

TOWN OF BRISTOL, RHODE ISLAND

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION



**Historic District Commission Meeting Minutes
Thursday, February 5, 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 7:00PM, and the Pledge of Allegiance was promptly recited afterwards.

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

Also in attendance: Town Solicitor Teitz, and Toth

Absent: Ponder and O'Loughlin

2. Review of Previous Month's Meeting Minutes

2A. Review of minutes of the January 6, 2026 meeting.

Chairperson Lima asked the Commission members if anyone had corrections or comments. Member Church's corrections were as follows: page 6, 2nd paragraph, 3rd line down, "cleaners" should be changed to "building" so it should read, "the building was a distinctive feature architecturally". On page 28, 4th paragraph, 6th line down, instead of "condos" it should say "condominiums". Member Allen's corrections were as follows: page 5 at the bottom on the last line instead "homeowner" it should say "building owner" since it is a building and not a home. On page 30, under #9 other business, is should say "3 sconces" not "3 scones". Also, in the same paragraph, it is the house on "Burton Street" not "Birch Street". With no other corrections or comments,

Chairperson Lima asked for a motion to accept the minutes of the January 6, 2026 meeting as corrected.

Motion made by Member Church to accept the minutes of the January 6, 2026 meeting as amended; Seconded by Allen.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

3. **Staff Report**

3A. Staff Report

4. **Application Reviews**

4A. 25-151: 76 State St, Sally Pinheiro Discuss and act on removal of County Cleaners Sign

Sally Pinheiro present.

Chairperson Lima began a discussion with Ms. Pinheiro regarding the removal of the County Cleaners sign. She asked Ms. Pinheiro how the County Cleaners ended up being removed. Ms. Pinheiro stated that the new business tenant asked for its removal a few times. She thought that since the cleaning business was no longer there, they could go ahead and remove it. Chairperson Lima asked Ms. Pinheiro if the sign went to the dump. Ms. Pinheiro stated that the guy removed it and got rid of it.

Nick Toth advised the Commission there wasn't anything that could be put back and what happens next was up to the Commission. He asked what the preference of the Commission would be. Chairperson Lima asked Attorney Teitz for his guidance. Attorney Teitz said the Commission did have the authority to deny the removal of the sign which meant it would have to be rebuilt since it was a clear violation in the historic district. He stated that what Nick was getting at was does that make sense, is that what the Commission really wanted if it's not there. As Attorney Teitz recalled the discussion at the last meeting the idea was there should

be a sign there. He said maybe the answer was a sign there that covered the current tenant or something to that effect, but to be able to restore the historic aspect of that property was to have a sign on the front façade. Attorney Teitz said if that's how the Commission felt then they needed to express that. He said it was something worth noting so the building owner could come back with a sign, so it's not spent purely on recreating something. Attorney Teitz stated the question was how important it was having the words "County Cleaners" there versus how important it was having a sign there. He said that's what needed to be discussed and decided to determine the course of action going forward. He stated the other alternative was it didn't matter if there was a sign there at all, but the Commission did make a finding that it was historically significant at the January meeting. Attorney Teitz said that was the question.

Ms. Pinheiro advised the Commission that she thought the building was part of the grandfather law and assumed that since the cleaners no longer existed it could be removed. She said the person who rented the space had asked a few times when the sign was coming down. Nick stated that it was in the January minutes that when the tenant came in the Commission was under the understanding that she didn't know anything about the sign coming down. Ms. Pinheiro said that the tenant came to her 2 times to ask about it coming down. Ms. Pinheiro's dad said that since the cleaners no longer existed, they could take it down, so they did.

Chairperson Lima said the Commission was half in and half out as the building nor the sign had not been designated as historic and upon reflection it was. Ms. Pinheiro thought they were grandfathered in and it was an honest mistake. Member Allen asked if fees were assessed and Nick said they were. Member Allen said that it was a moot point to talk about putting another sign up and it should be left as is. Member Page agreed with Member Allen. Member Millard proposed finding a colored photograph of the front of the cleaners and having it made into a display board. The display board could then be placed in the window to show what the original front of the building looked like. She stated the fine that was collected could be put towards the purchase of the board. Chairperson Lima thought that was a good idea.

Member Bergenholtz asked if it was a fine of \$150 per day or a flat fine of \$150. Nick said it was a \$100 fee for working without a permit and the Building Official is able to issue a fine for a continued violation. He said that would only be

in an instance like someone was replacing windows and they were told to stop but they continued to do so in which case the Building Official would be able to issue a \$100 a day fine. Nick said that is not typically done unless it was an egregious continuing violation. He said since an application was made, there was an effort here and they would be issued a fine like that. Member Bergenholtz said it was unfortunate to see the sign go as it gave the building an identity with mid-century roadside architecture. He stated that without it the building has no presence. He doesn't believe the sign ended up in a dumpster. Member Bergenholtz believed that it ended up in Brimfield because someone who knew what they were doing would pay a lot of money for the sign. Ms. Pinheiro said she contacted the guy who removed it and he said it went in the dumpster.

