

TOWN OF BRISTOL, RHODE ISLAND

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION



Historic District Commission Meeting Minutes

Thursday, May 1, 2025

at 7:00 PM

Town Hall - 10 Court Street, Bristol Rhode Island

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

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

1. Pledge of Allegiance

The meeting was called to order at 7:02 PM, and the Pledge of Allegiance was promptly recited afterwards.

In attendance: Lima, Ponder, Millard, Allen, Page, Teitz, and Toth

Absent: Church, Bergenholtz, and O'Loughlin

2. Review of Previous Month's Meeting Minutes

2A. Review of minutes of the April 3, 2025 meeting.

Lima: Directing your attention to the minutes from the April meeting. Does anyone have any questions, comments, or corrections?

Allen: I do. On page 5 about halfway down, Frederick said "single thick". I don't think that's correct. I think she meant "single pane".

Maynard: I will correct it.

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

Allen: So moved.

Lima: Is there a second?

Millard: Second.

Motion made by Allen to accept the minutes of the April 3, 2025 meeting as amended; Seconded by Millard.

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

2B. Review of minutes of the March 26, 2025 special meeting at 125 Hope Street

Lima: Does anyone have any comments? Could we have a motion to accept the minutes?

Allen: So moved.

Lima: Is there a second?

Ponder: Second.

Motion made by Allen to accept the minutes of the March 26, 2025 special meeting as presented; Seconded by Ponder.

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

3. Application Reviews

3A. 25-12: 125 Hope Street, 125 Hope Street, LLC Discuss and Act on demolition of 125 Hope Street.

Toth: Applicant is going to be doing a significant amount of additional review and probably won't be back to us for a few months, so I don't know how you want to handle that for a continuance.

Lima: How about if we continue it until the applicant files an application? Is that okay, Andy?

Teitz: Not really. Things can get lost that way. Unless you want to start carrying them over like the Newport Historic Commission does. Newport has a long list of ones that they are waiting for them to come back. I would say to just pick a date or have the applicant withdraw and refile without prejudice. I think given the complexity of this one, I would say push it off.

Lima: Until August?

Teitz: Or July. They might want to come back by July.
Nick, what do you think?

Toth: I'm not sure.

Teitz: Why don't we continue it to July, and they can request a further continuance. That way we can keep it on the tab without losing anything.

Lima: Okay. Would someone like to make a motion to continue this application?

Page: So moved.

Lima: Is there a second?

Allen: Second.

Motion made by Page to continue the application to the July 10th meeting; Seconded by Allen.

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

3B. 25-24: 41R State St, Bonnie Pacheco Discuss and act on installation of signs.

Toth: I wasn't sure if the applicant was going to be able to make it. Is there anybody here for this application?

Motion made by Ponder to continue the application to the June 5th meeting; Seconded by Allen.

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

3C. 25-25: 14 Union St, Lou Cabral Discuss and Act on Demolition of old and Construction of new detached 3 car garage.

Toth: Lou has requested that this be continued to June.

Allen: Didn't we already do that at the site visit?

Toth: He came in for the windows. He has some other things that he needs to have approved with his garage so he's working with that is going to come back.

Lima: So, the whole thing?

Allen: So we need to do a motion?

Teitz: The rest of the stuff wasn't on the agenda at the site visit so you need to make this motion.

Allen: Okay.

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

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

3D. 25-30: 446-448 Thames St, Richard Corrente Discuss and act on addition of deck.

Toth: The applicants are going to be doing something else. They talked with the Building Official it was counted as a patio and they're going to be withdrawing their application for this and change what they're doing.

Lima: So, do we need to continue it or take it off?

Toth: Just take it off.

Lima: So do we need to do anything?

Teitz: No, you don't need to do anything. It's all set.

3E. 25-35: 70 Griswold Ave, Constance LeFlamme Discuss and Act on installation of solar panels to buildings on property.

Spencer McComb, architect, present on behalf of Constance LeFlamme.

McComb: We were here before you a year or so ago for a pretty major renovation of the home. As the owner were going through the renovation process, they inquired about solar panels. They had a company come out and the homeowner talked about the historical significance of

building and the distance from road as it is an odd geometry to the road. The company and owner figured out best panel locations were. The majority of the panels will be in the back yard in the courtyard area and on the garage. The panels are thin, and they will be about an inch off of the shingles of the building. We are here just to get your thoughts on it and report back to the owner who couldn't make it tonight. We just want to get your thoughts on this. I have presented before many other historic boards regarding solar panels and have received mixed reviews.

Allen: I know the orientation of this house and it is different from most houses on that street. Spencer, could you tell us based on this photo what direction what direction are we facing and where is the actual road?

McComb: Sure. (Approaches the Commission to review photo.) So, the road is essentially 45 degrees to left of that picture. So, the side facing street is at a bit of a diagonal.

Lima: If we take front of house and kind of indicate, is there going to be any solar panels on the front of the house?

McComb: There will be. The front door does not face the street on this property. So, above the front door is the most left portion of roof in the picture you're looking at.

Lima: It would have been helpful if you had put the road in the picture.

Allen: Spencer, is this the road this grey shading on this? (Shows plan image to McComb.)

McComb: Yes, basically. It's not quite at that point, but it's at the top.

Ponder: That's the water and that's Griswold.

Allen: Okay. Again, Spencer, this is the front the house? If we're looking here, this is the main house and that's where the entry door is that we see in the photo?

Toth: I'm just pulling it up on Google maps and if you're facing it the way it's looking, that outbuilding garage,

that's basically perpendicular to the road. So, the front door is kind of a 90 degree angle from the road. The house is basically rotated about 90 degrees from where a house would usually sit on a road.

Allen: Okay.

McComb: There's Griswold and there's the garage. The front door is 90 degrees.

Ponder: So basically, you won't see much from the road.

Lima: Where would the solar panels be?

McComb: (Pointing to the image) So, they would be here and here.

Lima: So, you would not see them from Griswold.

McComb: They are facing south.

Teitz: We need to have this on record so please make sure everyone is talking in the microphones.

Lima: I was just describing that if you were to be standing on Griswold Avenue looking at the garage, you would not see the solar panels, and according to Mr. McComb you would not see the solar panels on the house from Griswold. Correct?

McComb: That's correct. I suppose if you go further down on Griswold you can see back to them because they're perpendicular to the road. It's a fairly wooded area.

Allen: Just out of curiosity, why so many panels?

McComb: I didn't make that decision. I don't know.

Allen: I think National Grid and now RI energy won't allow you to put more panels than is needed. It just seems like a lot.

McComb: I'm not sure where they came up with the amount.

Allen: I don't care. I just thought that it was kind of interesting that there were so many.

McComb: We had told the company about keep the panels away from public view as much as possible.

Allen: You did an excellent job with that.

Lima: Does this need to be approved by RI Energy?

McComb: The consultant from the company will do that.

Lima: Should we ask that it be run past RI Energy?

