

# **TOWN OF BRISTOL, RHODE ISLAND**

## **HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION**



### **Historic District Commission Meeting Minutes**

**Thursday, March 5, 2026**

**at 6:00 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](mailto:ntoth@bristolri.gov)

#### **1. Pledge of Allegiance**

The meeting was called to order at 6:00PM, and the Pledge of Allegiance was promptly recited afterwards.

In attendance: Church, Bergenholtz, Allen, Ponder, and Page

Also in attendance: Town Solicitor Teitz, and Toth

Absent: Lima, Millard, and O'Loughlin

#### **2. Presentation by Standards Guide Consultant**

**2A. Presentation of Standards Guide Draft** Consultant will present early draft of the Bristol Historic Standards Guide for feedback from the HDC.

Arnold Robinson presented the draft of the Standards Guide. Mr. Robinson stated that the purpose of the Standards Guide was to make sure that all applicants would have the proper information in order to submit better packages and applications to the Commission. He wanted the general public to be able to communicate with HDC staff more easily. Mr. Robinson asked regarding what was already on the website, *i.e.*, the introductory video of HDC, ordinance, FAQs, the old printed version of the brochure, and application link which did the Commission feel were the most useful and why. He said that he didn't want to fix what wasn't broken. Member Church felt that none of those elements were looked at by the applicants, with the exception of the application itself.

Mr. Robinson asked why that might be. Member Church felt that people didn't want to take the time. She said people just wanted to fill it out with the least amount of information possible and submit it then wait for someone to tell them what to do.

Attorney Teitz agreed with Member Church. He stated that people are more likely to read it if it was one page and were forced to read it before moving forward. Attorney Teitz asked Mr. Robinson if he could include items like executive summaries and bullet point lists, it may help. Member Church suggested that having the standards available along with a question "Does your project meet or comply with the standards set forth by the Commission". Nick suggested an applicant should be made to check a box off before being allowed to go further to application.

Mr. Robinson went on to discuss how the Secretary of Interior Standards was applied to particular elements of a building and what were the frequent issues around different elements of the buildings. He stated that other communities that have standards had a list of pros and cons for treatments for windows for example. Member Bergenholtz thought that would be extremely helpful for the Commission to have. He stated windows were the major thing the Commission deals with and the biggest problem was applicants who wanted to go from a 6 over 6 which was the right aesthetic to something like a 2 over 2. Member Bergenholtz said that if there was a visual comparison, it would give applicants a better idea as to why it wasn't acceptable. Mr. Robinson suggested that it should say the Commission typically wants to retain the historic configuration of the window pattern. Member Bergenholtz stated that it would be very helpful. Mr. Robinson said there was a gap between the Standards and the applicant being asked to interpret but it's not explicit.

Nick said the problem was people have idea of what they like, but the Commission says it's not appropriate and they don't understand why. He said applicants look at their neighbor's house which might be a big colonial and don't understand why their house, which is a 1920s Craftsman, can't have the same features. Member Church said that it has to do with massing and scale and people need to be aware of additions need to conform to the scale of the original building.

Member Bergenholtz said the other thing the Commission had an issue with more recently was vinyl windows from the 1980s and 1990s. He said the windows may be 1 over 1 and the

homeowners just want to replace them with the same windows and he felt that it would be much more appropriate to go back to the 6 over 6 configurations. He asked if there was a way to articulate that. Member Allen agree. Mr. Robinson said there were sections that talked about later changes and how they were reviewed by the Commission, especially changes made outside the period of significance. He stated there was a section which talked about definition of a period of significance and providing that updated period of significance that was redone when the historic district was resurveyed. He also said that within the treatment of different architectural elements section, windows and doors were highly likely to have changed over time. Mr. Robinson said the Guidelines draft will be going back and forth and that idea of the Commission wanting to see things going back to historic configurations can be added. Member Bergenholtz stated that way everything reads correctly and is clarified.

Member Church stated that some changes have been significant to a different period and should probably not be changed. Mr. Robinson said that no Standards document was going to define everything. They were just going to clarify what was appropriate and what wasn't appropriate. Member Church just wanted to make the applicant aware of what the Standards are and how necessary it is to have a complete application. She stated there needs to be an outline of what exactly an applicant needs to present to the Commission in order to get final approval. Mr. Robinson asked if Member Church was referring to the Secretary of Interior Standards or the Commission's standards for a complete application, or both. Member Church stated that the applicant needed to know the Secretary of Interior Standards because that's what the Commission based its decisions on. Mr. Robison agreed.

Member Allen said the Commission spends a lot of time dealing with applicants who submit incomplete applications and then they have to grant continuances. He said it was time consuming. Member Church stated the applicants don't read through what is needed. She said that applicants want the Commission to tell them what to do, what the Commission wants, and agree with things that aren't appropriate. Mr. Robinson understood and heard a very strong reaction to the more guidance that can be provided to applicants, the better. Member Bergenholtz said that visual examples would be easier. Mr. Robinson agreed.

Member Allen asked if there was some way to show examples of good applications versus bad applications. Nick said he had

been working on it, basically a step by step "how to" guide. He stated he was trying to communicate to the applicants that it was important they provide enough information in the description of proposed work. Nick gave the example of "replace windows" versus "I want to replace 12 windows, they're 6 over 6 wood windows, and I want to replace them with Marvin Elevate 6 over 6 aluminum clad and here are some pictures". He said that those are the types of things that should be included because it's a constant problem as people give him everything that is required for an application but it's not very good. Nick stated there's only so much he can do and say to the applicant to get information from them before having to send it to the Commission. Then the Commission must tell the applicant that it's not enough information. It's a vicious cycle.

Member Allen said that they've had some applications put together by professionals, but they've also received well thought out applications submitted by the homeowners. Nick said that unlike the Planning and Zoning Boards, the Historic District Commission has homeowners applying for themselves, they don't have the time or knowledge to sit down and draw renderings. He wanted to really include it in the text or as an appendices to bring their attention to Appendix A for a good application. Kathy Maynard (Steno) recommended making applicants aware that they didn't need professional renderings, they could do quick sketches on their own as the question had been brought up at previous meetings. Nick stated that the public needed to not be afraid of the process and it needs to be seen as a good thing. Member Church said applicants literally shake when they present. Member Bergenholtz said it's intimidating.

Member Church said with regard to certain sketches and renderings, it should clarify elevations, etc. Nick agreed as it's a constant problem. Mr. Robinson said it highlighted a good process point, which was the RFP was really well crafted in the sense that Nick's working on the procedural side of the Standards and keeping consistent language, while he is really focused on that Secretary of Interior Standards treatment of architectural elements.