Chairperson Lima agreed with Member Millard regarding her idea about finding a colored photograph and putting on display. Member Church agreed as well. Chairperson Lima asked Ms. Pinheiro if she had any pictures and she did not. Chairperson Lima suggested advertising in the Phoenix to see if someone possibly has a photograph. Nick said they could get one from Google Streetview. Member Allen said there may be one in the tax records. Chairperson Lima suggested putting it in the window of the vacant business window. Ms. Pinheiro said the new tenant may be amenable to putting it in her window or over the night depository. Chairperson Lima said the Commission will work with her on it.

Chairperson Lima suggested getting a group of people together to go around the district to see if there was anything else that's significant that needed to be designated and saved. Member Bergenholtz asked Ms. Pinheiro that it was the new tenant that asked for the sign to be removed and she said yes. Ms. Pinheiro said the tenant kept asking her when she was going to be removing the sign. Chairperson Lima said to Ms. Pinheiro that she had to spend the money on the removal in order to get the tenant to move in and she said yes. Ms. Pinheiro said they hadn't received any income for 5 years and wanted to get a tenant in there.

Chairperson Lima asked Attorney Teitz if a motion was needed. Attorney Teitz said a motion was needed but he wasn't sure for what. He said to have a motion to authorize retroactively the removal of the sign conditioned upon the installation of the historic marker as discussed to be coordinated by the staff.

Motion made by Member Church to approve application 25-151 retroactively for the removal of the County Cleaners sign conditioned upon the installation of a historic marker as discussed and to be coordinated by the Historic District Commission; Seconded by Page.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

Chairperson Lima said if anyone sees signs that should be designated to be part of the historic district and not be demolished, they should notify Nick. The Commission will then approach the owner of the building and notify. Attorney Teitz said they just have to be notified that it will be subject to the Historic District Commission jurisdiction which would include the removal of any signs that are part of the structure of the building. He said when there is a new Building Official, they are to make sure there is personal contact with the person with the permit advising them not to touch the outside of the structure without going to the HDC first. Nick said that any permit that did get applied for he would see it and he would notify people if they need to apply to the HDC. He advised Chairperson Lima that Matt and Ed Carusi knew that as well.

4B. 25-04: 34 Byfield St, Rosemarie Sirois Discuss and Act on addition of porch on front elevation, addition of roof over rear deck.

Christopher Stahl on behalf of Rosemarie Sirois. Commission had an email granting permission for Mr. Stahl to appear.

Mr. Stahl advised the Commission that Ms. Sirois wanted to add a covered front porch to the property to be in keeping with the neighborhood and it would replace the set of wooden stairs that were there currently. He said that there were no changes to existing structure. Chairperson Lima asked if there was a list of materials. Mr. Stahl said it was on page 51. Member Bergenholtz asked about the details of the columns. Mr. Stahl stated that Ms. Sirois included an example photo. He said the columns were going to be wooden columns in the style that was in the picture Ms. Sirois provided. Member Bergenholtz said the roof in the example he

was going to copy was flat, but the other roof was a shed roof. Mr. Stahl said the picture was specifically to show the style of the columns. Member Church asked if the roof would be above the door. Mr. Stahl said yes. He said the roof will be between the windows and above the details on the door so it will maintain the architecture. Member Church asked how far over the roof would be and Mr. Stahl said it goes close to where the roof turned in but stopped short of it. Their plan was to not touch any of the existing architectural features.

Member Bergenholtz asked Mr. Stahl if the railing height was going to be 36 and he said yes. Member Bergenholtz said it wouldn't look like the example they provided. Mr. Stahl said it would be as close as possible. Member Bergenholtz said a Greek Revival house would have that roof line. Mr. Stahl said they could do a flat roof up there as the homeowner didn't have a preference. Member Bergenholtz has requested that Mr. Stahl provide more details on the columns as they will be major character defining features. He said he was fine with porch on the house. Member Bergenholtz said that it could be left up to the Project Monitor, but he would like to see a flat roof and the Commission needed more details on the columns.

Chairperson Lima asked Mr. Stahl when he anticipated to begin the project. Mr. Stahl said they were hoping to start in May. Chairperson Lima suggested that the application be continued to the March meeting so Mr. Stahl could provide the Commission with a design of the columns and roof. Mr. Stahl said the columns were shown in the photograph and the actual railings were square balusters that were in the plans. Member Bergenholtz said it would be helpful to have more details with what was provided. He said the roof was wrong as it should be a flat roof. He said the Commission needed to know what the columns and balusters were going to look like. Chairperson Lima said the Commission usually receives more details. Mr. Stahl asked if there was an example of the level of detail from a previous application so he would know what he needed to provide. Chairperson Lima asked Nick if he would have something. Attorney Teitz advised Mr. Stahl that it didn't have to be an architectural drawing, but it should be from the catalog or something with more information. Mr. Stahl said that's what he needed to know if photographs from a catalog were sufficient. Attorney Teitz stated it needed to have dimensions as well, not just a photograph.

Member Church said it didn't need to be a flat roof. She said one of the standards said that they didn't want to create a sense of false history. Chairperson Lima stated they would be coming back. Member Church said the footings weren't going to be showing and asked if there was going to be lattice work in between. Mr. Stahl said that was correct and that there would be lattice work. She said the lattice work would need to be wood. Chairperson Lima said those were the kinds of things the Commission needed to know. Mr. Stahl said if he could get an example of the format that the Commission liked to see the information in, that would be helpful. Chairperson Lima told Mr. Stahl to contact Nick and go to the office to look through examples that the Commission has done. The Commission wanted him to come back so that they would have the proper information in order to give him a decision. They didn't want to say no but rather have the correct information so the project could go forward.

