the State, and a structure that is important to the district.

Attorney Teitz said what was causing the interest was the unusual nature of the icehouse. He said the structure looked like it had 4 gables, so it seemed to have an unusual roof structure. Member Church said the slabs are curious as well. Attorney Teitz agreed. Member Bergenholtz said he didn't know of icehouses having windows. Attorney Teitz didn't think it was an icehouse, but more like a root cellar. Member Bergenholtz felt it was something like a functional barn or other structure. Attorney Teitz said an icehouse wouldn't have had windows. Member Church said the unusual way the property was delineated to go around it had to have meant something. Attorney Teitz stated the way the front gable and opening was deliberate for air circulation which

would have made more sense for a barn or living quarters rather than an icehouse.

Chairperson Lima said the Commission would continue the application for another month. Mr. Broten asked what his next steps should be. Attorney Teitz asked Mr. Broten if he had taken any photographs of the icehouse other than what was submitted in the application. Mr. Broten said no, only what he submitted. Member Church recommended that Mr. Broten take more extensive photographs of the icehouse. Mr. Broten said the chains and the wood holding the structure up were rotting.

Member Church suggested voting on everything except for the front stairs and the demolition of the icehouse which included the extended hardscaping for the cooking space, the stained wood pergola, the bocce court, and the slab for the hot tub.

Two neighbors spoke and said they wanted to voice their comments on the application. Chairperson Lima stated the Commission wasn't ready to vote yet, but they would listen to the neighbors' comments. Debra Faler, President of the Bristol Landing Condominium Association, and Matt White, President of the Weetamoe Condominium Association, came forward to speak.

Ms. Faler advised the Commission that both condominium complexes directly abut Mr. Broten's property and were concerned that he moved his tennis court right to the property line. Nick advised Ms. Faler that the tennis court had already been approved and the issue had passed the window to appeal the issue. Ms. Faler asked about the pickleball court. Nick said it was not under the purview of the Commission. Ms. Faler said Mr. Broten should be aware that since they share a city sewer system and Mr. Broten was paying an assessment to the Condominium Association because they share a sewer, there was going to be more activity due to the pool, and the hot tub will add more pressure on the city sewer system. Nick advised Ms. Faler that it was a civil issue and not under the purview of the Commission. He said they only review the historic nature of projects.

Ms. Faler said since they're neighbors, it was important for someone to inform the other neighbors of major changes. Chairperson Lima said the agenda was published and the issues that the Commission was dealing with had

to do with the building and the structure of building. She said the Commission had nothing to do with the sewer or the like. The Commission only dealt with the buildings and any changes the homeowner wanted to make to the building. Chairperson Lima said the Commission didn't deal with the interior or mechanical issues. Attorney Teitz said they only deal with historic preservation issues.

Matt White came up to speak next. Mr. White disagreed with Nick as they had a good relationship, but the sewer issue is an important issue and the pool house, hot tub, and pool installation was going to have an impact on the sewer system. Nick tried to advise him it was not in the Commission's purview, but Mr. White cut him off and asked to be heard. He felt Mr. Broten did need to speak with his neighbors because of the impact it would have on the sewer system. Mr. White said the Commission was going to approve all of the things that would impact the sewer system and asked if Mr. Broten was going to put in a separate septic system because they may disagree and not want him to impact the sewer system.

Attorney Teitz stated they had let Mr. White speak enough. He said the only thing the Commission could do anything about, at which point Mr. White interrupted Attorney Teitz and said that the Commission could do something about every single thing that they had approved so far. Attorney Teitz said the Commission could only do something if Mr. White had something to say about the historical significance and how it affected the historical significance of the property regarding the hot tub, pool, etc.. He stated issues regarding the historical significance and appropriateness to the historical structure of the existing house were the only things the Commission had any control over and those were the only things they could hear testimony on. Attorney Teitz said Mr. White might be 100% right about his point, but it wasn't something to bring up to the Commission. Mr. White said it was the Commission that approved the pool. Attorney Teitz said it didn't matter and if he didn't have anything to say about the history of the property or the icehouse the Commission was moving on.

