

TOWN OF BRISTOL, RHODE ISLAND

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION



**Historic District Commission Meeting Minutes
Monday, March 30, 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 7:15PM, and the Pledge of Allegiance was promptly recited afterwards.

In attendance: Allen, Lima, Millard, and Camara

Also in attendance: David Marks, Esq. and Toth

Absent: Ponder, Church, Page, O'Loughlin, Bergenholtz, and Teitz

2. Staff Report

2A. Staff Report

3. Review of Previous Month's Meeting Minutes

3A. Review of minutes of the March 5, 2026 meeting.

A review of the minutes of the March 5, 2026 meeting was had. Member Allen had the following comments and corrections: on page 35, he asked the first sentence of the first paragraph be reviewed and fixed and the sentence seemed to not flow correctly. With no other comments or corrections, Chairperson Lima asked for a motion.

A motion was made by Member Allen to accept the minutes of the March 5, 2026 meeting as amended; Seconded by Member Millard.

Voting Yea: Allen, Millard, Lima, and Camara

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

4. **Application Reviews**

4A. 26-04: 34 Byfield St, Rosemarie Sirois: Discuss and act on installation of front deck and roof over rear stair.

Christopher Stahl was present on behalf of the homeowner. Nick advised the Commission that the homeowner had emailed him earlier in the day stating Mr. Stahl was going to be representing her.

A discussion commenced between Mr. Stahl and the Commission regarding the installation of a front porch and covering the rear deck with a roof structure. Chairperson Lima asked if the Commission had a list of materials. Nick stated it was on the last couple of pages of the application. Member Allen stated there had been a previous discussion about the front porch having a flat roof instead of a pitched roof and the new application did not show that. Mr. Stahl said the homeowner was adamantly opposed to having a flat roof. He stated the property had a few shed style roofs with asphalt shingles and the homeowner wanted the new roof to match with the rest of the property. Member Allen said the recommendation was that a flat roof would be more appropriate for that style of house. He was very adamant that he wanted to see a flat roof but wasn't sure how the rest of the Commission felt about it.

Member Millard stated that after looking over the drawings, she felt there was a necessity to have a bit of a slant even if it was shallow. Mr. Stahl agreed with Member Millard. He said with a flat roof it would need to be a different roofing material which wouldn't match the rest of the property. Mr. Stahl said he needed to keep it at a 3-12 pitch, which was the minimum for an asphalt shingle which was in keeping with the rest of the

property. Member Millard asked Mr. Stahl if he was thinking of a rubber roof if it had to be a flat roof. Mr. Stahl said it would have to be rubber, metal, or a different type of asphalt material. He said it would have to be a different color and style. Member Allen stated that with a flat roof, no one would be able to see the material on the roof, but there would also be a very mild pitch on it. Member Allen said that he would not vote for that particular style of roof, but he wasn't sure if he was the only one that felt that way.

Member Millard said she would like a pitched roof. Member Allen said flat roof. Member Camara said he was leaning towards the flat side as it might be a better fit but was unsure. Chairperson Lima said there was an impasse and asked if it was possible to do a slight pitch.

Mr. Stahl said that he had the roof modeled as a 3-12 pitch and could go down to a 1-12 pitch into a flat roof style. He said from the street view looking up, it wouldn't make a difference from what anyone could see for the roof materials. He stated the roof started about 5 feet above the street line at the deck and the roof was another 8 feet above that. So, looking up, no one would be able to tell the difference between a flat roof and a pitched roof. Mr. Stahl said that a pitched roof would let him set it between the window and the detail above the front door, which is what the homeowner really wanted to keep on the property. Member Allen pointed out the photograph on page 49 of the application which showed an example of a roof on another house. Mr. Stahl didn't know where the photograph came from and Nick said the homeowner supplied it. Member Allen said it was an excellent example of what the roof should be as it was a flat roof.

Mr. Stahl said he couldn't tell from the angle the photograph was taken at if it was a 3-12 or 1-12 pitch. Member Camara asked Mr. Stahl how much of a difference there was between the materials on each pitch. Mr. Stahl said that the whole shingle effect is lost between the two pitches. He stated it would no longer look like asphalt shingles on a flat roof. Mr. Stahl said the whole reason for doing a pitched roof was to keep consistent with the rest of the property which always had pitched shed roofs.

Nick looked up the house on Google Street Views map, and it was located at 46 Byfield Street. He said it was a pitched shed style roof.

Member Millard stated her home had a flat rubber roof on an addition and with ice damning this past winter, it caused the kitchen ceiling to get ruined. Member Allen felt it was not appropriate for that particular style of house. Chairperson Lima asked Member Camara for his opinion. Member Camara stated that he was thinking that the less pitched, the better, but Member Millard's point about flat roofs causing potential leaks was a valid to consider. Chairperson Lima did not have an issue with the presentation of the roof.

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

Millard to approve application as presented; Camara

A motion was made by Member Millard to approve application #26-04 as presented; Seconded by Member Camara.

Voting Yea: Millard, Camara, and Lima

Opposed: Allen

Motion carries 3 to 1.

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9

Project Monitor: Ory Lima

Chairperson Lima advised Mr. Stahl to have the homeowner place the certificate in the front window where visible so the neighbors were aware that they had permission for the project. Nick said that the homeowner would get a notification by email when the certificate was ready.