Mr. Stahl clarified that the Commission was looking for specific information on the columns, railings, decking material, lattice work, and the roof. Member Bergenholtz said that it looked like a shed roof. Mr. Stahl said it was designed as a shed roof. Member Allen agree that it should be a flat roof. Member Bergenholtz suggested a hip roof or something that would give it more massing. Mr. Stahl said the roof lines on the house were straight gable roofs and felt a hip roof would look out of place, but a flat roof would be better. Member Bergenholtz suggested a heavier cornice. Member Allen suggested that he use pressure-treated wood for the framing and another type of wood for the structure. Mr. Stahl said he discussed it with the homeowner and thought mahogany would be a good choice.

Chairperson Lima asked if there were any more questions or comments from the Commission members. She then asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to speak for or against the application. With no one coming forward she asked for a motion to continue the application to the March meeting.

Motion made by Member Allen to continue application 25-04 to the March meeting; Seconded by Page.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

4C. 26-06: 18 State St, David Zeilstra Discuss and act on replacement of doors on street frontage in kind.

David Zeilstra present.

Mr. Zeilstra advised the Commission that he would like to replace the front doors on the 2 commercial units on the 1st floor. He said the guts of the existing doors were the problem and the doors have seen better days. He stated the thresholds were beat up. Mr. Zeilstra said he was going to use a Simpson Fir door which was similar to the existing door. Member Bergenholtz asked if the doors were original to the building and Mr. Zeilstra said no. Member Church asked if the doors would open out instead of in. Mr. Zeilstra proposed to have the doors open out as his understanding of commercial building codes was that the doors should open out instead of in. Member Church said he would have to rework the door jams. Mr. Zeilstra said he would remove and reinstall the exterior trim. Member Bergenholtz asked if the fir wood was wrapped with anything and Mr. Zeilstra said it had a weather barrier coating on the door. He said it was going to be painted black.

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

Motion made by Ben for approval of application 26-06 for replacement of the doors that are not original to the building as presented; Seconded by Allen.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

Secretary of Interior Standards: 5, 10

Project Monitor: John Allen

Chairperson Lima advised Mr. Zeilstra to place the HDC permit in the window where it was visible. Nick said it would be available on Friday or early next week. He advised Mr.

Zeilstra that he needed to apply for any other permits as well. Mr. Zeilstra said he was all set with other permits.

4D. 25-07: 1 State St, Cruz Goler Discuss and act on removal of Judge Roy Bean sign and replacement with new signage.

Cruz Goler present.

Mr. Goler advised the Commission he wished to remove the existing sign which were just letters on façade and replace it with a new sign which was a model of the old Prudence Ferry boat. He said there was another sign which would hang beneath that and he was in front of the Commission for discussion, approval and feedback. Member Bergenholtz said he was excited and thought it was exactly what the downtown area needed. He said it was very creative. Mr. Goler said some of the regulars work for Ocean State Composite and they would be building the 3D model of the old Prudence II which ran through the 1980s. 3d of Prudence 2. Mr. Goler happened to work on one of the boats when he was a teenager. He said it was going to be constructed of two sides of hollowed out marine grade plywood which would be bonded together and then it would be hand painted. He stated it would have a weathered with a sign that would hang below. Mr. Goler was seeking a variance since it was a little outside of how big a sign could be in the historic district. He was asking for some consideration on that and try to understand the Commission's thoughts on it.

Attorney Teitz said the size of the sign was a zoning ordinance issue and he would have to go to the Zoning Board. He would need approval from them. He asked Mr. Goler where on the building the sign was going. Mr. Goler said it was going where the star was as depicted on page 69 in the packet. Attorney Teitz asked about the rest of the sign board as it was built into the building. Mr. Goler said it would have a new logo which would be painted on the façade. Nick said that in their discussions Mr. Goler stated they were still working on the designs for that and he would be coming back. Mr. Goler said that was correct. Nick said he was there just for the boat sign.

Member Church said there was no note from Stephen Delea giving Mr. Goler permission to erect a sign. She said Mr. Delea was in front of the Commission not too long ago with renovations to the building and wanted to know if Mr. Goler had talked to him about it. Mr. Goler said he had talked to

Mr. Delea but didn't know exactly when he was going to start the work. He said he would get some clarification from Mr. Delea. Mr. Goler did submit a letter with his authorization to build the sign. Chairperson Lima said they didn't have it. Stephen Delea appeared and came forward to speak. He advised the Commission that he sent a letter and Mr. Goler has he has consent.

Chairperson Lima asked Mr. Goler if he was present for just boat sign and would be coming back. Mr. Goler said yes. He was under the impression that a sign was something that stuck out from the exterior, not what was painted directly on the façade. Attorney Teitz said it didn't matter even if he was painting it since it was in the historic district, it was subject to the Commission's approval. Mr. Goler said the old sign was just letters and the new one would be painted. Attorney Teitz said the concern was if he put the sign in the center of the area, what was he going to do on either side. Mr. Goler said one side would have the new name and the other would have something, but he would show them. Attorney Teitz asked why the sign wasn't going on the corner of the building to pick up the visibility from both streets. Mr. Goler said it seemed out of place.

