TOWN OF BRISTOL, RHODE ISLAND

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

Historic District Commission Meeting Minutes
Thursday, August 6, 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

1. Pledge of Allegiance

The meeting was called to order at 6:05PM, and the Pledge of Allegiance was promptly recited afterwards.

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

Also present: Town Solicitor Teitz, Arnold Robinson, and Toth

2. Staff Report

2A. Staff Report

3. Review of Previous Month's Meeting Minutes

3A. Review of minutes of the June 29, 2026 meeting.

Chairperson Allen's corrections were as follows: Page 15, second paragraph, take out the sentence "Ms. Turchetta said the measurements allowed for the transom to stay" as the next sentence basically said the same thing and it seemed repetitive. Page 27, last paragraph, the sentence should read "an ADU," not "and ADU".

With no other comments or corrects, Chairperson Allen asked for a motion.

Motion made by Bergenholtz to accept the minutes as amended; Seconded by Church.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries

4. Review of Previous Month's Meeting Minutes

4A. Standards Guide Discuss and Act on Final Draft of Standards Guide

Arnold Robinson presented the Standards Guide to the Commission. He gave an overview of the project to the Commission. Mr. Robinson stated that he wanted it to be a one stop shop for all applicants to use in order to make the application process easier. Mr. Robinson said Nick was involved with the administrative side of things and some key topics related to new construction side and demolition of the Standards Guide. He said that the topics relating to the Secretary of Standards, preservation approach for key issues, architectural styles, and other issues were his responsibility to work on. After various meetings and drafts, he presented the current version to the Committee tonight. Mr. Robinson stated that the RIPHC had reviewed and approved the current draft of the Standards Guide as it met their standards and what RIPHC wanted to see out of the project.

Mr. Robinson said the document was written in a way that it was a living document. He stated it was mainly meant to be housed digitally where anyone could go to the HDC website and easily access the Standards Guide and find the section they needed quickly. Mr. Robinson said that as a living document it could be amended by the Commission at any time as new issues come up and evolve as need be in the future. He asked Nick if he missed anything. Nick said no and that he covered everything. He said the text of the document was on point, but the layout just needed some adjustments. He and Mr. Robinson were hoping that any final questions and comments could be addressed at the meeting, get it adopted, and start applying it to applications going forward.

Mr. Robinson stated there were editor notations for photographs as the graphics were out of his scope given the constraints on the budget. He said the Town had applied for a CLG grant; however, there were a lot of great photographs from the resurvey project that was done of the historic district that were ready to be applied for the first digital version if they wanted to use them.

Member Bergenholtz asked Mr. Robinson and Nick who was doing the graphics. Nick said the idea was the graphics grant would be for another consultant. He said before that would happen, he probably would put some photographs in from the resurvey. Member Bergenholtz said it would be great to get the Standards Guide up as fast as possible if Nick could get some photographs in it. Nick said he had spreadsheets with the different architectural types and would run it by the Commission before doing so as he didn't want to use a bad example depicting the wrong style. Chairperson Allen said it would be great to use as many photographs of local houses as possible. Nick said thanks to the resurvey they had many photographs of almost every house in Town or at least every house in the National Register district.

Chairperson Allen asked if the Standards Guide was going to only be digital. Nick said it was going to be digital primarily. Chairperson Allen asked if it was ever going to be published. Nick advised that if someone wanted a printed copy, he would print one for them, but they hadn't planned on printing and binding it as they wanted to keep it as a living document so it could be easily modified in the future. Chairperson Allen thought that was a good idea.

Mr. Robinson advised the Commission that the first 6 months of the Standards Guide going live is when there might be a lot of feedback and possibly changes made to it. Member Page stated it read really well. He did make a suggestion on page 16 under #8 the words "significant improvement". Nick stated those were the standards for rehabilitation which were taken directly from the National Park Service and couldn't be changed.

Chairperson Allen asked Member Page what he was referring to on page 16 under #8. Member Page stated he was referring to digging up the ground because someone thought there might have been something in the ground. Member Page went on to page 31, under the 1st bullet. He

stated the double paned and old windows and storms were not equal as he pointed out at the last meeting that there were 3 studies done by independent labs. Member Page said that the reference used in the Guide was not an unbiased source. Mr. Robinson asked Member Page which source he was referring to and Member Page said it was National Trust. Mr. Robinson said that came from the May meeting discussion, and he said there was another study that Member Page referenced, but that study was no longer available online. Member Page said there were 3 studies from 3 different national labs, and he had sent the references to Nick. He stated the last time he looked; they were all still available. Member Bergenholtz asked who sponsored the studies and Member Page said they were national labs paid by the federal government. He said they were the only studies done over a period of time wherein they were just doing research and not in favor of one side or the other. Mr. Robinson said he would go back and look.

Member Page went on to say that there were plenty of arguments for using old wood: 1) it looks right, and 2) it lasts longer. He stated that just looking at the cost aspect, the longevity would currently outweigh the 30% difference in energy cost. Member Page said they needed to be correct and deal with energy cost differential as it was. He said the other issue was that most of the national studies showed that the gain was having strom windows on the inside and not on the outside.

Mr. Robinson said he divided the content into 3 buckets. First, the overall standards for the preservation of existing and historic windows and doors and there were a series of bullets that dealt with it. Second, a discussion of repair v. replacement. Third, replacement of historic windows if the deterioration was too extensive where replacement needed to happen, it dealt with glass type, true divided lights, etc. Mr. Robinson stated that everything could certainly be amended and he would go back and look at the study citations and make sure they were available. He asked if he missed mentioning interior storm windows completely. Member Page said yes and it needed to be indicated. He said if an economic argument was going to be indicated, then it be done with real data. Mr. Robinson agreed that the bullet at the top of page 30 dealt with the issue from an aesthetic standpoint and not a performance standpoint.

Member Church said that energy efficiency wasn't as contingent on windows as there were other factors at play like insulation in the house, etc. She asked if they could really tell people that information. Member Page said he really didn't care how the economic argument was dealt with, but if something was mentioned, real data needed to be used. Member Church agreed.

