

TOWN OF BRISTOL, RHODE ISLAND

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION



Historic District Commission Meeting Minutes

**Monday, September 29, 2025
at 7:00 PM**

Town Hall - 10 Court Street, Bristol Rhode Island

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

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

1. Pledge of Allegiance

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

In attendance: Lima, Ponder, Allen, Church, Millard, Page, Toth, Goins (left meeting at 8:10p.m.), and Teitz (arrived at meeting at 8:10p.m.)

Absent: Bergenholtz, and O'Loughlin

2. Review of Previous Month's Meeting Minutes

2A. Joint Planning Board and Historic District Commission Minutes of August 7, 2025

Lima: Let's review the minutes of the special joint meeting of Planning Board and the Historic District Commission of August 7, 2025. Does anyone have any changes or comments? Can we have a motion to accept the minutes?

Motion made by Church to approve the minutes of the special joint meeting of August 7, 2025 as presented; Seconded by Allen.

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

2B. Review of minutes of the September 4, 2025 meeting.

Lima: Let's review the minutes of the meeting of September 4, 2025. Does anyone have any changes or comments?

Church: I do. On page 19, the last sentence doesn't make sense where O'Donnell said, "Once this is painted, this clapboard." It should be removed. Page 25, near the bottom where I said, "I think we need a better description and is it plastic?" I think what I said was, "if it is plastic, then it won't be approved." Please change it. On page 26, about a 1/3rd of the way down, it should be "Their description" not "They're". Page 27, in the 2nd paragraph where Andy is speaking near the end, "if it's going to be approved on a temporary basis, there be a deadline." It should read "there will be a deadline". On page 33, about halfway down, where Lima says, "I'm sending around the 2007 sad pictures", it should be "old pictures". On page 46, correct the spelling of Shusman in several places. On page 49, the spelling of Gibbemeyer needs to be corrected. That's all I have.

Lima: Anything else?

Allen: I had one on the bottom of page 30 to the top of page 31 redundant. The top of page 31 is done better, so just delete the paragraph on page 30. That's all I have.

Lima: Anything else? Can we have a motion to accept the minutes as amended?

Allen: motion as amended

Ponder: second

Motion made by Allen to accept the minutes of the September 4, 2025 minutes as amended; Seconded by Ponder.

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

3. Application Reviews

3A. 25-12: 125 Hope Street, 125 Hope Street, LLC Discuss and act on demolition and replacement or remodeling of existing property.

Alfred R. Rego, Jr., Attorney for the owners, Nancy DiPrete Laurienzo, homeowner/applicant, Madeline Melchert, architect, Dennis DiPrete, civil/environment engineer, and David O'Day, structural engineer, were all present.

A discussion was had between the members of the Historic District Commission, Attorney Rego, Ms. DiPrete Laurienzo, Ms. Melchert, Mr. DiPrete, and Mr. O'Day. A letter from the Rhode Island Historical Preservation and Heritage Commission dated September 25, 2025 was read into the record. It was the opinion of the Rhode Island Historical Preservation and Heritage Commission that the building was in such a state of disrepair that it could not be saved, and demolition was the only course of action. Attorney Rego, Ms. DiPrete Laurienzo, Ms. Melchert, Mr. DiPrete, and Mr. O'Day all agreed with the Rhode Island Historical Preservation and Heritage Commission's findings as it was more feasible to demolish the building than to try to bring the building and foundation up to today's Building Code standards. They did point out that a major part of the historic fabric of the home would be lost by removing the skin as all of it would need to be abated since it was asbestos and as such, could not be replaced in kind. Attorney Rego stated the home was in such a derelict state that it should essentially be considered as "demolition by neglect".

The Commission members expressed their concerns and objections to demolishing a building with such a deep historic connection to the Bristol waterfront. They stated a desire for the applicant to seek out more alternatives to help restore and/or maintain as much of the historic fabric as possible of the home. They also advised the applicant that they would need to see a proposed plan/design for a potential new building before they would consider the possibility of demolishing the old building as was standard procedure.

Another discussion concerning the flood plains, flood insurance and the like was had. It was the contention of the applicant and Attorney Rego that due to the flood plain situation existing on the property, the home would have to be lifted in order for a new foundation to be done which would need to be higher to meet current Building Code standards and also for the foundation to be above the flood plain. Further, the flood insurance that

needed to be placed on the home was going to be costly to the homeowner and what measures could be taken to supplement the cost of said insurance.

The Commission members asked Attorney Goins if they could do another site visit and possibly invite members of the State Historic Preservation. Attorney Goins stated that the Commission could do another site visit, but that the Rhode Island Historical Preservation and Heritage Commission came to a conclusion. However, if the Commission wanted additional insight from the Rhode Island Historical Preservation and Heritage Commission, they could invite a representative to come to a meeting or ask Nick to contact them for additional insight.

The Commission members that did attend the first site visit said they were shocked the interior seemed to be in as good condition as they saw it. They expected it to be worse based on what the exterior looked like. More discussions were had between everyone regarding the condition of the building and what would need to be done to restore, repair, and reinforce it to bring it up to code. The Chairman of the Commission then asked if there was anyone in the audience that wanted to speak for or against the application.