Chairperson Lima asked if Mr. Goler was going to remove the wood where the present sign was. Mr. Goler said he was just taking the letters off. Chairperson Lima stated he was just taking the letters off and putting his own letters on and Mr. Goler said that was correct but his were going to be painted on. She said all Mr. Goler needed was permission for the Prudence boat sign to be placed where star was located. Member Allen said he liked the sign.

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

Motion made by Church to approve application 25-07 for the erection of a new sign as shown in the application to be constructed of marine grade plywood with the dimensions as noted as long as it is in compliance with zoning regulations with aluminum rectangular tube brackets with aluminum plates and corner brackets; Seconded by Allen.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

Secretary of Interior Standards: 10

Project Monitor: John Allen

4E. 26-08: 20 Burnside St, Herreshoff Marine Museum Discuss and act on restoration of buildings, including siding, trim, and windows.

Bill Lynn, President and Executive Director, Herreshoff Marine Museum, present.

Mr. Lynn stated the Museum was seeking approval to embark on Phase 3, which was close to the final phase but was not totally the final of the restoration of the exterior of the Burnside building on the museum campus. He said that Phases 1 & 2 have been completed. He stated Phase 3 braces the annex that was built off of the south side of the original building that was built by Ambrose Burnside around 1860. Mr. Lynn said it was not visible from the street, and it has around 150 windows. They are planning to remove all of the windows and restore them, but not all at once. He said the windows will be restored and put back on. He stated the project also included remediating some trim and siding issues and then painting everything. Mr. Lynn stated it was about a \$900,000.00 project, but they were fortunate to have grant funding from the National Park Service. It's a Save America's Treasures Grant and from the Rhode Island Historic Preservation which is a State Preservation Grant. He said the contractor was John Damon of Damon & Company of Newport who did the first 2 phases and the restorer was Newport Window Restoration.

Chairperson Lima suggested that the Museum do an article in the newspapers giving positive recognition to the project. Mr. Lynn said that was a great idea. He said they were looking forward to getting it going as it has been a long time. She suggested the Providence Journal and Boating World as well. Member Allen said it was a wonderful project.

Chairperson Lima asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to speak for or against the application. With no one coming forward Chairperson Lima asked for a motion. Attorney Teitz stated there should incorporate the findings of the National Park Service letter dated May 5, 2025 and

that it be in conformance with the conditions set forth of Rhode Island Historical Preservation and Heritage Commission letter dated May 9, 2025.

Motion made by Allen to accept application 26-08 for restoration of 20 Burnside Street as presented. Finding of fact to include the findings in the National Park Service letter dated May 5, 2025, and that it be in conformance with the conditions set forth of Rhode Island Historical Preservation and Heritage Commission letter dated May 9, 2025; Seconded by Page.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

Secretary of Interior Standards: 2, 5, and 6

Project Monitor: Robert Page

Chairperson Lima advised Mr. Lynn to put the permit on the front of the building where it was visible so that everyone knew that they had the Commission's permission.

4F. 26-09: 601 Hope St, BayCoast Bank Discuss and act on addition of security cameras on rear of building.

Jason Martin, Assistant Vice President Security Officer for BayCoast Bank, present.

Mr. Martin asked the Commission for permission to add cameras to the rear of the building to cover the parking area, ADA parking spaces, and the handicapped ramp for safety reasons. Member Bergenholtz thought cameras were typically done through administrative approval. Nick said they usually were, but because BayCoast was a formula business he thought it was better to have the Commission's approval. Member Allen asked how they were going to attach the cameras to the building. Mr. Martin said he thought it was going to be at the top of the façade into the brick. Member Allen if they could put the screws into the mortar instead of brick. Mr. Martin said they would do that. Chairperson Lima asked about the ramp information. Attorney Teitz said it was on page 157

of the packet. Member Church asked how many ADA parking spaces there were, and Mr. Martin said 3.

Chairperson Lima asked if any other Members had any other questions or comments. Member Millard said on the historic building survey it was listed as the Fleet National Bank, but it was the Industrial National Bank. Mr. Martin thanked her for that information. Attorney Teitz said that it was the Industrial Trust Company originally. Chairperson Lima asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to speak for or against the application. With no one coming forward, she asked for a motion.

Motion made by Allen to accept application 26-09 for the addition of exterior cameras as presented. Further, any attachments were to go into the mortar and not into the brick if at all possible; Seconded by Page.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9

Project Monitor: Mary Millard

Chairperson Lima advised Mr. Martin to display the permit in the front of the front and back of the building where visible, so everyone knows they have permission.

4G. 26-10: 145 High St, Danial Ferreira Discuss and act on partial demolition of primary house due to severe decay, demolition of garage roof due to severe decay, demolition of porch, clearing of major debris.

Danial Ferreira present. Attorney Teitz advised the Commission that Mr. Ferreira was now the owner of the property.

