

TOWN OF BRISTOL, RHODE ISLAND

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION



Historic District Commission Meeting Minutes

Thursday, June 4, 2026

at 7:00 PM

Town Hall - 10 Court Street, Bristol Rhode Island

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

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

1. Pledge of Allegiance

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

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

Also in attendance: Town Solicitor Teitz, and Toth

Absent: Ponder

2. Staff Report

2A. Staff Report

3. Election of Officers

Attorney Teitz explained the procedure to the Commission, then the Commission made their nominations. Chairperson Lima nominated Member Allen for Chairperson of the HDC.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries

Chairperson Allen nominated Member Bergenholtz for Vice Chairperson

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries

Member Lima nominated Member Millard for Secretary

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries

4. Review of Previous Month's Meeting Minutes

4A. Review of minutes of the May 7, 2026 meeting.

Chairperson Allen asked if any members had any corrections. Member Bergenholtz's corrections were as follows: page 22, 3rd paragraph, it should read "try to get the height down" not "try to get it down". Page 31, last paragraph, it should read "Member Bergenholtz asked if", not "Member Bergenholtz said". Page 39, last paragraph, middle of the paragraph, the sentence should read, "Member Bergenholtz felt it was something lie a functional barn as root cellars didn't have large windows".

Chairperson Allen's corrections were as follows: page 25, first full paragraph, middle of the paragraph, it should read, "Attorney Teitz asked if there was any evidence of shutters being on the house previously." Page 33, last paragraph, the word "indicate" should be changed to "indicated".

Motion made by Member Church to accept the minutes of the May 7, 2026 meeting as amended; Seconded by Alternate Member Camara.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries

4B. Review of minutes of the 8 Constitution Street site visit meeting.

Chairperson Allen asked if anyone had any comments or changes. No changes were made.

Motion made by Member Lima to accept the minutes as presented; Seconded by Alternate Member Camara.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries

4C. Review of minutes of the 70 Griswold Avenue site visit meeting.

Chairperson Allen asked if any members had any changes or comments. There were no comments or changes made.

Motion made by Member Lima to accept the minutes as presented; Seconded by Alternate Member Camara.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries

4D. Review of minutes of the Standards Guide review meeting.

Chairperson Allen asked if any members had any changes or comments. Member Lima expressed to Nick to thank Arnold for his hard work, that he did a great job and it would work well for the Commission. There were no changes made.

Motion made by Member Lima to accept the minutes of the review as presented; Seconded by Member Page.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries

5. **Application Reviews**

5A. 25-35: 248 Hope St, Derek Rogers Discuss and act on installation of shed, solar tunnel on roof, replacement of existing skylight with larger skylight.

Derek and Elaine Rogers were present.

Mr. Rogers presented the application to the Commission and a discussion commenced. Mr. Rogers stated there were 3 items to discuss: 1) 10x12ft shed to be installed in the back yard; 2) replace a skylight with a newer larger skylight; and 3) install a 10 to 14 inch solar tunnel/tube which would magnify light into a dark area upstairs. Chairperson Allen stated the Commission had approved of solar tunnels previously, but neither were like the one he was proposing as they were flat to the roof. He said the Commission preferred it that way and it was in a house on Burton Street. Mr. Rogers said he had no problem with that and would be happy to look into it. Chairperson Allen said it might have been the same manufacturer. He stated it was the first house on the north side of Burton Street off of Hope Street. Mr. Rogers said he would call the manufacture. Member Lima suggested Nick could look it up for Mr. Rogers. Nick said he would need the exact address and Chairperson Allen said he would get it for him. Nick said he would pull the file on the Burton Street house to get the manufacturer's information for Mr. Rogers. Mr. Rogers stated that the solar tunnel would not be visible from the street. Chairperson Allen said that made a difference as the one on Burton Street was visible.

Chairperson Allen said to Mr. Rogers that it stated in the application a 10 to 14 inch solar tunnel. Mr. Rogers stated that was because the manufacturer was offering different prices and he told the salesperson that he

would choose one depending on the what kind of deal they offered him. Chairman Allen stated the Commission would allow the Project Monitor to approve the size of the solar tunnel Mr. Rogers decided on.

Chairperson Allen asked Mr. Rogers for the dimensions of the new skylight. Mr. Rogers stated that it was 48x30, which was larger than the old skylight. Chairperson Allen asked Mr. Rogers the size of the old skylight and Mr. Rogers said it was 24x24. He stated it was located on a slanted roof which made it difficult to utilize their tub. Mr. Rogers said the new larger skylight would allow for more head space so they could use the tub more easily. Chairperson Allen asked if the skylight would be visible from the street and Mr. Rogers said yes. Member Church asked if it would be in the same location and Mr. Rogers said yes.

Mr. Rogers then discussed the installation of a 10x12 shed manufactured by Tough Shed. He said it would be kitty cornered in the back yard and not visible from the street. Member Church asked what the materials were for the shed and Mr. Rogers stated it would be all wood materials. Chairperson Allen asked if it was real wood, T-111, or a wood composite. Mr. Rogers guessed that it was a combination of both wood and composite or T-111 materials. Chairperson Allen asked Nick if the Commission had previously approved T-111 siding on sheds and Nick wasn't sure. Chairperson Allen asked if the shed was visible from the street and Mr. Rogers said no. Member Lima asked where the shed was going to be located in relation to the generator in the back yard. Mr. Rogers stated when he originally submitted his application, he wanted the shed to be located in the spot next to the generator but due to the restriction of space, he couldn't do it. He later submitted a picture of trees and shrubs in the corner of the yard and that's where he planned on placing the shed. Member Lima said that meant it would be located behind generator. Alternate Member Camara said it wasn't going to be on the flat area shown in the picture and Mr. Rogers said that was correct.

Chairperson Allen asked if anyone in the audience wanted to speak for or against the application. No one came forward.

Motion made by Member Lima to accept application 26-35 as presented. The Project Monitor will make the final determination on the size of the solar tunnel; Seconded by Page.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9, 10

Project Monitor: Bob Camara

Chairperson Allen stated the green sheet would be available. Nick stated it would be available online on the portal and asked Mr. Rogers to display it somewhere visible on his house.

5B. 26-53: 224 Hope St, Gregory Leonetti Discuss and act on changes to front stair, addition of bulkhead, other improvements.

Greg Leonetti was present.

Mr. Leonetti reviewed his application with the Commission and a discussion commenced. Mr. Leonetti informed the Commission that he was going to forego the shutters for the time being. He stated that for the front steps he would like to use the same brick veneer material for the front of the stairs as he was using on the chimney. Mr. Leonetti would then use a blue stone for the steps. He stated the brick veneer would match the chimneys for a cohesive look.

Member Bergenholtz stated that the big concern the Commission had from the last meeting was the window casings. The Commission asked Mr. Leonetti at the last meeting to go back and figure out what happened. Member Bergenholtz stated it was not the federal aesthetic that's in the district. Mr. Leonetti discussed it with the manufacturer, Marvin, the lumber yard, and his contractor. He stated based on what was previously there he said there was never a true recessed look that would be usually seen on a traditional home where the brick

carried on into the recession. Mr. Leonetti stated in order meet the standards they had set with the size of the windows as the specs were for the exact same window size which were approved, that was the best way to weather guard against the brick. From his understanding, it created a proper seal so the sealing could go right on the side whereas with the half bricks there the trim would rub on the side of the brick causing damage to them and wouldn't for a proper seal.

Member Bergenholtz reiterated that the Commission did not approve of it and it looked incorrect on a federal brick home. He said having the lintel set back didn't look correct and certainly wouldn't have voted on it. Member Bergenholtz understood that Mr. Leonetti had come before the Commission several times for the window replacements and they finally gave him their approval as they thought he was going to do it with a window that would have the same look that was there. He stated Mr. Leonetti completely altered the look of the house. Member Bergenholtz said it was a prominent house on a corner and didn't understand how it happened as it wasn't approved.

Member Lima asked Mr. Leonetti where the windows that were removed were. Mr. Leonetti said he gave some of the windows to a local architect. He stated the windows were not the original windows. Mr. Leonetti posted other windows on Facebook marketplace and Craigslist for a couple of weeks to see if anyone wanted them and no one wanted them, so he disposed of them. Chairperson Allen asked Attorney Teitz what options did the Commission have to handle the issue. Attorney Teitz said the Commission should hear from the contractor first and since it wasn't before the Commission as part of the application, they needed to move on to items before them. Member Bergenholtz stated the Commission held off on their votes at the last meeting based on the based on Mr. Leonetti coming back with answers to their questions.