David Andreozzi, an architect with many years of experience in historic preservation, and as a former Historic District Commission member, came forward. He stated that any structure could easily be moved, but dealing with code issues is when an applicant is committed to spending over 50% of the value of a structure to bring it up to code. If the owner decided to do that, then they are committed to lifting it on the flood plain. Mr. Andreozzi said Attorney Rego and the homeowner had a responsibility to investigate if the structure is a historically contributing structure to Bristol and to look at other historic structures that have been in equal disrepair and whether they have been razed or saved.

Dr. Catherine W. Zipf, Executive Director of the Bristol Historical & Preservation Society, was next to speak. She stated that the house should be saved as it was wildly historic and intrinsic to the fabric of the community and history for about 150yrs in Bristol. Dr. Zipf understood the complexity of the situation and reminded the Commission that as far as siding, windows,

roofs, doors and such, they had all at multiple times approved replacements that were not the original materials but were similar and many of which had been modern materials, and which might be appropriate in this case. Dr. Zipf said the idea that a person can't replace asbestos with asbestos was something of a fallacy and there had been plenty of times when the Commission hadn't replaced wood with wood. She pointed out that recently 195 High Street was picked up and moved in order to pour a new foundation under it and the structure was already at least as bad as this one if not more. Dr. Zipf also gently pointed out to everyone, with all due respect to the team who was presenting the project, not one of them, to her knowledge, had consulted a preservation contractor who might offer some different solutions, particularly Roberta. She recommended that the applicant talk to someone at the Rhode Island Historical Preservation and Heritage Commission, especially Roberta Randall, for help on the project. Dr. Zipf made the recommendation of inserting a steel frame, which could be bolted down, and hanging what exists off it would solve many problems. She said the steel framing would withstand all the twisting winds of weather, climate change, etc., on a new foundation. It would save the historic pieces of the structure by not throwing out anything and adding to what is there in ways such as sistering, which was talked about regarding 195 High Street. There are ways to do this. I don't believe any kind of preservation contractor has been consulted on it. Lastly, Dr. Zipf said that she didn't think the Commission had any real reason to consider flood insurance as part of this. If the applicant was unaware that flood insurance would be a problem on this site, that's on them as flood insurance is a big problem all around. The Commission shouldn't bend over in the Historic District so someone could save on flood insurance.

Ms. Melchert stated she did consult with an architectural restoration contractor about what's possible versus what's feasible. Attorney Rego stated that since the cost was so high to try to save the home, that's where "demolition by neglect" should come in. He further stated that the Herreshoff family had more to do with outliving one's resources and not having the funds to put back into a building. This property was owned by Halsey who then sold it to these developers, and his family has done quite a bit to preserve the Herreshoff heritage in the Town and donated millions of dollars of property to

the Museum and what was part of that showplace of the early years of the Museum was now 1 Burnside. He said a lot of the issues were taken into consideration when the Rhode Island Historical Preservation and Heritage Commission reviewed it, and they looked at the lack of the historic fabric of this building from all the renovations that have to be done.

Nick Toth said that there's some concern with the applicant being stuck in a catch 22 situation as they were not going to want to put too much into designing a replacement without knowing if they're going to demolish. However, the Commission wouldn't grant demolition without knowing the plans for replacement. The Chairman of the Commission then poled the members. Each member of the Commission was not in favor of demolition and suggested that the applicant have a plan/design for a new build and having done more research into possibly saving the current structure. It was agreed upon that the application would be continued as a concept review and be placed on a special meeting, so as to not hold up the agenda, and that another site visit should be scheduled.

Motion made by Allen to continue application 25-12 for a future concept review to be scheduled for a special meeting to be determined at a later date; Seconded by Church.

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

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

Victoria Finucane was present.

Ms. Finucane explained to the Commission that she wanted to replace both the front door and the exterior door which have been damaged over the years and are not able to be repaired according to her contractor. She stated the front doors were fiberglass and were going to be replaced in kind. She also said there was an aluminum storm door on the front and back as well and the exterior door in the rear was a wood door. Ms. Finucane was unable to repair the wood door and wanted to replace it with fiberglass door with a double-pane window in it for energy efficiency. She said there was a single pane

window there currently. She also wanted to replace the storm door on the back. In addition, Ms. Finucane also had multiple single-paned windows, mostly 2 over 2 and some 4 over 4, on the property which she wanted to replace, and in various stages of disrepair, and not energy efficient. She also proposed some changes to the property which included the addition of new windows, and those would not be the same size as the existing windows. She wanted to get those windows approved now and be able to use that approval to add them to the property in due time as there was a second proposal that she had put on hold for the moment because she needed better and more developed plans.

A discussion was held between the Commission and Ms. Finucane. The Commission stated they couldn't approve the addition of windows without seeing plans first. Ms. Finucane understood but wanted the Commission to approve the use of the windows proposed to replace what was existing. The Commission wanted to know the age of the existing windows and the house. Ms. Finucane didn't know the age of the windows but said she thought the house was built in 1920. It was then discovered that the house was built in 1850, and the storefront was circa 1920. The Chairman read a description of alterations made to home listed in the home's history into the record. The Commission said it was possible that the windows could have been at least 50yrs old and they like to keep older windows in the homes if they could be repaired. Ms. Finucane agreed but said they couldn't be repaired.

