

TOWN OF BRISTOL, RHODE ISLAND

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION



**Historic District Commission Meeting Minutes
Monday, June 29, 2026
at 7:00 PM
Town Hall - 10 Court Street, Bristol Rhode Island**

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

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

1. Pledge of Allegiance

The meeting was called to order at 7:00PM, and the Pledge of Allegiance was promptly recited afterwards.

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

Also in attendance: Town Solicitor Teitz, and Toth

Absent: Ponder

2. Staff Report

2A. Staff Report

3. Review of Previous Month's Meeting Minutes

3A. Review of minutes of the June 4, 2026 meeting.

Chairperson Allen's corrections were as follows: Page 16, under "5B", 2nd paragraph down, first paragraph should read "Member Bergenholtz stated that" not "Member Bergenholtz state"; and on page 38, under "5H", the 3rd paragraph, the beginning of the sentence should read "Chairperson Allen asked" not "Chairperson Allen aside". With no other correction or comments from any other Commission Members, a motion was made.

Motion made by Member Lima to accept the minutes of the June 4, 2026 meeting as amended; Seconded by Member Page.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries

4. **Application Reviews**

4A. 26-83: 61 Court St, Caitlin Frumerie Discuss and act on addition of wood fence to property along rear of driveway.

Sebastian Wordell and Caitlin Frumerie were present.

Ms. Frumerie and Mr. Wordell presented the application to the Commission. The Commission then discussed the same. Member Church asked Ms. Frumerie to indicate on the photograph provided where the fence was to be located. Ms. Frumerie approached Member Church and showed her the location of the fence. Ms. Frumerie stated there would be a small gate that would look exactly like the picket fence. Chairperson Allen asked if it was going to be all pressure treated wood. Ms. Frumerie said yes and she was going to paint 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, he asked for a motion.

Motion made by Member Church to approve application #26-83 as presented for the installation of a pressure treated picket fence to be located in the back yard as shown in the diagram of Item 1 on Page 58; Seconded by Member Page.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries

Secretary of Interior Standards: 10

Project Monitor: Susan Church

Nick advised Ms. Frumerie that the permit would be issued through online portal and to post it in the front of the house where visible.

4B. 26-62: 15 Church St, Deborah Appleyard Discuss and act on permanent removal of shutters.

Member Bergenholtz recused.

Deb Appleyard present.

Ms. Appleyard presented the application, and the Commission had a discussion thereafter. Chairperson Allen asked if there was any proof that the shutters were not historic to the home. Ms. Appleyard stated Nate Bergenholtz was going to speak on that point, but that other houses in the area that were federal style didn't have shutters on them.

Chairperson Allen asked if anyone else on the Commission had any questions.

Ms. Appleyard stated that the shutters were not working shutters. Member Church asked if the shutters were wide enough to close and asked about the hardware. She asked Ms. Appleyard if she removed the hardware would she be willing to store it. Ms. Appleyard said she didn't know if there was any hardware there. Member Church said she noticed hinges in the photographs. Ms. Appleyard said it was done by a handyman rather quickly because it was windy and there were pieces flying around and they needed to be removed. Member Church asked Ms. Appleyard if she understood what Member Church was referring to and Ms. Appleyard said she did, but that she wasn't sure if all of it was there or not. Member Church asked if the shutters had been removed already and Ms. Appleyard said yes. Member Page stated the hardware was there the day before the meeting. Ms. Appleyard said she hadn't climbed up onto the house to remove the shutters herself.

Member Lima said that Ms. Appleyard had removed the shutters before she came to the Commission meeting. Ms. Appleyard said that the shutters were removed by a

handyman because there were pieces falling off and she was concerned that someone passing on the street was going to get hurt. Member Lima asked what was done with the shutters after they were removed and Ms. Appleyard wasn't sure. Chairperson Allen said if something like that were to happen again, Ms. Appleyard should get a hold of Nick before proceeding.

Nick stated he was aware of it and went out to the property during the process of the shutters being removed and had noted it in the Staff Report. He advised the Commission that the approval that was given administratively was for the removal and repair of the shutters as that was Ms. Appleyard's original intention. Nick stated that, as the applicant said earlier, the applicant didn't believe it made sense to replace them. He said it was approved to remove and replace, but in the process of doing so, the contractor couldn't repair them once they were down. Ms. Appleyard said the shutters weren't in any condition to repair and replace them. Nick stated that was her original intent and Ms. Appleyard said yes.