With that in mind, Mr. Robinson asked the Commission what particular building elements like windows, doors, roofs, were the most important ones that need specific language and examples. Member Allen said windows was #1 followed by wood gutters, and alternative materials. Those were his top 3 things. Attorney Teitz said the Commission has been fairly

liberal in granting approval for fiberglass gutters. Nick said the most recent update to the administrative approval list; they did allow fiberglass to be approved administratively because it looks similar to wood. Member Allen said that some people may want to replace wood with K gutters. Mr. Robinson said that based on the Commission's prior approvals, that it can be put in the "no" pile that replacing wood gutters with K gutters is not allowed. Member Church stated that people have to be careful with original wood gutters as some are integral parts of the roof.

Member Church suggested having examples of defining characteristics of a certain period house like a Greek Revival. Member Church suggested showing the distinctive features of certain styles of buildings. Mr. Robinson said they were dealing with that in two ways in the draft: 1) providing a section that runs through the major architectural styles that make up the district in Bristol; and 2) a section about character defining elements and how the Commission looks at character defining elements. He didn't want to box the Commission into something where there was no flexibility to say that something on that building was unique to that particular building was also a character defining element. Mr. Robinson stated the draft was going to discuss typical buildings of each style and what they typically look like, and then there would be a section that dealt with the Commission's review of each project and how the Commission would be defining the character defining features. Then the Commission would be able to review the draft and give their input. He said it would be a way to get the applicant and Commission on the same page.

Member Church said along with windows, there should be doors and side lights. Mr. Robinson said there's a significant section on doors with some great examples. He received permission from Providence to use their guidelines, especially with regards to inappropriate changes. He said there were visual of examples. Member Bergenholtz said massing was the biggest threat to the historic district. He gave State Street between Hope and High as an example. He said they were starting to get changes to roof lines to maximize every square inch of a house lot and it's a big problem. Mr. Robinson asked Attorney Teitz asked if zoning was the cap in terms of lot coverage and height. Nick said the HDC has ability to review anything that zoning would need to review as a project needs approval from both. Attorney Teitz stated that the problem was the change to the state law as far as the yard setbacks for undersized lots, so the

zoning may not be any impediment to it if the side yards are reduced 2 feet and things like that. Mr. Robinson said that section could be strongly worded about not only the character within the lot of the building itself, but then the scale of the streetscape and the district as a whole.

Member Church also wanted to address the garages that were originally for horses and buggies, and now many people want to convert them into ADUs or use them for huge cars. Mr. Robinson was also thinking about the massing section as being sympathetic to the existing surroundings was really important when doing an addition. Member Bergenholtz said that within the next 5 years Bristol was going to be inundated with ADUs. Member Church said that everyone wants an income from their property and asked if unit counts would be a problem. Mr. Robinson stated that unit count wouldn't be, but massing would be an issue. Member Bergenholtz said that roof lines changing is also an issue.

Mr. Robinson asked the Commission what the other top priorities topics were. Member Bergenholtz stated that windows took up most of the Commission's time. Member Allen said that was the #1 issue. Attorney Teitz said that the use of artificial wood materials. He stated that the Commission seemed to have developed certain rules of thumb as artificial wood has been allowed on new additions; however, the problem is that everyone just says Azek without specifying. Attorney Teitz stated the Commission tries not to get the shiny vinyl looking materials and tends to only approve it for the floors of porches and step treads especially when it's not visible from the street. Member Bergenholtz said the Commission only approves of it when it's located at the rear of the house. Nick said the Commission has approved of Trex at the front of the house. Attorney Teitz said it was approved for treads, but not for the vertical elements on a house like balusters.

Nick said the Commission has to be careful about artificial materials as they're getting better and better as time goes on. His parents' house is sided with 1990s vinyl siding and it's hideous compared to the true wood siding. He said that every few years new materials are coming out and the difference can't be distinguished. Member Bergenholtz said that the technology is definitely changing. Member Church said the new stuff was technically wood from Africa which has been thermally chemically treated. Attorney Teitz said that's an issue for the future as many people were coming in with clapboards made of manufactured wood products and at

this point, they still want the vertical elements to be authentic, particularly at the front of the house.

Attorney Teitz said when applicants come in for administrative permits for "like kind" replacements, it should really be for "like kind" replacements, *i.e.*, pine with pine, real wood with real wood and not artificial wood. He stated there has been an issue of conjecture with additions. For example, some people believe that all the windows on the house should match. He said that some additions tend to be huge and overwhelm the original part of the house, and if there are 12 over 12 windows in the original part of the house, the applicant wants the same in addition as opposed to trying to differentiate the two. Mr. Robinson said there's already some very good language about conjecture in the current documents and the requirements about documentation, but there's room to include language in the Standards. Attorney Teitz suggested adding picture examples.

Mr. Robinson said there should be some language stating the Commission will consider it on a case-by-case basis, *i.e.*, is it located on the front porch or rear porch of the building, is it vertical or horizontal, etc. He stated that there could be examples of things that may be appropriate, but still leaving room for the Commission to make judgments within the Standards without being boxed in. Member Church said that each building is unique and shouldn't be compared to a house down the street. She stated they should be judged individually.

Attorney Teitz suggested that when talking about windows, there should be information about how storm windows are allowed with an administrative permit. That's a great way to deal with energy efficiency without having a high cost of replacing or repairing existing windows. He said it would be a great way to remind people about it. Mr. Robinson said there may currently be language on the administrative side about it. He stated it went to the basic standard of not losing original materials. Member Bergenholtz said it should also mention that interior storm windows were also available.

Mr. Robinson asked the Commission if they have run across any other Standards documents or guidelines through conferences or on websites that they wish were included in theirs. Member Church had not but asked Mr. Robinson if he knew of any. Mr. Robinson said that Providence was very good, especially regarding the College Hill area, and Newport was

very good, especially regarding Victorian property. He asked the Commission to let him know if they did find anything.

Mr. Robinson expects to have a first draft in 2 weeks and will present it to Town staff who will have an internal review process. He stated it would be a three-draft process. He's looking to wrap it up by late spring. Member Church asked for Mr. Robinson's contact which Nick said he had. Mr. Robinson said they could funnel their comments through the Town, but they should wait for the first draft, so everyone is on the same page. Member Church asked if the Commission could contact each other. Attorney Teitz said that each member should email Nick with their comments and then Nick would circulate it to the rest of the Commission so there wouldn't be any violation of the Open Meeting statute rules.

Mr. Robinson said there would be another working meeting in approximately six weeks. Attorney Teitz suggested inviting members of the Town Council as it might be useful as some members live in the district. Nick said he would reach out to them.