The Commission advised Ms. Finucane that they wanted to conduct a site survey to review the status of the windows and then they could make a vote. Ms. Finucane understood but emphasized that she wanted to replace it rather than repair to make the home more energy efficient. She said that the windows also had aluminum storm windows, and the damage could be seen from the interior. She felt that if she were to keep those windows, in order to make her house energy efficient, she would have to replace the storm windows which would make all of this null and void. She believes what was proposed was a more pleasing aesthetic. Once again, the Commission stated that it was their charge to repair rather than replace. Ms. Finucane said she would have to put storm windows over them. The Commission said that with old windows sometimes all that is needed is some repair work and replacement storm windows. Ms. Finucane stated that she didn't like storm

windows and wanted nice windows that were more fitting to the property. The Commission understood her position but reiterated that they had a duty to repair and restore rather than replace in order to maintain the historic aspects of the building. They advised she could get more energy efficient storm windows.

The Commission and Attorney Andy Teitz both advised Ms. Finucane that a site visit was going to be scheduled at which time the Commission would be able to take a vote whether or not the windows should be replaced or repaired.

The next discussion was regarding the front porch portion of the application. It was noted that the application did not include any information regarding a description, drawings, specifics, etc., and without such information the Commission would not be able to vote on it. Ms. Finucane stated it was to be all wood. The Commission explained that was not sufficient. They needed a drawing, the size, how wide the steps were going to be, and exactly what materials she was planning on using, if the wood was going to be cedar, etc. Ms. Finucane said that she was in the process of getting plans for it, along with plans made for other pieces of the house so she could come back and present it to the Commission. The Commission advised Ms. Finucane to come back with everything when she was ready since she had already paid for the application, so she wouldn't need to reapply and pay for a second application.

After further discussion and review of the application, the Commission stated that the application was incomplete. Ms. Finucane was advised that she needed to provide more information regarding the windows and doors. The information provided did not give a complete description of the size and materials that the windows were made from and the Commission needed that information in order to make an informative decision. Further, the information provided by Ms. Finucane regarding the doors that she wanted as replacements was not correct in the application. She stated that she wanted to replace the doors with fiberglass doors, but the information provided was about steel doors. They told her to obtain the correct information and provide it to the Commission.

The Commission further advised Ms. Finucane that when she returned in the future for the porch and other parts of her home projects, she needed to make sure that the application contained very specific information which included material lists as it's a legal document associated with this building forever and a complete list of all materials needs to be a part of the official application and it would also be needed for the building permit.

The Commission asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to speak for or against the application and no one came forward.

It was decided that the application would be continued to the November 6, 2025 meeting. In the meantime, the Commission would schedule a site visit at which time it was recommended that Ms. Finucane provide a sample replacement window so the Commission could see it and provide a cut sheet for said replacement window to the Commission. The Commission also wanted a cut sheet for the replacement doors Ms. Finucane wanted. During the site visit, the Commission will take a vote regarding the windows and the doors.

Motion made by Ponder to continue application 25-48 to the November 6, 2025 meeting. A site visit regarding the windows will be scheduled separately; Seconded by Page.

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

3C. 25-54: 5 Milk Street, MARY ANN PELLEGRINO Discuss and Act on replacement of windows.

Mary Ann Pellegrino was present.

Nick Toth reminded the Commission that they had questions regarding the cladding material on Ms. Pellegrino's window, and if her manufacturer could create a matching arched window to replace the current arched window.

Ms. Pellegrino stated she had all of the information that the Commission needed regarding the windows and assured the Commission that the manufacturer could create an exact replica of the arched window. She confirmed to the

Commission that the windows were fiberglass with a wood interior from the Marvin Elevate series.

The Commission asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to speak for or against the application and no one came forward. The Commission approved Ms. Pellegrino's application. She was advised to put the Certificate of Appropriateness in front of her house, along with the building permit, so it was visible to the Town.

Motion made by Church to approve application 25-54 for the replacement of the windows on the 2nd floor and 1 window in the dormer on the 3rd floor with Marvin Elevate fiberglass exterior windows and noting that the window on the 3rd floor will be crafted exactly as the existing arched window; Seconded by Ponder.

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

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9

Project Monitor: John Allen

3D. 25-82: 224 Hope St, Gregory Leonetti Discuss and act on replacement of all windows

Nick Toth advised the Commission that he was still working with the applicant to set up a site visit, but it was difficult with the applicant's schedule. He advised the Commission that the applicant did reach out to some restoration people as suggested by the Commission and was doing his due diligence. The Commission asked for 3 dates from the applicant to see if they could work something out.

The Commission asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to speak for or against the application and no one came forward. The Commission then continued the application to the next meeting.

Motion made by Allen to continue application 25-82 to the November 6, 2025 meeting or a site visit; Seconded by Ponder.

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

3E. 25-104: 227 Thames St, Karen St. Pierre: Discuss and Act on installation of sign.

Karen St. Pierre and Mark Gale were present.

Karen St. Pierre and Mark Gale advised the Commission that their previous sign was taken down as it was too big. It was remade to fit perfectly in the box. They stated it was made from an aluminum composite board, and nothing would happen to it. Mr. Gale said when they first moved in, they could put up whatever sign they wanted. Unfortunately, such was not the case when they put up the original sign, they were informed by the Town there was a problem. Mr. Gale advised they had been working Nick and Ed Tanner to comply with the Town. He said they were able to recut the sign, and it is just waiting to be put back up, and it would make a nice impact. Ms. St. Pierre said their shop was in Newport for 28 years originally and they have been warmly welcomed to Bristol, and it has been great a great experience.