Mike Martins, the contractor, came up to speak. He stated they used the existing window frame to attach a new construction window which had 1½ inch flange. Mr. Martins said when they took the original brick molding away there was anywhere between 1/4 to 1/2 inch of caulk and a lot of the mortar and brick pulled away with the caulk. They thought instead of 1½ inch trim which still wouldn't have been inset, the bolder trim was a nicer look. Mr. Martins said they were never made aware that

the Commission had specified a trim type. Member Bergenholtz stated they hadn't specified one as the point was there shouldn't have been trim. Mr. Martins stated the windows were the same size. He didn't remove the existing window frame. He said to have done what the Commission would have wanted, the frames would have to have been removed, and the windows inset which probably would have made the windows smaller to accommodate a reasonable sized piece of trim. Mr. Martins said the trim that was there has been well caulked and siliconed. He stated some flashing will be put on the heads when they can find a mason. Mr. Martins said that wasn't a real concern. The real concern was the look of it. Member Bergenholtz stated the look that they wanted, not what it should look like. Mr. Martins said they weren't made aware of what they were required to do anything for the trim. He said he was aware that the windows had to be replaced like for like.

Member Lima asked who the Project Monitor was and Member Page said he was. She asked Member Page if anyone had contacted him. Member Page said he went to the property several times. He felt it was unusual to put the windows on the outside because of the issue of leakage against brick which is why they're generally installed inside. He said going over and looking at it today, there would be too much damage to do anything about it now. Member Page said admittedly when the Commission talked about the windows going in, he couldn't imagine that the windows wouldn't have been inset because that's generally what's done to brick and stone. He stated there was never a discussion on that issue. Member Bergenholtz said there have been replacement windows done in federal brick houses in the district before and they never required a trim like what was done here. Mr. Martins stated he didn't do replacement windows; he did new construction windows.

Mr. Leonetti said all of the specifications were submitted and he did stick to those. Member Bergenholtz stated Mr. Leonetti didn't provide any information about the window casing on the outside. Mr. Leonetti said the specifications were provided regarding the window. To his understanding, it seemed the only way to do what the Commission was looking for was to install a smaller window. Member Bergenholtz stated that wasn't true as there was a brick house a block away on the corner of Hope Street and Constitution Street that did replacement

windows that were replaced exactly as was specified. Mr. Leonetti stated he replaced the windows with the ones he specified, and he wish he knew about the situation sooner.

Attorney Teitz asked Mr. Martins if he had worked in a historic district before and Mr. Martins said yes. Attorney Teitz stated that Mr. Martins knew that any changes to a design needed to be approved. He said there was a change to the design of the window. Mr. Martins said he didn't know. Attorney Teitz asked him how he could have worked in a historic district previously yet not knowing that all changes to the exterior needed to be approved. Mr. Martins stated that he was in the house when there was a site visit and the trim issue was never brought up. Attorney Teitz said he was at the site visit and was pretty sure there was a question about the casing and if he was changing the casing and the answer was no, it was going to be replicated. Mr. Martins said it was never brought up.

Member Lima asked Nick if he could get the minutes of the site visit. Nick said he would pull the minutes and review them. Attorney Teitz stated he talked to Nick about looking at the possibility of bringing a notice of violation. He said it was not a given in a historic house that just because one thing was approved other elements of it can't be changed because it's a nicer appearance. Attorney Teitz just wanted to make sure there was no question about it. Nick asked if there was anything that could be done to modify the trim in the interest of making sure that Mr. Leonetti didn't have to rip out windows and the Commission was going to be seeing something that didn't get approved. He wanted to see if there was a way to bring it up to what the Commission wanted to see and not place an undue burden on Mr. Leonetti.

Mr. Leonetti voiced his frustration as the window specifications were provided and the trim was never discussed. He did what was best for the longevity of the project. Chairperson Allen stated Member Bergenholtz had concerns about the brick holding up. Member Bergenholtz stated Dr. Catherine Zipf brought up the concerns, not him. He just was more concerned about the aesthetics of the home. He said that he and Dr. Zipf felt it was completely wrong. Chairperson Allen said they would check the minutes.

Member Church asked if the specifications specified the exterior trim. She said it looked like they were all interior drawings and nothing about the exterior. Mr. Leonetti guessed it was just something that was overlooked. Member Church stated there was nothing in the specifications about exterior trim. Attorney Teitz said that's what Mr. Leonetti was saying. Mr. Leonetti said it was never discussed. Attorney Teitz said it meant that the trim would stay the same. He did remember someone asking about the casing but suspected that was on the inside. Attorney Teitz said going forward the Commission needed to develop a policy that when windows were going to be replaced, that only 1 window should be done and then the Project Monitor or the Commission should see it to make sure it was done as approved. He said they needed to go back and look at minutes of the site visit, but for now the Commission needed to move on to other stuff.

Chairperson Allen asked Mr. Leonetti if the brick on the stairs was full brick or a veneer. Mr. Leonetti said it was going to be a brick veneer to match what was approved on the chimneys. Chairperson Allen said it was more appealing than the stone veneer he had proposed originally. Member Bergenholtz stated the brick veneer was approved because it was 30ft in the air and that having it on the steps would look like fake brick. Mr. Leonetti said it was real brick. Member Bergenholtz said it wasn't a real federal brick. Mr. Leonetti said it would match the aesthetics of what was approved for the chimneys. Member Bergenholtz said that was approved because it was up high. Chairperson Allen asked if there was a way to use real brick. Mr. Leonetti said he wanted to utilize the existing cement that was on the steps rather than having to break it all open in order to keep the steps the same size.

Member Lima asked if anyone has physically seen the brick veneer. Mr. Leonetti said he didn't have a sample with him. Nick asked if he had the spec sheet on the brick. Member Church said the spec sheet was in the packet and it was a 3x5 veneer. Member Bergenholtz stated that was for the stone veneer, not the brick veneer. Member Church said that all of the stonework was now out and Mr. Leonetti wasn't going to do any of it. Mr. Leonetti said he was told it wasn't historic. Member Church said the foundation of the house was going to be left alone and

Mr. Leonetti said yes. Member Lima asked if the Commission could see a sample of the brick before it gets put on. Mr. Leonetti said his goal was to get the outside of the house done by the 4th of July and asked if they could do a site visit. Nick said he could set that up. Attorney Teitz stated it could be delegated to the Project Monitor for approval and suggested that there be 2 Project Monitors for the project. He made the suggestion as there have been problems setting up site visits. Chairperson Allen suggested Member Bergenholtz be the second Project Monitor and asked Member Page if he was okay with it and Member Page said yes. Nick asked for a sample piece of the brick to be submitted for the record.

Chairperson Allen asked if there was mortar in between the bricks and Mr. Leonetti said yes. He asked if Mr. Leonetti could make a mock-up of 2-3 pieces of brick with mortar in between so the Commission could see it. Mr. Leonetti said he could have it done. The Commission stated they wanted the spec sheet on the veneer. Mr. Leonetti asked if there was a site visit done, would he be able to get approval and Chairperson Allen said yes. Nick clarified that the Commission would be making a decision this evening contingent on the approval of the 2 Project Monitors. He said he would work with Member Page and Member Bergenholtz to set up a time. Mr. Leonetti said the earlier the better.

Mr. Leonetti then discussed the installation of a bulkhead door. He said he did a thorough walkthrough. He would like it to go on the back of the home which ran parallel to Hope Street where there was an existing window. Mr. Leonetti said some brick work would have to be done. He had an engineer on site who had no concerns about anything because there were no load bearing walls. His hope was to put it where the window was for functionality and access to the basement. Member Lima asked if it was a metal door and Mr. Leonetti said yes. Chairperson Allen said the site was on the back of the house. Mr. Leonetti said it was on the back of the house on the far side in the back left corner. Alternate Member Camara stated it was marked with an "X" on the map.

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

Dr. Catherine Zipf thanked Mr. Leonetti for withdrawing the portion regarding the shutters. As far as the bulkhead was concerned, she stated the walls were entirely loadbearing. She said the engineer needs to understand that the house has historic brick and not present-day brick and the proper shoring up of the house should be done. Dr. Zipf said it was quite clear that there was not an understanding of how this historic house works as it was very old. She reiterated that the way historic windows worked in a brick house was in fact to recess the window, leave a gap between the casement of the window and the brick wall and fill it with something originally called oakum. She said the reason was for the brick and wood to move with the weather independently from each other and the oakum allows everything to shift and breath accordingly so neither was damaged. Dr. Zipf said Mr. Leonetti needed to recess the window behind the brick, leave a gap, and then caulk or it will fail. She was very worried about the structure of the brick with the wood going over it as he would be entirely depending on the caulk which will fail. She said once it failed the water would get in behind the wood destroying window, trim, and brick. Dr. Zipf said it was a 4-alarm fire. She said it needed to be fixed as quickly as possible. She advised Mr. Leonetti that if he needed an example of how it worked to look at the Historical Society next door as it was done there. She said it wasn't a difficult problem, but it was a difficult to solve with modern materials. Dr. Zipf wished Mr. Leonetti had kept the original windows.