**3. 3A. Review of minutes of the February 5, 2026 meeting.**

A review of the minutes of the February 5, 2026 meeting commenced. Member Church had the following corrections: on page 12, last paragraph, Mr. Deleo's name was spelled incorrectly. Same for the first paragraph on page 13. Further, on page 13, first paragraph, last sentence should read "has his consent". On page 23, last paragraph, the last sentence should read "has his consent". On page 23, last paragraph, 3<sup>rd</sup> line it should read "stepped back from the original building". Also, in the same paragraph, 6<sup>th</sup> line, it should read "fit the width of the house". On page 24, last paragraph, Nina Murphy "lives" not "lived". On page 25, last paragraph, first line, delete "about" and have it read "if the density of the area". On page 26, in the middle of the huge paragraph, line 21, it reads "picture of he provided" delete "of". On page 27, first sentence, it should read "copy of Mr. Panza's letter". Member Allen's corrections were as follows: on page 9, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, it should read "36 inches". On page 10, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, 4<sup>th</sup> line, it should read "agreed" not "agree". With no other corrections or comments, Member Allen asked for a motion.

Motion made by Member Church to accept the minutes of the February 5, 2026 meeting as amended; Seconded by Page.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

**4. Staff Report**

**4A. Staff Report**

**5. Application Reviews**

**5A. 26-04: 34 Byfield St, Rosemarie Sirois** Discuss and act on construction of porch and rear porch roof.

Nick advised the Commission that the applicant contacted him and requested a continuance to the March 30<sup>th</sup> meeting as the owner was not able to attend the meeting. Member Allen asked for a motion.

Motion made by Member Church to continue application #26-04 to the March 30, 2026 meeting; Seconded by Member Page.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

**5B. 26-12: 217 Hope St, The Tides Condominium Association** Discuss and act on replacement of windows.

Colleen Hopkins, resident of Unit 1 at 217 Hope St, and Jim Hurley, resident of Unit 8 at 217 Hope St, were present.

A discussion commenced between Ms. Hopkins and the Commission. Ms. Hopkins and Mr. Hurley advised the Commission that they were interested in replacing the 6 over 6 windows in their units with Andersen Woodwright series windows. She stated that they would only be replacing the actual windows and the casing and trim would remain the same. Ms. Hopkins said the windows were the same as the ones that were used at 195 Hope Street. She stated that the windows were wood and wood clad with Andersen fibrex material. Ms. Hopkins had done a renovation in 2021 and the HDC had approved the Andersen 400 series windows, so she wanted to stick with Andersen windows. Member Allen said there was a comment noted that some windows were original to the

building. Ms. Hopkins stated it was referring to the curved windows. She said they were asking to replace 29 windows, which was the vast majority of the windows in 7 of the 9 units and the windows in the common areas. She said there were 2 curved windows located in her unit and she agreed to take those out of the application, so everything else would be a straight-out replacement window.

Member Allen asked Nick if he had toured the building. Nick stated that he had toured the building and it was a hodge podge of windows. He said there were a couple of older windows. He stated that Ms. Hopkins' emergency escape window located in her bathroom was an issue. Ms. Hopkins said that in 2021 the doors to the common lobby had been sealed off, so the Fire Marshall mandated that their bathroom window be a means of egress. When she did the renovations, she had all of the more historic windows fixed but that window still doesn't open or close and it's supposed to be a means of egress. She advised the Commission that the building was turned into condominiums in 1986 during which time a lot of changes were made to the windows. She put in a number of windows in 2021.

Member Allen asked Nick if the windows could be repaired. Nick said the issue was after having a discussion with the owners was that the windows had been repaired and they're back to square 1. With the understanding that the curved windows were something that the Commission was going to be more cognitive of and the issue of the egress window, Nick felt there were some windows that didn't look in terrible condition. Nick was only able to enter 2 units and from what he viewed, many windows were modern or at least from the 1980s. He said the windows did not appear to be in terrible condition, but problem was they had fixed the windows in the past and they're having the exact same problems again. Nick felt that the applicants were throwing money at a problem that wasn't going away. Member Ponder commented that building was exactly in the part of Bristol that gets beaten by the weather. Ms. Hopkins stated that there was a letter included in the application from the contractor stating that the windows had been repaired in 2021 and now don't work again.

Member Allen asked if there were any further questions or comments from the Commission. Member Page asked if the windows were going to be made to look all the same and were they going to match any windows that weren't going to be replaced. Ms. Hopkins said that the new windows would match

the 8 windows that were put replaced in 2021. She said there were 8 Andersen 400 series windows that were placed in 2021 which were approved by the HDC. She stated there was a mix of windows. Member Page asked when the project was done, would the windows look the same throughout the building or would there still be windows that would not match. Ms. Hopkins said the application was for 7 out of 9 units in the building and the common areas, so it would do the majority of the building, with the exception of the 2 curved windows in her unit. Obviously, she couldn't force the other 2 owners to change their windows. She spoke to those owners and if they do make a request for windows in the future, they would request the same windows.

Member Allen asked if the window configuration was 6 over 6 and Ms. Hopkins said yes. Member Allen asked if the windows that were not being replaced were also a 6 over 6 configuration and Ms. Hopkins said yes, they were all in the same configuration.

Member Allen asked if there were any further comments. Member Bergenholtz said that the windows were not all 6 over 6. He then showed Member Allen the photos in the application. Member Allen advised Ms. Hopkins that the windows were in fact 8 over 8. Ms. Hopkins said that they intended to replace the windows with the exact configuration existing in the building. She said if it's 8 over 8 then that's what the new window would be, but most windows were 6 over 6. Member Bergenholtz said he was fine with it as long as it retains the same configuration. Member Church asked if the size of the windows would change. Ms. Hopkins said that the sashes were being replaced, but everything else was staying the same. With no other questions or comments, Member Allen asked for a motion.

Motion made by Member Church to approve application #26-12 for the replacement of 27 existing windows in 7 of 9 units and in the common areas of the building to be replaced with Andersen Woodwright insert windows as presented. The 2 curved windows originally applied for in the application have been withdrawn; Seconded by Member Bergenholtz.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9

Project Monitor: Chris Ponder

Member Allen advised Ms. Hopkins that a Certificate would be available. Nick said that it would be issued through the portal online in the next couple of days. He advised Ms. Hopkins that she would be receiving an email. Nick said that it needed to print it out and posted on the building along with the building permit where visible when the work began.

**5C. 26-13: 31 Bradford St, Mark Shaw** Discuss and act on installation of 2 windows on garage.

Mark Shaw present.

Mr. Shaw advised the Commission that he and his wife purchased the building in August of 2025. He said that Woof Woof's business on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor had moved out, and Peggy Frederick, who had lived on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor, moved to her new home. Mr. Shaw said since Ms. Frederick moved, they had refurbished that part of the building, and since Woof Woof moved out last weekend, his wife was going to relocate her yoga studio to the 1<sup>st</sup> floor retail space. He stated the 2-car garage that was there was very dilapidated. He believed that it was built around the 1930s or 1940s and was never really used, so he decided to fix it up. He repaired the rotted sills and a few other things. He said there had been 2 windows on the left-hand side, but when the property was resided in 2012 or 2015, those windows were removed, so there was very little light in garage.