Chairperson Allen asked Member Page who did the study on interior v. exterior windows. Member Page said he could only find 1 study which was done by a national lab. He said that it was done for only winter or summer, but he couldn't remember which season. Member Page stated that they should be as quick and light with the economics as they could. However, if they were going to say something, they needed to say something that the data could back up. Chairperson Allen said it should be more recent data than 2010 and 2012. Member Page stated there was going to be date issue with anything like that. Further, window manufacturers claim to be getting better and better. He said that one of the problems with double panes in particular is that the Argon will leak out so you only get a limited amount of time where it actually exceeds an older window or a rebuilt window and storms. Member Bergenholtz stated double pane windows tend to cloud up as well. Member Page said everyone had issues with them.

Mr. Robinson said that's why it was a good idea to have the Standards Guide primarily as a digital living document. He stated when there's a new study done down the road, it could easily be added to the Guide. He said he would go back and review everything and make sure all of the links were correct and properly working.

Member Ponder said a living document was great, but if a study came out in 6 months, did the Commission need to vote on it before dropping it in the Guide? Mr. Robinson asked Attorney Teitz for guidance as he felt the Commission would need to vote on it. Attorney Teitz stated the Commission would vote and also provide a copy to the Town Council. He said the Town Council didn't need to approve it, but they needed to get notified about it. Attorney Teitz said although the Commission wouldn't be doing a public hearing on it, the Commission would be doing it at a meeting, and the public could speak on it. Chairperson Allen said it would be done at a regular meeting at the end of the meeting. Attorney Teitz said

at the end or beginning but suggested at the beginning of the meeting would be preferable.

Attorney Teitz mentioned that he had a colleague from his office, David, read the Standards Guide draft, and thought it was very good. He said that David commented that the comment about architectural styles in Bristol read like a side note. He felt it should be more towards the end because all of the rest of it was procedural stuff. Attorney Teitz asked if it would detract people from looking at it? If not, leave it where it is. Nick said it could be moved wherever the Commission felt. Alternate Member Camara asked if Attorney Teitz felt it should be an addendum rather than in the body. Attorney Teitz felt it shouldn't be in the middle of the body. Member Ponder suggested in an appendix that had notations. He said there were some general standards that could also be in an appendix.

Attorney Teitz stated the Commission wanted people to see the standards and the architectural styles, but where it was placed might throw people off. Chairperson Allen took a poll. Member Ponder suggested putting it in an appendix with a reference on the front. Member Page liked it where it was. Member Lima stated she didn't have a preference as everyone was going to read the Guide differently and was leaving it up to the experts. Member Bergenholtz stated it would be cool to see visuals when going through a document like this. He said where it was currently located, it would engage an individual to keep reading. He liked it where it was. Alternate Member Camara was fine with it either way but could see the argument from both sides. Member Church agreed with Member Bergenholtz. Chairperson Allen said he might be the only one that wanted to see it towards the end. Member Church suggested that it be in both places. Member Bergenholtz said wait to see what it looks like when it's live.

Member Lima thanked Nick and Mr. Robinson for taking their work on the Standards Guide as it was very readable. She said it was great for someone who was just starting out. She stated it appealed to the people on the street and the glossary was great. Mr. Robinson said the glossary was a labor of love.

Member Church said it was now up to Nick to encourage applicants to use it. Nick said that he has had many people ask about a Standards Guide.

Mr. Robinson asked if the Commission had any other comments. Nick stated with regard to materials and designs, he has seen a lot of people using AI to make applications. He said it was fine for a concept review, but he was starting to see people using AI images for designs and drawings for their applications. Nick wanted to include in the Standards Guide a policy that AI images were never acceptable for submission and approval in applications as it was going to become a problem. Member Lima said it was good idea. Nick said it was okay for a concept review, but never acceptable for an actual application. Member Bergenholtz agreed but felt it was going to be hard to enforce. Nick said it's been easy to spot AI images as things are usually out of proportion, or a little too perfect, etc. He said they need to at least discourage it.

Member Church said on the flip side, they could at least show what is acceptable like contractor renderings, scale drawings, architectural drawings, etc. Chairperson Allen stated that there have been applications where an applicant has taken something like a picture of a door and digitally placed it on a picture of their house and asked if that wasn't allowed. Member Church said if the applicant had a product sheet, that makes a difference as it backs up the image. Attorney Teitz said the difference is when an applicant asked AI to merge a photograph of a particular door they wanted with an actual photograph of their house versus taking that photograph of the door and placing it on AI rendered house. Member Bergenholtz said they needed to proceed with caution.

Nick said that he would do specific language to make it clear what was and wasn't acceptable regarding AI imagery and photoshopping.

Member Lima asked if a motion was needed to adopt the draft. Attorney Teitz said it was on the agenda to discuss and act on the final draft so the Commission should consider doing so. He also suggested letting anyone in the audience an opportunity to speak before voting.

Mr. Robinson said he would go back and look up the studies regarding the windows and put the correct ones in the Guide. Member Page said the studies he referenced were done by Pacific Northwest National Lab (PNNL) and National Research Electric Lab (NREL).

Chairperson Allen asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to speak. Linda Arruda came forward. She was delighted with the Standards Guide and has missed Arnold's input. She thanked everyone for doing it and said applicants will have a better understanding of the process.

Chairperson Allen asked for a motion.

Motion made by Church to approve the Bristol Historic District Commission Standards Guide as amended; Seconded by Page.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries

5. Application Review

5A. 26-97: 260 High St/Walley School, Town of Bristol
Discuss and act on installation of chain link shielding/security fence and gate around HVAC equipment.

Warren Rensehausen, Director of Bristol Parkes & Recreation, was present and presented the application to the Commission. He also stated that there was a plan to add some vegetation around 3 sides of the area while leaving the front open for easy access. Chairperson Allen said that the emerald green arborvitae were prone to getting chewed by deer and said another variety of arborvitae might be better. Mr. Rensehausen said they wanted something that was going to grow a bit wide but not overly tall.

Member Ponder stated that the fence type was not allowed under the new standards. Chairperson Allen said that it was previously approved behind Reynolds. Nick said the Town's concern was a wood fence would get damaged quickly and get vandalized. Mr. Rensehausen said it was also

combustible near the electronic equipment and there was already a standing backstop that had been there for decades.