Mr. Leonetti stated the windows were not the original windows. He said the specifications of the windows were provided to the Commission. He understood that the outside trim wasn't discussed, but what was approved and the specifications that were provided were the same. Mr. Leonetti stated in speaking with the manufacturer this was what from a building perspective made the most sense. He stated Member Bergenholtz's concern was more the aesthetics which he understood. He wished that was discussed more because he would have gone with a smaller window as this was the first time doing a project like this. Mr. Leonetti was looking to keep his project moving forward and was frustrated. He stated the casings have been done on the interior and have done a lot of work to the home. He said with a more controlled process this situation could be preventable for the future.

Member Bergenholtz corrected Mr. Leonetti and stated those were the original sashes to the house. Mr. Leonetti said they were not as multiple people said they were not. Member Bergenholtz said they were the original sashes but might not have been the original glass. He asked who the people were that said they weren't the original sashes. Mr. Leonetti stated Pacific Visions was one and other multiple restoration companies that he had brought in to look at the windows and said they were not original. He said there may have been 4 on the back side of the home that were original, but the rest were not. Mr. Leonetti said a lot of the reasoning was that the salt water had deteriorated the windows over time and they were replaced. Member Bergenholtz disagreed.

Member Church stated she agreed with Dr. Zipf about the bulkhead. She asked Mr. Leonetti if he had access to the basement inside the house. Mr. Leonetti said he had a 24-inch access door to the basement inside of the house. Member Church stated that he also had a storage shed in the yard and Mr. Leonetti said yes. Member Church said Mr. Leonetti hadn't indicated the height of the bulkhead. Mr. Leonetti stated the spec sheet was provided for the bulkhead. Member Church said the specifications were provided but there was no indication of which particular bulkhead Mr. Leonetti chose. She objected to Mr. Leonetti cutting into the foundation as Mr. Leonetti didn't indicate the size of the bulkhead he was proposing. Mr. Leonetti apologized to the Commission as he thought he had provided that information to them.

Attorney Teitz stated Mr. Leonetti only provided 4 different bulkhead options but hadn't specified which 1 of the 4 he wanted to use. Mr. Leonetti stated he wanted to use the "O" option. He said it was the option that was the smallest width and that he would look into it further and provide the correct information to the Commission.

Chairperson Allen asked if anyone had any other comments. With no other comments or questions, Chairperson Allen asked for a motion.

Motion by Member Church to deny the installation of metal bulkhead doors on the east elevation because it will destroy the original fabric of the building.

Member Bergenholtz stated caution needed to be made because of the way the home was structurally done. He believed structural engineers needed to come up with a plan to for how the brick wall load was going to be supported. He agreed with Dr. Zipf and believed that a steel beam would be required to make sure the wall wasn't going to cave in. Member Bergenholtz stated he would feel more comfortable if a structural engineer provided plans that would ensure that the wall wasn't going to cave in. He told Mr. Leonetti that he should want a structural engineer to look at it as well as it was a complicated issue. Member Page stated that Mr. Leonetti would need a steel beam to reinforce the brick wall. He wasn't sure what the engineer looked at but he didn't see any way Mr. Leonetti could go forward with installing the bulkhead. Member Page advised Mr. Leonetti that he would have to take window out, replace the brick, and framed it with a steel beam which was not radically difficult, but needed to be done.

Member Bergenholtz seconded Member Church's motion. Chairperson Allen stated Mr. Leonetti would have to wait a year before re-applying for the bulkhead. Member Church withdrew her motion.

Motion by Member Church to continue application #26-53 to the meeting on June 29th regarding the hearing on the bulkhead until Mr. Leonetti obtained a plan from a licensed engineer showing how the bulkhead will be cut into the house and supported. Mr. Leonetti is also instructed to provide the dimensions of the bulkhead he wishes to install; Seconded by Member Bergenholtz.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

Motion made by Member Church to approve application #26-53 regarding the installation of the brick veneer on the front stairs. The brick veneer will be approved by the 2 Project Monitors, Bob Page and Ben Bergenholtz; Seconded by Alternate Member Camara. (Standard 9)

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9

Project Monitor: Ben Bergeholtz and Bob Page

Motion made by Member Church to continue application #26-53 regarding the discussion on the windows to the meeting on June 29th; Seconded by Member Lima.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

Mr. Leonetti advised the Commission that he felt ambushed at the last meeting with regard to the window issue as they had been installed for 4 months. He asked the Commission what they needed from him to continue to move everything along as all of the work was already done. Chairperson Allen suggestion that the Commission look at the minutes which would provide some information. Attorney Teitz said the Commission would contact Mr. Leonetti before the next meeting. Mr. Leonetti wanted to get it resolved. Chairperson Allen stated there were still questions about it and whether or not there was information in the minutes that would show it was something that either the Commission overlooked or wasn't communicated clearly. Member Lima said having the 2 Project Monitors observing might help facilitate what Mr. Leonetti needed to do.

Mr. Leonetti felt like there was a double standard in the sense of the Commission asking Mr. Leonetti to do his due diligence, which he did as far as speaking with the contractor, manufacturer, and lumber yard. He also did his due diligence in speaking with restoration companies and having a site visit, but he couldn't comprehend why none of the minutes were reviewed and now the Commission was asking him to continue the matter. Mr. Leonetti was hoping this was going to spark positive changes for the process in the future. He suggested for any future projects that some sort of a neutral arbitrator would get

brought in to do a full assessment of windows. He said it could be revenue generating as an applicant would have to pay for an assessment regarding how many windows it would include, the condition of the windows, grading, etc. Mr. Leonetti said it would provide full clarity and transparency to what's existing. Attorney Teitz felt it was a good suggestion and would follow-up on it. He said they have reached out to the RI Historic Preservation and Heritage Commission who have historic preservation architects on staff. Attorney Teitz stated one of them have come to Bristol to look at another property and maybe she could look at Mr. Leonetti's property in order to give him another opinion as to whether it was dangerous or not, detrimental or not to the building. He would let Mr. Leonetti know.

Attorney Teitz stated Mr. Leonetti ignored the rules in the historic district that all exterior modifications needed to be approved by the Commission. He said Mr. Leonetti's contractor took the position that there was nothing specifically stated about the trim so he felt he could change it. That was the big concern and that's what the Commission wanted to review with the minutes. Attorney Teitz said they would ask someone from the State to look at Mr. Leonetti's property.

Mr. Martins took issue with what Attorney Teitz said. He did a house on Thames Street 2 years ago where the owner replaced all of the windows except the front windows. Mr. Martins said there was no oversight and trimmed the windows in the way they thought the windows should be trimmed. He stated that no one from the Commission came and said it was done wrong. Member Church asked if it was a brick house and Mr. Martins said no. Attorney Teitz stated that was the difference. He said one of the options the Commission looked at was not to approve the replacement of the windows on the street frontages because Mr. Martins had just mentioned he replaced all of the windows on the other house except the front windows.

Attorney Teitz said he would be in touch with Mr. Leonetti before the next meeting.

5C. 26-55: 10 High St, Pam and Rusty Mirick Discuss and act on addition of overhang and door landing changes, construction of patio and pergola, and movement of A/C unit.

Member Millard recused.

Pam Mirick, Rusty Mirick, and Dean Nadalin were present.

Mr. Mirick presented the elements of the application and a discussion commenced with the Commission. He mentioned that an A/C unit was going to be moved in connection with construction of the patio and Nick advised the Commission that Mr. Mirick's mechanical contractor applied for the moving of the A/C unit. He said it was administratively approved as it was far away from street frontage.

Dean Nadalin, the general contractor, addressed the Commission next. Mr. Nadalin discussed the pergola cover over the side door in the driveway and the blue stone patio with a pergola located on the south side. He said for the pergola columns, they wanted to mimic the column that existed on the house which was located on the covered porch. Chairperson Allen asked if the columns were wood and Mr. Nadalin said yes. Member Lima asked where it was going to be located. Mr. Nadalin stated there was an AI generated image of what it was going to look like in the packet and it was going to be located in the southwest corner of the house. Member Lima said it was located on the Lobster Pot side of the house. Member Church stated it would be like the porch on the other side of the house and Mr. Nadalin said the columns would be mimicked. Member Lima asked if the roof of the pergola was going to be lattice. Mr. Nadalin said it would be a regular pergola roof with smaller beams going across. Member Lima stated the Commission needed the specific information for the pergola rather than just an AI generated idea. Chairperson Allen asked Mr. Nadalin if it was going to be similar to photograph that was provided in the packet and Mr. Nadalin said yes. Mr. Nadalin said the photograph was of 9 Church Street's pergola and that's what the Miricks' pergola was going to look like.