4B. 26-27: 220 High St Walley School, Town Of Bristol:

Discuss and act on installation of sign on property.

Nate Ginsburg was present to represent the Town.

Nick advised the Commission that Mr. Ginsburg had the Town's permission to present on their behalf.

A discussion commenced between Mr. Ginsburg and the Commission regarding the installation of a sign. Mr. Ginsburg stated that plans originally had two locations for signs, but they were only requesting approval for the sign that would be located on High Street. He said it was a wood sign which would be done in a black matte finish with gold letters, and a base of brick and stone to match building. He said it was 6ft. wide x 4'7" tall and it would be illuminated with LED lights. Chairperson Lima asked where the sign would be located on High Street. Mr. Ginsburg said it would be located in the center of the building, and it was designated as #6 on the application. Chairperson Lima said that it would be located closure to the school between the sidewalk and the school and Mr. Ginsburg said that it was correct and it was about halfway back on the lawn in front of the planting bed. Member Camara stated he liked the style of the sign. Mr. Ginsburg said they would be using the same bricks that were being used for the brick repairs so it would match the building.

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

A motion was made by Member Allen to approve application #26-27 for the installation of a sign as presented; Seconded by Member Millard.

Voting Yea: Lima, Millard, Allen, and Camara

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9

Project Monitor: Nick to look up the name of the Project Monitor)

Chairperson Lima advised Mr. Ginsburg that the certificate of appropriateness would be available soon. She asked Mr. Ginsburg to display the certificate where

visible as it was appropriate for the Town to set a good example.

4C. 26-32: 235 High St, Town of Bristol: Discuss and Act on addition of 10 ft soundproofing fence.

Nate Ginsburg present on behalf of the Town.

A discussion commenced between Mr. Ginsburg and the Commission regarding the installation of a 10ft black chain link fence with black privacy slats. He stated that there would be black soundproofing material installed inside of the fence as well. Chairperson Lima asked Mr. Ginsburg if the picture provided in the application was the example of what the fence would look like and Mr. Ginsburg said that was correct. Mr. Ginsburg advised the Commission that the fence would not be visible from the street. Member Allen asked Mr. Ginsburg if he was asked the Commission to choose the black chain link fence with the privacy slats. Mr. Ginsburg stated that the fence came with the privacy slats and that the picture below showed the soundproofing material which would be on the inside of the fence. Member Camara said he went by the site on Sunday, and he could hear the noise from compressor units before stepping onto the property. He thinks it would make sense to install the fence and the soundproofing.

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

Jim Flynn, 63 Church Street, came forward to speak. Mr. Flynn stated that it could be seen from Church Street between the houses but was in support of it. He did appreciate the Town doing it as the noise was intolerable. He was not convinced that the soundproofing material was appropriate. Mr. Flynn talked to Diane Williamson and Ms. Williamson was going to talk to the architect. He just wanted it on the record that he was not convinced that the soundproofing was going to be sufficient. Yet, he was in support of the project.

Nick asked Attorney Marks if the Commission would have to re-approve the soundproofing materials since it was located inside the opaque fence. Attorney Marks didn't think so as the inside of the fence was out of the

Commission's jurisdiction and it would be better suited for Zoning or whatever other application it may need to go through. Chairperson Lima asked Nick if the project needed a different material, would it be up to Zoning. Nick said because the fence was opaque, it would be treated like an indoor thing. Mr. Ginsburg said that the materials would remain a black or dark color and be installed behind the fence and not be visible. Chairperson Lima said that the Commission could approve or disapprove what was before them and the soundproofing part would come before zoning. Attorney Marks said that was correct.

Member Allen asked Mr. Ginsburg if there was space to put thicker soundproofing. Mr. Ginsburg said there was plenty of space on the inside.

Chairperson Lima asked for a motion.

Bob: approve construction as presented; Allen

A motion was made by Member Camara to approve application #26-32 for the installation of a 10ft black chain link fence with black privacy slats as presented; Seconded by Member Allen.

Voting Yea: Camara, Lima, Allen, and Millard

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9

Project Monitor: Ory Lima

Chairperson Lima told Mr. Ginsburg that he could advise Nick of any questions and when the certificate was available to place it somewhere visible.

4D. 26-16: 244 Metacom Ave, Andrew Broten: Discuss and act on addition of mudroom and tennis court.

Andrew Broten and Sue Horwitz were present.

A discussion was had between Mr. Broten and Ms. Horwitz and the Commission regarding the addition of a mudroom on

the north side of the property and the construction of a tennis court. He said that he previously received approval for a pickleball court on the property and this was slightly larger but in the same vein. Member Allen said these items were the same ones that had been discussed at the concept review meeting and Mr. Broten said yes. Member Allen said it looked good. Member Millard agreed with Member Allen. Chairperson Lima asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to speak for or against the application.

Dr. Catherine Zipf came forward. Dr. Zipf stated that pursuant to the prior conversation at the previous concept meeting regarding the dairy building. She advised the Commission that she did not find any historic documentation regarding the dairy building. She had no objection regarding the application. Dr. Zipf just wanted to inform the Commission that she had looked up standards for documentation which she had at the ready when the Commission needed them.