Chairperson Allen asked Nick if he felt the shutters weren't able to be repaired. Nick said a few were in okay shape and a few were in really rough shape. He stated that as the contractor was loading them in his truck, the shutters were coming apart. Nick said it was about 50/50, some were salvageable and some were not.

Member Millard said it was her understanding that shutters were more of a Victorian feature on houses. She said people with earlier houses in Town had shutters because they liked them. Member Millard felt it was a Victorian feature and was okay with Ms. Appleyard not having shutters.

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

Nate Bergenholtz came up to speak. Mr. Bergenholtz stated that according to Timberlane's Old House Journal for federal style houses around the same time period, shutters were present in some and absent in others. He said they were mostly present in warmer, wet climates in the south. Mr. Bergenholtz said that Antique's Home Magazine stated that federal home exterior shutters were

only seen in rural houses with prime examples that had shutters which folded into the interior of the window jams. He stated when Ms. Appleyard's home was built in 1807, Bristol was not considered rural and was a busy seaport. Mr. Bergenholtz said many federal homes in Town didn't have shutters and gave examples. He asked the Commission to grant Ms. Appleyard's petition to keep the shutters off the house.

Chairperson Allen asked Attorney Teitz if the Commission needed a standard and Attorney Teitz said yes. Attorney Teitz said that the Commission was finding that the shutters were not an original character feature, so it was not violating Standard 5. He stated the Commission would be in conformance with Standard 5 because the feature, i.e. the shutters, that were being removed was not an original feature to the home.

Motion made by Alternate Member Camara to approve application #26-62 as presented with a finding of fact that research showed that the shutters were not original to the house; Seconded by Member Page.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries

Secretary of Interior Standards: 5

Project Monitor: (Not indicated)

4C. 26-67: 99 Bradford St, Carl Pearson Discuss and act on continued door.

Carl Pearson was present.

Mr. Pearson presented the application to the Commission. The Commission then discussed the same. Chairperson Allen asked Mr. Pearson if the door was going to be a custom door and Mr. Pearson said yes. Member Bergenholtz said the door was very nice and appropriate.

With no further questions or comments, a motion was made.

Motion made by Member Church to approve application #26-67 as presented on Exhibit 1; Seconded by Alternate Member Camara.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9

Project Monitor: John Allen

Chairperson Allen asked Mr. Pearson to put the certificate in the front where visible when it was ready.

4D. 26-53: 224 Hope St, Gregory Leonetti Discuss and act on bulkhead, changes to stairs if not approved at site visit, windows.

Nick advised the Commission that Mr. Leonetti requested a continuance.

Motion made by Member Lima to continue application #26-53 to the August meeting; Seconded by Member Page.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries

4E. 26-74: 570 Hope St, BWRSD Discuss and act on replacement of door in kind.

Nick advised the Commission that School Department requested a continuance.

Motion made by Member Lima to continue application #26-74 to the August meeting; Seconded by Member Page.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries

4F. 26-72: 142 High St, Nina Murphy & Bart Ferris

Discuss and act on installation of Solar Panels.

Bart Farris, Nina Murphy, and Mike Soldon(?) of NEC Solar, were present.

Mr. Ferris and Mr. Soldon presented the application. The Commission had a discussion thereafter. Chairperson Allen asked if the solar panels were going to power both the brick house and the back house. Mr. Ferris said it would power the back house which would give them credits which would be sold back and then they get credits for the front house which would provide more power to the front house. Member Church asked where all of the mechanics were going to be located. Mr. Soldon said they were planning to install everything to the right of the bulkhead. He said 2 of the boxes would be located there and there would be a conduit which would go up to the roof surface which would be located on the north side of the building which would be against a fence line with 10-15ft arborvitaes. Mr. Soldon approached Member Church to show her the location on the plan.

Chairperson Allen asked if anyone else had any questions or comments. He then asked for a motion.

Motion made by Member Bergenholtz to approve application #26-72 as presented. If the mechanical components become obsolete or inoperable it is to be removed within 1 year; Seconded by Member Lima.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9

Project Monitor: Ory Lima

4G. 26-76: 250 Metacom Ave, Mount Hope Farm Discuss and act on replacement of garage door with barn door.

Brenda Turchetta and Jon Feinstein were present.