Nick advised the Commission that this application was for the demolition of a rear addition to the house, demolition of a collapsed roof on the garage, and general clearing of the property. He stated the concept review immediately afterwards. Nick said all that was being considered for a

vote, for anyone interested and present at the meeting, was cleaning up the property, then the concept review would take place. He said that all of it would still need Planning and Zoning approval. Chairperson Lima said their focus was on what was shown in the pictures provided. Attorney Teitz said that was correct and their focus was on the demolition. He said the Commission could discuss the concept plan before they vote on the demolition like the house at 125 Hope Street. He said Historic District Commissions usually want to see what's going to be there before approving demolition. They just have it notices as 2 separate items so it can be approved separately if the Commission decides, but they should hear it all together. Attorney Teitz noted there would be all sorts of zoning relief that's required but none of it has happened yet. He said the Commission was simply going to deal with the demolition and the general concept of the massing, location, design, etc., of the replacement.

Chairperson Lima asked if she polled the Commission for the demolition part could they then hear the concept review and then vote on the demolition part. Attorney Teitz said she could but didn't have to. Member Allen said the situation was different from 125 Hope Street. Chairperson Lima asked Attorney Teitz what he thought the Commission should do. He said to let Mr. Ferreira present about the demolition.

Mr. Ferreira said he was now the co-owner as of 3pm today. They were supposed to close the prior week but there were a lot of issues with property that needed to be addressed. He and his wife were now the owners. Mr. Ferreira said the property, as shown in the pictures provided, was in extreme disrepair. He said the roof on the 10-car garage had completely collapsed and took down portion of the cinderblock walls, but most of the walls were still up. He said he was not sure of the extent of the damage as it was inaccessible due to the debris. He stated it was unsafe to try to access the property. Mr. Ferreira said the goal was to clean all of the debris, trash, and fencing that was dilapidated, rotted, and falling down from the site. He advised the Commission that on the existing structure the only portion he wanted to remove was the collapsed roof portion of the structure. He then wanted to secure remaining portion of the house with plywood until he could get approval to move forward on the development of the building. He did not want to touch the main house. Mr. Ferreira didn't know the condition of it inside as it was inaccessible as well. He said it was filled with debris from top to bottom and he couldn't get into the basement. He had to gradually work his way into the property

removing debris to start evaluating the safety of the structure. Mr. Ferreira said it was extremely rotted throughout. He has been inside and there's water intrusion coming from every wall and mold throughout the property. Mr. Ferreira said there were things scheduled to get started on cleaning the outside. He said the main structures were not going to be touched as the outside was an extreme eyesore. He advised the Commission that there were multiple liens put on the property in the past due to the condition of the exterior of the house and that was part of the problem of resolving the closing. Mr. Ferreira stated that as soon as the weather clears, he would be sending in crews to clean it out and make the property more presentable.

Chairperson Lima said the Commission was just looking at the demolition of the garage and the north side of the house where the roof was not there. Mr. Ferreira said it was the southwest portion of the property. Chairperson Lima said the roof under the blue tarp was located on the north side of the building. Member Page stated the attachment was located on the west side of the property. Mr. Ferreira said that was correct and it was a single-story portion, but he didn't know the year it was added on.

Chairperson Lima stated there was a 10-car garage behind the fence on the property and Mr. Ferreira said that was correct. Member Bergenholtz asked if anyone knew why there was a 10-car garage there. Nick said perhaps someone had a large collection of cars and trucks. He said it was obviously very old. He had conducted a site visit, and the roof had completely collapsed. Member Bergenholtz said that it looked like 1930s or 1940s construction but was curious as to why someone would need a garage that large. Chairperson Lima said it wasn't visible. Attorney Teitz said he wasn't sure why it was there as he has been involved with the property since the 1990s and knew that the previous owner was a hoarder. He said the owner started with the garage and filled the garage with stuff, then the yard, and then the house. Attorney Teitz stated the Town 3 times in the 90s, 2001, and 2010 the Town cleaned up everything that spilled out of the garage into the yard and in the front yard. Attorney Teitz didn't know the history of the cinderblock walls or why it was a 10-car garage. He said it wasn't a dairy barn.

Mr. Ferreira said the previous history he got from the previous owner is it was used for cars. He said there still could be a couple of classic cars in it. From what he

understood it was used for collecting and restoring old vehicles. He said there were a number of old vehicles and trucks on the property, trailers filled with debris, fencing, an old deck, and pool debris. Mr. Ferreira said he would leave the brick and stone structure in place as best he could as long as it wasn't falling down or had already fallen. Member Bergenholtz asked Mr. Ferreira why he would leave it up. He said he would like to have it for parking. He would have a problem getting rid of it if it wasn't salvageable, so he would come up with a different plan.

Chairperson Lima said the Commission was just looking to make a decision regarding the demolition of the garage and whatever surprises him on the north side under the blue tarp. Mr. Ferreira corrected Chairperson Lima and said the locations were on the north, west, and south sides as it covered that entire back portion of the home. He wanted to put plywood up to protect the rest of the structure. Chairperson Lima advised Mr. Ferreira that it was a building issue, and the Commission could only decide on the demolition portion and Mr. Ferreira would need to contact the Building Inspector. Nick said that was correct, but the question of temporary plywood wasn't really the Commission's concern. Mr. Ferreira stated he was going to be putting up temporary fencing because the foundation would be exposed after the debris removal and he didn't want anyone to fall and get hurt. The temporary fencing will be attached to the house so no one can move it and get hurt.