Teitz: No. Your concern is with the impact on the historic elements of the property. For example, if it had an authentic cedar shake roof or a slate roof, then it would be a concern and viability from the road. It's quite possible that they may be visible from a distance especially in the wintertime, and they are reversible. The Town zoning is similar to what RI Energy's policy is, although the Town does allow you to have as many panels for forecasted use. The idea in the end is that you have approximately enough panels to generate what you are going to use.

Lima: Nick, should I put something on here to date this?

Toth: Just write Exhibit 1 and today's date.

Teitz: I want to bring up one thing which is where the meter and shutoff equipment will be located. I don't think they indicated that here.

McComb: Because of the renovations on the interior, we have not. Does it have to go on the outside or can it be located on the inside?

Teitz: Everything is on the outside. I would just make a condition that the equipment be located on the southeast sides of the garage and of the building so that they are away from the street.

Page: Generally, you would have to have them mounted where the electric meter is located.

Teitz: As indicated, during the renovations, they can move the meter wherever they want, and they could just put it over on that side of the building.

Page: If RI Energy allows it.

McComb: I don't know where the electrical meter is.

Teitz: Generally, they'll tell you.

Lima: Andy, could we vote on this? We have as much information as needed.

Teitz: I think you're ready to vote. I just suggested that one condition in your approval of the panels.

Lima: Is that okay, Spencer, so you don't have to come back?

McComb: That sounds very reasonable, yes.

Lima: Anyone have any questions?

Allen: Spencer, just for your knowledge we usually don't allow people to put on roof especially on the street front, but this qualifies.

Lima: Is there anyone in the audience who would like to speak for or against this application? Can we have a motion?

Motion made by Page to accept the application as presented for the installation of solar panels with the condition that the shutoff switches and meters be maintained either in the current location of the electrical meter or in a new location away from the street; Seconded by Allen.

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

Secretary of Interior Standards: #2, 9

Project Monitor: John Allen

Lima: Nick will let you know when the certificate is available.

Toth: Just before it issues, just submit where the meters and shutoffs will be located.

McComb: I will do that.

Lima: Also, it would be a good idea if you would have a photograph taken so we can put it in the record regarding where the meters are now and if they go somewhere else.

McComb: Okay. Thank you.

3F. 25-37: 259-267 Thames St, TSL, LLC Discuss and Act on Reauthorization of expired approval 23-112 for addition of new third floor.

Spencer McComb present.

McComb: As stated, this project was before you in late 2023. It has been a bit of work to get everything sorted out and under way. Essentially, it is for adding 8 hotel rooms which we did get zoning approval for after we were in front of you and that condition still remains because they have a longer build time. Because we passed the one-year mark with you, we are back to look for the same approval that you gave us at that point. Just to refresh everyone's memory this is a 2001-2002 portion of the building. This was all built around that time. Essentially, it's raising or adding a floor between the brick building on Thames Street and the larger warehouse building which is housing most of the hotel rooms that is closer to the water and that center connector piece was a series of shed and gable dormers housing 8 rooms. Those rooms will remain and there is a hallway from the upper level which will now serve as the additional 8 rooms. The Board in late 2023 that this was an appropriate addition. We do intend on building, and we have worked on construction drawing for a year and we're ready to move forward, but the time did lapse.

Allen: Andy, do we have to make a new motion to reapprove?

Teitz: Yes you do, but you can incorporate your standards and findings of fact from the last one by reference if you want. The only new finding you would want to make is there are no circumstances that changed between then and now.

Lima: Is there anyone in the audience who would like to speak for or against this application?

Rachel Hamilton: I am an attorney and I am here on behalf of the abutters which consists of the owners of the Stone Harbor Condominium Association located at 341 and 345 Thames Street. They formally wish to oppose this application. As you can see from the application, there have been significant alterations to major architectural features which include the height, the massing, the wall covering, the trim, windows, porches, the second and third floors being reconstructed, and the rear portions being added. So, asking for this extension to add another third floor even more so takes away from the building's historical significance. It is not recommended by the Secretary of Interior Standard of constructing new addition that is as large or larger than the historic building which visually overwhelms it meaning a loss of historic value and that is the portion of the Secretary of Interior Standard the new exterior additions to historic buildings and related new construction section. The plans that are in front of you as well as the photographs, if you look at the plan A2.1, you can see that the majority of the building appears to be new work, and the rear building has two floors that are new work and then the center of the building which is their proposal. The view from State Street you can only see the new work based on that viewpoint, so it is creating the majority of the building appears to be new work rather than the historical basis of that building. Also, there are proposed double windows that stray from uniformity which is also not recommended in the Secretary of Interior Standards of changing the number, location, size, or raising pattern of the windows on primary or highly visible elevations which will alter the historical character of the building. These again are highly visible elevations. When viewed individually it might not seem like a big ask, but it also contributes to the building as a whole. Also, there has been some inconsistency with applicant's reasoning for these changes. If you recall, if you were part of the Board from 2023, part of that reasoning was that they stated that they needed more rooms due to pressure of being the only hotel, as well as being filled up by the school, but, however, this is in direct contravention of another application that they have before the CRMC which is requesting a berthing facility and marina expansion, and what they describe as a proposed pool boat in which that they stated the need for the pool boat amenity was to attract guests. There are two sides of the coin which are doing two different things which, in addition, will

be an eyesore historically from that perspective diminishing the value. It sets the tone for more pool boat amenities to come. That is all I have for you today. Thank you.

Lima: Thank you.

Teitz: First of all, the pool boat is not before you and it is not a structure under your regulation as it is removable as defined by the Harbor Master, so you have nothing to do with it, nor does it actually have the reasons why people want to do what they do. Otherwise, I doubt you would approve almost any of the things that people come and buy houses then they want to improve it, so that's not your jurisdiction. I would like to address the question of whether this is a historic building. When was this building built?

McComb: It was built in 2001. The front section, the brick building at the front, was rebuilt from photographs. It was a one-story building pre-2001, but the entire back of the building plus the larger wharf building is 2001 building. The building also sits in middle of property, so DeWolf Tavern is on one side and harbor is on the other side with what we call the bike building on that other side and where you drive through into it is also on the south side. This building is flanked with its own massing before literally anyone can see it and one of the things we talked about at the first approval was this additional mass that we're creating in center of complex is really hard to see from most vantage points. So, just like a year and a half ago I still think it is historically appropriate. I think the windows from the 2001 building are still appropriate and I still think it is an appropriate option.

Lima: Are there any more questions or comments?

Ponder: I'm trying to remember the actual plan from a year and a half ago and I think I remember the additional height of this increased. How much higher is it going to be after the addition?

McComb: It is 2ft higher.

Ponder: Yeah, I don't remember it being that much.

McComb: Sorry, it's 3ft. The mass of the roof is higher. We are adding a level, however, the existing ridge line is fairly close to where ridge line going to be this time.

Ponder: That answered my question.

Allen: I don't recall Stone Harbor being at the meeting in 2023.