Chairperson Lima said Mr. White may need to contact the sewer board. Mr. White said the sewer department didn't need to be contacted because it was their private sewer system. Chairperson Lima said the Commission had no

jurisdiction over it and couldn't tell anyone what to do. She suggested contacting the Town Council. Attorney Teitz said it was a private matter between the parties and there was nothing the Town could do. Mr. White said he met with many boards over the years and shutting him down before he could speak wasn't correct. He asked Nick about contacting Mr. Broten's architect which Nick very graciously did. Mr. White said the architect reached out to Mr. Broten and Mr. White never heard back although Mr. Broten had Mr. White's contact information as all of the issues need to be discussed or there's going to be an injunction. Attorney Teitz said that's fine, but the Commission could only hear about items that were relevant to the district and another applicant was waiting to be heard.

Attorney Teitz asked the Commission if they wanted to vote on the other items. He suggested that the Commission make a motion to continue the demolition and the stairs issue first.

Motion made by Member Church to continue the request for installation of stairs to the front porch and demolition of the icehouse to the June 4th meeting or another time that is convenient to the homeowner; Seconded by Member Bergenholtz.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

Motion made by Member Page to approve application 26-54 for the extended hardscape as noted in the application, the stained wood pergola, the bocce court, free standing hot tub slab, and pool house seating area all as listed in the application; Seconded by Alternate Member Camara.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

Secretary of Interior Standards: 2, 9, 10

Project Monitor: Robert Page

5. Concept Review

5A. CRHD26-3: 99 Bradford St, C&C Investing LLC Discuss conversion of property into single family home.

Greg Spiess and Carl Peterson were present.

Mr. Spiess said the structure was a former barber shop and retail building with an apartment above it. He stated it was the intent of the homeowner to make it into a single-family dwelling. They were looking for some guidance from the Commission on the project and wanted to share some of the steps they took. Mr. Spiess understood the building had a footprint that was part of the neighborhood, but it wasn't conducive to residential. He said it looked and acted like a retail building, but its future wanted to be residential. They were looking to modify it. Mr. Spiess said the initial idea of the owners was to bring it up into a typical Bristol federal or cape type front which was drawn up and looked at. Carl met with Cathrine Zipf, and they decided that it gave a false sense of history and wasn't the style of what the building was, so it was recommended that they talk to an architect who had done a lot of adaptive reuse projects. Mr. Spiess was happy to explore how to make it work. He understands that the clients want to make it a living unit where there's a living room on the main street with no setback and yet still have a neighborhood. Mr. Spiess wanted to maintain the sense of history of the building while giving the clients what they wanted. He presented some concept renderings to the Commission for their review.

Starting with Concept A, Mr. Spiess said one way was to bring up the bulkhead of the base of the windows so there was more privacy and have the ability to insulate the house. He said the challenge is to convert it to a thermally protected and efficient building while maintaining a historical structure and character. He said raising the bulkhead still gave it a sense of retail space. Mr. Spiess said it would bring up more insulated walls and having a pitched roof with an attic with a thermal roof and insulated front which was shown in Concept A. He explored the notion of columns or a porch

type of setting, but it might give it a false sense of history since it was a turn-of-the-century building.

Going to Concept B, Mr. Spiess had increased the amount of wall which structurally helped as the cornice was sagging. He was trying to keep the storefront footprint. Mr. Spiess said it helped it as a residential as well as it gave it an alcove to cover the front door. He said Concept B is more in keeping of where they wanted to go with the project. Mr. Spiess believes it combined the historical nature of the building with the residential character.

With Concept C, Mr. Spiess thought they would pronounce a bit more of the entrance. He suggested bringing it back to a cedar clapboard front with the same corner trim, repair the cornice in kind, and add a pitched roof which would make it look more like a house than a store. Mr. Spiess said if it was acceptable then they would pursue a formal application with the details worked out.