Ms. Turchetta presented the application to the Commission. The Commission then had a discussion regarding the application. Chairperson Allen asked the Commission members if anyone had any comments or questions. Alternate Member Camara asked Ms. Turchetta if the design of the proposed barn door was reminiscent of the style that would have been on the barn at that time. Ms. Turchetta wasn't sure but felt it was more appropriate for the barn. Alternate Member Camara stated the picture in the packet was of the existing door on the barn and Ms. Turchetta said yes. Mr. Feinstein said the existing door wasn't in keeping with the barn and it wasn't efficient from an energy point of view. He stated it would also allow for light to come into the room in the winter months when the door is closed. Mr. Feinstein stated they tried to find a wooden door that would look appropriate as they had spent a lot of money to restore the barn and replacing the door would be the final touch.

Member Bergenholtz asked if they were going to drop the transom that was on the top. Ms. Turchetta spoke with FT Construction and the measurements allowed for the transom to stay. Member Bergenholtz said the arch looked a little busy and suggested the New Orleans style door. Member Church asked if it was natural wood and Ms. Turchetta said yes, western red cedar.

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 Alternate Member Camara to approve application #26-76 as presented; Seconded by Page.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9

Project Monitor: Chris Ponder

Nick asked the applicants that the green sheet would be available online.

4H. 26-79: 301 Hope St, Eli Dunn Discuss and act on painting of sign on side of building.

Eli Dunn was present.

Mr. Dunn presented the application, and the Commission had a discussion thereafter. Chairperson Allen asked if there was any concern regarding the size of the mural. Nick advised Mr. Dunn to run it by zoning to make sure the dimensions were okay with zoning. Mr. Dunn stated he would work within the constraints of zoning. Attorney Teitz said the constraint may be 8sq.ft. and Mr. Dunn's proposed mural was much larger. He said Mr. Dunn could apply for relief. Nick said if the Commission was just approving the design, then they could approve it based on zoning. Attorney Teitz stated it could be subject to zoning approval.

Mr. Dunn asked Nick what the zoning process was. Nick advised Mr. Dunn to speak with Ed Tanner as he could help him with the application process. Nick said if it needed to go before the Zoning Board, it would be a similar process to the HDC.

Chairperson Allen asked the Commission members if anyone else had any other questions or comments. Attorney Teitz advised the Commission to make it clear that: 1) they were approving it, but it was subject to zoning; and 2) if a smaller sized mural was approved by zoning, then that would also be approved by the Commission and Mr. Dunn wouldn't have to come back. Attorney Teitz said if, for any reason, the mural was to be larger, then Mr. Dunn would have to come back for the Commission's approval.

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

Motion made by Member Lima to approve application #26-79 for the installation painting of a sign/mural as presented, subject to the approval of the Zoning Board regarding the dimensions. If the Zoning Board approves a smaller sign/mural, the Commission also approves of the same. If the Zoning Board, for whatever reason, approves or requires a larger sign, then application will have to return to the Commission for further approval; Seconded by Member Page.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9 and 10

Project Monitor: Ory Lima

4I. 26-80: 799 Hope St, Bristol Garden Club Discuss and act on installation of information kiosk signage at Thomas Park.

Lucy Perkin was present.

Ms. Perkin presented the application to the Commission, and the Commission discussed the same. Chairperson Allen asked Ms. Perkin to tell the Commission about the story boards. Ms. Perkin said it was a collaboration with Bill Buzza to design the story boards. They did a tremendous amount of research for Mrs. Perry's story board, as well as for the garden club story board.

Chairperson Allen asked the Commission members if anyone had any questions or comments. Alternate Member Camara asked Ms. Perkin if the story boards were roughly the same size as the other story boards existing in the Town. Ms. Perkin said they were designed to mirror the style and design of the other story boards in the Town. Member Lima asked where the story boards would be located. Ms. Perkin said the boards would be located in Mrs. Perry's garden to the left of the rain catch.

Chairperson Allen stated the Commission has had some reluctance to continue to approve story boards as there seemed to be a lot of them in the Town, but those were going to be in a good location. Member Bergenholtz agreed with Chairperson Allen. Chairperson Allen said that Johnson & Wales had their story boards printed on 2 sides so when one side wore out, they just flipped it over and used the other side. He suggested to Ms. Perkin that it might be something to consider doing for the club's boards.