Teitz: I don't think they were. That's not really relevant. This is a reinstatement, so they have the right to come here and make whatever arguments. It would appear to me that the arguments on the standards were based on if this was an addition to a historic building and this is clearly a 2001 building and this is neither a historic nor contributing building.

Allen: Okay. Should that be part of the finding?

Teitz: Yes.

Lima: Any other questions? Anyone else in the audience? Can we have a motion.

Motion made by Allen to approve the application as presented as it is an extension of the previously approval application #23-112 which was approved September of 2023. Finding of fact is that the building this located in was built in 2001 and is not historic as other parts of the building are. It is compatible with the existing structures, and it is located in the center of the complex and will not be significantly visible from the street or neighboring historic properties. This construction will only have a height increase of 3ft and will not have a significant impact on the surrounding historic properties; Seconded by Ponder.

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

Secretary of Interior Standards: #10

Project Monitor: John Allen

3G. 25-38: 21 High St, John and Nancy Breen Discuss and Act on replacement of 2 windows, bulkhead, and other features.

John Breen and Nancy Breen present.

Breen: My wife and I recently purchases this home. We are here before you to ask your permission to get it back to the vision that Carol and Randall Stone had when they came before you in the 1990s. We are not asking to make the house bigger in any way. Primarily, we want to change the front of house by adding a fiberglass gutter where there is currently none. Our contractor was chosen with the promise to try to restore the door and use the door that is currently there although our application has an equivalent door in it just in case they cannot save it. The Damon Company from Newport who is well versed in historical properties, is our construction company. They have already applied for the building permits. We have worked hard to get the yard back. The house has been grossly neglected for more than a decade. We're working diligently to bring it back. We have two severely rotted windows on the portion of the house that was built in 1961. It is the connector from the house, which is 1870ish I believe, and the garage and breezeway which are 1961ish. We are asking to replace those two windows with a more modern window with the same look. We would like to go with Marvin Elevated which is a fiberglass coated window, but it would still be 2 over 2 with a grid panel. The bulkhead was severely rusted and has been removed. You cannot see the bulkhead because it is under the deck. We wish to replace the bulkhead at some point with an equivalent to what was there. Again, not making any significant changes there. We would also like to replace the gutters in the back. Many of them were clogged with leaves for a long time. They are copper lined wood gutters and they're in tough shape, and we would like to replace them. Those are primarily on the west side of house and you don't see them from the street at all and we would like to replace them with fiberglass gutters.

Toth: Those can be considered administratively approved.

Breen: Nick has been very kind. He has already given us permission to replace the roof and to fix the hole on the side of the house where the squirrels go in and out. We are very glad we have gotten that permission. We're before you primarily to ask permission to put that gutter

in the front and to put more modern, more durable windows on the side of the house that really takes a beating from the weather which is the west facing side of the house. There are other things there that will be replaced, but they will be direct replacements of the doors that are already there as we have found another set of doors in the house. We are very anxious to get this going. We're hoping the tenant of sufferance leaves quickly. We've been waiting for him to move for six weeks, but we're optimistic.

Allen: Do we have a cut sheet on doors or windows?

Breen: I sent Nick a very large package about the windows.

Toth: There's a chunk but I couldn't find the specific window pattern. Are you going with 2 over 2 like what is there?

Breen: Yes.

Toth: I didn't include everything, but there is a cut sheet of Marvin windows in the back showing the set up.

Allen: It has details, but it doesn't have anything about the cladding.

Breen: It's a fiberglass over wood window.

Toth: My mistake on that, I apologize.

Allen: What about the other doors other than the front door.

Breen: There are a lot of Andersen doors, one on the breezeway which will stay.

Allen: Is it a wood door?

Breen: No, it is not. It is a 1990s door which is fiberglass over wood. There are two sets of sliding doors which are in terrible shape, but we've already located replacement doors that came in under warranty. They were in the garage, but Mr. Stone didn't do much. They're just sitting in the garage just waiting to go in. They're exact replacements and we're going to use them.

Toth: That's administrative. These are not on street frontage?

Breen: No, this is not on street frontage. This is all in the back on the deck.

Lima: Any other questions?

Ponder: This is the bulkhead door you want that's in here?

Breen: Yes, just replacing metal with metal. The trap doors of the deck are supported by the bulkhead so we have to get exactly the right size.

Allen: That makes it wonderful because you can't see it from the street.

Breen: There is a lot of clearing out that needs to be done there. Mr. Stone was a sign person so there's a lot of paint in the basement. We're very happy to be living in Bristol and look forward to being here.

Allen: Glad you are going to take care of it.

Breen: We will.

Teitz: I just want to note something. There is street frontage there because of Wally Street. It is not currently visible because of all of the overgrowth, but there is street frontage, and it will be more visible when it is cleaned out. So, I think your findings need to deal with the date of addition and the materials rather than not so much the visibility thing, and that it is a later addition to the house and modern materials.

Allen: Is this a later addition to the house?

Breen: Yes, this was all done in the 1990s. The records that Nick has are very extensive. All of the Andersen doors were put in the late 1990s, maybe in 1997.

Allen: Often times when people come in to replace windows, we ask for photos to show that they can't be repaired. These are great photos, and I wish everyone was like that.

Teitz: Can I also ask about the windows and the front door. You are replacing glass side lights on either side of the door?

Breen: No. We are hoping to save all of the front door, but if we have to then yes, we will replace the door and the sides. It will look similar.

Teitz: I would also like to point out that the drawing of your door has a curved top which is clearly not in keeping with all of the other square corners on that door. It is up to the Commission, but you are approving replacements.

Allen: Is it possible to get a door that has a straight line?

Breen: We have looked at one company that was recommended to us.

Nancy Breen: We can make it square. That door was installed in the late 1990s as well.

Ponder: The gutter that you want to put on the front of the house, I am assuming that's because it doesn't have a gutter there currently?

Breen: Correct. There is a lot of water damage on the front of the house, and we want one there to stop that.

Ponder: And that's going to be fiberglass?

Breen: Absolutely, we read the rules.

Allen: So, in the rear there were gutters there and they were wood?

Breen: Yes.

Allen: Is profile of the fiberglass gutters going to be similar or exactly the same as the wood ones?

Breen: I can't answer that question.

Allen: Okay. Is that something that we could request that you get something that is as close as possible and to do the same on the front as well?

Breen: Yes.

Lima: Is there anyone in the audience who would like to speak for or against this application? Any other questions? Could we have a motion?

Motion made by Ponder to approve application as presented to repair the front door with the design amendment to application that it will be a squared off design verses the current applied for curved to match the current door and replace and repair the surrounding trim work. To replace the existing windows on south facing breezeway which is on the Wally Street side with similar windows with a finding of fact that portion of the house was built in 1961 and redone in the 1990s. Also, to replace the basement bulkhead with a Bilko metal bulkhead that's in the application, and to add a fiberglass gutter and metal downspout on the front of the house where none exists currently, and to replace the wood gutters in back with fiberglass gutters and metal downspouts which will have the same profile as the existing gutters that are currently there. With regard to the front door, if it is to be replaced, and for the gutters, they are subject to further review by the Project Monitor, but if there will be any significant change, then it will have to come back before the Commission; Seconded by Allen.