Ms. Horwitz stated she made some minor changes which she spoke to Nick about. She wanted to make sure not to hide anything. Ms. Horwitz said it had nothing to do with the mudroom or tennis court. She stated there was going to be a new application for the next meeting.

Mr. Broten said that in light of Dr. Zipf's report on the icehouse, he had requested the demolition of that structure be continued. He wanted to know if the Commission felt comfortable taking that up for a vote. Nick said since it wasn't on the agenda, it would have to be continued and add to the May meeting.

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

A motion was made by Member Allen to accept application #26-16 for the addition of a mudroom and installation of a tennis court as presented; Seconded by Member Camara.

Voting Yea: Allen, Lima, Camara, and Millard

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

Secretary of Interior Standards: 2, 9

Project Monitor: Robert Page

Chairperson Lima reminded Mr. Broten that the certificate needed to be displayed in the front of the house where visible.

4E. 26-23: 30 Summer St, Celine Keating and Mark Levy:

Discuss and act on addition of shed and gazebo.

Mark Levy and Celine Keating were present.

A conversation was had between Mr. Levy and the Commission regarding the installation of a shed and gazebo. Mr. Levy stated that in November of 2025, they received permission to demolish two structures behind their house and now the buildings were down. He said the last bits of work was being done to complete the demolition work. Mr. Levy said they had been shopping around for the kind of building and size of building they wanted. They had changed a little bit from what they had originally submitted to the Commission. He had pictures of what they were looking at which were a little simpler and a little smaller. (Mr. Levy gave the pictures to Nick.) Member Allen asked Mr. Levy if he was talking about the gazebo or shed. Mr. Levy said both structures were going to be a bit smaller to save money. He stated the first picture was for the gazebo and the other picture was for the shed. When they viewed the shed on site in Narragansett, it was much too tall so now they want a shed that was shorter and smaller. Mr. Levy said the size of gazebo was 12x16 and the shed would be 8x10. He said the other important thing was that their yard could not be seen at all from the street. He said everything was blocked by the house.

Member Allen stated he liked the gazebo as it was an improvement from first one that was presented. He asked Mr. Levy about the shed materials. Mr. Levy said the shed would be made from wood and not vinyl. Chairperson Lima asked about the materials proposed for the gazebo. Mr. Levy said they were looking at a vinyl material for the gazebo. He said he spoke to several people who pointed out that it would be impossible to take care of a wood gazebo with screens. They were planning to use the

gazebo in various seasons. He said his home was all vinyl on the outside, so a vinyl gazebo wouldn't be a change to what's on the property. Member Allen said the Commission would have a hard time approving a vinyl gazebo. Chairperson Lima said she wouldn't approve of a vinyl gazebo. Member Allen stated that the Commission did not approve of anything made of vinyl. Mr. Levy said that the structure couldn't be seen from the front and the house was also vinyl and Member Allen said it still wouldn't be approved. Mr. Levy stated that one of the people advising them that if the gazebo was wood with screening, the whole building would have to be stripped of all of the panels that were screening in order for it to repaint it or restain it and that it would be almost impossible to have that kind of building back there.

Chairperson Lima suggested to Mr. Levy to have the application continued to the May meeting so he could do more research into alternative gazebo options and check if his house was in fact vinyl. She said that she was not comfortable moving forward with a vote on the gazebo. Chairperson Lima said they could vote on the shed but continue the gazebo. She didn't want to vote no and have to make Mr. Levy wait a year before he could apply again. She wanted to give Mr. Levy the time to do more research and come back for the May meeting. Mr. Levy said the only problem was there was a 60-day wait before the company could start making the gazebo. So, until the Commission made a decision, he couldn't order the gazebo. Chairperson Lima asked Attorney Marks for guidance on the continuance because she didn't want Mr. Levy to put money down on a gazebo then the Commission voted differently and Mr. Levy wound up losing money on it. Attorney Marks said that if the Commission continued the application, it would be for Mr. Levy's benefit although it would slow the project down, but it was better than denial. Chairperson Lima requested that Mr. Levy look for alternative materials for the gazebo as the Commission would not agree to a vinyl gazebo and he would not be able to build it. Attorney Marks advised Mr. Levy that he would have to re-apply in a year if the Commission voted no.

Mr. Levy stated that they would get a wood gazebo. Ms. Keating said that if the Commission gave them an agreement to accept wood, they would get a wood gazebo. Chairperson Lima said they could look for alternative materials. Ms. Keating and Mr. Levy stated they had been

looking for months. Member Allen stated the Commission could potentially vote on it. Attorney Marks stated the Commission could approve it conditionally based on a plan coming back or wood being used, as long as the condition was something that the Commission could verify. Member Allen said the Project Monitor could actually be responsible for the final approval. He asked Mr. Levy and Ms. Keating if that would be acceptable and they said yes.

Member Allen said the Commission would accept wood, but it would be contingent upon the Project Monitor giving final approval. Chairperson Lima stated that they would have to come back with more specific materials. Nick clarified that they wouldn't have to come back to another meeting but just have to contact the Project Monitor with the style of gazebo and materials they intended to use. Ms. Keating stated it was going to be almost identical to what was originally proposed, just in wood. Nick stated the picture they provided to the Commission could be obtained in wood and Ms. Keating said that it was the gazebo in wood. Attorney Marks said that was fine unless a continuance was more appropriate. Ms. Keating stated there was no other option. Nick clarified that Ms. Keating and Mr. Levy were going to get the same gazebo style in wood and the Commission was fine with it, and they would be vote on it tonight. Chairperson Lima said that was correct.