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 Member Church to approve application #26-80 for the installation of 2 story boards as presented; Seconded by Alternate Member Camara.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries

Secretary of Interior Standards: 10

Project Monitor: Robert Page

4J. 26-81: 1200 Hope St, Infinity 1217 LLC Discuss and act on construction of well house, change of previously approved siding materials for carriage houses.

No one present.

Motion made by Member Lima to continue application #26-81 to the August meeting; Seconded by Chairperson Allen.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries

4K. 26-82: 8 Constitution St, John Marshall Discuss and act on replacement of denied sliding glass door with window on rear of garage.

Attorney Alfred R. Rego, Jr., John Marshall, and Peter Dwyer were present.

Attorney Rego presented the application to the Commission. The Commission then had a discussion. Attorney Rego approached the Commission and presents a mock-up to the members. Member Church asked Attorney Rego what the dimensions were that they were requesting. Chairperson Allen stated for clarification the slider doors were going to be taken out and 2 double hung windows were going to be put in. Attorney Rego said that was correct.

Attorney Teitz asked if they had a plan or the dimensions of the windows that would be installed. Mr. Marshall said no one would be able to walk out through the window. Attorney Teitz asked Mr. Marshall if he had a plan showing what it would look like with the window. Mr. Marshall said only what was in the packet. Attorney Teitz said that the dimension of the windows was going to be the exact dimension of the sliding glass door. Mr. Marshall said that was correct.

Member Church said the object was to recreate a window that was appropriate for the period. Attorney Rego said there wasn't a window there, so they weren't recreating anything. Member Church stated to create an opening to let in light that would be appropriate to the period and scale of the building. Mr. Marshall stated his main concern was that his neighbor didn't want him to go on her property and Member Church stated that was immaterial.

Member Lima clarified that Mr. Marshall was going to have 2 8 pane windows that would fill the space. Attorney Rego stated it would fill the upper portion of the space, and the bottom will be siding. Member Church said nothing gave them any dimensions of the windows, i.e., how high or wide the windows were going to be. Member Lima said it wasn't going to be any bigger than the existing sliding glass door. Attorney Rego agreed and said it wasn't going to be any bigger in width, but half the height as the bottom was going to be siding. Member

Lima advised Attorney Rego they needed to amend the application to include the dimensions of the window for the record. Attorney Rego said it would be filled in. Mr. Marshall stated it was going to be a 2ft high knee wall and 6ft wide. Member Lima advised them to put it in writing and give the information to Nick so it could be put on the record. Member Church stated it should be on the record before the Commission voted on it. Member Lima didn't want to have the applicant come back again.

Chairperson Allen asked Mr. Marshall for a cut sheet showing the size of the window. Mr. Marshall stated he would drop it off to Nick the following day. Member Bergenholtz asked to clarify if it was a total of 4 lights and not 8 lights. Mr. Marshall said that was correct. Attorney Rego stated it was 4ft high and 6ft wide. Chairperson Allen said it would be better for the Commission to have a cut sheet of the windows. Mr. Marshall stated he would bring it in the following day.

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, so a motion was made.

Motion made by Alternate Member Camara to approve application #26-82 for the removal of the sliding glass door at the rear of the garage and to be replaced with a window and 2ft high knee wall as presented subject to the appropriate cut sheet with dimensions for the window being submitted; Seconded by Member Lima.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9

Project Monitor: Ben Bergenholtz

4L. 26-54: 244 Metacom Ave, Andrew Broten Discuss and act on demolition of stone structure based on recommendations from RIHPHC.

Mr. Broten was present.

Nick advised the Commission that the application would need to be continued pending receiving advice from RIHPC. He said the RIHPC had visited the site, conducted a walk through, and were now looking into the history of the structure. Nick stated that they were now waiting to hear back from RIHPC.

Attorney Teitz suggested continuing the application to the September meeting, so it didn't get lost.

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

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries

4M. 26-84: 244 Metacom Ave, Andrew Broten Discuss and act on addition of multi-sport court area with fences and lighting on property, previously presented as HDC-25-65.

Mr. Broten was present.

Mr. Broten presented the application to the Commission. The Commission then discussed the same. Member Bergenholtz asked if the Commission had approved the lighting at the last meeting. Mr. Broten stated the lighting was approved over a year ago. Nick said the Commission had approved the project pending the receipt of the lighting specifications and Mr. Broten had changed his mind on a few things, so the Commission hadn't received that information originally. He stated the Commission hadn't seen the lighting specifications, but Mr. Broten had provided it at this time. Member Bergenholtz stated the Commission hadn't approved it. Nick said the Commission had approved everything else but the lighting at the previous meeting.