Member Page understood that it was grandfathered in, but if the Commission continued to do it with residential verses industrial, i.e., having two different standards, it didn't make sense. Chairperson Allen asked Member Page what he would do. Member Page said to put in a wood fence. Mr. Rensehausen didn't think it was necessary as there was an existing backstop 5ft from it. He said a wood fence would stick out and increase the possibility of a fire. Member Page stated if that was going to be the Commission's position, then they needed to change the standards.

Chairperson Allen asked for the Commission's opinion. Member Bergenholtz said that they should look into changing the standard. He felt the application made sense as it was presented because it was a commercial property. Chairperson Allen agreed with Member Bergenholtz. He said the Commission had approved the fence in the back of Reynolds less than a year ago.

Attorney Teitz said it was not so much a legal thing, and asked Mr. Rensehausen if he had considered something like an aluminum fence. Mr. Rensehausen had not since the backstop was approximately 5ft away, it made sense to keep the fence the same throughout. He said they didn't want it to stick out on the property.

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

Motion made by Page to approve application #26-97 for the installation of a chain link fence with black ribbing, and plantings as presented; Seconded by Lima.

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

Opposed: Page

Motion carries 6 to 1

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9

Project Monitor: Susan Church

5B. 26-33: 145 High St, Danny Ferreira Discuss and Act on modification to approved design to meet zoning requirements.

Danny Ferreira was present. Mr. Ferreira presented the application to the Commission. Member Bergenholtz asked Mr. Ferreira if he would have been able to keep the garage, it would have been located closer to the property line. Mr. Ferreira stated the garage was pre-existing, but what he was doing now was not pre-existing. He wasn't sure what the new owners were going to be doing. Member Bergenholtz asked Mr. Ferreira how many feet the design would be shifting on the property. Mr. Ferreira stated the existing setback was 6.7ft and it was now going to be 10ft.

Member Church said the description stated three townhouses. Nick stated that description was from the old application. Mr. Ferreira said it was now a single family with an ADU. Member Church said the ADU was above the garage and Mr. Ferreira said yes. Member Church asked if it was still a 2-bay garage and Mr. Ferreira said yes. Member Church said it was fine and felt it looked like a New England home. She asked Mr. Ferreira if the dormers were the ones that were approved of in the previous application. Mr. Ferreira said the dormer on the left side was an existing dormer and the dormer on the right-hand side was the new proposed dormer. Member Church asked if the dormer was part of the application. Nick stated that it had already been approved and that everything on the application was basically taking the already approved application and shifting it 3½-4ft to the left in order to satisfy zoning requirements.

Chairperson Allen asked Nick where was it advertise as such. Nick said it was advertised as to discuss and act on modification to approve design to meet zoning requirement. Chairperson Allen said he thought that was just for the setback. Nick said it was. Attorney Teitz said that was correct.

Chairperson Allen asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to speak for or against the application. Sebatian Wordell came forward to speak.

Mr. Wordell stated that Mr. Ferreira told him that he was going to take down trees and put up arborvitae so Mr. Wordell wouldn't have to see it. He asked if that was still part of the plan as it was still a big building. Member Bergenholtz informed Mr. Wordell that the Commission did not have any authority over the vegetation on the property. Mr. Wordell understood but said the Commission had authority over what it was going to look like. Attorney Teitz referred Mr. Wordell to the Zoning Board plans and if it showed vegetation then that's what Mr. Ferreira needed to do. Mr. Wordell said it didn't show anything and it was discussed at the Commission meetings several times. Attorney Teitz reiterated to Mr. Wordell that the Commission did not have any jurisdiction regarding softscape landscaping. If it wasn't on the plan, then it could be assumed that it wasn't going to be done unless Mr. Ferreira decided to do it.

Nick asked if there was anyone else in the audience who wanted to speak. With no one else coming forward, Chairperson Allen asked for a motion.

Motion made by Bergenholtz to approve application #26-33 as presented with the slight modifications to move it as per the zoning recommendations; Seconded by Church.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9

Project Monitor: Ben Bergenholtz

5C. 26-53: 224 Hope St, Gregory Leonetti Discuss and act on issues with windows.

Greg Leonetti was present. Mr. Leonetti presented the history of the situation and application to the Commission.

Chairperson Allen asked Member Page if he wanted to present the information he found on the situation.

Attorney Teitz stated before Member Page did that, he wanted to point out that there was another item on the agenda that related to this situation which should be addressed now. It was noted on the record that the letter regarding 224 Hope Street was to be combined with the application discussion. Chairperson Allen asked if there was anyone present to present the letter. Member Bergenholtz said it was mentioned at one of the meetings that 3 experts had gone through the house and said that those weren't the original windows and the Commission had a letter saying that wasn't the case. Attorney Teitz asked Mr. Leonetti if he saw the letter in question and Mr. Leonetti said yes.

Member Page reviewed the record, and the issue was more physics than look although the Commission anticipated that the windows would follow the form that existed. That didn't happen. He advised Mr. Leonetti in spite of what the contractor said to Mr. Leonetti, there are very few examples of windows in hard surface buildings that are not inset. Member Page said the ones that can be found are closer to the era of Mr. Leonetti's building. It was learned that the physics for hard surfaced buildings was to inset the windows within the framework of the building, i.e., backing them into the space because the hard surface and the wood expand and contract differently depending on moisture and heat.

From Member Page's perspective, and other Commission Members would have different ideas, the issue that Mr. Leonetti's contractor presented him with is physics in that those windows are going to leak. He said the hard surface and the wood were going to expand and contract differently and separate which is why windows were inset in hard surface buildings. Member Page said it didn't matter if the building was for residential or commercial use. He said there were examples otherwise, but they failed. He stated there were 2 things that Mr. Leonetti was going to have to do. First, he would have to deal with the wood at the top of the window that was going to leak. If he had inset the windows and still had the stone lintels, it would have covered it. Second, Mr. Leonetti was going to have to deal with the window expanding outward away from the brick. Member Page said as a Commission looking back at this, they would in the future spend more time discussing the way windows are done in different buildings so issues like this didn't

happen again. He wasn't sure what the solution was in this situation and Mr. Leonetti needed a solution.

Mr. Leonetti said his contractor mentioned that on top of trim there's something that will help. Member Page said the Commission wasn't in the position to dictate where he should go with it. He said there were metal pieces that Mr. Leonetti could put at the top of the windows, or he could build out a new lintel to cover it. Member Page said that he certainly would not use caulking or a sealant because the expansion and contraction was going to be too great.