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

Secretary of Interior Standards: #6

Project Monitor: John Allen

Lima: Nick will provide you with the proper permits. Please put a copy of it in the front window so that people can see that you have permission to begin.

Breen: Thank you.

3H. 25-40: 366 Hope St, Tom Bergenholtz Discuss and act on removal of rear chimney.

Thomas Bergenholtz present.

Bergenholtz: I'm here tonight for the removal of a rear chimney that is structurally unsafe and really causes a lot of concern for safety.

Toth: There is a failed inspection report from the Building Official in the packet.

Bergenholtz: As you know we are doing the third floor and we are taking down to the studs and when you get to certain points of construction like that you find some very interesting things. So, when we got to this point, we went up into the attic and as you can see by the photos, the photo that shows the shows the attic with the chimney. It is resting on 2x6s and that span that it is resting on, that's really the bottom of the chimney and the boards are bending. You can also see some water damage into the mortar and the mortar is starting to break away. If you look at the next photo, you can see a pipe sticking down from the ceiling. That used to be a gas furnace which is now gone. You can see where they supported the four boards that are still standing, the vertical board, there are some 2x4s that are actually holding up some of those 2x6s. Basically, it's a real safety hazard. If you look at a couple of other pictures, it is not significantly visible from either Hope or Church Street. I really need to get it down. (Approaches the Commission to show photograph.) There is a deck that is right below the roof line and there are three door. There is a door to one of the units, there is a deck, there's a door to the second egress for other units in the building and there's a third door. So, if that chimney goes it could hurt or kill someone. It's really in rough shape and I really need to get it down. I also had a structural engineer, Steve Otten, from Northeast Engineering, take a look at it and he said it is really bad shape.

Millard: Did this chimney go down to first floor?

Bergenholtz: Yes.

Millard: So, they took it away and then supported on the top.

Bergenholtz: Yes. There are four other chimneys which are the major focus of the house that have been repaired. We don't use them, but they are structurally sound.

Lima: Any other questions? Is there anyone in the audience who would like to speak for or against this application? Can we have a motion please.

Motion made by Ponder to approve the application as presented to remove the rear chimney that is structurally unsafe and repairing that particular section of the roof. Finding of fact that there is a failed inspection report from the Structural Building Inspector, Steve Greenleaf. It has been altered from its original state; Seconded by Allen.

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

Secretary of Interior Standards: #5, 6

Project Monitor: Chris Ponder

Lima: When you get the certificate, please put it in the front of the house where visible.

3I. 25-43: 8 Constitution St, John Marshall Discuss and Act on addition of second story and associated materials.

John Marshall and Cordelia Dawson present.

Marshall: My wife and I are excited to come to Bristol. We met with the neighbors, Elaine and Bob, to discuss the house and showed them the new rendering. We tried to incorporate a lot of the changes that you had suggested along with the materials that you suggested. Cordelia Dawson can present the material list and answer any questions.

Allen: Have you seen this letter?

Dawson: No.

Allen: It is important for you to see it.

Dawson: Would you us to address any of the concerns?

Lima: Present what you came to present first.

Dawson: The property was built in 1904. It is a modest footprint of under 900sqft of living space. John and Vivienne would like to add a second-floor addition to make it more appropriate for modern living standards and to fit their needs. They proposed an addition and we understand we want to preserve the massing of original

home which I believe was determined to be originally a doctor's office. There's also existing single pane, single hung wood windows with a diamond pattern which are on most of the windows, but not all. They're proposing that we save the best and those that are in disrepair and need reglazing and other improvements, but to save the best ones and we will keep them at the front of the house. The second-floor addition will contain new double hung windows, Andersen E series, aluminum clad with true divided light. The owners are open to carrying the diamond pattern on the second floor, but in an effort to distinguish between what was original and what is new, they're currently showing them without any pattern.

Allen: I think that's was we discussed last time.

Dawson: Additionally in order to distinguish what was original verses what was new, they're looking to preserve shingle siding on the first floor and switch to clapboards above. We are proposing LT smart side engineered wood siding which is a siding that is available in both shingles and clapboards, and it is a wood base that has additives and coating which allows it to last much longer. Also available in trim products. It cuts and appears as wood. Additionally, there are details on the existing home which are exposed decorative rafter tails. They would like to preserve them and make new ones out of wood to match on the addition. Additionally, they would like to rebuild the front porch as some of it is in rough shape. They want to go across the front of the house in keeping more with the neighbor's house, they want to add a hipped roof as it currently has a flat roof. This will help to give the first floor a larger presence. It extends the mass and helps the second floor be slightly smaller overall. They also plan to add balcony off rear of the property. The railing materials proposed would be glass for the new addition. Composite decking is proposed for the rear and cedar for the front porch. We also propose new fiberglass doors for the front and side entry and also replacing the existing garage door with a custom-made wood door. The driveway improvement would be to take the existing pavers and reset them into a new crushed stone bed. We have included a photo of what is there currently, but we would try to match that if there wasn't enough. We will lay it out in a more organized manner that will be easier to maintain. I was going to comment on Catherine's letter, but I will wait for your

questions. I will clarify that in the last round there was a room that was marked as a closet, but that was a typo on the plan. It was always intended to be a bedroom at the front of the addition on the second floor.

Lima: How long was it empty for?

Marshall: The tenant vacated the property sometime in October.

Lima: So, it was not owner occupied?

Marshall: No. It has been rented for years. The house is in such disrepair. The bathroom sink had a huge hole in it and the water was pouring on the floor. I spoke with my neighbor, Bob, and he said that the chimney is in such disrepair that bricks were falling off onto the sidewalk almost hitting people. Many of the windows don't work. We're excited to hopefully make it look great and make Bristol proud.

Lima: Thank you.

Dawson: I just wanted to clarify that they intend to demolish the existing chimney, move it, and rebuild it on the west elevation. It would be a new brick chimney.

Allen: I am not in favor of fiberglass door as the entry door on the existing house. So, I'm wondering if we could revisit that at some point. Secondly, I have to agree with what was said at the meeting with Catherine Zipf, that it really is changing this house. It's really taking away from what was a cottage. I have been on this board since 2006 and I can only think of one house that we allowed to build a second story and it's one that fits very nicely. It was an old service station on the northern part of High Street. It's not a big footprint on the second floor. Here, you're taking and adding a pretty large second floor and it's really changing what I think is the historic characteristics of the house. I thought about this for a month, and I am against this. If it could be a smaller addition set back. This is much too large for this particular house.

Marshall: I visited the house you suggested. I can show you the pictures. It doesn't fit with any of the houses next to it at all. It's a completely different style.

Allen: It matched with the house that was previously there which was a stucco house. It was only one story so they went up.