The Commission asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to speak for or against the application and no one came forward. The Commission approved the application.

Motion made by Allen to approve application 25-104 as presented; Seconded by Church.

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

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9

Project Monitor: Determined wasn't necessary.

Nick Toth advised that a sign permit was applied for and that there may have been 1 other step.

3F. 25-119: 240 High St, Bristol Santa House Discuss and act on temporary construction of Bristol Santa House.

Michael Riley/Santa Claus was present.

The Commission and Mr. Riley discussed the return of the Santa House to the property. Mr. Riley said he was amazed at the overwhelming response from all over the country every year as it's a unique experience for families with children with disabilities. He stated it was also open to public on certain days. Mr. Riley said that he has had families come from as far as Alaska, California, and New Jersey and it's something that makes Bristol unique.

The Commission asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to speak for or against the application and no one came forward. The Commission approved the application with the condition of a timeline for operation from November 1, 2025 through February 15, 2026.

Motion made by Allen to approve application 25-119 for the installation of the Santa House around November 1, 2025 and to be removed by February 15, 2026; Seconded by Ponder.

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

Secretary of Interior Standards: 10

Project Monitor: Determined not necessary.

3G. 25-122: 444 Thames St (Independence Park), The Lafayette Trail Discuss and act on installation of Lafayette Trail maker in independence park.

Dr. Catherine Zipf appeared on behalf of Julianne Iker.

Dr. Catherine Zipf on Julianne Iker's behalf refreshed the Commission's recollection that it was agreed that the application was going to be held back until the construction on the boat ramp was completed. She stated that 3 possible sites in Independence Park were selected and presented to Ed Tanner, who chose only 2 of the possible sites for the installation of the proposed Lafayette Trail marker. Dr. Zipf said that it was now up the Commission as to where the marker should be installed.

The Commission looked at the 2 maps indicating the 2 choices and asked Dr. Zipf if she had a preference to which she did not. The Commission asked if they could make any decisions on the design of the sign. Dr. Zipf said the sign was what would come from the Lafayette Trail and what would be different was the Daughters of the American Revolution would not be referenced on the sign and the text would be what was submitted and specific to the area of installation. She also advised that there was a materials list presented in the application.

After further discussion, the Commission decided to place the Lafayette Trail marker at the north end of Independence Park at the parking lot entrance by the Liberty Tree.

The Commission asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to speak for or against the application and no one came forward. The Commission approved the application.

Motion made by Ponder to approve application 25-122 for the installation of the historic marker honoring the Marquee De Lafayette in the position near the entrance the parking lot near the Liberty Tree as shown on page 315 perpendicular to the sidewalk and facing the sidewalk; Seconded by Allen.

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

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9, 10

Project Monitor: Chris Ponder

3H. 25-123: 474 Thames St, Daniel Brooks Discuss and act on replacement of siding.

Daniel Brooks was present.

Mr. Brooks came to discuss 474 and 484 Thames Street. He advised the Commission that he was looking to redo the siding on both properties with wood siding, wood trim, and asked the Commission to consider some form of low maintenance material like Azek for the 3rd floor rakes,

soffits, and facia. He said that due to exposure to the waterfront, it would be a better choice for those areas on both properties. The Commission stated they have approved Azek materials for properties near the waterfront in the past, but not necessarily for the street facing portions of properties. Mr. Brooks stated that Azek was paintable and would look good painted and he wanted to do as much trim as the Commission would allow due to the exposure, but the wood siding would stay the same. He advised that he would replicate and replace any missing molding, trim, and corner boards. Mr. Brooks stated that the front door was a steel door with 12-inch side lights, and it was not historic or original. He said the front gable and flashing all needed to be taken down and replaced due to water penetration and he had it measured, and it would be replicated and replaced.

The Commission stated that the application was only for siding at the current time as everything else was not advertised and discussions could not take place.

Mr. Brooks stated that the siding was the major concern at the current time. He wanted to do clapboard on the sides and the rear and shakes on the front gable to keep with the aesthetics.

The Commission discussed the removal of the back decks. Mr. Brooks stated that he would be replacing the back deck at 474 Thames and at 484 Thames it was an oversight on his part. He talked to Nick about it and apologized to the Commission. He stated it was a glass house which was pulling away from the house with a plywood deck that Douglas from Arrow Home Inspections fell through it to his knee. Mr. Brooks stated that it was also one of the main egresses to the house, but it led to a glass room that had no exit, and not knowing how the process worked, he removed it and apologized to the Commission for doing so.

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

Dr. Catherine Zipf said she was confused about the removal of the corner boards at 484 Thames. She asked why they couldn't be saved. Mr. Brooks advised that there was a lot of decay behind the boards, and the overhead of door was rotted and there was no viable wood. She asked if they would be replicated in wood, to which

Mr. Brooks advised it would be wood. He stated that he was only asking for Azek on higher elevations like the 2nd or 3rd floor elevations and it would be painted to match everything else. Mr. Brooks stated that both 474 and 484 would have wood corner boards and Azek trim on high elevations.

The Commission was in favor of using Azek could be used along the roof line, as long as the corner boards remained wood. Mr. Brooks advised that he was not changing the door to the storefront but would trim it out with new wood.