Mr. Leonetti said the windows were never a true recessed window. He stated some of the pictures showed that the windows were never recessed but rather they were flush with the brick. Mr. Leonetti said there was a ¼ or ½ inch bead of caulking running down and that's what was relied upon and coupled with metal or whatever component the contractor advised, it would combine the effect to disburse the water and provide the proper seal around the windows.

Member Page said keeping those windows from leaking was going to be very difficult. He stated that houses in coastal towns that have hard surfaces have windows that are inset. Chairperson Allen told Mr. Leonetti that the Commission wasn't asking him to remove the windows and replace them but rather advising him that he will have problems in the future with the way the windows were installed.

Member Bergenholtz stated the trim should be removed. He said that Mr. Leonetti agreed that the trim was never discussed because the trim was never there, and it was something that the contractor decided to do. Member Bergenholtz said looking at an important federal house in downtown Bristol and seeing the trim that was now blocking the lintel was not right and needed to be removed. He respected what Member Page stated about it leaking, which it will eventually, but it was more about the aesthetics. Member Bergenholtz said the Commission was here to protect the integrity of the historic district, and this was a violation of what was supposed to happen. Chairperson Allen said even though it was never discussed. Member Bergenholtz said it was never discussed because it was never there. He said the trim was not supposed to be on a federal brick house.

Chairperson Allen asked Member Bergenholtz if he thought the trim could be removed and Member Bergenholtz didn't know. Member Bergenholtz stated that was not what a federal house was supposed to look like and that was not what had come before the Commission as the house was in fairly original condition.

Mr. Leonetti disagreed on the original condition of the home. He noted that there was a site visit and those were not the original windows. Member Bergenholtz said he received a phone call stating the house in question was featured on a show on HGTV and that at the end of the show it said that the house was for sale, and he asked Mr. Leonetti if that was true. Mr. Leonetti said it was not for sale. Member Bergenholtz asked Mr. Leonetti if it was intention to sell it and Mr. Leonetti said no. Mr. Leonetti stated there had been rumors about it. He said it was a reality TV show which was filmed last December and he clearly still owns the home. It was dramatized and any basis on the show was completely irrelevant. Member Bergenholtz agreed that it didn't matter. However, what did matter was the fact that the trim was incorrect, and Member Bergenholtz would like to see the trim removed.

Member Church agreed with Member Bergenholtz about the trim. She said that not one brick building that had any wood trim around the windows, and all of the windows were recessed. Member Church stated that at the site visit, she was against replacing all of the windows. She said some of the original windows had wavy glass and she was hoping that Mr. Leonetti would use some of the original windows for at least the front of the house. Member Church remembered asking at the site visit if it was going to look the same from the outside, but she didn't remember what Mr. Leonetti's response was. However, her intention was that it wouldn't change the outside aspect of the house. Member Church said it looked so inappropriate for that style and age of the home.

Mr. Leonetti appreciated her input and opinion. He said the neighbors have been very complimentary of the project. He said the home was crumbling, falling apart, and was neglected for 20+ years which was shown in the site visit. Mr. Leonetti felt that it was never discussed. Member Church said the trim was never presented as part of the application, so it had not been approved.

Chairperson Allen was not sure what the Commission should do and asked Attorney Teitz' guidance. Attorney Teitz said everyone was hoping to get to some common ground but that didn't happen. He stated there wasn't an application pending before the Commission nor was there any indication of future intent to submit an application for either removing the trim or for putting some sort of protective measure over the protruding part of the window trim from Mr. Leonetti. It was Attorney Teitz' opinion that the trim wasn't discussed because it wasn't part of the application. He said the windows were to have been replaced as is and not in a different configuration. He didn't think there was anything else to do at the moment except move on in the meeting. Attorney Teitz said there would be a notice of violation and let a court decide whether it was approved or not since no agreement was reached. He stated that a neutral arbitrator should decide that question.

Mr. Leonetti wanted it acknowledged that, as part of the process, this was his 1st time going through this. He looks at the Commission as a resource to help guide him through the process and Mr. Leonetti asked why the trim was never discussed. Member Bergenholtz said it was because the trim never existed. Mr. Leonetti asked what Member Bergenholtz meant and Member Bergenholtz said there was no trim on the house. Mr. Leonetti said there was trim on the house. Attorney Teitz said there was no trim protruding beyond the surface. Mr. Leonetti continued to state that there was trim on the house. Attorney Teitz said there was a window casing and Mr. Leonetti said that was considered trim. Attorney Teitz stated that there was trim that was flush and now there was trim that was protruding from the house.

Attorney Teitz said if it was purely an aesthetic thing or a minor thing, then the Commission may have been more accepting that it was a mistake. However, what was presented to the Commission shows evidence that it will cause continuing problems not just to the windows, but the bigger problem is the damage to the walls, which is the structure of the house. The walls are going to be damaged and the whole house was being placed in jeopardy which now causes a lack of flexibility from the Commission's standpoint. Attorney Teitz stated that if Mr. Leonetti, for whatever reason, didn't want to take the issue up with his contractor, then maybe the

Commission could help. He said maybe with the Town's influence if Mr. Leonetti was able to point out to the contractor that there was no choice then maybe the contractor would step up and do something about it. He stated it was a serious problem, and everyone was sympathetic towards Mr. Leonetti. Mr. Leonetti didn't agree with the Commission's explanation. Attorney Teitz said that clearly neither side was changing their minds and Mr. Leonetti would have the opportunity to present it to an impartial party.

Mr. Leonetti said the door trim was the exact same as the window trim. Member Bergenholtz said it was such a federal aesthetic, and Mr. Leonetti didn't understand it at all. Mr. Leonetti said it wasn't a structural thing, but rather an aesthetic thing. He said that Attorney Teitz said it was a structural problem and Member Bergenholtz said it was an aesthetic problem. Member Bergenholtz said he always said it was an aesthetic issue and it completely ruined the federal aesthetic that Bristol was known for. Mr. Leonetti felt there was an oversight on the side of both parties and didn't believe there were any structural issues. He said a resolution should be reached. Member Bergenholtz said the resolution was to remove the trim that wasn't supposed to be there and was never allowed to be there.