Member Bergenholtz said he loved Concept B, but he felt it should maintain a flat roof or to step it back, so it still reads as a 1900s building. Mr. Spiess felt a pitched roof provided additional storage and insulation while noting residential use. He said that even today flat roofs are typically used for commercial properties and not residential except for contemporary architecture. Mr. Spiess has done many flat and pitched roofs, and a pitched roof is far less troublesome and easier to insulate. He said that looking at the street, it was the only flat roof on the street. Chairperson Lima said that's what made it unique. Member Millard said he was looking for additional space as well. She said if it's going to be a residence, it needed to come into some sort of proportion with its neighbor and not stand out as a barber shop. Mr. Spiess said it's been a challenge to get a good balance.

Chairperson Lima said she liked Concept B and Concept C regarding reducing the storefront windows to 2 smaller but functional windows. She said she wasn't a fan of the roof and asked if there was a way to possibly ease it. Mr. Spiess said it could be a lower slope. Chairperson Lima said possibly keeping the front and maybe doing something in the back with a different kind of roof so the owners could get a room in the back, so the streetscape looked the same. Mr. Spiess said they could

lower the pitch but having a flat portion to the roof might be asking for trouble. Chairperson Lima didn't want anyone to take buildings in Bristol and make them into something they weren't but understood the building couldn't stay the way it was. Mr. Spiess said they could consider a lower sloped roof.

Member Bergenholtz referred back to the standards that new additions will not destroy features and spatial relationships that characterize the property. He reiterated that Concept B was beautiful, but it needed to maintain a flat roof or step it back somehow. Mr. Spiess said maybe there's a way and can explore it. Chairperson Lima said to maintain some sense of history the front should remain flat. Mr. Spiess said there was an upper eave which would be maintained and the bottom eave was significant which he could work with.

Mr. Spiess asked if they could go forward with a formal application with Concept B in mind. Member Page said Concept B looks like they're representing what the building was. He said it read the drawing lost the upper cornice and the fact that it rims the entire building and it got taken out by the pitched roof coming all the way down to it. Member Page said he wouldn't mind the pitched roof if it was stepped back to deal with the cornice being there. Mr. Spiess stated they were going to rebuild the cornice and do gutters as well. Member Page said that Mr. Spiess needed to leave that architectural feature.

Member Bergenholtz said what if there was a third floor with a flat roof that was stepped back from the cornice. Mr. Spiess said the owners didn't need it. Member Millard said Member Bergenholtz' idea to lower the pitch a little bit was a good idea. She also suggested adding a barber's pole on the front. Mr. Spiess said that Mr. Peterson found the barber's sign and gave it to Catherine Zipf.

Alternate Member Camara liked Concept B and agreed with the rest of the Commission about reducing the pitch of the roof as it was really what was seen from the street. Mr. Spiess said the pitch sat a little heavy on the cornice and could possibly be backed up. Member Church was also in favor of the flat roof and adhering to the design elements as much as possible to what was existing. She would be okay with the 1 door in the recessed entry

way and reducing the size of the store front windows. She did not like the idea of columns. Member Church said side lights on the side of the door were fine but keeping it as much in line with what's existing on the building was her preference. She said there were some pretty distinctive architectural styles right in a line there and they were all different and creating something else in the neighborhood would be a loss of that distinctive style of building.

Chairperson Lima asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to speak for or against the project. Dr. Catherine Zipf came forward to speak.

Dr. Catherine Zipf stated the structure still stands as it was built and it was a rare moment of authenticity which was worth protecting. She didn't love the roof either and hoped that they change the pitch to get it as low as they could would change the optics. Dr. Zipf suggested a shallow shed roof where it would go all the way to the back. She would like to see as much of the original store front to be retained as possible. Mr. Spiess said the front wasn't in good shape. Dr. Zipf said to fix it and retain it. She asked if it was a cast iron store front and Mr. Spiess said it was not.

Mr. Spiess said the concept review was very helpful, and they would be back with a formal application next month. Chairperson Lima said at least the applicant knew what the Commission was going to be looking for and the applicant wouldn't be wasting their own time having to come back multiple times. Chairperson Lima said they could always come back for another concept review.

6. **Monitor Reports & Project Updates**
7. **HDC Coordinator Reports & Project Updates**
8. **HDC Coordinator Approvals**
9. **Other Business**
10. **Adjourned at 10:25PM**