Member Church asked Mr. Ferreira if there was a basement underneath the red building and he said yes. Member Church asked Mr. Ferreira if there was to be any demolition to the original house and he said no. Mr. Ferreira said that nothing would be done until future plans were discussed. Member Allen asked Mr. Ferreira which fence he was planning on removing from the property. Mr. Ferreira said he was going to remove all of the white fencing as it was rotting and falling down. He said he tried to tie it up with straps, but it could not be saved. Member Allen said that would expose a lot of the debris in the yard. Mr. Ferreira stated it was all going to get removed slowly. He said that the bulk of the inside was going to get done and then focus on the rest of the exterior. Mr. Ferreira said the main focus was on getting the cars out and all of the debris taken out. He said the fencing that was falling down was going to be removed. Mr. Ferreira said the area was already extremely exposed as the fencing was falling into the neighbor's yard and the property itself.

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

Dr. Catherine Zipf came forward. She didn't object to the demolition but wanted to advise Mr. Ferreira that the bricks from the garage were fabricated in the 1920s. Dr. Zipf said the bricks were made by individual concrete block making machines that a person would buy and then they would manufacture them. She said they came with different rock faces so they could be made to look like different rocks and usually an individual only purchased one machine. She stated there was a historic context in Bristol of those types of garages going up and were quite significant in the area. Dr. Zipf just wanted to note the historic significance of the bricks in Bristol and gave Leffingwell Garage, which was made of the same material. She said if Mr. Ferreira did have to demolish it, the cut masonry units are difficult to come by so he might want to Leffingwell Garage to see if they have one. She said the blocks will be fragile. Dr. Zipf said it is significant to the early automobile arrival in the district particularly up and down High Street. Member Bergenholtz asked Dr. Zipf if she thought the garage would have been personal storage and Dr. Zipf said yes. Member Bergenholtz asked why it would have been for 10 cars. Dr. Zipf said usually it would only have been a 1 or 2 bay garage, but along High Street there were a number of service stations and it's possible that the garage may have been affiliated with a service station. She doubted that it was for storing a classic car collection because there weren't a lot of cars in the 1920s and none would have been classic or affordable. She said it probably was for car storage, and it might have worked more like a stable or carriage house or a rental project for cars. Dr. Zipf encouraged Mr. Ferreira to save the garage. Mr. Ferreira said his original intent was to rebuild and restore the garage.

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

Mike Fanning of 146 High Street came forward to speak. He wanted to know how Mr. Ferreira was going to enter into the demolition phase as he saw the renderings of what he wanted to put there which was a 4-story block condominium building. Mr. Fanning wanted to know how the Commission was going to look at the demolition portion without looking at what Mr. Ferreira was proposing. Chairperson Lima stated that the Commission is having a concept review with Mr. Ferreira at

the meeting after discussing the demolition portion, but they could only discuss 1 thing at a time. Mr. Ferreira advised Mr. Fanning that it was not his goal to put up a 4-story building there. He was only using that picture as an example of the deck.

Chairperson Lima said they were just going to focus on the demolition situation first. With no one else coming up to speak, she asked for a motion.

Dr. Catherine Zipf added that the house dated to about 1860. The first appearance of the house was on the 1851 Wallen Map. She said the addition appeared on the 1870 Atlas Map and existed all the way through perhaps rebuilt in various forms. She said the only way to tell would be to get into it and look at the structure. She stated the addition was really old but not salvageable.

Motion made by Page to approve application 26-10 for the removal of the falling garage roof, removal of debris across the property, removal of the demolished deck, and removal of the fence. At the rear portion of the building there is currently a 1-story portion that is falling in which will be removed. Applicant will attempt to preserve the bricks from the garage. Finding of fact that this does not include any alterations to the main house which the Commission finds much more historically significant than the outbuildings and the addition. The demolition of the addition is based on the deteriorated condition rather than the lack of achieving historic significance; Seconded by Allen.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

Secretary of Interior Standards: 2, 4, and 5

Project Monitor: Benjamin Bergenholtz

5. **Concept Review**

5A. CRHD-26-1: 145 High St, Danial Ferreira Discuss early concepts for refurbishment of 145 High Street into multifamily property.

Danial Ferreira then presented the concept review. Mr. Ferreira stated that the property consisted of 22,000sqft of land in an R6 zone. He wanted to make the property a multi-family property. He stated that he wants it to fit with the neighborhood and referred to a multi-family building across the street, which was similar to what he wanted to do, but he wanted to also add an extension to the back of the property. Mr. Ferreira said it involved taking the roof off, adding an additional story, and adding a couple of dormers on either side. He wanted input from the Commission and the neighbors. Mr. Ferreira owns other properties in Bristol and takes pride in what he does own. Chairperson Lima asked Mr. Ferreira if the Commission was presented with any renderings. Mr. Ferreira did not have any renderings as he just closed on the property that day. He wanted to go to architect with the Commission's ideas and neighbors' input so he could appease everyone as best as possible. He stated zoning wise, the property had the square footage and depth, but it didn't have the width, and he would be going to zoning for relief for the width which should be the only relief he asked for. He said that he wouldn't be exceeding lot coverage. Mr. Ferreira said he wouldn't exceed the side yard setback and that it might improve the side yard setback after the addition is done or it will be the same.