The Commission and Nick Toth advised Mr. Brooks that he needed to provide a detailed design and materials list for a new deck on 474 Thames and it would need to be properly advertised. Mr. Brooks stated that he was not going to replace the deck at 484 Thames, but he would obtain the necessary information for the deck at 474 Thames. He explained that he had already removed the glass bubble deck from 484 Thames and was not going to replace it. Mr. Brooks said he would come back with design plans for 474 Thames. Mr. Toth explained that it wouldn't have to extremely specific design plans, but there would have to be an application for the deck along with a list of materials.

The Commission asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to speak for or against the application and no one came forward. The Commission approved the application.

Motion made by Ponder to approve application 25-123 for 474 Thames Street to replace the siding on the entire house with wood as presented with wood shingles on the front street facing side and wood clapboard on sides and back of the building. Also, replacement of the fascia boards, gable rakes, and soffits with Azek which is to be painted. Finding of fact that Azek was approved due to the proximity of the building to the waterfront. Further, the corner boards are to be replaced with wood and the species of wood will be presented to the Project Monitor; Seconded by Allen.

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

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9

Project Monitor: Chris Ponder

3I. 25-124: 484 Thames St, Daniel Brooks Discuss and act on replacement of siding and removal of deck.

A discussion was had between the Commission and Mr. Brooks regarding his request for the replacement of the wood siding for the building at 484 Thames Street. The Commission also advised Mr. Brooks that he would have to return with an application for the replacement of the deck on the back of the building.

The Commission asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to speak for or against the application and no one came forward. The Commission approved the application.

Motion made by Ponder to approve application 25-124 for 484 Thames Street to replace the siding on the entire house with wood as presented with wood shingles on the front street facing side and wood clapboard on sides and back of the building. Also, replacement of the fascia boards, gable rakes, and soffits with Azek which is to be painted. Finding of fact that Azek was approved due to the proximity of the building to the waterfront. Further, the corner boards are to be replaced with wood and the species of wood will be presented to the Project Monitor. Finally, the approval of the removal of the rear deck; Seconded by Allen.

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

Secretary of Interior Standards: 2, 9

Project Monitor: Chris Ponder

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

No one present.

Motion made by Page to continue application 21-125 to the November 6, 2025 meeting; Seconded by Allen.

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

3K. 25-126: 1237 Hope St, David Manocchio Discuss and act on addition of bulkhead.

No one present.

Motion made by Page to continue application 21-126 to the November 6, 2025 meeting; Seconded by Allen.

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

3L. 25-127: 467 Hope Street, FEDERAL PROPERTIES OF R.I., INC. Discuss and act on addition of sign.

David Andreozzi, architect, was present for the applicant.

A discussion was had between the Commission and Mr. Andreozzi regarding the addition of a new tenant signage 4 inches high with metallic gold finished prismatic lettering "ANDREOZZI ARHCITECTURE" in Times Bold font attached on existing entablature between two existing lettered signs, along with new tenant numbers for four tenant doors with 4 inch gold metallic vinyl lettering with black backgrounds which would be in the middle centers of the glass transoms above the doors.

The Commission asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to speak for or against the application and no one came forward. The Commission approved the application.

Motion made by Allen to approve application 25-127 as presented for the installation of a new sign and new tenant numbers; Seconded by Page.

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

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9

Project Monitor: Robert Page

3M. 25-129: 186 Hope, William K. Campbell Discuss and act on replacement of garage door, replacement of decking and steps, replacement of French door, repair to windows, repair to railings.

Millard recused.

William K. Campbell was present.

A discussion between the Commission and Mr. Campbell commenced. The discussion was taken in the order that was listed in Mr. Campbell's application. During the discussion, however, the Commission informed Mr. Campbell that he had done much of the work without getting the proper permits first. Mr. Campbell believed that if he was replacing in kind, he thought that he did not have to pull the permits. He acknowledged the misunderstanding and apologized to the Commission.

Item #1 - the garage door: Mr. Campbell wanted to replace just the lower panel on the garage door, but the garage door is no longer manufactured as it was a wood interior with a laminated exterior, and new doors are wood interiors with steel exteriors. Also, his current garage door had one panel with windows, and the new garage would not have windows, but the overall relief design would be similar to what was there currently. The Commission had Mr. Campbell confirm which photo in the packet was the door he was requesting, which was located on page 354.

Item #2 - the back porch stairs, decking and post: Mr. Campbell stated that he had a situation on the 4th of July where the stairs gave out, so he fixed them immediately. He retained a contractor and was now going to replace the decking with mahogany, pressured treated stringers, mahogany posts, keeping the existing copper caps, and railings.

Item #3 - installation of an iron railing on the front entry steps: Mr. Campbell stated that the front entry step railing would be replaced with a simple design with square posts made of iron and the posts would be drilled into the stone and permanently mounted. He stated that he did not have a drawing or photo of the actual railing design, but he did have a diagram which he had drawn himself and showed it to the Commission.

Item #4 - wood trim and sills on the addition portion of the house: Mr. Campbell said the trim was finger-jointed pine at the sill with trim at the bottom and sides of the window which began to rot. He stated the work had already been done and replaced it with a mahogany sill, mahogany trim, and lifespan pre-primed solid wood on the large trim. The Commission asked if the list of materials was in the application, which it was.