Marshall: The house today was a two bedroom with no door so one of the bedrooms looks directly into the kitchen. For my wife and I that would be a problem. It's only 800sqft.

Allen: just my opinion.

Ponder: When we saw this two months ago, I walked the street and looked at it. I think this plan does change the house, but I think the house is diminutive on that street. So, I'm in favor of doing this. I think looking at this plan for the first time, the extension up is bigger than what I was expecting. I like plan. I like the changes you did to the plan. It makes it more of a livable space on that street. The only comment I would have is that it is a very obvious second floor instead of an adaptive second floor.

Millard: I wasn't here for the last meeting. I can't criticize the plan, but is there some way you could make the second floor a little setback? It would be nicer. It is important to make it livable. I like the diminutive feel. The second floor doesn't fit the character of it. I would like to see the second floor stepped back a little bit.

Marshall: By adding a hipped roof which would be on the front that's what we tried to do. One of things you guys wanted to do was make sure that the second floor didn't look at all like the first floor. I personally love the diamond shape on the windows, and I wanted to do that on the second floor along with the rafters so it would all look gorgeous, but I took your recommendation to make sure the second didn't look at all like the first floor. I think it would great with the diamond windows and the roof rafters. I am more than willing to do that. If we need to change the front door to something else, I am willing to do that as well. It's just my wife and I living in the house, but the house is unlivable currently and we would love to have a second floor. We did do the hipped roof around the entire house to do that.

Page: I'm a yes.

Lima: I agree with Mary that there should be a little more distinction between the second floor and the first floor. There should be a little bit more of a setback differentiating between the two. I think it is okay.

Dawson: I heard you say that stepping it back would make it desirable. Is there any chance of changing roof pitch. There's room there to bring it down and make it less imposing. The ceiling height is 8ft which is not acceptable. It's fairly modest by today's design standards. Given that we need a fair amount of height for inflation with modern energy codes, our buildings are getting bigger. Is there space to alter the roof which is hipped at this point to bring it back. If we were to bring that down to a less steep roof, it would overall diminish the entire height of the addition.

Lima: That wasn't the issue for me. Height is not the issue. I would like to see the separation between what the cottage is and the new addition. Maybe it would if the roof was pitched differently, but if there is a way to step the second floor back a bit.

Ponder: The front of the second floor addition is directly over the first floor. If it was stepped back a foot so it would look a little better.

Dawson: Okay. Setting back one foot is more reasonable than 1/3.

Ponder: Just a small step back. There's a house on Burton that did an extension, and we asked him to step it in just to make sure there was more of a delineation from the new. That's what we're asking for here.

Dawson. Okay. So, setting the front elevation back a foot from the existing and revising door to a wood door.

Ponder: So, the diamond pattern on the windows upstairs I like, but you don't have to.

Marshall: I would love to do diamond windows and the roof rafter.

Page: I actually thought that losing the roof rafters would be unfortunate.

Millard: I like diamond pattern as well.

Dawson: That's what's desired.

Lima: Are there any other questions? Is there anyone in the audience who would like to speak for or against this application? And just for the record, Catherine Zipf's letter has been passed out.

Bob Hope: He showed me the rendering. Mary wasn't here the last time I was here. Yes, it was my great-grandfather's first doctor's office in Bristol. It holds historical value to my family. The biggest problem I have is it is close to my property. We had it surveyed, and I'm worried about water runoff, snow, and it has a dirt foundation. I heard that if he stays the same distance on the property it doesn't have to go to zoning. Is that true?

Lima: I don't know.

Hope: The problem I have is that it is a bungalow. He bought a bungalow for him and his wife. He came into our Town and bought a bungalow. Nice little place. I don't agree with the second floor. The structure he showed me is all square. The neighborhood is changing. Whatever you decide, I'll support it and try to be a good neighbor.

Lima: Thank you.

John McClosky: The house was built in 1902 not 1904. I July of 1971, Lombard Posey did a survey on the house and the historic value listed by Lombard's survey was a 1A. A 1A, I believe, refers to architectural significance to a particular geography at the time. So, there is no question that this house is historic and has extreme historic value to Bristol and to the integrity of the Historic District Commission. I'm sorry 2A is the architectural value and 1A is the historical value. I would urge the HDC to study this and make sure that we're not ruining the fabric of our Town by making these big increases to these homes. It is really unfortunate that people can come in, do their due diligence, buy a 500sqft or 600sqft cottage knowing what they're getting and then decide that they can't live there because it's too small. Thank you very much.

Lima: Thank you. Anyone else? Is there a motion?

Motion made by Ponder to approve the application as presented to add the second story with the modification from the application of having a step back of one foot from the current design, to amend the front door applied for to wood, to change the second floor Constitution Street side windows to a diamond pattern as presented in the original concept review, and the addition of rafter tails on the second floor. All other details in application besides the ones that have been specified are approved as applied for; Seconded by Page.

Voting Yea: Lima, Ponder, Page, and Millard

Opposed: Allen

Lima: Motion carries 4 to 1.

Secretary of Interior Standards: #5, 9

Project Monitor: Chris Ponder

Lima: When you get your certificate, please put it in the front window where visible.

Marshall: Thank you.

3J. 25-44: 132 High St, Dean & Susan Morris Discuss and act on addition on rear elevation, change to windows, repair to siding, windows, and chimney.

Dave Rizzolo and David Andreozzi, architects, present.

Andreozzi: Our clients bought this property, and they want to restore the house and part of that is to modernize inside, but a key part of that is to preserve most of the historic architecture. On the first floor the most important thing is to make a logical, modern kitchen and family room which really can't be done without removing fireplaces and chimneys and things like that. In going through the sketches, we propose a small addition 11'8"x13'10" at the back of the house that cannot be seen from the front. This would give them just enough room to relocate the kitchen and add a small sitting area with a small table and basically modernize the house. We're doing some minor configurations, but the inside of the house is basically being preserved.

The key concept is that we are stepping this addition back the length of the craning on both elevations and we're doing that to keep it, in our opinion, in alignment with Secretary of Interior Standards to make it clear that it was an addition, and it was never part of the original house. I'm not sure whether the original house was actually just the center and the parts to the left were an addition as well, but that's a whole different issue. The point is that it is not matching the main house or the addition to the north which is really the historic fabric which makes it so beautiful. We are using clapboard which is used on the north addition, and we are not reusing coining, we are using clapboards to again differentiate the architectural style on the outside fabric of the house. So, it would be clear to everyone looking at it that it was not original and that it was done in phases. The plans are to relocate two existing windows that are in the house now and relocate them to the north elevation, and we're going to restore them. Our goal is to hopefully restore all of the windows. We will have an expert come in and restore anything that is rotted. Anything that would be replaced, we would come to you, but that's not our goal. Our goal is to restore it. We are replacing both roofs. We've had a mason look at the chimneys. They're going to try and repair them, but I think we would like to get an application to replace them in kind just from the roof up because they are in such bad condition. So, that would be the goal is to just take them down to the roof and then replace them back totally in kind. Finally, we would like to replace the storm windows.