Mr. Shaw advised the Commission that he didn't know that he needed permission to replace windows. He was fortunate enough to find two 6 over 6 single pane, true divided, double hung mahogany windows. Nick noted in the Staff Report that there was no spec sheet on the windows because Mr. Shaw went to the lumber yard and the windows happened to be there since another person had ordered them but never picked them up and Mr. Shaw was lucky enough to purchase them. Nick said he had been to the property, and part of the refurbishment was constructing a wall behind the garage doors. He had discussed it with Attorney Teitz and Member Lima. Nick said that the garage doors still did close, so it was considered an interior renovation. Nick commended Mr. Shaw for the clever design and Mr. Shaw stated that it was his friend's idea. Mr. Shaw said he knew he had to come before the HDC for new doors in the garage, but he couldn't find anything

that was attractive. So, his friend came up with the idea. He advised the Commission that he's very passionate about historic structures. He had worked for AAA for 40 years. They purchased a lot of old buildings. One being the old post office in Barrington on Maple Avenue. Mr. Shaw said that 3 of the lights he saved from the old post office were going to be used on Bradford Street. He didn't realize that there were over 700 historic structures in Bristol. He apologized for not knowing he needed permission to replace the windows.

Nick stated that he has been to the property and seen the windows. He advised the Commission that the windows were high quality, all wood windows and not clad with anything. Member Allen asked Nick if they were single pane windows and he said yes. Nick said that the windows were not visible from the street. Member Church said the application noted that the windows were located on the south elevation, but they were really located on the west elevation. Nick said it was actually the south elevation because of how the house sat on the property. Member Church said faced south on the property and the windows were located on the left-hand side of the property which was the west elevation.

Motion made by Member Bergenholtz to approve application #26-13 for the installation of two windows on the west elevation of the garage that were previously removed from the building years earlier. The windows will be all wood, true divided mahogany windows with a 6 over 6 configuration; Seconded by Member Church.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9

Project Monitor: N/A

**5D. 26-14: 235 High St, Town of Bristol** Discuss and act on replacement of wood door with lights to steel door with no lights to address safety and security concerns.

Edward Tanner, Principal Planner, Department of Community Development, present for the Town of Bristol.

A discussion commenced between Mr. Tanner and the Commission regarding the replacement of an exterior steel door of the back boiler room located in the northwest corner of the former Reynolds School building. The door faces north on Court Street. He stated there was a fenced in area with an electrical transformer and the door was located behind that. Mr. Tanner stated that the door that was currently there was a replacement door and was not original to the building and it was a wooden door that did not meet code. He said it was broken and didn't latch properly. He advised the Commission that since the door opened into the boiler room, there were certain fire codes that needed to be followed, so the Town was proposing a steel door which had to be self-closing with self-latching hardware. Mr. Tanner showed the Commission the image of the steel door the Town was proposing. Member Bergenholtz asked Mr. Tanner if the door could be seen from the street. Mr. Tanner said yes it could be seen from Court Street, but there was a new fence surrounding the electrical transformer which made the door less visible.

Member Allen asked if there were any further questions or comments.

Motion made by Member Church to approve application #26-14 for the installation of a new steel door on the north elevation as present; Seconded by Member Bergenholtz.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9

Project Monitor: John Allen

Mr. Tanner said he would place the green sheet somewhere visible on the building so everyone knew they had approval.

**5E. 26-17: 205 Thames St, Gladding Shops, LLC** Discuss and act on addition of shielding fence under stairs, enclosure of deck ceiling, installation of lights.

Ben Bergenholtz recused.

Tom Bergenholtz present.

A discussion was had between Mr. Bergenholtz and the Commission regarding a back patio. He advised the Commission that the work was to have been done by a previous tenant, but it had not been done and the situation ended badly. He was here seeking to close in the ceiling above the brick patio with Embara wood which would be an 8-inch-wide shiplap. He stated it would enclose the 2x12 beams shown in the photos attached to the application. Mr. Bergenholtz said he was going to put in some recessed lighting as well. He stated that the patio was located in the back of the building which was the west elevation which was not visible from the street. Mr. Bergenholtz directed the Commission to look at page 84 of the application. He advised the Commission that he also wanted to use the Embara wood underneath the back stairs leading to the deck to enclose the space. Mr. Bergenholtz wants to use the Embara wood vertically to create storage space for the furniture during the winter months, and it would also block the north wind so people would be able to enjoy the space more.

Member Allen asked if anyone had any questions. Member Church asked if Mr. Bergenholtz was going to cover just the north side of the stairway and the east side of the shorter part of the stairs or was it both sides of the stairway. Mr. Bergenholtz said it was on both sides of the stairway. He stated that it would be enclosed on both sides of the two vertical sides of the stairway with a door in between the last two vertical columns to have access to the storage area under stairs. Member Church asked if the door was going to be made from the same Embara material and Mr. Bergenholtz said yes. Member Church said that it would be on the interior of the patio. Mr. Bergenholtz approached the Commission to look at the photos with the Commission and show exactly where on the patio the wood would be installed.

Member Allen asked if the Commission had any other comments or questions and then asked for a motion to be made.

Motion made by Member Ponder to approve application #26-17 to enclose the deck stairs with Embara wood and to cover the underside of the deck with the same Embara wood material. Further, to install 4 recessed lights as proposed under the deck, and to install an entrance door made out of the same Embara wood as proposed; Seconded by Member Page.

Voting Yea: Ponder, Page, Allen, and Church

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9

Project Monitor: John Allen

Member Allen reminded Mr. Bergeholtz to place the green sheet in the front window where visible so the neighborhood knew that he received approval from the HDC.

Steno Maynard reminded Member Allen to ask if anyone in the audience wanted to speak for or against the projects.

**5F. 26-18: 500 Wood St, Tupelo Realty** Discuss and act on installation of solar array on roof of unit 320 and the newly constructed KVH building.

Dan Kusmano, Chris Clutier, and Ian Walsh present

Mr. Kusmano and the Commission had a discussion regarding the solar array system being proposed for Building Group 2 at Unity Park. They had additional photos, rendering views, and a site plan showing where the rendering views were taken from, and presented it all to the Commission. Mr. Kusmano said they were there to present on behalf of Tupelo Realty. They were seeking approval for an additional solar array to be installed on the roof of Unit 320 as well as the roof of the newly constructed pre-engineered metal building for KVH. Mr. Kusmano said just like what was shown in the photographs on Building Group 2, they would be adding similar solar panel arrays on both Unit 320 and the metal building. He said that on Unit 320, those panels would have about a 10-degree angle and at topmost portion of it would be 11 inches off the base of the roof. He stated the parapet that was on the existing Unit 320 was about 13 inches at its' lowest point. Mr. Kusmano said that the panels would not be seen from anywhere in the park. He previously mentioned that they had the precedence that the panels being utilized on the property and the ones that were mounted on the sawtooth windows on the roof of Unit 320, those also weren't seen from anywhere in the park, and these would also be kept out of the public eye while still being able to collect solar power and run the property.