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

A motion was made by Member Camara to accept application #26-23 for the installation of an 8x10 wood utility shed and a 12x16 wood screened-in gazebo as presented; Seconded by Member Millard.

Voting Yea: Camara, Millard, Allen, and Lima

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9

Project Monitor: Robert Camara

Chairperson Lima advised Mr. Levy that even though the project was located in the rear yard, he needed to display the certificate of appropriateness in the front where visible, so everyone knew that he had permission from the HDC.

4F. 26-25: 474 Thames St, Daniel Brooks: Discuss and Act on addition of shed to property.

Applicant was not present.

A motion was made by Member Allen to continue application #26-25 to the May 7, 2026 meeting; Seconded by Member Camara.

Voting Yea: Allen, Camara, Millard, and Lima

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

4G. 26-26: 8 Constitution St, John Marshall: Discuss and act on approval of sliding glass door on rear of garage.

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

A discussion commenced between the Attorney Rego and the Commission. Member Allen asked Mr. Marshall why the work had been done without coming before the HDC to seek permission first. Attorney Rego stated that conditions were found to the rear of the garage once work was being done. He said there was a series of photographs submitted showing what was found when siding was removed. He wasn't sure the sequence the photographs were in, but it showed that in between each support there was stucco that had collapsed which needed to be replaced. Attorney Rego said the photographs went further to demonstrate the need to replace certain beams and the like which opened up the back side. He said the garage itself was an undersized accessory building and the owner decided that the work needed to be done. He said it wasn't going to be used as a garage but rather as a home gym and storage. Attorney Rego stated the materials that were used mirrored what the Commission previously approved of on

the main structure. He stated that John Marshall and Peter Dwyer could answer the Commission's specific questions. Attorney Rego said that the photographs showed clear evidence of the deteriorated conditions that were found and that he had never seen stucco in between beams.

Member Millard asked if the stucco was on this inside or outside. Attorney Rego approached the Commission and showed the photographs. He said the void was filled with stucco which was crumbling and falling apart. Member Allen asked why a sliding glass door was put in when there wasn't a door there before. Attorney Rego said it was just to fit the look of what the Commission had approved of on the main building itself. He said since it was going to be used as a home gym, the door was just for air flow and light on both ends.

Member Allen asked if it was true that the door was only 20 inches to the property line. Attorney Rego didn't think so. Mr. Marshall thought it was more like 2 feet. Chairperson Lima asked Nick if he was aware of all of this. Nick stated that he was made aware of the fact that it was very close, between 20 inches and 2 feet, that it was a tight distance. Nick said it was the same door as what was put on the house. Member Allen but it wasn't a flat area between the property line and the door. Nick said that the area sloped slightly.

Chairperson Lima asked Nick and Attorney Marks if it was an issue that should be deferred to zoning. Nick said that it would be more of a zoning issue. Chairperson Lima asked Attorney Marks if the Commission should continue the matter until after it was heard at zoning. Attorney Marks didn't think it was something that would go to zoning, but the applicant would have to meet the zoning requirements regardless so whether that required relief from the Zoning Board he didn't feel that the Commission should have to decide that issue. Chairperson Lima said that the Commission only had to decide if the door was appropriate and the rest was out of the Commission's hands. Attorney Marks said that was correct.

Member Allen asked Mr. Marshall if he would be using the door for entry into the garage. Mr. Marshall said the door was strictly for airflow and light in the building. He stated that he was going to landscape the area.

Robin Allister, 5 Thames Street, came forward to speak. Ms. Allister stated that this Committee has been very generous to Mr. Marshall in approving renovations to the property, and now Mr. Marshall was asking the Commission to retroactively approve work that had already been done. Ms. Allister said Mr. Marshall was a commercial and residential real estate developer who knew that any substantive work on a property, especially one in a historic district, required necessary approval and permits. She said the credibility of the Commission was at stake because it had been a contentious community development and the message this would be sending to other Bristol residents was the HDC was nothing more than an afterthought. Ms. Allister felt that it signaled to people that they could change their properties and then come to the HDC after the fact for retroactive approval. Her concerns about the door were three-fold: 1) it was not up to building code. She said building codes required that doors that were either egress or non-egress have 36 inches of landing clearance in the direction of travel. She said by Mr. Marshall's own surveyor's work, there was 1.7 or approximately 20 inches between her property and Mr. Marshall's door, which did not meet applicable building code and as such gives rise to regular trespass. Ms. Allister said the Commission would approve a door that didn't meet building code. She stated it allowed for trespass, introduced a safety hazard creating improper footing which could result in a fall onto the neighbor's property, and that could force the neighbors to accept liability for an accident that originated on Mr. Marshall's property. She urged the Commission to refrain from approving it retroactively.