Attorney Teitz suggested a motion to receive and file.

Motion made by Allen to receive and file a notice of violation that project wasn't completed as applied for; Seconded by Bergenholtz.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries

5D. 26-54: 244 Metacom Ave, Andrew Broten Discuss and act on demolition of stone structure.

Mr. Broten was not present.

Nick advised that this was just to hold Mr. Broten's place as guidance was just received back from the State and which was in the file. Nick advised the Commission

that the State didn't approve anything, they only provided guidance. He asked the Commission if they wanted to continue the application to the September meeting.

Motion made by Lima to continue application #26-54 to the September meeting; Seconded by Page.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries

5E. 26-94: 399 Hope St, St. Michael's Church Discuss and act on shortening of bell tower, repairs, and change to roof profile.

Member Church recused.

Frank Monroe was present on behalf of St. Michael's Church. Mr. Monroe presented the application to the Commission and showed a rendering to the Commission. Member Bergenholtz asked if Mr. Monroe believed the deterioration was the result of neglect. Mr. Monroe stated it was the result of neglect and poor workmanship when it was built in 1963 as there were no weep holes anywhere. He said when water got behind the brick it just washed out the mortar joints. Mr. Monroe said instead of the lintels being 90 degrees, it was a flat piece, so it leaked inside of the building, and the brick was falling and the mortar was falling out, and the caulk was falling out.

Member Bergenholtz asked if there was a currently a membrane roof there and Mr. Monroe said there was. Member Bergenholtz asked when the last time was the membrane roof was repaired or replaced. Mr. Monroe said sometime before 1986. Member Bergenholtz felt the tower was almost like a landmark in Bristol as it was over 50yrs old and historic and the changes proposed to the roof and losing the parapet are significant.

Mr. Monroe had two different printed reports stating it needed to be fixed. He said the lintels right below the deck are pushed out almost a 1/3 of their width. Mr. Monroe stated when it freezes to the south side and then

thaws, it pushes the lintels out, so something needs to be done. He said to keep all 18 bells, it's about $25,000 per bell to be reconditioned and made into an electronic chime. If they go that route and keep the parapet, they would never be able to raise enough money. Mr. Monroe would like to get it approved so the church can form a 501C3 and start raising money. He said the project could cost up to approximately $500,000.00.

Member Bergenholtz thought the church was a 501C. Mr. Monroe said it was a 501C for raising money for the church, but not for raising money for the bell tower. He stated the bells used to ring on the hour, during the holidays, and for weddings, etc., but they have been turned off and cannot be turned back on due to extensive water damage. Mr. Monroe said the doors can't be opened because the lintel is pressed down on one of the doors. Also, the electric meter for the building is inside and every time Narragansett Electric needs to read the meter, they have to unlock it so it can be read. Mr. Monroe said the meter is going to be located somewhere else. He said it's not feasible to keep the parapet.

Member Bergenholtz said that the church has done an analysis of what the cost was going to be. He asked Mr. Monroe if they have tried to raise funds for the project. Mr. Monroe stated there was new leadership in the church and vestry, and he has commitments from certain people who would donate to the project, but it was not going to happen in a year. Mr. Monroe stated they probably would have to come back in a year to revisit the project. He said it was going to be a lot of money and work.

Member Ponder asked Mr. Monroe if the application came before the Commission approximately 5 years prior to totally demolish the tower and Mr. Monroe said yes. Member Ponder likes the new proposal rather than totally demolishing the tower. Mr. Monroe said it was a scare tactic. Member Bergenholtz said it was definitely a scare tactic because the model looked like Lego land. Member Ponder stated he would support the project.

Mr. Monroe stated the project will allow the bells to play again at a reasonable cost. They can't keep all 18 bells. Member Ponder asked Mr. Monroe what was the difference in the height of the prosed tower versus the current tower. Mr. Monroe said the new tower would be approximately 32ft whereas the current tower was

approximately 42ft. Member Bergenholtz asked if the footprint was shrinking as well and Mr. Monroe said no, it was staying the same. Mr. Monroe said it would still be steel beams clad with brick and the grading would be cut down symmetrically so it would look proportional on three of the sides. He said they would save the cross on the front side on Hope Street.

Member Bergenholtz stated the application should have been a concept review versus an actual presentation since it is such a prominent building in Bristol. He asked Mr. Monroe if there was thought given to taking the parapet and dropping it down to where the new proposed roof line is and doing a new membrane roof. Member Bergenholtz' feeling is that the standing seam copper roof looks very contemporary and wouldn't look right for the building. He asked if it would be possible to drop the parapet and then do a membrane roof. Mr. Monroe stated the problem with that idea would be that it's still open where the bells are and the gutters on the parapet have rusted out so those are being removed. He said to be able to service it, they would have to hire someone with a lift to clean it out due to the trees. Mr. Monroe said it was a service thing, and the new proposed roof would pitch the water away as there would be an 8 to 10 inch overhang.

Member Bergenholtz asked Mr. Monroe if the copper roof could be hidden in the parapet. Mr. Monroe said they would be dealing with scuppers off of the copper roof and then it would run down the side of the building. Member Bergenholtz was hesitant about the roof as it was a drastic change. Mr. Monroe said the alternative was to do it in slate as it wouldn't match the parish house. Member Bergenholtz stated the material wasn't the problem; it was the style as it looked more like a Tuscan design rather than what it was meant to look like. Mr. Monroe said the copper would change in color over time. Member Bergenholtz stated he was referring to the massing.

Mr. Monroe understood that it was a drastic change but stated that it was a practical change as flat roofs always fail. He said if the roof isn't maintained, then the downspouts ang gutters get clogged and the same problems happen all over again. The new roof would pitch water away from the building.

Member Lima asked what the difference in the present height versus the proposed height was. He said the church only needed 5 bells, and they could be controlled from an iPhone. Member Lima asked Mr. Monroe what the actual height of the tower would be when it was finished. Mr. Monroe said approximately 32ft, so the difference in height is approximately 10ft.

Mr. Monroe said there was no maintenance with a pitched roof. He understood it would look different but pointed out that the brick was different from the brownstone on the parish house. He said it was to get the project off the ground. He said this would allow the Organist to play and to have pre-recorded music to play.

Member Bergenholtz thought it was wonderful to have the music again but stated the Commission's main concern was the building. He said it was a big change.