Item #5 - replacement of the 2nd floor east bedroom window: Mr. Campbell stated his contractor advised that the window only needed 1 new bottom railing on 1 sash, a flat piece of stock was put on the outside in between double windows because the outside piece was part of the interior workings of the window. Everything else was repaired and was working fine. The Commission again advised Mr. Campbell to make sure they had a list of the materials for the record.

Item #6 - repair or replacement in kind of windows on the south and west sides on the 1st and 2nd floors: Mr. Campbell advised that he did not have to replace any sashes. He only needed to replace 1 flat inside piece between a double window. He acknowledged that again, the work had already been done.

Item #7 - French door located on the south side of the house: Mr. Campbell stated it was a new project that had not been done yet as he knew it had to be approved by the Commission. He was requesting to remove the French door and replace it with an new fiberglass door. He advised that the doors measured a total of 45 inches in width and with 1 door open it was only 21 inches and hard to get through. Mr. Campbell wished he could have kept them, but the opening is too small and the 80+yr old resident was having a hard time entering and exiting the home. He was requesting leaving the exterior opening the same but putting in a 32-inch-wide door with a 12-inch fixed light panel on the side as it was the closest he could find to match the existing window configuration of the door. The Commission asked if it was visible from the street and Mr. Campbell stated that the door was partially visible from Burton Street. The Commission stated that the doors were a unique, defining feature to the home. The Commission asked if he could put a handle on the door to help the resident enter and exit. Mr. Campbell was unsure if a handle would fit on the door. The Commission did not approve the removal of the door due to the unique

character, material of the door, and defining feature of the door to the home. Mr. Campbell asked for recommendations from the Commission. The Commission suggested a metal railing bolted to the porch which is reversable in the future would be a lot less expensive. Mr. Campbell understood and said he would have look at alternatives.

Item #8 - main porch railing: Mr. Campbell acknowledged he had already repaired the parts of the main porch railings that had rotted as needed.

Item #9 - exterior trim and cedar shingles located on the addition portion of the home: Mr. Campbell stated that there was a recent discovery of rot in the shingles and in the plywood underneath the shingles. He said it had not been removed yet to see the extent of the rot. The Commission stated that it wouldn't be a problem as long as he was replacing in kind. Mr. Campbell said that white cedar shingles were no longer available, and the contractor recommended that he should go with yellow cedar shingles. The Commission said that as long as it was cedar shingles, it was not a problem. Mr. Campbell stated that there was a skirt around the entire house and that the skirt angle carried up to the corners of the house so the side wall of the 2nd floor was almost like a roof and he was having a hard time keeping paint on the area so he did cedar shingles. He asked the Commission's opinion about using asphalt shingles on that portion of the wall to make it look more like a roof. The Commission would not render an opinion as it was not listed on the application.

The Commission clarified that work on all of the items had already been done except for the French doors. They asked Nick if he was aware of the work being done. Mr. Toth stated that Mr. Campbell reached out to him after a lot of the work had already been done, but a fee was not assessed against him as most of the work may have been approved administratively. The Commission stated that a fee still needed to be assessed since the work was done without the proper permits. Mr. Campbell said that he had spoken to Mr. Toth before he started anything about what he could do administratively. Mr. Toth advised him that no administrative application was ever filed until now. The Commission said that there had to be an application filed. Attorney Teitz stated that the assessed fee would be \$150 for working without a permit

and that going forward an application must be filed even if it is administrative.

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

Dr. Catherine Zipf came forward and asked for clarification regarding the French door. The Commission stated that they were denying the applicant's request to remove the French Door without prejudice and that he could come back with a new application with an alternative to removing the door if needed.

Motion made by Church motion replacement of garage door be approved as presented page 354 without windows steel garage door, approval of items 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, on page 357 of application as presented and completed, item 3 on 357 for new railings on front steps to be custom constructed approved, applicant to submit more formal sketch of design to be approved by PM, item 9 on page 357, rotted cedar shingles can be replaced as necessary with new cedar shingles to replace rotted white cedar shingles with cedar shingles as available. Item #7 on page 357 the French door, applicant is denied without prejudice; Seconded by Allen.

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

Secretary of Interior Standards: 2, 9, 10

Project Monitor: Robert Page

3N. 25-107: 186 Hope St, William Campbell Discuss and act on installation of heat pump using basement windows to run coolant lines.

Millard recused.

William Campbell was present.

Nick Toth advised that compressor could be done administratively and that the only issue that needed to be discussed was whether or not the Commission would allow the placement of a vent through a window.

A discussion was held between the Commission and Mr. Campbell regarding where the window was located in the

house. Mr. Campbell advised that the window was located in the basement. Mr. Campbell showed the Commission a photo that was in the application showing a view from the street towards the house, indicating the window was on the left side of the house. He stated that it would not be visible from the street. Mr. Campbell advised the Commission that the compressor would be on a platform, and the vent would go through the window. The Commission asked if the Building Inspector saw it, and Mr. Campbell stated that the Building Inspector would have to look at the mechanical aspects of the compressor.

The Commission asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to speak for or against the application and no one came forward. The Commission approved the application.

Motion made by Allen to accept application 25-107 for the installation of a heat pump adjacent to the east end of the north side of the existing house not visible from the street, with running the coolant and electrical connection lines through one pane of an existing three-pane window opening of the foundation a few feet from the heat pump unit. Applicant is to make sure it is to be shielded with plant materials so it will not be seen from the property; Seconded by Page.