Chairperson Lima asked Attorney Marks if the Commission should refer the application to the Building Inspector's Office or Code Compliance Office before making a decision. Attorney Marks said the Commission could do so, but the issues were outside of the jurisdiction of the Commission. He agreed with Ms. Allister that there should have been approval first, but he advised the Commission to imagine that the installation hadn't occurred and base the approval on that. Nick said that was the standard procedure. He said in cases where permission wasn't sought, a fee for work without a permit was levied and then it goes forward as if it had not been on the merits of whether or not it would be appropriate had it been brought to the Commission if it did not

exist. He said the Commission should weight the matter as if it hadn't happened and if it was a new project, would the Commission approve it or not.

Chairperson Lima said since she had not visited the property, she wanted to continue the application so the Commission could do a site visit. She felt the Commission could get a better understanding of what happened and whether they should or would have approved it had the project come before them versus just sitting here without having any knowledge of what the Commission was looking at. Member Camara said that just looking at it, didn't make any sense. He asked the rest of the Commission if it was something that would normally be allowed. He would have understood a window, but not a door and suggested a continuance. Member Allen asked Mr. Marshall if it could be changed to a window instead of a door. Chairperson Lima told Mr. Marshall that he didn't have to decide, but he could. Mr. Marshall said he would like to do a site visit.

Member Millard suggested to Mr. Marshall that since he had already put the door in and it was not to code; why not have a carpenter make it into a window. Mr. Marshall said he wasn't sure he could do that. He said he would have to throw the door away. Member Millard said there were a lot of carpenters in town that could make it into a nice window. Mr. Marshall asked if the Commission wanted to do a site visit. Member Allen said if that's what he wanted the Commission to do then they would do so. Mr. Marshall said that was good with him. Chairperson Lima said she would have Nick schedule a site visit after she checked if there was anyone else in the audience who wanted to speak for or against the application. Nick stated he would schedule a time when the Build Official could attend as well.

Dr. Catherine Zipf came forward to speak. Dr. Zipf said that she had not seen the photographs showing what was discovered in the walls. She was troubled to hear that what was found sounded like standard early construction called waddle and dab. Dr. Zipf said it was vertical beams that were filled in with a stucco or stucco-like material. She said it wasn't a common building material in Bristol and, in fact, was very rarely used as it was must more typically used in places like the Caribbean Islands or in the south where a particular type of that construction called Tabby or Adobe. Dr. Zipf said it

would have been nice to have a call placed to the Historical Society so it could have been documented what was there. She wanted it on the record that for future reference if something like this is ever found again, a call should be placed to the Historical Society so it can be properly documented.

A motion was made by Member Allen to continue application #26-26 for a site visit; Seconded by Member Camara.

Voting Yea: Camara, Allen, Millard, and Lima

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

Nick stated that it will be advertised as a meeting and there will be an agenda. Chairperson Lima said that it would be posted online and anyone would be welcome to attend.

4H. 26-28: 9 Court Street, Karen Gieseke: Discuss and Act on installation of sign on front of building.

Karen Gieseke and Ian McCullen were present.

A discussion between the Commission and Ms. Gieseke, and Mr. McCullen was had regarding the installation of a sign at the front of the building at 9 Court Street. Mr. McCullen proposed a recreation in size and scale to the sign that was on the building when it belonged to the Town of Bristol. He said they wanted to keep the sign within the framework that was already familiar and approved. They proposed composite raised lettering on a composite based sign with gold leaf. Mr. McCullen said the sign would have 3/4-inch molding in white all the way around the sign with 1/2-inch lettering which would sit inside of outer molding. He stated they were also adding an element which was a carved relief with a painted surface which would be digitally produced due to its size. Mr. McCullen said that everything on the sign was going to be hand painted. He said it would be acrylic paint with a clear coat over the top. Mr. McCullen said the letters would be made from a composite material with gold leaf and the sides would be finished in a metallic gold paint. He said the sign would be 24 inch wide and 32 inches high and would be affixed to the building with French cleats so there would not be any visible

fasteners. Chairperson Lima asked if the sign was going to be installed in the mortar and not into the brick. Mr. McCullen said the sign would be installed in the mortar and not the brick.

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

A motion was made by Member Allen to accept application #26-28 for the installation of a sign as presented; Seconded by Member Millard.

Voting Yea: Millard, Allen, Lima, and Camara

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9

Project Monitor: John Allen

Chairperson Lima advised Mr. McCullen to display the certificate in the front window where visible. She told Mr. McCullen to contact Nick if he had any questions. Nick reminded Mr. McCullen to pull the sign permit as well.

4I. 26-30: 220 High St, First Baptist Church: Discuss and Act on addition of shed to property.

Leonard P. Sanford was present.

A discussion between Mr. Sanford and Commission was had. Mr. Sanford advised the Commission that the Church would like to install a shed which was designed by a student from the high school under the supervision of the Shop Instructor. Member Camara asked Mr. Sanford if the shed was located inside of the wrought iron fence line and Mr. Sanford said yes. Nick advised the Commission that the shed was all wood. He stated that Building Code reduced the size a building could be without a building permit from 200sqft to 64sqft and this was below the 64sqft. He said the building was located in the back corner and although it was visible from the Common, but it was

within the wrought iron fence line in the Baptist Church property, so it wasn't on the Common itself. Nick said it wasn't well seen from High Street. Mr. Sanford said it would hide the recycle and trash bins. Member Allen asked if there was any concern regarding setbacks for a shed. Nick said as long as it was kept 6ft away from the property line there were no concerns. Chairperson Lima said it was close to the building. Attorney Marks said according to the Staff Report it seemed there might be some zoning relief needed but the Official had asked for the HDC's approval, and the Commission didn't need to concern themselves with zoning issues.