Chairperson Lima stated that in terms of a concept review, the Commission usually expects from the applicant some design information and Mr. Ferreira didn't have any. Mr. Ferreira asked the Commission if they liked the idea of him building up or keeping it as is and putting on an addition and doing the majority of the units behind the building. He asked if he could incorporate it into the existing structure by going up as it would be below 35ft. He didn't want to spend a lot of money on his architect to draw something for the Commission to reject it. Chairperson Lima stated that it was not the Commission's position to design the project for him. She said he should come back for another concept review. She advised Mr. Ferreira that he could take pictures of buildings that were similar with what he wanted instead of spending money on drawings. Mr. Ferreira stated he had provided a picture of the building across the street. Chairperson Lima said the Commission has that picture. He said that was the idea and concept he wanted to base his project off of, but he wanted to add it directly behind the building via an open breezeway.

Chairperson Lima suggested that Mr. Ferreira contact someone at Roger Williams University like a student who could use his property as a class project. Nick told the Commission that Mr. Ferreira's idea was to do a later concept review anyway and since he was presenting his application at the meeting, he wanted to do a concept review. Chairperson Lima advised Mr. Ferreira that it was not the Commission's responsibility to tell him what to do. She said some of his project needed to go to the Zoning Board and he would have to get permission from them for setbacks, etc., before he could come to the Commission. Mr. Ferreira understood about the zoning issues. He said that Zoning members told him that he would need the Commission's approval. Chairperson Lima said that they didn't have anything to look at.

Mr. Ferreira said that Zoning was on board with what he had in mind, but they didn't want to approve of something that the Commission didn't like. He wanted to present something everyone liked. Mr. Ferreira was hoping to involve the neighbors in the design process.

Member Church objected to making the house in the front into a 3-story house. She said dormers would be okay if they were set back from the original building. Member Church added that she was not in favor of adding 3 porches on the south side of any addition. She stated that the massing and scale of the original house fit in width of the lot. She felt it would destroy the streetscape view along High Street if it was altered with porches and decks on different levels. Member Church asked Mr. Ferreira if it was possible to construct duplexes in the back of the property. Mr. Ferreira asked if she meant something like townhouse style units and she said yes or duplexes. Mr. Ferreira said it was possible. Member Church suggested 3 separate buildings in the back. Mr. Ferreira said that the buildings couldn't be separated from the main building, they needed to be attached per zoning. His original thought was to keep the front of the house the way it is and then have a 15-20ft buffer and then do a separate structure with arborvitae in front of it, so it won't be seen, but the Zoning Board didn't like that idea. The Zoning Board wanted the units to be attached. Mr. Ferreira said he could do townhouse style units. Member Church said she wouldn't object to that as long as height didn't overpower the main structure. Chairperson Lima asked if any other Commission members had any comments or questions.

Member Bergenholtz agreed with Member Church. He stated that the dormers should be stepped back so as to not interrupt the lines of the house. Mr. Ferreira said to keep the lines of the house the way they were and to make sure the dormers were not flush with the walls or peaks. Member Bergenholtz recommended to Mr. Ferreira that he look at Member Bergenholtz's home as he had to do the same thing. Mr. Ferreira asked if he could view the home and take pictures and Member Bergenholtz said yes.

Mr. Ferreira said he would have architectural drawings done so they could be reviewed. Member Bergenholtz said that the Commission really needed to see sketches or something in order to make any suggestions or comments. Mr. Ferreira thanked Member Church for her suggestions. Member Church stated she wouldn't object to porches added on to the south side. Member Allen agreed with Members Church and Bergenholtz. He also preferred not to have any height or elevation added to the front of the house. Member Page agreed with the other Members. Mr. Ferreira stated he had an architect who had done historic restorations who was waiting for Mr. Ferreira's response to get going.

Chairperson Lima said there were some neighbors who wanted to speak.

Sebatian Wardell, who lived next door to the property, to speak. Mr. Wardell wasn't sure what Mr. Ferreira wanted to build. He asked how many units Mr. Ferreira was looking to build. Since there was nothing to look at, he wasn't sure if he was for or against the project. Chairperson Lima stated that the Commission also needed more information.

Greg Carleu, an abutter, came up to speak. His interest was keeping the form and function similar to what the property should be as much as possible. Mr. Carleu stated that Mr. Ferreira seemed to be keeping the form in the front essentially the same, but the function would be changing. He felt that the neighborhood and historic quality of the neighborhood would be changing as well. Mr. Carleu felt that moving the home from a 1 family to a 6 or 10 family home would have an effect on the neighborhood. He wanted Mr. Ferreira to keep that in mind moving forward.

Nina Murphy, who lived across the street, came forward to speak. Ms. Murphy said that there was more information that was needed about the project to know if she was for or against the project. Her concern was about the number of

vehicles resulting from the number of units. She said would they be coming and going from the 1 driveway located there or would they go down towards Pleasant since it was a deep lot. Ms. Murphy said it was going to make a huge change to the neighborhood. She was looking forward to learning more about the project and working with Mr. Ferreira to make it a positive aspect. As a homeowner, her concern was more about the responsibility everyone has to take care of High Street. She said everyone needed to respect High Street as the project moved forward.