Alternate Member Camara asked if the blue stone patio was going to be raised. Mr. Nadalin said the patio was going to be on grade. Alternate Member Camara asked Mr. Nadalin where the air handler going to be relocated. Mr. Nadalin stated it was going to be relocated around the corner of the sunroom, and some bushes were going to be moved which would also block the view. Chairperson Allen said that the air unit was not visible from the street and Mr. Nadalin said that was correct.

Attorney Teitz asked Mr. Nadalin if there was a door to the patio and Mr. Nadalin said no.

Chairperson Allen asked if there was anyone in the audience who wished to speak for or against the application. No one came forward.

Motion made by Alternate Member Camara to approve application #26-55 as presented; Seconded by Member Bergenholtz.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9

Project Monitor: Ory Lima

5D. 26-62: 15 Church St, Deborah Appleyard Discuss and act on making removal of shutters permanent.

No one showed up.

Motion made by Member Church to continue the application to the June 29th meeting; Seconded by Alternate Member Camara.

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

5E. 26-66: 31 Bradford St, Mark Shaw Discuss and act on addition of sign.

Mark Shaw was present.

Mr. Shaw presented his application to the Commission. The Commission had a brief discussion. Chairperson Allen asked if there was anyone in the audience who wished to speak for or against the application. With no one coming forward to speak, Chairperson Allen asked for a motion.

Motion made by Member Bergenholtz to approve application #26-66 as presented; Seconded by Member Lima.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9

Project Monitor: John Allen

5F. 26-54: 244 Metacom Ave, Andrew Broten Discuss and act on removal of stone structure and continued installation of stairway.

Mr. Broten was present.

Mr. Broten presented his application regarding the stone house to the Commission. He stated that Nick mentioned doing a site visit. Nick said the Commission was going to have the State go to the property for a site visit. He advised Mr. Broten the State will be able to provide their expertise. Nick said there was a photograph of the dairy barn/stone house in the packet from late 1890s. He asked the Commission if they wanted to wait to decide on the demolition of the structure until the State had a chance to look at it. Chairperson Allen felt that was a good idea. Mr. Broten said he was available whenever the State was available for a site visit.

Mr. Broten said the missing information regarding the specifications for the porch stairs had now been provided in the packet. He said it was going to be a simple wooden staircase to match the style on the other side. He stated the design was in the packet for the Commission's review.

Chairperson Allen asked Mr. Broten if those were the last items that needed to be done and Mr. Broten said yes, for now. Mr. Broten asked if there was going to be a continuance on the stone house. Nick stated he would attempt to have quorum for a site visit.

Attorney Teitz advised Mr. Broten and the Commission that he didn't expect that they would get an immediate answer from Elizabeth Totten, the architect from the State. He said she would look at the structure then go back and put something in writing. Attorney Teitz didn't think there would be a vote on it that day. He said Mr. Broten would be provided with a copy of whatever Ms. Totten drafted, but for the time being the matter should be continued to the next meeting. Mr. Broten understood and was fine with it.

Member Bergenholtz asked Mr. Broten if seeing the photograph changed his opinion on the structure. Mr. Broten appreciated the history but after speaking with a couple of masons, the cost to rehabilitate the building would be too much. He said they may end up fencing it off for now as he didn't want any kids climbing on it.

Chairperson Allen asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to speak for or against the application. No one came forward to speak.

Motion made by Member Page to approve application #26-54 with regard to the addition of a wooden stairway as presented; Seconded by Member Church.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9, 10

Project Monitor: Robert Page

Motion made by Member Page continue application #26-54 with regard to the stone building demolition pending a visit from the State historic architect to the June 29th meeting; Seconded by Member Church.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries

5G. 26-45: 721 Hope St, Mosa Al Zoweilei Discuss and act on additions to existing garage to construct an ADU.

Olivia Spence Architect was present.

Ms. Spence presented the application on behalf of Mr. Al Zoweilei to the Commission. She presented the same 2 options as previously discussed but each now has 2 roof options, that being, gabled and flat. She provided elevations and renderings for each option. A discussion commenced with the Commission. Chairperson Allen stated he wasn't at the last meeting and asked about the consensus on the cantilever. Member Bergenholtz said he was against it. Member Page stated he liked it, but others did not. Chairperson Allen felt the cantilever wasn't appropriate.

Ms. Spence felt the cantilever wasn't appropriate but had to go with what the client wanted for an option. She asked if the Commission had any authority to work with the Zoning Department at all as the cantilever came from the fact that the 2 floors above were offset to stay within the setback to reduce what was needed ask for from zoning. Ms. Spence asked if there was any way they could build over the existing footprint and use that square footage, it would be a great opinion. Attorney Teitz stated the Commission didn't have any leverage with the Zoning Board. He said there were modifications that could be approved administratively and there were dimensional variances that could be obtained from the Zoning Board. Attorney Teitz said the only thing the HDC's view was relevant as evidence before a permitting thing would be a case for flood zones and there are specific things where flood zone requirements can be for historic preservation. He said as far as other things go, the Commission couldn't do anything about the Zoning Board. Attorney Teitz said they were putting a lot of stuff on a small lot and that's the concern they were facing as far as the historic aesthetic.

Ms. Spence said it was a balancing act to give the client what he was looking for while trying to please the Commission and the Zoning Board. Hypothetically assuming the 1st option was approved, page A1-3, where the 5ft offset to stay within the zoning setbacks was located,

Ms. Spence asked if it was possible to also have the design with that extra 5ft approved knowing that they would go in front of Zoning and Zoning could potentially not approve of it just so they would have the opportunity to present it to the Zoning Board. She was content with the design, but the homeowner was trying to maximize his square footage, and she just wanted to help him.

Member Bergenholtz asked Ms. Spence which option she was trying to get approved. Ms. Spence stated the client wanted the 6ft cantilever option approved and didn't have a preference about the roof style. She said the options came from the concept review meeting.

Chairperson Allen polled the Commission about cantilever. Member Page was fine with it but understood the objections. Member Bergenholtz was against the cantilever. Member Lima was against it. Alternate Member Camara agreed with Member Page but preferred no cantilever. Member Millard wouldn't object to the cantilever if it could be hidden somehow. Member Church was against the cantilever.

Ms. Spence said the cantilever was not her favorite idea. Looking at the 1st option, she asked the Commission which roof style they preferred. Ms. Spence said the flat roof was originally presented as it kept the height down as much as possible. She stated the gabled roof was presented because the existing structure had a gabled roof and, to her, it felt more historical looking, but it added height to the structure. Ms. Spence said the options were located on pages A1-3 and A1-4 for the gabled roof and A2-3 for the flat roof.

Member Church liked the gabled roof but objected to the dormer on A1-3. She stated the dormer was vertically in line with main part of the building and it should be stepped back at least a foot. Member Church said it was stepped back from the north/south end but not from the east/west end. Ms. Spence said it was due to spacing and that it was mostly from a construction and structural standpoint because of the way the new joist in the garage ceiling was going to be placed and the way the loadbearing wall was going to be set back 5ft. Member Page stated the dormer couldn't be set back. Ms. Spence said she continued the gabled soffit on the east side.

Ms. Spence stated if the application was approved, zoning was going to be another hurdle for them and then figuring out the engineer as to what the existing foundation was doing was a whole other thing the homeowner will need to address. She said it might get to a point where the homeowner doesn't want to do it.

Member Bergenholtz asked if the dormer could be set down from the roof ridge as it was currently giving a contemporary look. He said by stepping it down slightly and carrying it over would look great. Ms. Spence said on page A1-5, she did continue the soffit line across and made the dormer on the east side smaller as well. She stated she could continue the soffit along the west side as well. She wanted to present it in this manner to preserve as much visual connection to the water as possible. Ms. Spence said she could get egress windows on each gable end and rework the floor plan to make it work. Member Bergenholtz said he liked where the design was going.

Chairperson Allen polled the Commission regarding their preference of the style of roof, and all voted for a gabled roof. Member Church stated there was a flat roof right next to it but that was a later addition, and she wouldn't want to emphasize it by making the new construction a flat roof as well.

Alternate Member Camara asked about the proposed railing regarding cable versus traditional railings. He asked Chairperson Allen if that was something the Commission needed to approve. Chairperson Allen said the Commission has approved of cable railings before with wood posts, never steel. Ms. Spence said they were wood posts. She stated in A1-4 there was a photograph of a neighbor's railing system at 715 Hope Street. Ms. Spence said the homeowner wasn't set on it. She stated for view's sake, it would be nice, but they were open to alternatives.

Attorney Teitz asked Ms. Spence if they will need to obtain CRMC approval and she said yes. He asked if there were flood vents in the garage floor. Ms. Spence said at this point it was mostly preliminary to make sure they could get the approvals they needed. She stated they haven't obtained a survey as the homeowner wanted to make sure they could move forward before taking other steps.