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

A motion was made by Member Camara to approve application #26-30 for the installation of a 6x8 wooden shed as presented; Seconded by Member Allen.

Voting Yea: Camara, Allen, Lima, and Millard

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9

Project Monitor: John Allen

Chairman Lima advised Mr. Sanford that if there were any difficulties, he could contact Nick. Nick told Mr. Sanford, just for clarification, to have the McGuires reach out to Ed Tanner regarding the zoning certificate.

4J. 26-31: 267 Thames St, Eunice Kim: Discuss and Act on addition of menu/sign for business to building.

Eunice Kim present.

A discussion was had between Ms. Kim and the Commission regarding the installation of a menu/sign for her business. Ms. Kim advised the Commission the property was actually located at 259 Thames Street but was advised to use the 267 Thames Street address since the business

was located inside the Bristol Harbor Inn. She stated the sign was to be used for her menu. Chairperson Lima said the Commission had a picture of the front of the building and Ms. Kim said the sign would be exactly where the previous sign was hung. She stated that everything would be the same as far as the hooks, screws, and the specifications. The only thing that changed was the graphics and menu items. Chairperson Lima asked if the sign was wood. Ms. Kim stated it was an aluminum sign.

Chairperson Lima asked if anyone in the audience wanted to speak for or against the application. With no one coming forward, she asked for a motion.

A motion was made by Member Allen to accept application #26-31 for the installation of an aluminum menu/sign as presented; Seconded by Member Camara.

Voting Yea: Allen, Lima, Camara, and Millard

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

Secretary of Interior Standards: 9

Project Monitor: Lima

5. **Concept Review**

5A. 26-33: 145 High St, Danny Ferreira: Discuss and act on construction of new townhomes, rehabilitation of existing house, rehabilitation of existing garage.

David Sisson and Danny Ferreira were present.

Nick advised the Commission that Mr. Ferreira requested the application be changed to a concept review so it could go forward to zoning.

Mr. Sisson first gave some photographs to Nick which were enlarged versions of the photographs that were already in the application. He described to the Commission what Mr. Ferreira wanted to do on the property. Mr. Sisson stated the lot was narrow with 23,000sqft containing a small single-family dwelling which was pushed right up to High Street and a lot of land at the back. He said the house

had a large existing addition at the rear with an additional long and skinny historic garage at the rear of the property. Mr. Sisson stated the property was in extremely rough condition and very dilapidated. The roof on the addition was collapsing and walls were tipping over. He stated the garage roof had completely collapsed and parts of the walls had fallen. He characterized the property as a hoarder property as there was a lot of trash and garbage on the property which contributed to the severe conditions. He stated the goal was to salvage house in front. Mr. Sisson said they were proposing something a little different than what was shown in the proposal which was to demolish the garage. He stated after cleaning out the garage, its condition was made clear that it cannot be salvaged.

Mr. Sisson said that Mr. Ferreira could, by right, have up to 5 units and they were proposing 4 units. He advised the Commission that they intended to do so by renovating the existing house for single use with a few changes. They wanted to add on 3 more single-family townhouse style units for a total of 4 units. He stated there were 2 options to achieve that goal. He wanted the Commission's opinion on what might look better for the Town and the neighborhood. In both cases, Mr. Sisson stated they were intending to rebuild the addition located at the rear of the house, at least on the same footprint. He said it was tough to see what's there now because it was in such bad condition. Mr. Sisson said in both cases they wanted to add another set of dormers to match what was there. Further, in both cases, they wanted to add a slightly larger porch to the left side of the house as there was an existing small porch, and they wanted to make it a little larger. Lastly, in both cases, they wanted to add 3 units to the rear. However, in 1 case it would be 1 large building, and the other case there would be 2 separate buildings. Mr. Sisson said the goal in both cases was to get a garage that served the single-family house, but in one case it would be connected to the main house and the other it would be a separate building. He said in both cases, they would like to build a new garage towards the rear of the property using the existing footprint to replicate it.

Mr. Sisson said the existing garage was somewhat of a concrete block structure, but the front wall was wood which had collapsed. He said in the case of a rebuild, they would do a wood frame structure for the whole thing.

I know there would be questions regarding the materials. Mr. Sisson said there was a materials list for the Commission to review. He stated there was a previous question as to whether they were proposing Hardy plank as the siding material for the whole project or just for the new structure. He said they were probably going to end up needing to strip the siding off the front to insulate it to modern code standards then reside it. He said in that scenario, they would be proposing Hardy siding for the entire project and the Hardy trim for the entire project. Mr. Sisson stated they would be replicating the look of what was there today.