Lima: I think that's a sign off.

Andreozzi: That's a sign off?

Toth: The flat roof is exempt and the roof is a sign off as well.

Andreozzi: That's basically what we are coming before you for. There is going to be an elevated patio in back which we will be working with a landscape architect, but it's not in your preview as it is not designed yet. The last issue is there is a shed on the back of the garage. That shed is a new shed. I believe there are pictures in there that shows the inside. It's new framing and a new foundation and we just want to remove that and repair it and bring it back to the original elevation.

Ponder: Your intent on the chimneys are to take them out down to the roof and replace.

Andreozzi: If they can be repointed then that's what we're going to do. The mason looked at it and he said that they may have to be replaced.

Ponder: 1200 Hope Street basically took a brick and shaved it in half and then put it back on. It took the weight down a lot.

Lima: Kyle Ritchie did that.

Ponder: It's just an option for you.

Lima: If you have questions, you can ask him.

Andreozzi: They're very complicated chimneys. One chimney has 4 flues going up. Thank you for recommendations.

Lima: Should I mark this Exhibit 1.

Toth: Yes.

Rizzolo: That picture is of the shed from the inside. If you look, you can see that it is sitting on a contemporary concrete foundation and all of the framing looks like it was probably from the 1980s or 1990s.

Lima: Any questions? Is there anyone in the audience that would like to speak for or against this application? Can we have a motion?

Motion made by Allen to accept the application for the work that has been proposed and the addition at the back of the property, and maintenance work to repair the siding and trim, windows, and chimneys; Seconded by Ponder.

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

Secretary of Interior Standards: #5, 6 and 9

Project Monitor: Chris Ponder

3K. 25-45: 417 Hope St, Jacob Milne Discuss and act on change to front entrance from wood to brownstone appearance.

Robert Page recused.

Jacob Milne present.

Milne: So, the front steps have been in disrepair for quite some time. Currently we're working on a plan to try to do what we believe is most accurate to what the steps would have been. Based on some of our exploration we've noted that there is modern PT supporting that 2by material that's being used as decking right now. What I'm proposing is basically rebuilding the brick that was behind the Portland cement that we originally had there that has been broken back and parging it to match the brownstone with Lithomex which is the product we are using on the headers across the street as well.

Allen: It looks wonderful.

Milne: Thank you. Basically, the idea is now to do the face and the sides with Lithomex. After having a conversation with my mason, we have some concerns about originally my intent was to basically continue that look over the top where that 2by material is, but we have some concerns about how exactly we can do that without potentially causing larger issues down the line as we are putting brick back and there's basically a fieldstone foundation underneath that. The concern is that if we pour on top of it, it could damage that brick, moisture could get in there and pop the brick and create cracks and other issues over time. So, basically what I would like to do is some type of wood material as the topper. My initial thought was something like maybe mahogany. I'm open to suggestions. I have been digging through whatever I can find to try to find old photos that showed what potentially was there before because that would be my goal. As of right now, since there's only wood there that's where my head is at. The other alternative I did have, and I don't know if you noticed, but we had to repair one of the walls by basically taking it all the way down and unfortunately, we found out that the foundation was compromised so we had to pour a foundation to then build that wall back up. In doing so, we removed quite a bit of fieldstone from that foundation and one other thought was to potentially find a way to mortar

that fieldstone on top of those two areas. Those were the two ideas that I had since we looked at it a little more. I'm certainly open to your thoughts or if anyone has any information or other photos that might help.

Allen: Have you been to the Historic Preservation Society?

Milne: I have. Unfortunately, I haven't been able to find anything that shows that portion of the building. I even dug through the national archives. I've tried Google searches and anything I could think of. There's not much out there.

Millard: Have you ever thought about the size of the portico being reduced? The original portico might have been just the same width as the steps and that it was never a full porch like that?

Milne: It is certainly possible. I wondered if that portico was even originally there just based off of the trim that you see at the head of the door. If you walk into the portico and you look at the head of the door, there is actually some ornamental trim right at the head that I wouldn't imagine they would have put there if there had already been a portico.

Millard: It might have been structured differently. There are not that many brick houses from this time period in Town. They all have conflicting messages with their porticos, porches, and pediments. Things have changed over two centuries. You have done a lot of work supporting this already.

Milne: Right now we have just broken it away and getting it ready to basically do what we have to build it back up and replace the wood that is starting to decay in there that was used as nailers. I would certainly be open to that. I have to look a little bit more closely at what exactly that would look like. I can't quite picture it right now but obviously bringing it back down to those two pillars right down to that brownstone. I definitely want to look just a little bit closer to see what that would end up looking like.

Millard: Have you determined if those pillars are original or not?

Milne: So, my assumption is that they are original. Whenever that portico was put in and honestly based on what we found after were knocked that Portland cement back a lot of the foundation technique they used is what we saw was carried throughout the house. The brick that was wrapping that was also brick from the same time period which is a very unique brick that was most likely brought here from England. That's what my mason has told me. Because of that, it makes me think that the portico was added on soon after, but I think it was always that size.

Millard: Thanks.

Lima: You've done a lot of good work.

Milne: Thank you. I appreciate it. I also appreciate your patience with this as it has not been a quick project.

Lima: In future, I would suggest that you make a wish list and put everything on the list that you would like so you don't have to keep coming back. If you put everything together and ask for it then you don't have to keep putting in new applications.

Milne: Definitely. It's something that has crossed my mind. Thank you.

Lima: This is a new project to you and every time you turn a corner there's something new that happens. We do appreciate your diligence. Anybody have any questions?

Allen: You're asking for our opinion, right?

Milne: Yes. My original plan isn't going to work quite how I hoped it would. My goal is to just restore it to what it should have been, especially the front entrance. It is a prominent house where it is and I want to do what's right for the house.

Allen: I've walked by this house for 24+ years and never new there was wood planks there until I saw your photos.

Milne: They blended pretty well. I'm not opposed to doing some sort of wood planking again. The only thing I probably would want to do is picture frame it as opposed to having just the raw end of the wood facing the street.

Lima: I also think that you wanting to use some of the fieldstone is interesting.

Milne: I don't really have a use for it right now so I thought it would be a good way to incorporate it.

Millard: It wouldn't really show.

Lima: I agree with Mary that it wouldn't really show.

Milne: Yeah, you really wouldn't know it was there until you got close to it. It's one of those hidden details.

Allen: Could you use a brownstone slab?

Milne: I haven't quite explored that yet. My only concern with brownstone is over time it does start to decay, and you can kind of see that on those steps. Luckily they are in good enough shape that we haven't had to touch them. That is my only concern with the brownstone.

Lima: Maybe somewhere else on the property you can make a patio or sitting area with the fieldstone.

Milne: We're holding onto all of it right now and my goal is to try to find some way like your suggestion to incorporate it and keep it with the building.