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

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9

Project Monitor: Robert Page

The Commission advised Mr. Campbell that he needed to notify Nick Toth so Bob Page could observe the installation of the compressor and if he ran into any complications, he shouldn't do anything until he contacted Nick or Bob.

30. 25-131: 19 Byfield St, Elena Bao Discuss and act on changes to previously approve addition to property.

Daniel Kusmano, architect for the project, was present to represent the applicant.

A discussion was held between the Commission and Daniel Kusmano. Mr. Kusmano advised the Commission that after

numerous discussions with various contactors after the previous design had been approved, with current construction costs the design itself was not feasible to the homeowners so they came back with a much more scaled down design of the rear addition. Mr. Kusmano stated that the new design would be an 18ftx18ft addition centered on rear façade with a gabled roof single story so the roof lines would go underneath the 2nd floor existing windows so it would impede as little as possible. He said that the façade, and all of the materials would be the same as previously presented and approved, that being, cedar shingle siding, asphalt shingles for the roof, and the 3 windows would be the Marvin Elevate series with the Fibrex exterior with wood interior. The Commission asked what the size was of the original design and Mr. Kusmano advised it was going to be approximately 840sqft and be approximately 20½ftx30½ft and about 1½ stories high with a hipped roof.

Mr. Kusmano then advised that the French door currently existing on the rear of the home would be repurposed and used on the rear of the addition, and then the old French door opening would be used to insert a zero-clearance fireplace which would be clad on the exterior with red brick. He approached the Commission and showed them on the plans where the fireplace would be located and clad in red brick. Mr. Kusmano told the Commission that it would be an indoor wood burning fireplace with a chimney that requires less structure and masonry than a traditional fireplace. Nick Toth advised Mr. Kusmano that he needed to talk to the Building Official about the fireplace being vented up to the roof line. Attorney Teitz advised that it would have to be vented above the roof line. Mr. Kusmano asked if the chimney was something that he could speak with the Building Official about and then come back before the Commission to discuss further. The Commission stated that they could discuss and approve the addition, but not the chimney as there was nothing the application about the chimney. Mr. Kusmano said that it was just something the applicants were considering for that opening since the French door was going to be repurposed. The Commission asked if the removal and repurposing of the door was on the application, which it was.

The Commission advised Mr. Kusmano that they would approve the addition so they could start working on it, but they would have to come back for the removal and

repurposing of the French door and the addition of the fireplace. They also advised Mr. Kusmano that he needed to talk to the Building Inspector about the fireplace and the vent.

The Commission asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to speak for or against the application and no one came forward. The Commission approved the application.

Motion made by Ponder to approve application 25-131 to changes the scope of the already approved project to include the construction of an 18ftx18ft single story addition off the rear of the house with the materials remaining the same from the previously approved application with cedar shingle siding to match the original materials of the historic home, 3 new windows of the Marvin Elevate series with wood interior with Fibrex exterior, and roof asphalt shingles; Seconded by Allen.

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

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9, 10

Project Monitor: John Allen

Keith Robbins, the homeowner, said to the Commission that it did not matter to him if the chimney went all the way up to the roof line as it was probably a zoning issue. He asked the Commission if they had any issue with placing the fireplace in at all. The Commission said that they did not deal with any projects in the interior, but they're only concern would be the chimney and the brick covering. Mr. Robbins stated that a fireplace was going to be put in, and they would comply with whatever the Fire Marshall and the Building Inspector required. The Commission said that since the chimney and fireplace wasn't mentioned in the application, they would have to come back for it.

3P. 25-130: 476 Hope St, Federal Properties of R.I., Inc. Discuss and act on addition of second floor above barbershop, addition of roof deck, addition of spiral stairs, addition of balustrade, replacement of siding.

Vincent Pacifico, architect, was present for the applicant.

A discussion commenced between the Commission and Mr. Pacifico. Mr. Pacifico advised the Commission that the applicant had come before the Commission in November/December of 2024 for a concept review, and since there hadn't been any significant modifications to the design. The Commission stated asked if Mr. Pacifico was still planning on keeping the unique door on the 2nd floor even though it would be an interior door. Mr. Pacifico said he was going to keep it. He reminded the Commission about the project that the missing portion of building above the barbershop was destroyed in a fire in the 1970s. Mr. Pacifico would like to recreate that portion from old images he found on a postcard, the Sandborne map showing the size of what was there, and a couple of images from books, and 1 image showing what the brick building just to the south of it looked like when that building burnt down. He stated that one of the changes to it was to remove 1 of the windows on the back and change it to a doorway which they were no longer planning on doing, which was on page A3.03 on the west elevation. Instead, there would be a rear deck in the back with a spiral staircase from the rear deck to the roof deck addition. Mr. Pacifico said that one piece that was not shown in the drawings that was in the application was the barbershop had wood siding that was non-historic, and he planned on changing to clapboards. He had no evidence that it was clapboard, but it made sense based on images that the upper stories were clapboard siding, and he was making educated assumption. Further, Mr. Pacifico stated there was a historic balustrade on the roof of the main portion of the brick building that he was planning on reconstructing which would be done with solid wood materials as it was historically created and painted.

Mr. Pacifico went on to discuss the addition of a window. He said there was 1 new window going in the building from the Pella Reserve series 2 over 2 all wood window with true divided lights with a putty profile, and he had the cut sheet in the application. The Commission asked about the thickness of the muntin. Mr. Pacifico stated the 5/8th inch thickness would be the most appropriate for the home.