Mr. Monroe said to do a parapet there would be a maintenance and cost issue. He stated with the new design, there would be no issues.

Chairperson Allen asked the Commission for their thoughts. Member Millard thought it was an excellent design. She didn't think it was a terribly historic part of Bristol. Alternate Member Camara appreciated the presentation and agreed with Member Bergenholtz as to the style and look of it. He believed it looked choppy and would hate to see it go. He liked the idea of a slate roof versus copper. Member Lima approved of the changes and would like to see a slate roof. Member Page felt from a practical aspect a pitched roof made sense but didn't know if the Commission could suggest it at the current time because the brick wasn't in great shape. Further, there was a concern about the weight of a slate roof.

Mr. Monroe stated that Slate & Copper out of Portsmouth did the parish house several years ago and would do the roof on this project as well. Member Ponder said the visual beauty of the tower was at eye level, and the top wouldn't be noticed while walking around town. He stated that would much rather have the current plan than the previous plan that was presented. He liked it. Member Ponder stated many other applicants have had issues obtaining slate roofing materials so he would support a copper roof. Chairperson Allen agreed with Member

Bergenholtz in that he would rather see the top of the shorter tower look more like what it does currently but understand the need for a pitched roof. He would rather see slate over copper, if possible, but Member Page brought up an excellent concern regarding the weight difference between slate and copper. Mr. Monroe stated that a copper roof would last longer.

Chairperson Allen asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to speak for or against the application. With no one coming forward, Chairperson Allen asked for a motion. Member Bergenholtz stated the application should have been a concept review rather than an actual application.

Motion made by Page to approve application #26-94 as presented with the applicant to consider slate roofing material over copper. The roofing material choice to remain up to the applicant; Seconded by Lima.

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

Opposed: Bergenholtz

Motion carries 6 to 1

Secretary of Interior Standards: 6

Project Monitor: John Allen

5F. 26-81: 1200 Hope St, Infinity 1217 LLC Discuss and act on addition of well house, change of previously approved siding on new construction buildings.

No one was present for the application.

Nick advised the Commission that this was the second time that no one appeared. Chairperson Allen suggested taking them off of the list. Nick said he would contact the applicant the next day to tell him three strikes and he's out.

5G. 26-85: 348 High St, Todd Jarem Discuss and act on replacement of shed.

Member Lima recused.

Todd Jarem was present. Mr. Jarem presented the application to the Commission. Mr. Jarem stated that the location of the shed was going to be moved a few feet based on Ed Tanner's comments regarding the spacing off the property lines. Chairperson Allen asked Mr. Jarem which doors he was looking to use. Mr. Jarem showed the drawing plan to the Commission and pointed to the doors. He stated they would be matching the Marvin door located on the back of the existing house that was approved by the Commission approximately 20 years ago. Mr. Jarem said it was an ultimate wood Marvin door which was a custom order. He said there was slight wainscotting in the lower portion of the door with an arched top with divided lights.

Chairperson Allen asked if the front elevation doors were wood. Mr. Jarem stated everything was wood and custom built, which would be Douglas fir wood.

Chairperson Allen asked if anyone had any questions or comments? He suggested to Mr. Jarem that his water table boards should be Azek. Mr. Jarem said they could be as he will be almost at grade. He said the shed will be on piers, not on the ground like it was before. Chairperson Allen said it was up to Mr. Jarem as it was just a recommendation. Mr. Jarem said he may use mahogany. Chairperson Allen said they could leave it up to the Project Monitor and the Commission could give Mr. Jarem the option to use either one. Mr. Jarem said he would err on the side of the most traditional.

Member Church asked Mr. Jarem how much longer the new shed was compared to the original. Mr. Jarem said approximately 1ft longer. Member Church stated Mr. Jarem would have to move it off of both property lines. Mr. Jarem said he needed to move it forward slightly as Ed Tanner said 2ft in the current configuration. Member Church asked Mr. Jarem if the shed was for storage and Mr. Jarem said yes.

Chairperson 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 Church approve application #26-85 as presented for removal of the existing shed and replacing it with a new 10x20 wooden shed with materials as

discussed. The Project Monitor will be consulted as to the waterboard materials and to refer it back to the Commission if necessary. The approval of the door as presented, that being a Marvin ultimate wood door and custom-built doors on the front side; Seconded by Camara.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9

Project Monitor: Bob Page

5H. 26-89: 70 Griswold Ave, Constance Laflamme Discuss and act on enlarging previously approved pool plans by 10 feet.

Jesalynn Jarest was present on behalf of Constance Laflamme. Ms. Jarest presented the application to the Commission. Chairperson Allen asked if anyone on the Commission had any questions or comments. Member Bergenholtz asked if there were any photographs of the inside of the house. Nick asked if there was a vote taken on that issue and Member Bergenholtz said yes. Ms. Jarest stated she had sent Nick a link to a drop box containing the photographs. Nick said he would look for it.

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

Motion made by Church to approve application #26-89 as presented for enlarging the approved 20x40 pool design to 20x50ft as presented; Seconded by Page.

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

Abstained: Lima

Opposed: None

Motion carries

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9

Project Monitor: John Allen

5I. 26-90: 5 Thames St, Robin Allister Discuss and act on replacement of damaged railing, replacement of decking.

Robin Allister was present. Ms. Allister presented the application to the Commission. She stated the tenant tried to hoist furniture over the railing, and it collapsed. Ms. Allister said no work has started but the contractor removed the damaged railing so it wouldn't fall and hurt someone. She said without permission the contractor had also removed the Azek decking that was there. She was proposing like for like installment. However, the railing that was there was not up to code and Ms. Allister was proposing a higher railing to meet current code standards.

Member Bergenholtz asked why the application wasn't approved administratively since it was repair in kind. Nick said due to the change in height of the railing, he didn't have anything in his administrative guidelines that would allow him to do so.

Chairperson Allen asked Ms. Allister if she had Azek caps on the original railing. Ms. Allister thought she did. Member Church said even if there were Azek caps, would the Commission be able to tell her to change them to wood? Attorney Teitz stated if there was request for a change to the railings then the Commission could require it if they wanted to. He said generally they didn't require it if something had already been replaced, but it could be done in return for granting the change in the height.