Member Bergenholtz asked if it was an LED light or a cold light, a blue or warm light? Mr. Broten stated it was an LED 120-watt fixture but didn't see the color of the light. He said if the Commission wanted a specific

warmth, he could change the color of LED. Member Bergenholtz said the Commission had approved 2700 lumens for exterior lights which was a warm light. Alternate Member Camara said there was a 120-watt and a 240-watt and asked which one Mr. Broten was proposing. Mr. Broten stated it was the 120-watt option. Chairperson Allen asked Mr. Broten how many lights he was asking for and Mr. Broten said just 1.

Member Millard asked Mr. Broten where the light was going to be located. Mr. Broten stated it was going to be located opposite from the hoop on the 60ft side of the court. Alternate Member Camara asked if it had a solar panel. Mr. Broten said it did have a solar panel, and it was also connected to electricity if the solar panel wasn't working. Alternate Member Camara asked Mr. Broten which option (A, B, or C) proposed was the one that he wanted. Mr. Broten stated he wanted option A as the location of the light would be furthest from any property line. Member Millard asked which side of the house it was on. Mr. Broten said it would be located on the north side of the house. Member Bergenholtz asked if the light would be seen when it was on. Mr. Broten said it could be seen from Metacom Avenue when it was lit, but when it was off, no one could see it unless they were to come into the yard and specifically look for it. Member Bergenholtz stated he didn't want it looking like a prison yard. Mr. Broten said it wouldn't be lit at 10pm, only when the court was being used.

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

Mr. White voiced his concerns about the size of the court, and the lighting not being overly bright and affecting the neighbors. Mr. Broten answered Mr. White's questions. Mr. White wanted to clarify that Mr. Broten was no longer moving forward with the outdoor kitchen, pool house, and fire pit projects. Nick advised Mr. White that the HDC's approval was an upper limit and if Mr. Broten was reducing or changing things, Mr. Broten would have to appear before the Commission again. Nick stated if Mr. Broten wasn't changing anything, then that would be a conversation with the Project Monitor. He stated there was a conversation to change the mudroom around which would come back before the Commission. Mr. White said that nothing else has been approved on the

project because Mr. Broten has taken it off the table for now. Nick said that Mr. Broten was able to do what he had been approved for, but if Mr. Broten wasn't doing segments, he wouldn't have to come back for them. If Mr. Broten was doing the pool but not the pool house, that wouldn't require any additional approval by the Commission. Nick advised Mr. White that any changes to original plan would have to come back to the Commission.

Chairperson Allen asked if there was anyone else in the audience who wanted to speak for or against the application. No one else came forward to speak, so a motion was made.

Motion made by Alternate Member Camara to approve application #26-84 re-approval to include the LED light fixture; Seconded by Member Page.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9 and 10

Project Monitor: Robert Page

4N. 26-33: 145 High St, Danny Ferreira Discuss and act on demolition of garage, rehabilitation of home and construction of addition, additional site work.

David Sisson and Danny Ferreira were present.

Mr. Sisson presented the application to the Commission. A discussion commenced between the Commission and Mr. Sisson. Member Bergenholtz asked if the dormers had been scaled back as it was one of his concerns and Mr. Sisson said they were scaled back. Mr. Sisson said it was now a doghouse style dormer. Member Church asked how many units there were and Mr. Sisson said it would be 2 units. Member Bergenholtz said it was everything that the Commission had asked for.

Chairperson Allen said that the main house would have a wood exterior and the addition would have a Hardie board

exterior. Mr. Sisson said that was correct. Chairperson Allen asked which doors would be the JELD-WEN doors and Mr. Sisson said the doors would be used in all locations except for the front door as it could be salvaged. Chairperson Allen stated that if the front door couldn't be restored, they would have to come back. Mr. Sisson said it was his goal to restore it.

Member Lima asked where the second residence would be. Mr. Sisson said it would be located above the garage. Member Lima asked if the garage and the main house would be attached. Mr. Sisson stated it would be attached by a breezeway.

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, Nina Murphy, June Veraguard, and Cindy Fanning spoke against the project. Their concerns consisted of the massing, setbacks, possible addition of an ADU in the future, and parking issues.