Mr. Ferreira advised the Commission that the current presentation was based upon the previous recommendation of the Commission. He said what was now shown was not taller or wider than the largest portion of the existing home. He said the property had been mostly cleared out and he has taken close to 16 30-yard dumpsters out of the property. In addition, another 10 30-yard dumpsters filled with recycled materials were removed from the property. Mr. Ferreira said it took 5 30-yard dumpsters to clean out the inside of the home. After the clearing out the back portion of the house, it almost collapsed. The main beam was completely rotted. He stated it was tied into the sills of the left and right hand sides of the back portion which were also rotted. He would need to rebuild the sills. Mr. Ferreira said the plate that sat underneath the front door was also rotted. Further, there were windows with water coming in which had caused rot, mold, and other issues. He stated that was another reason why a large portion needed to be removed because it needed to be evaluated to make sure it was all good and sound before rebuilding. He said the foundation on the main house looked really good and most of the sill seemed to be intact. Mr. Ferreira said that a lot of the main beams were in great shape.

Mr. Ferreira advised the Commission that he has been doing a lot of outreach with the neighbors. He wanted to work with the neighbors as he knows a lot of them are opposed to the density. He was trying to do something that accommodated additional housing as there was a need for it in Bristol. He stated that the units would not be short-term rentals. Mr. Ferreira said they were going to be 2-bedroom units with covered parking in the garage that they wanted to rebuild. He wanted to make it as accommodating as possible. He also advised the

Commission that he was trying to save as much of the garage blocks as he could so it could be reused if someone wanted to come by the property and take them.

Chairperson Lima asked Attorney Marks if they should hear from the public first before the Commission made their comments. Attorney Marks said they could do that. Mr. Ferreira said he would like to hear everyone's comments. Chairperson Lima said they should hear what the neighbors had to say first. Attorney Marks clarified that the meeting was just for a concept review and opinions and that there was no voting during the meeting. Chairperson Lima stated the Commission was not going to be voting on anything. They were just going to be listening as they didn't have any specific plans with the list of materials. Mr. Ferreira said the Commission did have a list of materials. Chairperson Lima stated the Commission was not going to be looking at anything as it was only a concept review, so the Commission was not going to be voting on anything. She told Mr. Ferreira that the Commission would only be making suggestions now and they would be reviewing everything when he made his formal application at the next meeting. Mr. Ferreira understood. Nick advised Mr. Ferreira that the meeting would be on May 7th which will occur after the Zoning Board of Review meeting and they will have feedback from zoning at that time.

Attorney Marks suspected that some of the public comments were going to touch on zoning and permitting issues and as a general rule that might not be exactly relevant to what the Commission was determining. He said Mr. Ferreira was going to zoning and everyone was going to have the chance to address those issues then and the Commission shouldn't concern themselves with that. Chairperson Lima advised Attorney Marks to step in if he felt if any comments were not applicable to the concept review in order to keep the meeting moving along. Nick advised not to cut anyone off as that was not what they wanted to do, but that the Commission did not have jurisdiction over the number of units or use, just the design and materials. He advised everyone to direct any comments about the number of units to the Zoning Board.

Mr. Ferreira advised the Commission that the only relief he was seeking was for frontage. He was trying to remain in compliance with everything else. Nick cautioned him to speak with Ed Tanner if the garage was coming down as

relief may be required to go back into the same footprint. Mr. Ferreira left some walls standing, so he wasn't taking it all down. He stated whatever was unsafe came down. Nick advised Mr. Ferreira to speak with Ed Tanner about it. Member Allen stated that he was of the belief that siding on the original house needed to be left as wood. Mr. Ferreira appreciated it and was okay with it. Nick invited the public to come up and speak.

Lenny Pansa of 149 High Street came up to speak. Mr. Pansa said that a group of 10 neighbors sent a letter to the Commission. They felt strongly that the letter should be part of the record for the meeting. Nick stated that it was passed out to everyone and its contents would be entered into the minutes.

Mr. Pansa stated his house was built in 1809 and has owned it for almost 70 years. He and his wife consider themselves as temporary caretakers. He was thankful that the Bristol Historic District was established 4 decades ago to help preserve and safeguard special areas of historical and architectural value for future generations. Mr. Pansa went over some important points of the letter and emphasize that the neighbors strongly believe that the development of the property was grossly inappropriate based on the size, mass, and the number of new units on what was legally a single-family lot. He said the proposed development of new town homes would add approximately 80 to 100ft of new structure less than 5ft from his property. In addition, if the garage was allowed to be rebuilt, there would be a massive structure nearly 200ft long along the property line less than 5ft from the common line. He stated another important point to be considered was the potential long-term precedence of approving 3 new townhouses for a single-family lot on High Street in the historic district. He wanted to make it clear that his brother, nor his wife or him, had any intention of ever selling their properties and hoped to retain them for future generations. However, Mr. Pansa wanted the Commission to strongly consider that his lot was almost twice the size of Mr. Ferreira's lot in square footage, and he also had over 120ft of frontage which would technically allow for a huge development without getting zoning approval. Mr. Pansa said he could probably put 8 to 12 townhouses on his property without a zoning variance and that the Commission would be the only thing that could potentially stop that from happening. He felt that it was a slippery slope if the Commission

approved what was being proposed on Mr. Ferreira's lot. Mr. Pansa emphasized that he had zero interest in selling, but the precedence that may be set for future HDC decisions based on the proposal for Mr. Ferreira's property was something they needed to consider.

Greg Carleu came forward to speak next. Mr. Carleu just wanted to voice his concerns over the number of units being proposed. Nick advised Mr. Carleu that the Commission had no jurisdiction over the number of units and its only materials, massing, and design. He advised Mr. Carleu that his questions should be presented to the Zoning Board.