Ms. Allister asked if there would be an articulation problem with changing the caps. Member Church said the caps came in different sizes. Ms. Allister asked if the caps were premade and Member Church said yes.

Chairperson Allen asked what Ms. Allister was applying for regarding the posts. She said it was pressure treated wood. Chairperson Allen asked if that what was the railings were before and she wasn't sure as it had

been removed. He stated the photograph seemed to show a 4x4 with a sleeve of 1x6. Ms. Allister stated she would do wood. She said the only thing she was aware of was the Azek decking.

Member Church asked Ms. Allister about the blue arrows pointing to the gutter in the photograph. Ms. Allister said that was something someone did on the photo and she wasn't sure what the person was trying to indicate. Member Church asked if it included the repair of the vent and Ms. Allister said no. Member Church asked if she wanted to fix it and Ms. Allister said she did.

Chairperson Allen said to Ms. Allister should rebuild the deck as it was prior to it failing, which would include pressure-treated wood posts which could be wrapped in wood 1x6 if she wanted to. He stated the Commission normally wouldn't allow an applicant to have Azek decking but because it's located on a 2nd level and that's what was there before, it can be approved. Chairperson Allen said there should be a wood cap on the wood post as well. He asked Ms. Allister if that was acceptable and Ms. Allister said yes.

Member Lima asked Attorney Teitz if a certain piece on the roof could be done as a sign off (pointing at a photograph). Nick said if she was just fixing it, it would be a sign off. Ms. Allister was pleased.

Chairperson 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 Page to approve application #26-90 as presented for the replacement of the damaged decking and railing. The railing to be pressure treated wood, the caps to be changed to wood, and the height to be raised to current code standards. Decking to be replaced in kind with TimberTech by Azek; Seconded by Bergenholtz.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9

Project Monitor: Ory Lima

5J. 26-91: 27 Cottage St, Sara Miles Discuss and act on replacement of porch decking, change of skirting from lattice to solid slats, installation iron handrail to match existing, repairs/replacements of footings.

Sara Miles was present. Ms. Miles presented the application to the Commission. Chairperson Allen confirmed that Ms. Miles was not going to do anything with the columns, and she said that was correct. Chairperson Allen said the columns were very distinctive.

Member Church asked about the vinyl materials. Ms. Miles said it was for skirting over the garden beds and said it was cellular PVC. Member Church said it had to be wood. Ms. Miles asked the Commission for a recommendation for the type of wood to use. Member Bergenholtz asked if she was referring to the decking and Ms. Miles said she was asked about the skirting materials. Member Church asked Ms. Miles if she wanted to change the design to which Ms. Miles said yes. Ms. Miles said she wanted to change the design from lattice to something else. Member Bergenholtz asked if it was going to be painted and Ms. Miles said yes. Member Bergenholtz said anything pressure treated would be good. Chairperson Allen suggested to Ms. Miles to let the wood age for a year before painting it. Ms. Miles said that's what she had been told.

Member Bergenholtz asked Chairperson Allen if the property was individually listed and he said yes. Member Church said it was a contributing home. Nick stated the home wasn't under the National Register survey. He said he would notate it for future reference.

Member Church thought it was fine as long as everything was natural wood. Chairperson Allen also asked Ms. Miles to promise to paint it. Member Church asked Ms. Miles if she wanted red balau wood, which was a hardwood that looked like mahogany. Chairperson Allen asked if Ms. Miles wanted it for her decking and Ms. Miles said that's what she was told. Member Bergenholtz said it might also be referred to as ironwood from Indonesia.

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

Motion made by Allen to approve application #26-91 as presented for the replacement of the footings, decking, and the addition of a matching iron railing; Seconded by Page.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9

Project Monitor: John Allen

5K. 26-93: 66 Poppasquash Rd, James Yess Discuss and act on replacement of skylights in kind.

Eugene Kuntsevskiy was present for the applicant. Nick advised the Commission that he had a signed contract.

Mr. Kuntsevskiy presented the application to the Commission. Nick stated that the application for the roof work would be approved administratively, but the skylights needed to be approved by the Commission.

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

Motion made by Bergenholtz to approve application #26-93 as presented; Seconded by Lima.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9

Project Monitor: Bob Camara

5L. 26-95: 44 State St, Nicole Martel Discuss and act on addition of window to previously closed window opening.

Nicole Martel and Matthew Martel were present. Ms. Martel presented the application to the Commission.

Chairperson Allen asked Ms. Martel if the windows proposed were the same ones she put in previously and she said yes. Member Bergenholtz said the windows were Andersen and Ms. Martel said yes.

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

Motion made by Bergenholtz to approve application #26-95 as presented; Seconded by Page.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9

Project Monitor: John Allen

5M. 26-96: 19 Byfield St, Heath Robbins Discuss and Act on addition of windows to carriage house.

Daniel Cusmano was present for the applicants. Mr. Cusmano presented the application to the Commission. He noted that the brackets underneath the metal overhang roofs on the carriage house were changed to simple L brackets per the May meeting discussions.

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

Motion made by Page to approve application #26-96 as presented for the addition of two windows on the second

floor of the carriage house as submitted with the spec sheets; Seconded by Church.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9

Project Monitor: John Allen

5N. 26-98: 48 Constitution St, Stacy Stevens Discuss and act on addition of new skylight and exhaust port.

Daniel Cusmano was present for the applicants. Mr. Cusmano presented the application to the Commission.

Member Church asked Mr. Cusmano what the dimensions of window was. Mr. Cusmano stated the dimensions were 36x36 and they may shrink it to fit between the rafters. Member Church asked if it was the same size and Mr. Cusmano said it was slightly larger by 6 inches, but it might shrink a bit to fit between the rafters.

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

Motion made by Page to approve application #26-98 as presented for the addition of a skylight and vent as presented; Seconded by Lima.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9

Project Monitor: Chris Ponder

50. 26-100: 132 High St, Susan and Dean Morris Discuss and act on new light fixtures, changes to 2nd floor guardrail/porch, replacement of fencing and gates.

Dave Andreozzi was present for the applicants. Mr. Andreozzi presented the application to the Commission.