Andrea Michaels, neighbor on Union Street, came forward. Ms. Michaels' property was 2 lots that were merged into 1 lot. She agreed with her neighbors that single-family style homes were preferable and not multi-family. She has access to Pleasant Street which was already crowded with the neighborhood as it exists already, and she didn't wish to see traffic going there. Ms. Michaels' property is located at the end of Pleasant and she has many people go into her driveway to turn around even though she has signs indicating not to do so. She agreed with everyone that plans needed to be seen. Ms. Michaels understood that Mr. Ferreira wanted to make it into an investment property but felt that it wasn't the right property to do so.

June Bjerregaard, 159 High Street, came forward to speak. She could not imagine a 6-family house in that area. Ms. Bjerregaard said that a 6-family house would change the character of the neighborhood. She stated with all of the one-family homes in the area, it would seem out of place. Ms. Bjerregaard spoke with Mr. Panza who was also against the idea of a 6-family house in the neighborhood.

Chairperson Lima stated the Commission did receive information from Mr. Panza. She said that it was there if anyone wanted to see it and it would also be entered into the record.

Member Church asked Attorney Teitz about if the density of the area was always that way. Attorney Teitz said that the area was an R6 zone as was much of the downtown and 6,000sq.ft. was required for the 1st dwelling unit and each additional dwelling unit required 4,000sq.ft. He said that a 10,000sq.ft. lot could have a 2-family unit. Attorney Teitz said that if Mr. Ferreira's property was 22,000sq.ft. it would allow for 5 units according to the zoning which has existed in the downtown area for at least the last 40 years or longer. He said there was a question about the lot width

so it would have to go before the Zoning Board, but the density itself would allow for 5 units as a right.

Dr. Catherine Zipf came up to speak and said the house was too big for a third story. She said it seemed like Mr. Ferreira was suggesting readjusting the proportions to fit into the district or widening the building, which the lot would allow for and that would be basically rebuilding the whole thing. Dr. Zipf said there would be some big structural issues by taking the roof and raising it to add a floor in and it would be a bad idea structurally. She said there were many reasons to leave the house as it is. Dr. Zipf said the real challenge was managing expectations for what the lot could do. She said it wasn't a very big house as it was similar in size to Peggy Frederick's house who is having trouble making 1 house out of her house. Dr. Zipf said Mr. Ferreira is going to be hard pressed to get 2 units in the structure and they would be very small units. She said to Mr. Ferreira that he would want the addition on the house to be subordinate which was going to be a challenge. She said when thinking about variances, what's being planned is already out of sync with the intent of the neighborhood. Dr. Zipf told Mr. Ferreira that style was very important here. She said the picture of he provided was of a house in Charleston and not in Bristol. Mr. Ferreira said that it was just for the porches and not for the actual house. Dr. Zipf stated that the style of the porches was not right for Bristol either. She advised him not to hand it to his architect. She stated that they've seen a lot from architects who thought they knew what they were doing in Bristol as far as putting together the architectural parts and, in the end, didn't. Dr. Zipf advised Mr. Ferreira to be careful with matching style, roof lines, massing, and what kind of accoutrements went on them. She said what gave her pause was the first design from George Sisson Architecture. She gave Mr. Ferreira her business card and offered to help Mr. Ferreira's architect. Dr. Zipf suspected that Mr. Ferreira was going to realize that 6 units were going to be too many and 4 units might be a stretch. She stated that everyone needed to be mindful of what the lot could accommodate

Chairperson Lima asked if there was anyone else who wanted to speak and no one else came forward. She advised Mr. Ferreira that he had enough information to move forward. Mr. Ferreira thanked the neighbors for their input as it gave him a good path to go on at that point. He asked the neighbors for their contact information. Member Allen gave Mr. Ferreira a

copy of the letter. Chairperson Lima said the Commission would see him again in the future and asked Attorney Teitz if anything further needed to be done. Attorney Teitz said there was nothing else that needed to be done that evening as it was just a concept review. Chairperson Lima ended the concept review and invited Mr. Ferreira and the neighbors to use the conference room to continue their discussion.

- 6. **Monitor Reports & Project Updates**
- 7. **HDC Coordinator Reports & Project Updates**
- 8. **HDC Coordinator Approvals**
- 9. **Other Business**

Nick advised the Commission that OpenGov finally made an easy way to put the things he had administratively approved which was on the back of the Staff Report. He said they were finally under contract with Arnold Robinson to complete the standards guide. Nick stated that Arnold's plan was to attend the March meeting for a very early draft to make sure they're going in the right direction. They're also going to be applying for the 2026 CLG which is for an additional \$11,000.00 to do design work and outreach efforts for the standards guide which was due in a few weeks. He said the money would likely be available over the summer just as he's wrapping up the first phase of the standards guide. Nick said hopefully they could do it as a continuation of the contract, but that was a bridge they'll cross when they get there. He said there were no major things to be aware of. He stated the only major enforcement thing he did was the gentleman that did stuff on his garage had been taken care of. Nick said that if anyone sees something that looked like a wall going upon on Bradford Street, technically it was behind some doors that closed so it was being considered as interior. He wanted everyone to know just in case someone thought they had put up a wall without permission.

Member Page said to Nick that the Staff Report was a nice addition. Chairperson Lima asked if there was any other business. With no other business being discussed, a motion to adjourned was made by Member Allen.

- 10. **Adjourned at 9:01PM**