Chairperson Allen said to Ms. Spence that she wasn't anticipating that the Commission was going to give her their approval on one of the options this evening. Ms. Spence said she would like to see an approval happen but if there were other things that needed to be discussed. Nick said it was a catch-22 where Zoning asked what the HDC said and CRMC asked about what Zoning and HDC say. Chairperson Allen said it might be better to give an approval. Nick said with the assumption that any changes required by CRMC would have to come back to the Commission for separate approval. He said if the HDC doesn't approve of it, then Zoning was going to ask what did the HDC say and so forth.

Attorney Teitz stated it wasn't like others the Commission has dealt with CRMC in the flood zone. He didn't anticipate other CRMC requiring anything other than minor changes. He said there may be nothing that requires the Commission's approval and if there is it was likely to be minor details.

Ms. Spence asked if a decision was going to be made one way or the other, and Chairperson Allen believed so. She asked if the Commission were to approve it, did it make sense to do a preliminary approval if they were to take back that 5ft from the deck just to have the conversation with Zoning. She stated Zoning could say no probably would say no, but to give the homeowner the extra square footage would be nice. Member Page said Zoning was going to do whatever they do, but that change wouldn't change it for the Commission. Chairperson Allen asked Member Page if he was suggesting they approve it. Member Page said he was suggesting that approving it with or without the extra 5ft wouldn't be an issue for the Commission. He said they had discussed all of the issues of concern to them. He asked Ms. Spence if they were going to make their decision with the flat or gabled roof. Ms. Spence stated it was the same design on A1-3 and A1-4 just to be 5ft wider to stay over footprint. Member Bergenholtz said it would be with the continuation of the soffit. Ms. Spence said she would continue the soffit and bring the dormer down a foot.

Member Church asked about the materials and stated they didn't have any product sheets for the windows or doors. Ms. Spence said she didn't have the spec sheets for the windows but had the materials list from the last meeting. She stated the exterior would be a wood product with a

painted finish in a similar fashion to the existing house. She talked about doing a shingle as the existing home had shingles; however, the existing home had a 9-inch exposure possibly asbestos shingle. In her example, she showed clapboard as the existing garage had clapboard which would be all wood. Member Church asked about the windows. Ms. Spence said the windows would be possibly Marvin Elevate windows, something that was either wood all the way through or wood interior and a clad exterior. Member Church asked what kind of clad was Ms. Spence considering. Ms. Spence thought it was clad with aluminum but wasn't sure and would check into it.

Member Lima suggested approving the building design and Ms. Spence could come back with a specific window choice for approval. Attorney Teitz advised the Commission to approve the envelope and the basic design and then have them come back for the specific details. Chairperson Allen said to Member Page that the Commission should approve it with and without the deck. Member Page felt the extra 5ft didn't matter to the Commission but rather mattered to the Zoning Board. Chairperson Allen said to Ms. Spence if the Commission gave her their approval without the deck, that would give the homeowner the space he wanted; however, if the Zoning Board said no, it would give the homeowner a fallback position. Ms. Spence said that would be great if it didn't matter to the Commission as she would like to have the opportunity to put it in front of Zoning.

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

Dr. Catherine Zipf stated she really wanted to like it. She said it was a beautiful design, but she had huge reservations with creating a precedence. She feared what could happen with essentially a 3-story garage which is what has been presented. Dr. Zipf worried about how many other garages might all of a sudden be 3 stories tall. She stated it was going to be slightly taller than addition but not taller than the existing house. Dr. Zipf said it was a tower of a structure and was worried about what it could mean for other garages in the area. She said from the district's perspective it's going to be a lot hard to defend.

Member Bergenholtz valued Dr. Zipf's opinion and the reason he would be for the project is this particular area of Bristol has always been considered the compact part of Town. He said things were very close and tall and was okay with it. He said he wouldn't be okay with it if it was something that was farther away from the area. Chairperson Allen asked if that could be something that was put into the decision as a finding of fact.

Ms. Spence agreed with Dr. Zipf about setting a precedence with making the building taller. From what she tends to see in the different zoning ordinances in different towns, the only reason they're allowed this height on an accessory structure is because it's in a W zone. She stated typically in a residentially zoned area, they're not allowed that height. She said she couldn't do something like this in Providence. Member Church stated since it was a compact area and the main house itself because of the flat roof addition was somewhat compromised it wasn't like it was a stand alone lot that had a colonial house with a small horse barn garage. The Commission looks at each area individually and what works for one doesn't necessarily mean it would work for another.

Nick asked Ms. Spence when they were going to go before Zoning. Ms. Spence said she wanted to talk to client as they may not be at a point to do it yet. Nick asked if they were on a meeting date yet and Ms. Spence said no. She said they still needed to get a survey and may go before Zoning in a couple of months.

Attorney Teitz suggested that Ms. Spence take what she's offered now and then come back to amend it if they wanted. Ms. Spence asked what the process was and Attorney Teitz said it would be treated as new design the Commission would have all of the background information. Member Church stated Ms. Spence needed to come back with the list of materials. Ms. Spence asked if the list of materials could come after the zoning approval and Attorney Teitz said yes. Nick said the only thing that was contingent is building permits.

Member Bergenholtz stated the decision should reflect that the dormer was going to be dropped by a foot below the ridge. Ms. Spence said the dormer could go down as much as it needed to and she could make the dormers flat.

Chairperson Allen asked if they didn't have a plan in front of them, could they approve it and Attorney Teitz said yes. Attorney Teitz said that's why they needed to have a plan in front of them. He said the Commission should vote on what was presented on A1-3 and A1-4 and if Ms. Spence wanted to come back with changes, she could. Chairperson Allen said if they approved it, Ms. Spence could do exactly what the plan stated. Attorney Teitz asked if they didn't want to do it. Chairperson Allen said if they approved what they had in front of them, then she didn't have to come back. Attorney Teitz said then the Commission didn't want to approve it now.

Member Bergenholtz said the motion that was presented was that the soffit was going to continue across the west side. Attorney Teitz said there was a difference about a detail like the soffit continuing along as opposed to the basic massing and envelope of the property which is what Ms. Spence was talking about changing. He said she wanted to go out 5ft closer to the property line. Member Page said they weren't going to do that now, just approve it the way it was presented. Member Bergenholtz said also dropping the height of the dormer so it's a foot below the ridge line. Attorney Teitz said to make it clear in the decision.

Motion made by Page to approve application #26-45 based on what is shown on A1-3 and A1-4 with the modification of the soffit to be extended across the west side of the building, with the gabled roof, with a drop of approximately 1ft of the dormer from the center beam of the roof. Finding of fact that the property is in the zone for water intrusion which changes the height of this particular structure and allows for the massing as it is located in the Waterfront Zoning District and to comply with CRMC; Seconded by Camara.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9, 10

Project Monitor: (Not specified at the meeting)

5H. 26-67: 99 Bradford St, Carl Pearson Discuss and act on changes to former commercial property to convert to single family home.

Greg Spiess and Carl Pearson were present.

Mr. Spiess presented the application on behalf of Mr. Pearson to the Commission and a discussion commenced. Chairperson Allen asked Mr. Spiess if the windows where true divided lights. Mr. Spiess stated they were dimensional mullions. He said the roof would be set back about 18 inches and lower the slope which was shown in the drawing. They were hoping to obtain the Commission's approval so they could get under way.

Chairperson Allen asked the Commission members if they had any questions. Alternate Member Camara appreciated the design changes with the roof. He stated they did a good job of keeping the spirit of building while making it suitable for residential living.

Chairperson Allen asked if anyone in the audience wanted to speak for or against the application. Dr. Catherine Zipf came forward to speak.

Dr. Catherine Zipf felt it was in the spirit of what was discussed at the previous meeting. She would like to see roof get less prominent, but this was a compromise on it. She raised a concern about what was happening around the windows on the 2nd story. Dr. Zipf said the windows looked a little more federal than they should be. She said the 1st floor still read as a commercial structure that was filled in with windows and it was done beautifully, but the 2nd story looked too Georgian to her. Dr. Zipf asked if the lintels could look less robust and look more commercial since it was a commercial building and they wouldn't want to Georgianize it too much. She said it was something to consider.

Mr. Spiess said they could look at the trim. He said it was a 1900s building moving into the craftsman era and perhaps they could find a transition trim. He stated they would revisit it. Mr. Spiess said in some ways this building was responding to the buildings around it. He hopes that could be done with the Project Monitor and not hold the project up.

Member Church asked if there was a design for the door? Mr. Spiess gave the product sheet to the Commission. Member Church asked if it was an all wood door and Mr. Spiess said yes. Member Bergenholtz advised Mr. Spiess that the selection was not appropriate for the house as it was an arts and crafts style door and the building was not an arts and crafts building. Mr. Spiess said the homeowners liked it and he felt it looked about the same vintage. Mr. Pearson stated they would go with the 6-panel wood door instead. Member Bergenholtz stated it looked like something from California. Mr. Spiess said if it was too much, they would change it. He said the concept submission had a door with 4 lights. Chairperson Allen said they could continue the door selection and they could come back. Member Church said it was a major feature right on the street.