Attorney Teitz addressed Mr. Carleu's request that it be approved with the condition that there be no additional mass added in the future. He said by the very nature of the approval, the Commission was approving what's currently presented to them. There was no way to condition whatever may happen in the future. Attorney Teitz said someone would have to come back before the Commission and obtain the appropriate approvals. He stated there was no way to condition something now and say "never again" as everyone always had the right to come back before the Commission.

Attorney Teitz also addressed Mr. Carleu's question about what happens with the existing Commission approval on the property if the back part of the property is split off and sold to someone else. Attorney Teitz if someone wanted to do anything, even if there's an approval for a separate lot and they wanted to build something on it, they would have to come before the Commission to get approval before doing so. He said the existing approval and plan didn't go away. Attorney Teitz said the subdivision itself might need the Commission's approval.

Vincent Pacifico, a registered architect, reviewed the applicant's submission and looked at the design issue he was facing. Mr. Pacifico suggested a book for Mr.

Ferreira that talked about the New England connected farmhouse. He said showed examples of how to add small additions, so it wasn't a big, long box. Mr. Pacifico said that Mr. Ferreira could pull it in from the property line and just wanted to make that suggestion to him.

Chairperson Allen stated at the last meeting there was somewhat of a consensus from the Commission that they wanted to see the house more linear and he wanted to make sure that's what everyone still wanted. Member Lima asked Attorney Teitz if he could stake out the site and the Commission could do a site visit. Member Bergenholtz said it was suggested at the last meeting as well. Attorney Teitz stated if the majority of the Commission wanted it, it could be something the Commission required. Member Page stated he didn't need it. Member Bergenholtz said he was prepared to vote. Member Lima said she would like to see it. Alternate Member Camara stated he didn't need to see it. Member Millard wanted to see it.

Member Millard suggested to Mr. Ferreira that he move the garage out and away and also move the addition a little bit away from the house. She referred to Mr. Pacifico's earlier suggestion of referring to the book examples. She said if the addition was moved a bit in from the property line maybe it would be more appealing to the neighbors.

Member Church asked if any consideration had been given to move the house to the south. Mr. Ferreira said that had not been considered and it was not in the plans. Member Church asked about the dimension from east to west of each of the buildings. Mr. Sisson said for the existing structures that were less than 3ft from the property line, they were going to be shortening the total length because the existing 10-car garage was very long. He said if you add the existing house, addition, and 10-car garage, it was longer than what was being proposed.

Chairperson Allen said the Commission was asking what was the depth of the original house plus the addition. Mr. Sisson stated the existing house was approximately 28½ ft deep and the addition was about another 21ft. He said they were proposing taking the existing house at about 28.6ft, putting on a breezeway of about 7ft, adding an addition roughly or slightly smaller than the existing addition of about 21ft putting another breezeway of about 10ft and then the garage at 28ft. Mr. Sisson said they

lengthened it by about 45ft. Chairperson Allen stated that was almost double of the existing home. Member Bergenholtz said that wasn't including the garage, and Mr. Sisson said that wasn't including the 10-car garage. Mr. Ferreira said the garage was approximately 120ft in length. Mr. Sisson said the garage was 3ft from the property line.

Member Millard said it was her understanding that the 10-car garage was not going to be used. She asked Mr. Ferreira if he was keeping the garage and Mr. Ferreira said no. Nick said the application for total demolition of the garage. Mr. Ferreira said they would be reducing the amount of building on that side yard setback substantially. He said the surrounding properties were all within the property setbacks as well.

Mr. Sisson said in terms of lot coverage, they were reducing the footprint by approximately 1,000sq.ft. in the current proposal from what was existing on the site. Member Millard asked if that included the garage and Mr. Sisson said yes. Member Millard asked how that was relevant to what was actually happening. Mr. Ferreira said it was a building he could put back up in its existing location in the exact form as a 10-car garage. He was trying hard to satisfy everyone but continued to get pushback. Mr. Ferreira advised the Commission that the property was on the market to be sold. He said it was going to go to someone who wanted it as a single-family home or a single-family home with an additional unit. Mr. Ferreira had a local family interested in it and the only way they could get it was to have the multi-family use on the site, and he would like the property to go to that family. If that didn't get approved, then it might go to another bidder from Connecticut. He wanted to keep it local.