Member Allen asked if anyone on the Commission had any questions or comments. Member Church stated she had no problem with the angle of the solar panels on the new

building since it was a new building. Mr. Kusmano said the panels on the new building would be flush mounted. Mr. Clutier advised the Commission that the panels would be following the ridge of roof and be out of sight. Mr. Kusmano said that the panels would look similar to the ones on Unit 320 that were flat, not on the sawtooth, those that were flush mounted. Member Church said that they wouldn't be seen at all then and Mr. Kusmano said that was correct.

Member Allen asked if anyone else had any comments or questions. He then asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to speak for or against the project. With no one coming forward, Member Allen asked for a motion.

Motion made by Member Church to approve application #26-18 for the installation of a solar array on the roof of Unit 320; Seconded by Member Ponder.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9, 10

Project Monitor: John Allen

Member Allen advised Mr. Kusmano to place the green sheet somewhere visible so everyone knew that they had received approval from the HDC.

**5G. 26-20: 21 High St, John Breen** Discuss and act on conversion of garage to livable space, removal of garage door, installation of door, replacement/moving of windows.

Attorney Teitz asked Mr. Breen if he wanted to wait until later on in the meeting to present his application so as to give him some time to wait for Mr. Fosse to appear at the meeting and Mr. Breen agreed.

Jack Breen and Vincent Fosse present.

A discussion commenced between Mr. Fosse and the Commission. Mr. Fosse appeared on behalf of Mr. Breen to seek approval to convert an attached garage into a livable space. He stated that part of project included the removal of the existing garage doors and replacing it with a single front door and

having two 2 over 2 double hung windows on either side of the door. He said the garage was not part of the original house which was constructed in 1887 and the garage was built in the 1960s. Mr. Fosse said that Mr. Breen wanted to bring the historic nature to the garage by matching the windows, trim, and materials on existing house, so it was replicated on the garage. He stated that there were 3 existing windows in the garage and they were looking to get them replaced with Marvin Elevate which was a fiberglass window with a wood interior. He said he would also replicate the wood trim on the new windows as well and the windows would also be in a 2 over 2 configuration.

Member Allen asked Mr. Breen if the Marvin Elevate windows were the same windows he used on the breezeway and Mr. Breen said yes. Member Church said she liked it because the garage hadn't changed in proportion in relation to the house. Mr. Fosse said that they were keeping the existing footprint. Member Allen said that it was a good plan. Member Page said it looked good and commended Mr. Breen on the nice job he did on the house.

Member Allen asked if anyone in the audience wanted to speak for or against the project. With no one coming forward, he asked for a motion.

Motion made by Member Church to approve application #26-20 for the conversion of the existing garage into a living space and the scope of the work is to be included in the decision as shown on page 111 of the application. The materials are to match the materials on the existing house, and the windows are to match the existing replacement windows previously approved; Seconded by Member Ponder.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9

Project Monitor: John Allen

Member Allen reminded Mr. Breen to place the green sheet in the front window of the home where visible so everyone knew he received approval for the project.

**5H. 26-16: 244 Metacom Ave, Andrew Broten** Discuss and act on Construction of swimming pool, associated patio, and pool house, demolition of dairy structure, deck, and addition to animal stall structure.

Andrew Broten and Sue Horwitz (Project Designer) were present.

Mr. Broten and the Commission had a discussion regarding the construction of a swimming pool, patio, pool house, demolition of a dairy structure, deck, and an addition to an animal stall structure. Mr. Broten advised the Commission that he had plans to build a structure for a pool house, dig a steel and vinyl pool, and small mud room for backpacks, jackets, and dirty shoes, and then the removal of a very old dairy icehouse in the southern corner of the property which was falling apart. He stated the previous owners had held the icehouse together with a long chain and wood to hold it up. Mr. Broten stated there was also a design for a future project for a tennis court which would require the removal of part of the backside of the dairy/goat barn that existed on the property.

Member Bergenholtz commented that the plans looked fine to him. He was very interested in the stone building as it looked much older than the main house and wondered about the history of the structure. Member Bergenholtz said it looked similar to the stone structures that exist on High Street which were very early 19<sup>th</sup> Century and built by slave labor. Mr. Broten said from what he was told by the previous owners, the structure was about 7 or 8 feet deep and was part of large dairy farm and was for ice to keep the dairy products cold throughout the year. He stated in terms of how it was built and the ongoing usage throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> Century, he was not certain of the history. Mr. Broten said it was in ruins when they moved in 4 years ago. Member Ponder asked if there was a roof currently on the structure and Mr. Broten said no. Member Allen asked if the structure was in the way of where Mr. Broten wanted to install the pool. Mr. Broten said it was close enough to the area.

Ms. Horwitz approached the Commission with a blown-up site plan. She showed the Commission the location of the existing home, driveway, and stone structure. She said the main was that it was really dangerous because the structure was unstable. Member Church said it was interesting that the property line skirted around the structure. Member Ponder said the structure might be more important than anyone thinks

it is. Member Church stated that it should be researched and asked Mr. Broten if he wanted to withdraw that part of the application. Mr. Broten said that was something he could do.

Member Allen asked Mr. Broten if he could show the Commission where the barn was located. Mr. Broten showed the Commission where the current barn was located on the site plan. He said it was a 5-stall horse barn. Member Allen asked where the stone building was located. Mr. Broten showed him the stone building on the plan. Member Bergenholtz said it looked similar to the DeWolfe barn on High Street, and it could be the oldest thing on the property. He agreed with Member Church that he found it interesting that the property line was carved around the structure. Member Church stated that it was done on purpose in order to keep it on that particular property, so it wasn't sold when that portion of the land was sold for the condominiums. Member Bergenholtz said he was fine with pool house and swimming pool, but he really wanted to know more about the stone structure before making any decision on it. Ms. Horwitz stated they could withdraw it from that part of the application. Mr. Broten asked what resources he could use to do research and find more information in order for the Commission to make an informed decision on the demolition of the structure.