Motion made by Alternate Member Camara to approve application #26-67 as presented. The Project Monitor will work with the homeowners on the project regarding choosing the window trim. The selection of the front door will be continued to the June 29th meeting; Seconded by Member Church.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9

Project Monitor: John Allen

Mr. Spiess asked if they needed to make a new application for the front door. Nick advised him to provide Nick with the spec sheet for the door, and the updated application information will be placed on the June 29th meeting agenda, and they will have to come back before the Commission to discuss the same. He advised Mr. Spiess that they could start the project, but to not install the new door yet. Nick told Mr. Spiess he was able to begin permitting.

5I. 26-33: 145 High St, Danny Ferreira Discuss and act on demolition of garage, rehabilitation of existing home, construction of addition to existing home.

Daniel Ferreira was present.

Mr. Ferreira presented the application to the Commission. The Commission then had a discussion with Mr. Ferreira.

Mr. Ferreira stated it wasn't what he wanted for the site. It was now going to be a 2-family home with a 2-car garage which would be designed more like a carriage house so a future homeowner could possibly use it as an in-law apartment or live in it and rent the front portion out.

Chairperson Allen was confused by the packet presented. Nick explained the old information was in the front and the new information was started on page A10. Mr. Ferreira stated it featured a yellow house. Nick clarified that the materials proposed from the original submission had not changed, but the design had changed. Mr. Ferreira stated that was correct.

Chairperson Allen stated he didn't understand the design. He asked Mr. Ferreira where the additional 3 units were going to be located. Mr. Ferreira stated that he eliminated the 3 additional units he had originally proposed and now it was just a 2-family home at the front with a 2-car garage with a unit above it. He stated he made a massive reduction and a huge shift in the design to be more in line with what the neighbors were requesting. Mr. Ferreira said it was zoned R-6 for multi-family use. He stated the property across street has a similar design, but his property had more square footage.

Member Church asked about the materials. Mr. Ferreira said the materials list was in the packet. Chairperson Allen said it was all wood. Mr. Ferreira stated the front would be all wood and back portion would be done in Hardie. Chairperson Allen asked about the railings on the porches. Mr. Ferreira said they would be done in wood. Member Church asked about the materials for the windows. Mr. Ferreira stated the windows would be vinyl as the existing home had vinyl windows. Nick said the existing home had vinyl 1 over 1 windows.

Chairperson Allen asked if the information on the windows was in the packet as well. Mr. Ferreira stated it could be seen in the photographs of the existing home. It showed vinyl windows and aluminum gutters. He stated he would be doing an aluminum gutter, but it would be an upgraded version which would look like copper. He said the existing windows were casement windows that didn't look appropriate. Mr. Ferreira said he was going to make them 4 over 4.

Mr. Ferreira stated the existing condition of the home was very poor and he would have to remove the majority of the siding due to rot. He said the back portion completely collapsed and was removed. He has the property stabilized but wants to get moving on it.

Mr. Ferreira said he wanted to remove the remains of the 10-car garage in the back as it was in very poor shape. Chairperson Allen stated Mr. Ferriera would need the Commission's approval to do so. Member Bergenholtz though that was already approved. Mr. Ferreira said the Commission approved the partial removal of the roof structure and whatever else had collapsed. He kept up what hadn't collapsed. He didn't want to do anything further without the Commission's approval.

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

Neighbors, Lenny Pansa, Greg Carleu, Sebastian Wordell, Bart Ferris, and Michael Dupont, spoke against the project. While they all appreciated Mr. Ferreira's efforts to clean up the property and reduce the overall size of the project, they still felt the massing was too much.

Dr. Catherine Zipf came up to speak. She commended Mr. Ferreira for coming in and cutting 2 whole units out of his project. She asked Mr. Ferreira about decorative woodwork on the corners of the building and around the doorway. Mr. Ferreira said he would save it if he could as there was a lot of rot in those areas. He didn't want to get rid of it. Mr. Ferreira wanted to recreate the molding the way it existed to keep the esthetics of the home. Dr. Zipf stated it was a working man's cottage which was obvious in the trim around the doorways as it was very basic with no bottoms or corner pieces to create

a whole column. She wanted to point it out to Mr. Ferreira so he would retain those details as it would be easy to replicate. Mr. Ferreira said he would take a lot of photographs. He asked Dr. Zipf for her help.

David Sisson, architect for the project, wanted to explain the zoning issues for the project. He explained some of the decisions that were made in the project. Mr. Sisson stated the property was zoned for multi-family. He said the neighbors were correct that they had some dimensional issue which was a different standard for the Zoning Board. Mr. Sisson stated the dimensional issues were regarding the width of the property and the side setbacks. He said on right hand side of the property, the existing side setback was less than 3ft, approximately 2.8ft. They were improving that side setback such that their addition will align with the existing home. Mr. Sisson said it would go to 6½ ft which would make it better. On the other side, they're required to have 10ft and they're going to ask for 7½ ft. He stated they wanted to do that so people wouldn't have to swerve around the house to get into the garage. He felt it looked better and worked better.

Mr. Sisson said the reason they went wide on the property is for a practical reason, for firefighting reasons. He would have preferred to have gone longer and deeper, but it would become harder to fight a fire on the property. Mr. Sisson said the longer and deeper they went with the project, the fire department would require them to place sprinklers in the house and that would have been a dealbreaker for getting the project done. They worked really hard to keep the height of the addition to be the same as the existing home. He said it was shorter than a lot of the neighbors.

Chairperson Allen asked Attorney Teitz whether or not the Commission could require Mr. Ferreira to build a single family on the property. Attorney Teitz said no, the Commission did not have purview over the use of the property. He stated that the Commission's issues were confined to the historic appropriateness of the physical structures, not how they're going to be occupied. Attorney Teitz said there was an interrelationship with zoning in the fact that if Mr. Ferreira was to put two separate buildings on the property, he would need much more significant relief than if he had one large building. He believes that was Mr. Ferreira's idea

behind keeping it as one building as opposed to putting a whole separate building or detached second structure. Attorney Teitz said that was not the Commission's worry or control. He stated if the Commission was able to justify based on their findings of fact and the historic appropriateness that it was not appropriate with the garage attached and should be farther back as a second structure separated from a historic point of view, then the Commission could do that. Attorney Teitz said it was Mr. Ferreira's issue to deal with Zoning. He advised the Commission to focus on the buildings.

Mr. Sisson advised the Commission that they attempted to go to Zoning, but Zoning said they had to go to the HDC first. Attorney Teitz stated that was the normal practice because the Commission would want the first crack at where the project was going.

Chairperson Allen stated he had previously recommended that the building be pushed back. He felt it should be two buildings. He said it was too much upfront. Chairperson Allen asked Mr. Ferreira how many feet in the current plan was behind the second building. Mr. Ferreira said there was a lot of space towards the back. He said there were a lot of homes in the area that have 7,000sqft lots and most of those lots are covered by homes. He said the property across the street was similar in design and his design was only connected by a breezeway. Mr. Ferreira said he could eliminate the breezeway which would make it two separate buildings. He said breezeways are highly sought after to be able to utilize it and not have to go through lousy weather from the garage to the main home.

Mr. Ferreira said the unit above the garage was in line with ADU specifications. He stated it was meeting all of the guidelines for an ADU, and he didn't need any approval from Zoning or anyone except for the Commission for aesthetics. Mr. Ferreira said he could get it as an ADU instead of a multi-family property, but he would rather do it as a multi-family property for whomever purchases the property. He stated there was plenty of parking on the site. Requirement wise and zoning wise, he has met the obligation. Chairperson Allen asked how many spaces there were for parking. Mr. Ferreira stated there were 2 spaces in the garage and 2 to 5 spaces in the driveway. He said on the left-hand side of the building, there would be a spot for the ADU. Mr.

Ferreira said the main house would have 4 spaces and the ADU had access to 2 spaces which was on the site plan.

Chairperson Allen said the massing was too much for the lot. He suggested moving it back as far as he could. Mr. Ferreira stated he still had the 10-car garage in the back. He said the existing structure did have a lot more space, but that back addition section was torn off and was no longer on the site. Mr. Ferreira said he narrowed that area and made it smaller on the design plan. He stated everyone was commenting that the new design was 3x times the size but that was actually not true. Mr. Sisson stated they actually reduced the lot coverage. Nick stated that Chairperson Allen was referring to the massing of the building itself and not necessarily the lot coverage. Chairperson Allen said a compromise would be for Mr. Ferreira to take building as far back on the lot as he can. He stated the house across the street had the same, but it wasn't connected by a breezeway. Mr. Ferreira said the breezeway wasn't visible due to its angle.