Teitz: I share your intriguing interest about the portico. My first thought was that it was narrower or extended at some point. On the other hand, it looks like it matches the pediment at the top so maybe the physical evidence that has been introduced is that it is very close in time period to the original. My thought it is that either it is original or it has acquired historical significance and without any evidence to the contrary, it seems it should be kept pretty much the same and you should focus on the request before you for the side treatment of what would be going around there under the wood and if other evidence comes up we can always come back. It seems dangerous to deal with it without any evidence to the contrary. We are conjecturing.

Ponder: Do we want to approve you replacing it with wood and are we okay with you picture framing it instead of

just having planks or using the fieldstone that you found if you feel that's a better option.

Milne: I think both of those are viable options. That's where I kind of like to ask to make sure.

Ponder: I don't have a preference between the two to be honest with you.

Allen: I don't either. We're open to it. Is this something that we could leave it to the Project Monitor to discuss with him? You have some ideas of what you want to do.

Milne: Yes.

Allen: I can only speak for myself, but I have no problem with anything that you proposed. I don't know if everyone else feels that way.

Ponder: I feel the same. I was just looking in my phone to try to find some old pictures, but there aren't any.

Milne: I was surprised about that.

Teitz: To answer your question, John, I think it could be left to the Project Monitor. Basically, you're going to leave wood as the surface of the porch on either side, but the details of how the wood is framed and the facing of the foundation underneath the wood could be left to the Project Monitor.

Allen: Are you okay with that?

Milne: Yes, that would be fine.

Millard: I invite you to see my porch. It's an entry with a pediment not portico and my mother had the option of putting the portico back and they decided not to due to the expense at the time. Lombard Posey designed a pediment for it. The brownstone is deteriorating as we had put railing on it, but it shows symmetrically the proportions of front of house and it's much higher than the level that this house. Maybe you could come see it.

Milne: I would be curious to see it. Thank you.

Millard: The columns that were there were similar.

Milne: Thank you. I would be very intrigued.

Millard: 620 Hope Street.

Milne: Thank you. I will take a look.

Millard: It might help you decide because I don't get the wood on the extension. It makes me think that it was a porch going out and that some had just gotten an extra column.

Milne: I would be very curious to see. It is a little weird to me that they would have done wood and brownstone.

Millard: It seems like in that time period everybody was pretty tidy.

Lima: Is this the only folder we have on this property. I was wondering if there was some other historical stuff.

Toth: I can take a look.

Milne: I brought in one photo at the last meeting that I had found that was from somewhere between 1910 and 1920.

Lima: I'm just wondering if we had any record of previous owners coming before us with photos that could help you.

Milne: That would be awesome.

Lima: So, what do we want to do then?

Ponder: I guess approve this application with the binder that John could help make the determination of the final design.

Lima: Is there anyone in the audience who would like to speak for or against this application?

Linda Arruda: It just so happens, thankfully Mary spoke up, I've been fascinated with this house as I do business across the street at 418 Hope Street. You need to know that St. Michaels Church in 1861 was built on the corner of Hope and Church Street and the Minturn family that had a farm up where the animal shelter is donated the money for the brownstone of that church and I have been

fascinated about it. There were some discarded things on St. Michaels Church property and those two scrolls were offered by the Church to Ben Bergholtz and they're on Church Street on his side apartment. I can also tell you that most brownstone comes from a watery source and is very porous. I think that you can still consult Portland CT and maybe the Portland Brownstone Company, I believe they preserved it. You can go there. I like that brownstone on your building. It is proportionate to what is there. At Mary's house they put in railings, don't do it as it will do a job on the brownstone. I offer this in support of what you are doing. I applaud it and I think you're doing a great job. I will be hot on the trail to find out more about the brownstone.

Milne: Thank you.

Arruda: The columns are fascinating.

Lima: Any other questions? Would someone like to make a motion?

Motion made by Ponder to approve the application with the amendment to the original application that applicant is going to replace the wood at this point with wood and the final design will be approved by the Project Monitor, and to do the face and sides with brick to be parged over with Lithomex which will match the brownstone. Finding of fact that the original design of the front door, portico, or porch is unknown and the Project Monitor along with the applicant can make the final determination; Seconded by Millard.

Voting Yea: Ponder, Allen, Lima, and Millard

Secretary of Interior Standards: #9

Project Monitor: John Allen

4. Concept Review

4A. CR-25-2: 125 Hope St, 125 Hope Street ,LLC Concept Review for potential replacement buildings.

Toth: The applicant has requested a continuance.

Lima: Okay, so that's off.

Teitz: They can put it back on easily. Just continue it to July.

Lima: Okay. Does someone want to make a motion?

Ponder: Sure.

Motion made by Ponder to continue the concept review to the July 10th meeting; Seconded by Allen.

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

4B. CRHD-25-3: 583 Hope St. HBSBRI, LLC Concept review for additional floor on building.

Dan and Diane Shusman, homeowners, and Chris Cote, Architect, are present.

Toth: It's supposed to be 583 Hope not 538 Hope. My mistake.

Lima: How was it advertised?

Toth: 538 Hope.

Teitz: You can go ahead and hear this as it is only conceptual.

Dan Shusman: My father passed in 2023 and the estate settled in 2024 and I acquired this building in October of 2024 along with a Bradford Street parking lot. We are hoping to move from our current home in Sudbury, MA to Bristol and make this our retirement home by adding a residential portion while maintaining retail in the front. I am really hopeful that we can collaborate on these designs and that they're acceptable to you. It's a romantic aspiration of mine to return to Bristol. I would like to introduce Chris Cote and let him go through the concept with you.

Chris Cote: (Hands out packet to the Commission.)

Lima: do I need to put anything on this?

Toth: I got it.

Cote: In this packet there are a few existing photographs to get you oriented. The 4th sheet is a rendering of basic concept for our discussion here and then there are floor plans after that to get a sense of what the plan is. The project is in the single-story piece that's in the building next to the bank where there are 2 retail units currently in the building. This is obviously an incredibly prominent location. It's important to myself and to the Shusmans that we do something really appropriate here. We have not gotten too much into our architectural design process as we really wanted to get this in front of you, open a discussion, and get your early thoughts on this before we go too much further. It's a really visible spot and a big development for the downtown area and we're here to listen and have a good collaboration on this project.

Ponder: Is your intension to demolish the current structure and build a new one or are you just adding on to this structure?

Cote: If we can keep anything, we certainly would like to do so. It's a sizable building. From cost standpoint, we'll see what we can do.

Ponder: What year was building built?

Shusman: Sometime in the 1930s.

Cote: It doesn't seem to have any major historic value. I haven't seen any pictures of what it was before.

Lima: In terms of parking, I don't know if you have sat there and watched what goes on.

Cote: On the Bradford Street side.

Lima: When school gets out, there's no parking. Parents even go into the bank parking lot. I would strongly recommend that you have some dedicated parking. I know that you have it around the corner on Bradford Street, but just be aware of the fact that some people have no regard for businesses, etc.