The Commission discussed the balustrade and deck next. The Commission wanted to clarify the location of the

balustrade, which is on the roof of the main building. They also said that Mr. Pacifico had previously not decided on putting a deck on upper level. Mr. Pacifico said that when he came previously, he had 2 options, and he decided that a deck on the upper level made sense with a spiral staircase in the back. He had done a study which was on page 3.04 and standing on the east side of Hope Street where the view line would be to the roof, the deck would not be seen as it was set back off the façade. Mr. Pacifico said that the only way anyone would see the deck was from the parking lot at the back of the building. The Commission told Mr. Pacifico that he had put together a good packet for them to review, and they were glad he added a deck.

The Commission asked Mr. Pacifico if he had anything else to discuss. Mr. Pacifico said that the only other piece that was on the scope of work previously was for awnings that he was looking to reconstruct which were on select windows, but that was it.

The Commission asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to speak for or against the application and no one came forward. The Commission approved the application.

Motion made by Allen to accept application 25-130 as presented for the addition of a second floor above the existing barbershop which would replace the missing structure which was damaged by fire in the 1970s, addition of a roof deck as presented, rear deck addition with a spiral staircase to the roof deck, addition of a main roof balustrade to replace the missing architecture element noted in old images, replace street level barbershop siding with materials to match second floor; Seconded by Ponder.

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

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9, 10

Project Monitor: John Allen

The Commission reminded Mr. Pacifico that once he obtained the permits to place them in the front window where visible, so everyone knew he had permission to do the work.

3Q. 25-132: 234 Hope St, Louis A. Sousa and Catherine Q.

Sousa Discuss and Act on replacement of cedar shingles with clapboard.

Louis Sousa and Catherine Sousa were present.

A discussion between the Commission and Louis Sousa commenced. Mr. Sousa advised the Commission that their contractor looked at the cedar shingles on the east side of the building and noted they were especially bad. The contractor removed a few of the shingles and discovered there was old clapboard underneath and they had thought about exposing the clapboard and using it, but with all of the nail holes in the clapboards, it wouldn't look nice. Mr. Sousa said that the contractor recommended removing all of it and replacing the whole house and garage with clapboards. He said that he showed a sample of the wood to Nick Toth which was going to be in the mahogany family called Ause. He said it was thermally treated and resistant to insects and very durable. The Commission asked for a product sheet on the materials and Mr. Sousa showed the Commission a sample of wood.

Tim Silvester from Broden Millwork, a specialty lumber yard in Middletown, Rhode Island, was present to discuss the product. He told the Commission that the product was called Ambara which comes from West Africa, and it was not actual mahogany, but it was part of the mahogany family. He said it was thermally modified wood. He said it has the same characteristics as mahogany and same dimensions 1/2x6 and an all-wood product. Mr. Silvester advised the Commission that the Newport Historical Society has accepted the use of the product. The Commission asked if it was a painted or stained product. Mr. Silvester said the product came either raw or primed and for this project it would be primed. He said that it was a beautiful product and a comfortable alternative to red cedar as the price of red cedar was going through the roof. He stated that it can come in trim stock as well as siding. The Commission asked if it was going to be used as trim on the house as well. Mr. Silvester stated that it was only going to be used as siding on the house. He said that the trim on the house was not going to be touched. Mr. Sousa said that it was going to be used as siding on the garage as well.

The Commission asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to speak for or against the application and no

one came forward. The Commission approved the application.

Motion made by Church to approve application 25-132 for the removal of the existing wood shingles and underlying clapboards and to be replaced with new Ambara wood clapboard siding on both the house and garage. Finding of fact that there were underlying clapboards under the existing shingles on the house; Seconded by Allen.

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

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9

Project Monitor: Ory Lima

3R. 25-135: 195 High St, Peggy Frederick Discuss and act on installation of lighting and installation of driveway.

Peggy Frederick was present.

A discussion commenced between Peggy Frederick and the Commission with regard to the installation of lighting and a driveway. Ms. Frederick stated that she would like to install a driveway with an exposed aggregate concrete driveway with a rough surface with 5/8th inch pea stones on top with cobblestones on either side. The Commission asked if the driveway was going to go straight back to the garage. Ms. Frederick said that it started 12ft wide at the curb and then fanned out to 16ft wide at the garage. The Commission asked if the cobblestone went all the way to the street as it showed in the picture. Ms. Frederick said that the cobblestone was going to be on the sides along the border of the driveway but was unsure if she was going to put it on the end of the driveway as shown as it was approximately \$5,000 to do that.

Ms. Frederick then discussed the installation of the proposed light fixtures. She advised the Commission that she wanted to put 3 lights on the garage and 2 on the front door of the house which are all to be bronze hang plate fixtures. The Commission complimented Ms. Frederick for her work on the house as it was no longer considered the Vulture house.

The Commission asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to speak for or against the application and no one came forward. The Commission approved the application.

Motion made by Allen to approve application 25-135 for the installation of a driveway and outdoor lighting as presented; Seconded by Page.

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

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9

Project Monitor: John Allen

4. Concept Review

5. Monitor Reports & Project Updates

6. HDC Coordinator Reports & Project Updates

7. HDC Coordinator Approvals

8. Other Business

9. Adjourned at 10:43PM