Catherine Zipf came up to speak. Ms. Zipf stated she did a plaque research for the property. She said the inner core of the building actually dated to the Issac Royal period and over time it had a series of 19<sup>th</sup> Century wrappers put around it, so the very center of the building was extremely old. She said it probably did have provenance pursuant to Issac Royal and for plantations. She looked at the barn and the dairy outbuilding as well, and it's probably a 19<sup>th</sup> century structure. She said it could be an early 19<sup>th</sup> Century structure but wasn't sure if it dated back to the Royal period as the Royal period was more about farming and less about dairy. Her take on it was she was more than happy to look into it as the property was very difficult to research as maps didn't go back that far. She said that they could go back through the chain of title which she did have and see if there was a reference to a barn on the property. Ms. Zipf said whatever the Commission decided to do about the structure, she requested that it have some level of HABS documentation to go with it to capture it in time regardless of the outcome. She said it was not unreasonable or expensive to do. Ms. Zipf asked the Commission if they had standards for that level of HABS documentation, but it's

something to think about. Nick said she should email Arnold Robinson about it.

Member Bergenholtz asked Ms. Zipf to explain what HABS was. Ms. Zipf said it was the Historic American Building Survey (HABS). She said the documentation of the outbuilding didn't need to be measured drawings or anything. She did say that the documentation should consist of archival quality photos with archival quality storage and nomenclature. Ms. Zipf said it was outlined through the HABS program and by the National Park Service. She said it was not unreasonable and probably about a day's worth of work. Member Bergenholtz asked if she could do some research into the deeds. She said she would be happy to do that and provide information on the deeds.

Member Bergenholtz said the British were great at taking old outbuildings and turning them into follies in their gardens and up light them. His suggestion to Mr. Broten was if he could stabilize it, it would be a great addition to his yard. Ms. Horwitz said the only problem was that the floor of the dairy was considerably lower than the surrounding area. Member Bergenholtz said the floor could be filled in. Ms. Zipf suggested a ball pit. Member Bergenholtz said there were a lot of options and there needed to be more information found on the structure.

Ms. Zipf said she would talk to Ms. Horwitz and Mr. Broten about researching the chain of title, photos, and help guide them. Ms. Horwitz said they were going to withdraw it for now so as to not hold up the rest of the application. Member Ponder said that the good news was that the withdrawal of the demolition wasn't going to interfere with the rest of the application. Mr. Broten said that it was more of a concern for the overall safety with having more people in the back yard.

Member Page asked Mr. Broten if he needed the lean-to at the goat structure removed. Mr. Broten said yes in order to fit the tennis court in properly. He said the back of the barn was not historical as it was built along with the horse barn. He stated they just needed that additional space. Member Page said it was just the lean-to which was a later addition and Mr. Broten said that was correct.

Member Allen asked if anyone had any further questions. Member Church asked what the materials were. Member Allen said all of the materials were specified in the application.

Member Church said that the materials were for the pool house, and pool. Nick said that Mr. Broten was going to be coming back up for a concept review for the mudroom addition and tennis court. He said it wouldn't be a very long concept. Ms. Horwitz said it was attached to the building they were trying to get the pool house going and didn't want to delay it. She said there was a list of materials for the pool house consisting of Andersen 400 series windows. They were hoping for approval of the use of composite materials on the trim for maintenance which would be painted. Member Allen said he didn't have a problem with it. Member Bergenholtz said it was a very thoughtful application.

Member Church said they were not doing the tennis court or addition/mud room, just the pool, pool house, and patio, and Member Allen said that was correct. Member Page said the lean-to as well. Mr. Broten said the demolition of the existing deck as well. Member Church asked where the deck was located. Member Allen said it was at the back of the house.

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

Motion made by Member Page to approve application #26-16 for the installation of a new steel and vinyl swimming pool, construction of a pool house based on the drawings attached to the application, the demolition of a lean-to to the goat stalls, the demolition of an existing exterior deck located on the back of the house which is marked, and installation of a patio. Further, applicant is withdrawing the application for the demolition of the icehouse outbuilding in order to obtain further information on it which will be revisited at a later meeting; Seconded by Member Bergenholtz.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

Secretary of Interior Standards: 3, 9, 10

Project Monitor: Robert Page

Member Allen advised Mr. Broten to place the green sheet in the front window of the home where visible so everyone knew he received approval for the project from the HDC.

**5J. 25-12: 125 Hope St, Nancy DiPrete Laurienzo** Discuss and act on demolition of structure, review of potential replacements.

Attorney Alfred R. Rego, Jr. appeared on behalf of Nancy DiPrete Laurienzo. A request was made for the application to be continued to the May 7<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Motion made by Member Church to continue application #25-12 to the May 7<sup>th</sup> meeting; Seconded by Member Ponder.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

## 6. **Concept Review**

**6A. 26-16: 244 Metacom Ave, Andrew Broten** Concept review of Mudroom and tennis court.

Mr. Broten and Ms. Horwitz came back up to present a concept review for a small addition of a mud room on the north side of the house attached to kitchen entering from driveway. They also proposed the construction of a tennis court which would include the demolition of the goat stall in that part of the pasture.

Member Bergenholtz said it was a nice scale. Member Allen asked if the tennis court was visible from the road and Mr. Broten said it was not. Member Church asked if the mud room was located on the north side of the building and wouldn't be visible. Mr. Broten said if anyone was looking at it from Metacom Avenue it would be visible. Ms. Horwitz said it was well set back from the road, so someone would have to specifically stop and look at it. Ms. Horwitz approached Member Church to show her where the mud room would be located on the site plan. Mr. Broten said there was an existing deck there now. Ms. Horwitz stated it was all going to be taken out.

Member Ponder asked if there was going to be a vote and Member Bergenholtz said no, it was just a concept review. Member Allen said that he was fine with it.

Ms. Horwitz asked if they needed to submit an application. Nick said they had already submitted everything as a general package. He asked Ms. Horwitz if they had submitted the materials lists for all of the addition. Ms. Horwitz stated they had submitted the lists for the pool house and everything else, but not the mud room and tennis court. Nick advised her to submit it and they would have to come back for the March 30<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Ms. Horwitz and Mr. Broten thanked the Commission for their time.

**6A. 25-12: 125 Hope St, Nancy DiPrete Laurienzo** Discuss and act on demolition of structure, review of potential replacements.

Attorney Alfred R. Rego, Jr., Dennis DiPrete, and Madeline Melchert were present on behalf of Ms. DiPrete Laurienzo.

Nick advised the Commission that it was for a concept review only.

Attorney Rego stated that the concept review was in keeping with what had been previously discussed a few months ago that had to do with a proposal of development on 1 parcel rather than a proposal of a subdivision. He stated the parcel contained approximately 15,500sqft. with 100ft of frontage in an R6 zone which would allow a multi-family/2-family type of dwelling. Attorney Rego said the objective tonight was to continue working with Commission to come up with a concept that they would approve and which would be in keeping with the historic nature of the area.