Cote: The fact that they do own that parking lot and the plan is, from a zoning standpoint, to merge it into a single lot. That's a great benefit to a building in the downtown location to have parking. There will be a plan

for a garage and to keep a couple of spots for the retail tenants.

Lima: I did see that. I just wanted to let you know that it's not the easiest spot.

Ponder: I'm looking at this proposed view from northeast and it goes back. Since that parking lot is part of the property and you're merging it, are you going to build onto that?

Cote: If you go to the next sheet you'll see the first-floor site plan, it's mainly a garage there and even since this drawing we're talking about pushing it even closer to that existing Hope Street lot in order to reduce the footprint and to help out with the parking situation. The thought there is with that single story piece we just want to be understanding of the area. We do not want to do a 2-story building there so the neighbors still have views from their buildings. So, we're probably going to a low, flat roofed single story garage.

Ponder: The reason I'm asking is remember the Belvedere second phase looked like the building was encroaching on all of the other buildings. If you do that if you can keep it lower so it doesn't look like a monstrosity it would look more appropriate.

Cote: The goal here is to create a simple elegant building that is appropriate from a scale standpoint where it's of similar size of the retail portion of the building right next to it and maintaining that lower height. Fortunately, from a massing standpoint, the yellow building is a big three-story building with an attic. It's a big building and this is a two-story building with an attic and from a scale standpoint it feels appropriate and sympathetic to the surroundings and it's a similar scale to the bank building, so it feels like it makes sense from a massing standpoint.

Ponder: I like the setback of the second floor. The balcony is the only thing that makes me think that's not going to fit.

Cote: I've gone all over town looking at different conditions and there are different conditions here and there. There is an intentionality in how narrow it is.

It's 4½ft of usable space there. It's not a space where you can go out and have a bunch of furniture and things like that. It's really important to do that setback. I think it is so critical here to relate to the surroundings. We talked a lot about not making a big place there where you could have a whole bunch of furniture and stuff. It doesn't really want to feel like a balcony and that's where having that kind of raised parapet instead of open railings so you're not seeing that kind of thing. I absolutely understand that concern.

Lima: I think you could make it user friendly by having what you have on the roof deck on the west side, so the front still maintains the street scape over the retail area but then your personal space to enjoy the view is on the west side.

Cote: Yes. Part of the desire for the little balcony is that it is a great place to watch the parade. Again, there is no intention for it to be always a bunch of people up there and a bunch of furniture as it would detract from the landscape. It just wants to always be a very quiet thing. You would never really know it was a balcony unless, like on the 4th, there's a couple of people up there watching the parade.

Ponder: I agree. I don't know that current building is significant enough to really want to save it. I personally support the building. I think if I were to vote on something right now, I would say that I would like the balcony to be even smaller than this and make it more of like an observing balcony.

Cote: That's something we'll definitely take into consideration. I think if it was critical that it had a smaller footprint, I still think from an architectural standpoint it would want to look the same as it does now. That's certainly something we can talk about.

Ponder: Even if it had the exact same design, just set the railing back a little from the storefront. That's my opinion.

Cote: Thank you.

Allen: The building right now has no character, and I think this would add something to that area. I like it.

Lima: I like it. I think extension past where the bank is may be a little too big. You have a separation at the end of the second floor.

Cote: So that's really at the attic level. That's in order to provide that roof deck on the west side. So, the gable stops and then it ends up being kind of a flat roof.

Lima: Just looking at it on paper, it looks different.

Cote: Next time around when we come to you for full review, I will have more of these types of views from different places.

Millard: I like it very much.

Page: Back to the Ory's point, if you end that first roof line and you go to the second roof line, I don't mind the mass because you're next to the bank, but it seems awkward that you ended what is the house structure with no delineation on the side.

Cote: We can certainly study if there's some delineation there.

Allen: It gives it more mass than what I think is there. And you're saying that there is a deck on top of the back portion?

Cote: Yes. It would be significantly set back from edges so you're not going to see much. There will be a railing, but it would be something a lot lighter. There's a building on State Street next to the Bristol House of Pizza where there is a roof deck, and it has a cable rail which is very light and transparent. I think that might be the type of thing even though it is going to be set back 6ft from that edge, it's something that is light and as transparent as can be so it's not too visible.

Ponder: We've approved the cable railing.

Teitz: You haven't done any drawings of the garage yet?

Cote: Not this type of drawing, no.

Teitz: I think that will be very important even though Hope Street is the main front, Bradford Street is a considerable street too. There's just a parking lot there so putting a garage there might be fine, but I think it will be very important as to what the garage looks like. It should not look like a suburban garage, and it has some sort of other character to it.

Cote: Right.

Teitz: I don't know about how the other Commission members feel, but I almost feel like it should come farther to Bradford Street side and not be so far back. Just looking at the schematic it might be better to actually bring it closer to the street.

Cote: There's a complication there in that there is a curb cut which is only so much there. If that garage comes too far out, we will end up take out parking spots on Bradford which I would imagine is a no-no. So, there's some vehicular circulation challenges with that location.

Lima: Any other questions?

Dan Shusman: I very much appreciate that when you're driving south on Hope Street and pass that bank, you've left the residential feeling and enter into the commercial feeling, and this building has to help with that transition. And going down Bradford Street you have to feel in scale. So, as Chris was describing, our vision for this garage is a very low profile. We want to be good neighbors to all of the abutters to not block their views, to not cause snow problems for anyone, all of the things that I wouldn't want happening to me I don't want happening to them. I think that the idea of having retail on the bottom is a nice transition point also where you're entering that space it jives with the yellow building that has retail on the bottom and residential top. My closing remark to you is that our intention is that this building really does enhance the character of Bristol and replaces what is a saltbox kind of building with something that makes Bristol look that much more modern but at the same time keeps its historic character by this kind of quiet elegance to the exterior. The windows which we haven't discussed of course, they all have to be in character and, of course, that's a requirement of your Commission, but at the same time it's our require as well. Thank you.

5. Monitor Reports & Project Updates

6. HDC Coordinator Reports & Project Updates

Toth: There is nothing major to report. I am still plugging away with the standards guy.

Teitz: I just wanted to let you know that I saw something about the Historic District Commission in Providence has prepared a draft policy on window replacement. I was going to print it out and give it to you but it runs 33 pages. I emailed it to Nick and he will forward it to you so you can see it. It is something to think about. I haven't read it. I don't have any opinion on it. I just wanted you to be aware of it.

7. HDC Coordinator Approvals

8. Other Business

Allen: We've brought up several violations and concerns over the last few months. I haven't seen anything changed on any of those things that I brought to your attention. Can I send you a list rather than do it here and you can give us an update.

Toth: Sure.

Teitz: I will tell you on some of them a policy decision has been made not to enforce them, and others are awaiting time and so forth. Send us your list and we'll go through it and respond.

Lima: I must say that when I do call Nick with a concern, 99% of the time he's right on top of it.

9. Adjourned at 9:40 PM