One of the neighbors asked Mr. Ferreira which house he was referring to and Mr. Ferreira stated it was the white house across the street. She stated that was a single-family home he was referring to. Mr. Ferreira stated even if he decided to keep it as a single-family home and decided later to make it an ADU, the house across the street was a 3-story home which was taller than his property. He stated the frontage was the same as his and it has a garage that was close to the 3-story home. Chairperson Allen stated the garage wasn't as tall as the one Mr. Ferreira was proposing on his property. Mr. Ferreira understood as he had a proposed living space above, but it was still within the height requirements.

Chairperson Allen stated he would not be able to vote for the project due to the size of the massing. Member Lima asked Mr. Ferreira what his plans were for the area where the 10-car garage was currently located. Mr. Ferreira stated it would be grass, trees, or a garden space. Member Lima understood what Mr. Ferreira was trying to do but suggested shifting the proposed garage and making everything parallel might not be as difficult for people to grasp and see from the High Street side. She said if stuff was hidden behind the main house, it would still accomplish what Mr. Ferreira wanted to do in terms of

adding on more housing and more garage but not being seen from the street.

Mr. Ferreira said that could be an option to consider; however, the neighbors stated at the previous meeting that they didn't want to see a strip mall. He stated that by shifting the garage it would make it look like a strip mall like he had before, no one is going to be happy. Mr. Ferreira said that no one wants him to put a multi-family home there. He was doing the best he could to please everyone but felt he wasn't getting anywhere and was frustrated. Mr. Ferreira stated the renderings of the white house in the original submission showed exactly that, but the neighbors objected to it. He said if the Commission wanted to give them a decision on that submission or the new option.

Chairperson Allen took a poll of the Commission. Member Bergenholtz appreciated that the dormers were set back but felt they were still too big. He said the dormers looked contemporary, which ruined the original lines of the house. He asked if they could be set back more and less contemporary looking. Member Bergenholtz also made a suggestion was to stake out the site and have a site visit.

Member Page said the garage lining up just made it far more of a wall on that street, but the general historical look was fine. He agreed with turning the garage, so it was all in one line. Alternate Member Camara appreciated Mr. Ferreira cleaning up the property. He felt if the garage was in one line, it could still stay connected, and it would preserve the site line. He said it would preserve the street view. Alternate Member Camara said the design on its face wasn't a bad thing but given the district's nature and given the history of the area, moving it around would preserve the property.

Member Millard appreciated the work Mr. Ferreira put into the project. She agreed with Member Bergenholtz regarding the dormers. She also felt that the side porch was too big, but beyond that, it was doable. She asked how many people would be living there. Mr. Ferreira was going to retain the property, but now it will be sold. He said the main house will have 4 bedrooms, 2 of which being master bedrooms, 1 on each floor. He wasn't sure how many would be living there, possibly 6 to 8 individuals. He stated that everything was designed in

accordance with zoning and there were no more than 4 beds per unit. He designed the house specifically with someone in mind that he knew was interested in buying in the area who had a family of 2 children and their mother-in-law.

Member Church said the massing and scale of the original house bothered her. She asked if the shed dormer in addition could be reduced because it ruins the whole streetscape and personality of the original house with the yellow house design. She agreed with the rest of the Commission about turning the garage. Mr. Ferreira asked if Member Church liked the way the garage was on the white house design and Member Church said yes. Member Church said it preserved the original massing of the house. Mr. Ferreira stated in order for him to do a multi-family space above the garage, he would need to have that style of dormer there to have the living space above.

Attorney Teitz said the concern was with the shed dormer on the original house at the front on both sides. Member Church mentioned the dormer on the addition as well and asked if he could make it 1 dormer. Mr. Ferreira asked Member Church if she would be okay with the white house style. Member Church asked if it would be all one building and Mr. Ferreira said yes. She stated he would have more of a driveway with parking behind it and Mr. Ferreira said yes and he would be able to retain the 10-car garage as well. Attorney Teitz asked to note the pages they were looking at. Member Church stated it was page 216, Option B on Plan A10-2. Attorney Teitz said it was the first 3 elements, the original house, the connector, and the garage, and it wouldn't include anything beyond that. Member Church said without a dormer. Attorney Teitz stated there wouldn't be shed dormers on either side, only 2 doghouse dormers on the original house, and no dormer on the connector. Member Church said the porch was fine.

Member Lima agreed with Member Church. Member Page agreed as well. Chairperson Allen thought it would look awful to see a long row of a house. Member Church said the Commission has done it with others. Chairperson Allen said not with that much massing. Member Church said there was an example on Union Street, that being a yellow colonial house. She said they added on a kitchen addition that went into another family type room and

another addition past that which went right down the east side of the property. Chairperson Allen didn't think that house was a good idea either. Member Church stated the homeowner retained the main house, so they knew its time, place, and significance in the district. She said with Mr. Ferreira's yellow design could be any time.

Chairperson Allen asked Mr. Ferreira if he could mask the back buildings. Member Lima asked Mr. Ferreira if he could set them in somehow. Member Church asked if the Commission had a drawing of the dimensions. Mr. Ferreira said the dimension should have been in the packet. Member Lima said she never knew there was a 10-car garage on the property. Mr. Ferreira said it was covered with junk and trees that fell on it. Member Lima said if the addition could be disguised in the same way the garage was, then it might be easier for everyone.

Member Church directed Chairperson Allen to look at page 212. She stated that's what everyone would be looking at from the street. Mr. Ferreira said the only addition that would be beyond the original building would be the 2-car garage as everything else was pre-existing on the property. Chairperson Allen stated no one ever saw the garages. He stated looking down the driveway, it would be like looking at a shopping mall. Mr. Ferreira stated he was trying to avoid that with the second design.

Chairperson Allen stated if he took the back building and moved it as far back as he could on the property, it wouldn't look so massive. Mr. Ferreira said it was a fire safety issue at that point. He was trying to avoid issues like that. He stated the cost significantly increases even more and at that point he would probably walk away from the project. He doesn't want to do that and wants to make it something beautiful. Mr. Ferreira suggested using the white house design and putting arborvitaes along the front portion of it, so as someone is going down the driveway people won't see it. He liked the idea of switching to white house design. Chairperson Allen stated Mr. Ferreira would have to get some very tall arborvitaes for it. Mr. Ferreira understood.

Attorney Teitz stated the Commission was not able to control the plantings. He asked Mr. Ferreira if the arborvitae on the sidewalk was still there and Mr. Ferreira said no. Attorney Teitz stated that's what hid a lot of the area to begin with. He said the Commission

had to look at it by the softscape landscape. Chairperson Allen said he couldn't vote for it if there wasn't some type of masking of the building. Attorney Teitz stated the Commission needed to decide which way to they wanted go. He said one of the suggestions was to stake out the site and perhaps the 2 alternatives could be staked out with different colors for a site visit. Mr. Ferreira stated it was obvious that no one liked the yellow house design, so he wasn't going to stake it out. He liked the idea of the white house design. He was trying to do his best and was just looking for a decision.

Mr. Ferreira also liked the yellow house design. He asked if it would help if there was a breezeway for separation. Chairperson Allen said the breezeway wasn't visible. Mr. Ferreira said the breezeway wasn't visible, but it would add some separation. He said the same idea of the breezeway from the yellow house design could be done with the white house design where the 2-car garage was separated with a breezeway and it would give the illusion of being separated from the street. Mr. Ferreira wanted to keep it connected because people do like to go from the garage to the house while being protected from the elements. He asked the Commission for a consensus so he could come back with designs.

Chairperson Allen polled the Commission. Member Page said he was good with page 212, the top drawing. He understood the idea of further separation with a breezeway. Member Bergenholtz and Member Lima agreed with Member Page. Chairperson Allen was not for any of the options. Member Camara agreed with Member Page. Member Church and Member Millard were okay with it as well.

Dr. Catherine Zipf, referring to page 212, A5 drawings on the top of the page (1 on the right and 1 on the left), asked Mr. Ferreira if he was going to build only those structures. Mr. Ferreira stated it was just those structures with the breezeway to separate the 2-car garage from the pre-existing structure and nothing else. Dr. Zipf stated the existing structure would be more like the design of the yellow house rendering in the sense he would have 2 dormers and Mr. Ferreira said yes. She asked if the 2nd unit would be entirely over the garage. Mr. Ferreira said that was correct. Dr. Zipf said the

main structure would not be a 4-bed home. Mr. Ferreira stated it would go back to a 3-bed dwelling.

Dr. Zipf asked Attorney Teitz if an ADU would still be allowed on the property. Attorney Teitz wasn't sure. Mr. Ferreira said yes but it wasn't his intention to do so. He said the lot was 23,000sqft and he could do a detached ADU, but, again, that wasn't his intention. Attorney Teitz asked Dr. Zipf if she meant if someone else could add one in the future and Dr. Zipf said yes. Attorney Teitz stated it couldn't be a 3-story garage, but theoretically it could be up to a 1,200sqft separate building as long as it met all of the setbacks.