Chairperson Allen asked Mr. Andreozzi what the name of the product that they wanted to use was. Mr. Andreozzi stated it was cellular PVC. Chairperson Allen asked if Mr. Andreozzi had used the material on other projects. Mr. Andreozzi stated that the landscape architect had used it before. Chairperson Allen asked the Commission members' opinions on it. Member Church was against it. Chairperson Allen said they have not previously approved of it. Member Church said it was a plastic fence. Mr. Andreozzi stated it was not plastic but would go with mahogany. Mr. Andreozzi said it would be primed and painted, and they would not be able to tell the difference but if it was an issue mahogany was fine. Member Bergenholtz stated the Commission has approved some type of PVC fencing in the past. Chairperson Allen asked if it was located in the back of the property and Member Bergenholtz said yes. Mr. Andreozzi said he would do whatever the Commission wanted.

Chairperson Allen stated that the proposed fence was going to be facing the street. Member Church stated they were both facing the street. Member Bergenholtz didn't like using mahogany due to deforestation. He wants to see wood, just not a tropical wood like mahogany. Member Millard liked a composite material as it lasts a long time. Mr. Andreozzi said he would never want to see something that looked like plastic on a historic house. Member Church said 10 or 15 years ago the Commission would have never approved it.

Member Page said that he has worked with those types of materials and wood fencing was not a great idea. He stated if the Commission was going to give the Town permission to put in something that clearly is disallowed, this made sense because it could be painted and look like a wood fence. Member Page said this was the type of practical solution that the Commission needed to consider.

Mr. Andreozzi disagreed. For example, windows that actually look like true divided light windows and not

replacement windows should be used. When he was on the Commission, there were many times where he worked with people and approved column bases in particular and fiberglass columns because they knew the vulnerability of a modern wood column. Mr. Andreozzi stated there were opportunities to use technology to reproduce something that had been lost.

Member Bergenholtz suggested doing a vote based on the application being a test run as cellular PVC has never been approved before. Member Ponder agreed with Member Bergenholtz regarding the deforestation of tropical hardwoods is bad, especially on a fence. He said there were some things like gutters that the Commission has changed their minds due to the utilitarian nature of it. Member Ponder stated with regard to a fence that has been beaten down by the weather if the Commission could find a composite that did still hold to the historic fabric and didn't look like cheap plastic was okay.

Mr. Andreozzi suggested that the Commission approve a sample and if not, he will switch to mahogany. Member Church stated it was not located close to the property line so no one could touch it to know it was PVC. Member Ponder stated he wouldn't mind judging it as Project Monitor. Member Church asked if it was going to be painted and Mr. Andreozzi said it would be painted. Member Lima said it was worth a try.

Chairperson Allen stated the Commission could make it subject to the approval of the Project Monitor or switch to the second choice. Member Ponder said if it looked terrible then switch to mahogany. Mr. Andreozzi agreed.

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

Motion made by Ponder to approve application #26-100 for the installation of two new light fixtures, to raise the second-floor guardrail at the Union Street porch, and to place fencing and gates on the High and Union Street sides with final approval from the Project Monitor using the cellular PVC materials as presented. If the Project Monitor rejects the use of the cellular PVC material, then the applicant is to use mahogany as presented; Seconded by Bergenholtz.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9

Project Monitor: Chris Ponder

6. Concept Review

6A. CRHD-26-5: 64 High St, Hope-High Realty Trust, LLC
Discuss proposal to reconstruct front porch based on historical evidence.

Vincent Pacifico was present on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Pacifico presented the concept review to the Commission. Mr. Pacifico stated the reason for the concept review was to get the Commission's input and opinions about reconstructing the two wings on the porch. He said he looked at the Sanborn maps and the first map the house appeared on was the 1891 map which only showed the portico and then in 1896 the two wings of the porch appear on the map and on every map until 1947 which was the last one that was published one of Bristol.

Mr. Pacifico said at some point after 1947 the two wings of the porch were demolished. He showed a photograph to the Commission which clearly showed the two wings of the porch. He stated the goal was to reconstruct the two missing pieces of the porch. Mr. Pacifico said that in the Historic and Architectural Resources published in 1990 it did state that there was a porch demolished at some point. He showed another photograph showing what it looked like after the two wings were removed. The two wings were removed between 1947 and 1990.

Mr. Pacifico said the foundation has some areas of granite where the porch was on both sides. He stated that even though it wasn't built in 1870 when the house was originally built, John Brown Herreshoff lived there until 1915, and he commissioned the porch to be built. Mr. Pacifico feels that it is significant and contributing to the building.

Steve Deleo stated he thought it would look great.

Member Millard asked if they would be considering rectangular porches on either side or rebuilding the porches. Mr. Pacifico and Mr. Deleo stated they would be reconstructing the porches exactly as they once existed.

Mr. Pacifico stated that the Bristol Historic Society didn't have much on record about the house. He was going to look at the Herreshoff Museum records as they might have something on it. They stated it was going to be a recreation project. Mr. Pacifico stated they were going to be as accurate as possible.

Chairperson Allen asked if anyone had any other questions or comments. Member Page and Member Lima both thought it was great. Member Church said it would make the house much more interesting. Member Ponder said he would do it.

7. Monitor Reports & Project Updates

Member Page stated that Blithewold Greenhouse was staked out just in case any Commission members wanted to see where they were going to build. Nick thought they pulled building permits.

Nick didn't have any major updates except for the Standards Guide. He was going to clean it up and work on getting it posted.

Chairperson Allen had a question regarding the ADU on Burton Street. He stated the applicant was originally going to use the footprint of the first floor. He asked Nick to check on that as the applicant has torn down almost everything except for one back wall and one-half of one side wall. Member Church asked if it was the one located on the corner of Noise. Chairperson Allen said it was closer to High Street on the north side, either the second or third houses east of Noise. He stated there was very little left of the structure. Nick said he would look into it.

Nick advised the Commission that he would keep everyone informed as to if and when he obtains the second CLG grant to do the graphics. Chairperson Allen thanked him for all of his work on it.

8. **HDC Coordinator Reports & Project Updates**

9. **HDC Coordinator Approvals**

10. **Other Business**

10A. Letter regarding 224 Hope St Discussion of letter regarding 224 Hope St.

Motion to adjourn made by Church

11. **Adjourned at 9:06PM**

APPROVE
BRISTOL HISTORIC
DISTRICT COMMISSION
DATE: 9/3/26