Member Allen said that in Attorney Rego's letter he talked the Commission had further expressed its' preference for a single primary structure, and that it was the crux that they wanted to see a single structure as opposed to two structures. He didn't see anything that met that request. Mr. DiPrete said he understood that to be the case as well. He thanked the Commission for all of the time they have given to them regarding the concept reviews. Mr. DiPrete said the Commission has been very generous with their time in doing site meetings and gave them an evening to come in with the structural engineers and architect to receive directions on

the project. He said they spent a lot of time on the different options and going over why the house wasn't demolished and what the codes required, the flood plain requirements, CRMC requirements, and State Building Code requirements.

At the January meeting, Mr. DiPrete stated they heard from the Commission that they would be more comfortable before taking a vote to talk about future houses. He and Ms. Melchert talked about what could be there and submitted concepts on two different houses. When they left that meeting, they heard from the Commission that the Commission wanted to see something that was historically in form that looked at the existing house and captured what was important on the existing house to the extent they could. Mr. DiPrete stated that the Commission wanted them to take elements from the existing house that couldn't be saved and recreate them on a new house as a tribute to the old. Ms. Melchert did a draft showing the different components like the windows and how the houses were at different angles from each other and the distance off of the street. They took an inventory of the existing house and started developing concepts of what the reconstruction would look like. They hadn't submitted it yet as the next step was to elevate the design to a higher level and submit it to the Commission as part of a development plan review. He said the only application pending before them was the demolition permit. They wanted to seek as much feedback as they could from the Commission and feel they were close to that point now.

Mr. DiPrete approached the Commission and handed out renderings A, B, and C. He said that rendering C was a different variation to the one the Commission said wasn't the Commission's preference. It had two separate houses with a slightly different design. Mr. DiPrete said the Commission previously advised them to look around the neighborhood and capture design elements from the other homes. Member Ponder said the previous rendering of the two separate homes was out of proportion and he liked the new concept as it was scaled more alike.

Mr. DiPrete discussed rendering A. He said the goal was to listen to the Commission and take at least 10 elements from the existing home. They work wanted to further expand it and submit a real design and a real inventory of the existing house. He is calling the building a historically informed reconstruction of a house since they're not replicating the house but rather replicating what they saw as the most

contributing elements on the existing house. Mr. DiPrete said that since the last meeting, they had met with the CRMC to talk about the direction the plan was going in with the Commission, and that they're probably going to elevate the house and get it out of the flood plain. He stated that CRMC had already given them a preliminary determination almost insisting on that which they had submitted to the Commission. They have had a meeting with CRMC to discuss how the buffers would work and how the geometry of the house would work. Mr. DiPrete felt that they were pretty close to something that was what CRMC was asking for as well.

Member Church stated she was opposed to the demolition of the current property. She said it wasn't correct to compare massing with rest of the houses on the street as they were built in different periods. Member Church said this was a distinct and unique building with architectural and historic value. On the current renditions, she said the model room appeared massive and pictured as same size as the original house and she felt it was a huge error. Member Church said if they were going to do anything with the model room, they should conform it to the percentage of size volume of the original house. She said the rendering looked like something that would be seen on the East Side of Providence and not in Bristol. She did like the design of the corner windows. Member Church asked if the drawings were showing the elevation that would be required by the CRMC. Mr. DiPrete acknowledged that Member Church had been consistent with stating she was not in favor of demolition throughout the process, but they didn't know another way to do it. He said that the drawings did include the elevations required by CRMC. He said the existing house framing didn't come close to meeting code, and the new house would have steel in it and the framing would be a whole different structure. Mr. DiPrete said it would be at a great cost that the look would be recreated, but it would be nothing like the way the existing house was built. He said the elevation shown was the minimum elevation. Mr. DiPrete said if the Commission read the CRMC determination, they requested that the house be even higher. He said this met the FEMA flood plain elevations and CRMC are requesting it to be even higher.

Member Page stated that the problem with FEMA's work was they didn't consider the rain flooding and it should be taken into account when the decision is made. He said FEMA only dealt with ocean water and that's why there were discrepancies between what the State was doing and what FEMA was doing. Member Page said FEMA discounted flooding coming down the

street. Mr. DiPrete said CRMC would agree with Member Page, but within the historic district, every time they raise the houses, it creates other challenges. He said another thing with the square footage was there was a lot of square footage inside the existing home that was going away because it was below the flood plain. So, they tried to thread the needle to get something that captured what seemed to be most important. Member Page said it was their choice. He said as for renderings A and C, they had worked hard in getting rid of the driveway in the middle. Member Page said it would be interesting if they could do something to make it look like a bigger house and a slightly less similar second house. He said they had come a long way since last time and it was hard to complain. Mr. DiPrete appreciated it as there was still a lot of work to be done.

Member Bergenholtz asked how much taller the new structure was going to be. Mr. DiPrete said he wasn't exactly sure. He said they may have to go through a special use permit process, but they would have that information. He said they would need to bring the structural engineers back and have them do a conceptual structural plan. Member Bergenholtz said that Mr. DiPrete must have some sense of how much taller it was. Mr. DiPrete said the first floor was going up about 1½ feet and the ceiling heights would be a bit more because they're old ceiling heights. He said it's a 2-story house and it depended on where the house was measured. Member Bergenholtz said approximately how much higher was the structure going to be than what was there now. Mr. DiPrete said maybe 5, 7, or 10ft, but he really didn't know.

Member Allen was concerned about it going from a single home to two homes on a single lot. He didn't think it was right, especially with the model room being scaled to the same size as the main house. He wanted to see one house, not two. Member Church asked if the model room was going to be one dwelling or were they proposing to multiple dwelling units in it. Mr. DiPrete said there was going to be one dwelling in each building. Member Church asked if the buildings were parallel and Mr. DiPrete said the buildings would be at the same angles as they are now. He approached the Commission and showed them another plan. Member Church stated that the proposed plan showed the model room building being larger than the main building. Mr. DiPrete stated it wasn't going back as far.

Member Bergenholtz said that the original foundation would no longer exist. Mr. DiPrete said that they had to raise the

new buildings per the CRMC requirements. Member Page said it was necessary because of the flood plain. Member Bergenholtz said that the original location of the house was being wiped out. Mr. DiPrete said the existing foundation wasn't going to be saved and the new foundation would have piers, but he wasn't sure if they would be concrete or wood. He stated there would be an elevated deck with breakaway walls to cover them. They hadn't gotten that far with the design yet, but that would be the next step. Mr. DiPrete said parking would be underneath and not in front.

Member Ponder said in January the historic informed reconstruction of the model room building that looked similar to the current model and then they had the larger structure next to it and they shrunk the larger structure which he appreciated. He asked if the model room building grow from the previous concept to balance out the two buildings. Mr. DiPrete said along the street it would generally be about the same, but it was going to go deeper back towards the water, so it shifted a little towards the north and moved back a little bit. Member Ponder was talking about in contrast to the concept in January and Mr. DiPrete said that the two houses were parallel to the street. Member Ponder liked the changes and agreed with Member Church about the scaling. Mr. DiPrete said their intent is to make the model room about the same width as the existing model room and the main house about the same width, but it changes a bit because of the garage. Member Ponder understood that the current existing home will most likely be demolished and liked the fact that they scaled down the big house part of the two and agreed with Member Allen about the liking the scaling as the same as current existing. He thought the model room looked bigger than the house and looked too close together. Mr. DiPrete understood and said there was a lot more work to do.