Dr. Zipf advised the Commission it was a good deal. She stated Mr. Ferreira came originally with 4 units and he was now prepared to settle on the original structure and preserve it as much as possible. She said Mr. Ferreira was replacing the addition that was already there with something different but more or less the same while adding a garage and a second unit. Dr. Zipf said it was a good deal from where Mr. Ferreira originally was and encouraged the Commission to accept it. She appreciated there could be further modifications in the future, but what Mr. Ferreira was offering now the Commission should give it significant consideration.

Mr. Pansa voiced his concerns against it. Member Lima stated it was a concept review, and the Commission was not making a decision. Attorney Teitz advised everyone that since substantial changes have been made to the design, no vote was going to be taken without having a plan presented. He stated Mr. Ferreira would have to come back with complete plans.

Mr. Wordell stated Mr. Ferreira kept addressing the 2nd unit as an ADU, but as long as it met the setbacks, he wouldn't have a problem with it. Mr. Ferreira stated that his intent was to not put another ADU structure on the property. He's working on a few things that would prevent that from happening. Mr. Ferreira stated he was in negotiations to reduce the square footage of the lot which would then eliminate the ability to add an ADU.

Attorney Teitz suggested continuing the matter to the next meeting including a site plan. Mr. Ferreira said he would have everything. Nick stated the deadline was June 12th. Attorney Teitz reminded everyone that the next

meeting would be on Monday, June 29th as there wasn't going to be a July meeting.

Motion made by Member Lima to continue application #26-33 to the June 29th meeting; Seconded by Member Church.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries

5J. 25-12: 125 Hope St, Nancy DiPrete Laurienzo Discuss and act on demolition of existing structure and replacement with new structure.

Alfred R. Rego, Jr., Attorney for the owners, Madeline Melchert, architect, and Dennis DiPrete, civil/environment engineer, were present.

Attorney Rego gave an overview of the application and the Rhode Island Historic Preservation's opinion.

Chairperson Allen asked if everything in the packet was from the previous packet. Nick stated everything in the packet was new information but was all based on the previous application.

Dennis DiPrete presented the application to the Commission. The Commission then commenced a discussion. Mr. DiPrete handed out enlarged copies of the plans to the Commission. Chairperson Allen stated the Commission thought they were coming to get approval for the demolition of the building. Mr. DiPrete said the Commission wouldn't approve demolition without seeing new designs. He said there were 2 applications before the Commission this evening; 1) the demolition permit request, and 2) the future design. Chairperson Allen said Mr. DiPrete did an excellent job of putting together something that he could support. However, there were no details about the new building, and the Commission would need that information before they could approve it. Mr. DiPrete said they submitted elevations, materials list, and a report. Attorney Teitz stated there was a May 20th submission. Nick stated it was submitted.

Mr. DiPrete said they still had a long way to go. They still needed to engage CRMC at a higher level, but they needed the Commission's approval. Mr. DiPrete stated the Building Inspector also had to sign an affidavit for the CRMC that the local approvals were in place. He said CRMC gave them a preliminary determination.

Chairperson Allen polled the Commission. Member Page said the new submission answered all of the questions that had been brought up previously. He said it was good as a single family, and it reflected what was there. Member Page was good with it.

Member Bergenholtz stated he liked it as a single family and liked the way it looked from Hope Street. His only reservation was the number of windows that would be seen from the water. He didn't recall that many windows facing the water. Mr. DiPrete said there weren't a lot of windows in the structure, and they wanted to find a compromise. He said the main house had a considerable number of windows, but the model house didn't. Mr. DiPrete stated they were moving some of the living space from the basement to the first floor. They didn't try to get a replica of the house, but rather a historically informed replacement. He said they took the most important elements of the existing structure and tried to envision what people were going to want when living there.

Member Lima agreed with Member Bergenholtz. She said the Hope Street side was very appropriate and understood the need to have a better view of the water but felt having only windows on the water side was a bit too much.

Alternate Member Camara asked Member Bergenholtz which photograph he was referring to and Member Bergenholtz said it was A2-1. Alternate Member Camara asked how many windows there were. Member Bergenholtz said there were 30-40 windows. Alternate Member Camara stated he didn't have as much of an issue with it but understood Member Bergenholtz' point. He said it was too bad original structure couldn't be saved. Member Millard liked the new design very much as she felt like she was looking at the old building. She didn't feel that it had to mimic it exactly, but the massing was good.

Member Church liked the design and the 1-story connection between the 2 buildings. She liked the window

configuration in the rendering. Member Church didn't like the double window on the Hope Street side. Mr. DiPrete stated she was looking at the old design and showed her the current design and stated the window was eliminated.

Attorney Teitz asked if there was a photograph simulation from the water and Mr. DiPrete said no. Mr. DiPrete said looking at it from certain elevations the windows might look more harsh in black & white. He stated looking at it in the photograph rendering, it didn't look harsh. Member Bergenholtz said the back looked non-descript and full of glass. He was concerned with it. Chairperson Allen said it was too much glass on the back. Mr. DiPrete said that maybe a rendering of the back would give the Commission a better understanding of the look. They didn't think it was a high priority to the Commission. Member Bergenholtz stated the Commission was charged with the visual from both the water view and the street view.

Mr. DiPrete made a suggestion to the Commission that the applicant agree to reduce the square footage of the windows by 10-15% along the back. Member Lima stated the Commission would need to see a rendering as they couldn't visualize what 10-15% less would look like. Alternate Member Camara asked if that part of the application affected their request for demolition. Chairperson Allen said yes. Mr. DiPrete said they would extend their request as it was all tied together.

Chairperson Allen said that everyone was happy with the front. He asked Mr. DiPrete the height from ground to top of the peak in the front from both street side visual renderings. Mr. DiPrete said from the 1st floor of the proposed house to the peak it was 31ft. He wasn't sure about the grading in the front because of the flood plain. Chairperson Allen asked the height of the existing house and Mr. DiPrete wasn't sure. He stated the Commission needed to know that information. Chairperson Allen said just from the photographs the proposed building appeared to be about the same height, but they needed to know. Mr. DiPrete said it was a little tall and the architect took it into consideration. He stated he talked to CRMC about moving the structure back a couple of feet further from the street to accommodate that. He will address it when they return for the next meeting.

Member Church asked if the connector would be 1 story, not 2 stories. Mr. DiPrete said it would be exactly as it existed currently. Member Church stated the rendering appeared to show the connector as 2 stories. Madaline Melchert said they made the connector 2 stories once they made it a single-family residence so it could be accessed from both sides. She said it was recessed back and there was a shed roof that mimicked how it existed currently. Member Church asked what it looked like from the water. Ms. Melchert said the connector was glass. Member Church said that changed the whole aspect of it being 2 buildings. Mr. DiPrete said it was designed that way to keep the same look. Ms. Melchert said there was a viewpoint through since it was just a connector.

Member Lima said those were the things they needed to come back with. Mr. DiPrete said it seemed like they were getting closer to the finish line. He reiterated that they would come back with a rendering of the back with less glass. Member Church asked Mr. DiPrete to differentiate the 2 buildings more boldly. Mr. DiPrete asked if there was anything else they needed. Chairperson Allen said they wanted to see the connector in the mock-up. Ms. Melchert asked if they needed a physical model. Nick stated that as long as Mr. DiPrete filed something by June 12th, supplemental items could be presented at the meeting.

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

Dr. Catherine Zipf said she wanted to know how much taller the new building was from the old building. She asked Ms. Melchert if the roof pitch was the same. Ms. Melchert said it was steeper than before but didn't know by how much and would get that information for the next meeting. Dr. Zipf said the issues with the windows on the back said were due to the style of the house. She stated they should be horizontal not vertical windows. Dr. Zipf said the Commission might feel better about the windows if they weren't as tall. She remembered the panoramic view through the middle, but it was more of a horizontal window, not floor to ceiling. Dr. Zipf asked for a condition on the demolition permit was for full documentation of what was there. She said there was 100% high integrity contributing building to the historic

district which should be captured and documented before it was demolished. She stated Mary Harrington did it for Mt. Hope High and she would have specifications on the process for them and probably some contractors to recommend. Dr. Zipf would love to see it done. She stated the documentation from Mt. Hope High was placed in both the RI Historical Preservation Society archives and the Bristol Historical Society archives.

Motion made by Member Lima to continue application #25-12 to the June 29th meeting; Seconded by Page.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries

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

Chairperson Allen advised the Commission that Peggy Fredericks was nominated by Preserve RI as she needed a letter of recommendation from the Commission. Nick stated he would draft a recommendation letter.

Motion made by Chairperson Allen to write a recommendation letter on behalf of Peggy Frederick; Seconded by Page.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries

10. **Adjourned at 11:02PM**



07-08-2026