Mr. Ferreira said he could stake out the site, if necessary, but wanted to get a definitive answer from the Commission. Member Bergenholtz asked Mr. Ferreira if he was going to be doing the build out. Mr. Ferreira said he was trying to sell it as a package deal and then he would be involved with the build. He wanted it done right and good for everyone and the Town.

Member Lima asked, in terms of the property line, was the distance between one house and the other going to be decreased? Mr. Ferreira said he would be moving away

from Mr. Pansa's property line. He would be improving the side yard setback. He stated he could break up the massing by facing the garage forward, but he showed that at the last meeting and no one liked it.

Member Lima said in terms of the 10-car garage, the new garage wasn't going to extend that far west, and Mr. Sisson said it wasn't even close. Member Lima said the cinder blocks would come down and there would be a grass space and Mr. Ferreira said yes. Mr. Sisson, while looking at the site plan, said on the drawing everything was stopping about 15ft before where the existing 10-car garage started. He said the length of the 10-car garage was about the length of the entire structure they were proposing which included the existing home.

Member Lima said the location of the proposed breezeway is where the previous part that fell into itself was located and Mr. Sisson said that was the location of the 1st breezeway. Mr. Sisson said it was designed with 2 breezeways to break up the mass of the house.

Chairperson Allen asked if anyone else wanted to speak.

Cindy Fanning came up and expressed her concern about whether there was going to be enough parking for everyone that would be living on the property. Nick said that was a zoning issue and of no relevance to the Commission. Mr. Ferreira stated there was a 2-car garage for the single-family home and 1 space for the other unit. He said the Town only requires him to provide 2 spaces for the main house and 1 for the ADU, essentially 1 per bedroom. Mr. Ferreira was providing 4 parking spaces on the site plus the remaining portion of the driveway.

Mr. Wordell came back up and asked why Mr. Ferreira kept calling the other unit an ADU. Mr. Ferreira said it was not; it was a single-family. Mr. Wordell said that's what Mr. Ferreira called it, an ADU. Nick said that it was a zoning matter and not relevant to the Commission. Mr. Ferreira said that he wanted it as a multi-family because he didn't know who was going to be taking over the property and didn't want to have any restrictions on how the property is rented out. He said it would be over 16,000sqft. Mr. Ferreira said per zoning they were allowed 3 full units plus an ADU. He stated the people that most of the people that viewed the home wanted to keep it as a single-family so it may not be an issue.

However, the way Mr. Ferreira was trying to have it done as he wanted to sell it to the people he knew who were Bristolians, they didn't want the restrictions so they could do what they wanted with the property. He stated they would be living on the site.

Chairperson Allen asked for a motion. He asked if the Commission should do the motion for the demolition first. Attorney Teitz said to do the new build motion first and then the demolition motion second.

Motion made by Page to approve application #26-33 for the remodeling of the existing home and proposed addition as presented. Finding of fact as to Standard #6 the restoration of the front building is based on the deterioration including the removal of the collapsed section. Finding of fact as to Standards #9 and #10, the addition will fill for the section that collapsed and the new addition beyond that going to the west. Further, the minutes of the June 4, 2026 meeting regarding this application are hereby incorporated by reference; Seconded by Member Bergenholtz.

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

Opposed: Allen

Motion carries 6 to 1.

Secretary of Interior Standards: 6, 9, and 10

Project Monitor: Ben Bergenholtz

Motion made by Page to approve application #26-33 as to the demolition of the original 10-car garage to the rear west of the property using case concrete block structure which has collapsed, and it is appropriate at this time to remove the remaining corner of the structure. Finding of fact that placement of the 10-car garage was not a contributing factor to the district and the garage does not show on any historic surveys; Seconded by Bergenholtz.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries

Secretary of Interior Standards: 5

Project Monitor: Ben Bergenholtz

Mr. Ferreira said he would salvage what he could of the concrete bricks and save them for the Historic Society. He would also put out a posting for the rest of the salvaged bricks so if anyone else wanted them, they could go by and get them.

Nick advised Mr. Ferreira that the green sheet would be available online and to post it in the front where visible.

40. 25-12: 125 Hope St, Nancy DiPrete Laurienzo Discuss and act on demolition of existing structure and replacement.

Alfred R. Rego, Jr., Madeline Melchert, and Greg Spiess were present.