Member Allen said he would still like to see one house, but if everyone else decided they would go with two houses then he would completely agree with what Member Ponder said. Mr. DiPrete said they were not looking for decision as they had a lot more work to do. He asked if Nick needed anything from him for the development plan and Nick said whenever they were ready to apply to just submit the application. Member Ponder asked if there was an active application for demolition and it needed to be continued, and Nick said yes. Mr. DiPrete asked for a continuation of the application for demolition as their next step was to submit something much more detailed. He thanked the Commission for being very generous with their time. Nick said as far as the HDC is concerned it would be

applying for a vote on demolition and submitting the proposed replacement design.

Member Church stated that the Commission would need a finalized construction plan before they could vote on the demolition. Nick said in that case, then they should submit their finalized plans. Member Church said they should keep coming with concepts for new construction. Mr. DiPrete said that's what they were thinking of doing because they need to do CRMC with more details beyond concept. Member Bergenholtz said it needed to include the height elevations as well. Member Church said that it should have a list of materials on the exterior, elevations, and dimensions. Member Ponder said it should include all of the cut sheets. Mr. DiPrete said that's what he thought they needed to do and they wouldn't be back before the HDC before May. Member Church said that would be okay. Mr. DiPrete asked for a continuance. Nick said the Commission could vote to continue it to May. Member Church said they could always ask for an extension if necessary. Mr. DiPrete said if they weren't ready they would bring a letter and ask for a further extension.

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

Catherine Zipf came forward to speak. Ms. Zipf stated that the application was coming along nicely. She said Member Bergenholtz was right to ask about the height of the buildings, which was important, along with the size of the model room and massing. To her, the crux of the massing comes down to what it's going to look like when rounding the curve around 7 Oaks. She questioned if it was going to be a behemoth or was it going to be similar to what was there. Ms. Zipf said what's there was nice and tidy and going much larger would be a big detriment to what it looks and feels like to the district. She stated that keeping it tight on what's there was important. She appreciated the complexity of raising it 1½ feet, but perhaps more compromising on the internal spaces in order to maintain the massing might be necessary. Ms. Zipf felt that it was an awful lot of work to shoehorn a house on a lot that nature may simply decide shouldn't be there anymore and raised the question of how much money were they willing to spend on a house that could get washed away the next day. She said the expense of it didn't seem to be worthwhile for a lot so precarious in its position. Ms. Zipf asked Attorney Teitz if the Town was protected from any sort of claim of climate change if house flips in 3 years. Then the new owner experiences a

hurricane, and they go after the Town saying that the HDC approved it. She didn't want it to bite the Town. Attorney Teitz didn't think particularly with HDC approval that the Town would be liable for any damages.

Member Church said based on what Ms. Zipf said, she suggested taking photographs be taken at that corner of existing streetscape coming from both directions and when the new designs are presented, they be scaled into those photographs so everyone can see what the effect would be. Member Allen said that would be a good idea. Member Church asked Attorney Teitz if she could make that in the form of a motion. Attorney Teitz said yes but it wasn't something that could be made mandatory, but it could be made as a motion that the Commission agreed that the Commission was requesting it.

Motion made by Member Church that the Commission requests that elevations of the streetscape be illustrated from both the southern view from Hope Street and the northern view from Hope Street of any new designs that are proposed in comparison to the existing streetscape; Seconded by Member Ponder.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

Mr. DiPrete understood and said he would do that. He said that when looking at the existing streetscape at the pedestrian level, one of the most prominent features is a big hedge across the front. He asked the Commission if they should be looking at future landscaping in the submission and the hedge hid a lot of the house. They had eliminated the hedge in the views they showed. Member Bergenholtz said he hadn't paid attention to it. Member Church said the hedges were trimmed down a while ago. Mr. DiPrete said they tried to take photographs already and superimpose the future house, but up against the Lobster Pot the vegetation was really thick and the hedge along the street was really thick. Member Church said whatever's there now, illustrate it with the new design. Member Ponder said don't take a picture with the hedge and then a drawing without the hedge. Member Church said that once they started construction, all of the landscaping was going to be removed. Mr. DiPrete said they anticipated submitting a landscaping plan.

Motion made by Member Church that application #25-12 be continued for a concept review to the May 7<sup>th</sup> meeting; Seconded by Member Ponder.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

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

Nick asked the Commission if there were any other updates or business.

Member Bergenholtz asked why the Santa House was still on the property. Member Allen said it was because it couldn't be moved. Member Church said they had until the end of March to move it. Nick stated they had until the end of January, but his understanding was they hadn't been able to get in there to remove it due to the snow. Member Bergenholtz asked if it was going to happen every year because it looked ridiculous to have it there for over 4 months. Nick said that's what the owner wanted to do. Member Bergenholtz said that the Santa House should have been moved and the Commission agreed. Attorney Teitz said the alternative was the owner wanted it there permanently. Member Bergenholtz said no. Nick stated the Commission had been very clear about it. He said the problem was the amount of snow and the inability to move it. He stated that when the Santa House comes back next year, the Commission should be explicit about its removal. Member Bergenholtz suggested between Thanksgiving and Christmas and then down before New Years.

Member Church asked if the Planning Department was going to move to the Guiteras School in the near future. Nick said it would be in about a year and a half. Member Church asked if that plan was in the works and Nick said yes. He said the entirety of Town Hall was going to move to Guiteras School. He had been told it would be within 18 months. Nick said that would be more of a question for Diane to answer, but that was the current plan. He said there was an endowment or

funding to update it. Nick said the building was in good shape so it wouldn't be a situation similar to the Wally School. He said the idea was 1½ to 2 years that Town Hall would be moved there. Member Church asked if it would be all on 1 floor and Nick said that it would be 2 floors as there was an elevator. Nick said the Town Hall was taking over the whole building as the school department was moving out.

Member Ponder asked Nick what was going on with the property at 8 Constitution Street after Nick had reached out to the owners. Nick said what happened was the owners put a sliding glass door on the back of the garage. He said the contractor had received something from the architect that the owners figured it was too small for a car, so they used it as a home gym. Member Ponder just wanted to make sure the owners had responded to Nick. Nick said he received a phone call, and the owners were going to be at the March 30<sup>th</sup> meeting. Nick said they were going to receive a fine as it was already done. Nick stated it wasn't anything crazy and didn't change anything on the garage.

**11. Adjourned at 8:36PM**