Mr. Spiess presented the application to the Commission. A discussion by the Commission then followed. Chairperson Allen asked how much less glass window surface there was on the new design as opposed to the previous design. Mr. Spiess said the window size has been reduced approximately 20% than what was previously shown as they tried to look for what was appropriate. He stated the biggest impact was to get rid of the vertical alignment. Chairperson Allen remembered that most of the ones on the previous rendering were glass doors or large windows. Chairperson Allen said the new renderings were a vast improvement. Member Bergenholtz agreed with Chairperson Allen.

Chairperson Allen asked if anyone else had comments. Member Page said it was good. Alternate Member Camara also said it was good. Member Millard liked it as well. Member Church liked the new design.

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

Attorney Teitz stated that the Commission needed to make the motion in 2 parts. First one is for the new construction, and the second motion is for the demolition.

Motion made by Alternate Member Camara to approve application #25-12 for the construction of new house and garage as presented. The minutes of previous meetings with regard to this application on multiple dates are hereby incorporate by reference; Seconded by Member Bergenholtz.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries

Secretary of Interior Standards: 2, 3, 9, and 10

Project Monitor: Robert Page

Motion made by Alternate Member Camara for application #25-12 for the demolition of the existing structure. Findings of fact based on the Commission's site visit of the property, the flood velocity codes, and the determination of Rhode Island Historic Preservation Commission (RIHPC) that it is not feasible to restore the property based on the condition of the property and its setting within the velocity flood zone. The decision letter of RIHPC is also incorporated by reference herein; Seconded by Member Lima.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carries

Secretary of Interior Standards: (standard # wasn't stated, if applicable)

Project Monitor: Robert Page

5. Concept Review

6. Monitor Reports & Project Updates

Alternate Member Camara, regarding 248 Hope Street, the sky light placement was not clearly visible from street as it was on the back portion, not the main portion of the house. He said he was waiting for final dimensions on the dome versus the flat and once he had that, he would offer a decision. Chairperson Allen said it was not visible from street at all. Alternate Member Camara said someone would have to really approach the property from a certain angle to see it. He didn't believe it was visible to someone casually going by. Chairperson Allen stated it needed to be documented that it's not visible from the street as the person who did the flat one did so because it was visible from the street. Alternate Member Camara said the drawing stated the height of the dome was 2½ inches, but he was waiting for clarification. Chairperson Allen asked if that was something that was delegated to the Project Monitor and Alternate Member Camara said yes.

Chairperson Allen wanted to share that Nick did an excellent job with the reference letter on Peggy Frederick's house. If she didn't win after that, no one would and thanked Nick for his efforts.

7. HDC Coordinator Reports & Project Updates

8. HDC Coordinator Approvals

9. Other Business

Nick asked the Commission about their thoughts about reducing the length of the agendas. He said there were discussions in the past about putting a limit, but his concern was if a number limit was placed, then it might create a problem of a backlog. Nick said with the standard's guide which he hoped could be presented to the Commission in a completed form at the August meeting as Arnold's section done and Nick's part will be completed soon. He is hoping potentially they can add a few common things to the administrative approvals. Nick suggested that sheds, as long as they're under the footprint size, i.e., 64sqft. could be approved administratively. He said if it's a 200sqft shed, then it would be treated

like an outbuilding, and the applicant would have to come before the Commission. Member Bergenholtz thought that was a great idea. He was also interested in how the standards guide could be applied to the new applications. Nick was hoping to send it directly to the applicants.

Member Church stated making sure the applications were complete and including a materials list, dimensions, elevations, location, etc., was important. Nick said he would try to put something together to address the common issues.

Member Bergenholtz asked if he could address the letter the Commission received today about that particular property at 224 Hope Street. Attorney Teitz said it wasn't appropriate as it was continued to another meeting and the owner wasn't present. He didn't think it was appropriate to address it in the absence of the owner. He said it could be put on as part of the agenda for next meeting and if the owner isn't present at the next meeting, the Commission could still address it then.

Member Bergenholtz said he was supposed to be at the meeting this evening. Nick stated the owner did notify him that he couldn't get a babysitter. Member Bergenholtz stated he has been disturbed by the situation. Attorney Teitz said to put it on the agenda for the next meeting as separate item to discuss and act on whether the applicant appeared or not.

Alternate Member Camara asked if there was a reason why the Commission meeting started at 7 and not earlier. Nick said it was the standard time for Town meetings. Attorney Teitz said an earlier start could be done but recommended against it and to just keep it, unless there was a specific reason to start a meeting earlier on a particular day.

10. **Adjourned at 9:05PM**