Sebastian Wordell came forth to speak. He stated that he and the neighbors didn't want the neighborhood to drastically change. He felt that if Mr. Ferreira really wanted to work with the neighbors, he wouldn't put all of the units on the property. The neighbors don't want it. He hopes the Commission listened to everyone.

Nina Murphy from 142 High Street came forward to speak. Ms. Murphy felt that changing the dimensions and size of project would affect the entire street. She said that there were other pockets of land on the street that could potentially come before the Commission in the future including Mr. Pansa's property. She said it was a catch-22 situation. Ms. Murphy said she would hope that whatever comes down the path, the mass and size would not destroy the character of the street as it has survived for hundreds of years. Everyone that visits Bristol remarks how the Town appreciates the past and preserves it and it needs to keep being preserved. She stressed to the Commission that needs to be considered as the project moved forward. Ms. Murphy wished Mr. Ferreira well and hoped his project would represent High Street appropriately.

June Bjerregaard of 159 High Street came forward. Ms. Bjerregaard stated that the beauty and culture of being in downtown Bristol was created by the preservation and heritage of the old homes and spaces. She said when those spaces are impeded upon, it was equal to impeding on the character of the homes. Ms. Bjerregaard stated while the number of units might be a zoning issue, the responsibility for the beauty and character of the area weighed heavily on the Commission. Yes, it's a zoning issue, but there were many ways to approach the property

that didn't include mass housing, a duplex, or every square inch of the property being developed as it impedes on heritage and preservation of the Town. She said it was a choice, privilege, and expense to live where the history and character need to be protected. Ms. Bjerregaard gave the Commission for its work and hopes that they continue to do so.

Dr. Catherine Zipf came forward to speak. Dr. Zipf stated the first choice was to simply allow for the single-family dwelling to remain and not move forward with anything else. If she could choose, she would not move forward with the development. What shocked her a little, and not in a bad way, was the visual complexity. Dr. Zipf said it read like 3 individual townhouses, which made it look like a very long and skinny building. She stated that since it looked like the garage wasn't going to stay, then perhaps Mr. Ferreira could move the proposed townhouses further back on the property. She also suggested that Mr. Ferreira only do 1 dormer window instead of 3 dormers on the main house. Dr. Zipf thought it was a bit overkill for the property.

Member Allen asked Mr. Ferreira if he was still planning on rebuilding the garage. Mr. Ferreira said he wanted to provide covered parking for the tenants even though it was a huge and unnecessary expense to do so. He said he wanted it to be appealing to the people that were going to be living there. Mr. Ferreira said he could eliminate the garages and do basements instead. He was open to repositioning the building and discussing it with Dr. Zipf. He reminded everyone that the site was zoned R6 for multifamily, but the only thing it didn't have was the frontage. Mr. Ferreira said he was only looking for relief on 1 or 2 items. He stated that most of the houses on the street were right on property line and he was proposing 10ft from the property. He said if he needed to shift the buildings over a bit, so they weren't sitting on the property line, he was okay with it. Mr. Ferreira wants to accommodate everyone as best as possible and was more than willing to stay and hear thoughts and ideas.

Chairperson Lima asked Dr. Zipf if she was willing to have a discussion with Mr. Ferreira. Dr. Zipf said she would be happy to do so. Chairperson Lima advised Dr. Zipf that the Commission didn't have any specific designs or information yet so they couldn't make any decisions.

Nick said the information was in the packet. Chairperson Lima said that the Commission wanted to see rendering options. Mr. Ferreira stated there were two different options. He said Option A showed everything as 1 building and Option B showed separate buildings.

Sebastian Wordell came back up and asked if all of the cars from the property were going to be exiting out onto High Street. Mr. Ferreira stated they would be exiting the property onto High Street through the current driveway existing on the property. Mr. Wordell said the property was in the heart of the historic district and Mr. Ferreira wanted to build 4 houses and 10 garages and he was going to essentially build a new road. Mr. Ferreira stated it was a common driveway. Mr. Wordell stated he was going to have to deal with all of the noise, lights, and everything else associated with the property and was against it.

Chairperson Lima couldn't say specifically exactly what she was for or against, but she did feel that that putting the units together was a lot. She asked Mr. Ferreira to come back with another rendering. Chairperson Lima didn't like the idea of a 10-car garage with the large building. She wanted to see an alternative plan.

Mr. Ferreira asked for some direct as he didn't want to keep presenting the same proposal over and over again. He presented Option A and B and needed to know which way the Commission was leaning towards. He stated he could make Option B connected by adding a breezeway or mudroom in between the units so it was all one building. Chairperson Lima was not in favor of 1 big building on the property. In her mind she understood that Mr. Ferreira's property was big, but she suggested having 1 main house and 2 or 3 other outbuildings with a garage. She couldn't say exactly what she was thinking as she wasn't a builder.

Mr. Ferreira said he was not trying to go over closer to any of the neighbors. He was willing to move the building further away and be more within the setbacks of what was allowed by zoning. He was okay with putting in 3 separate buildings with garages underneath which would save Mr. Ferreira some money, but he was trying to avoid going higher with the buildings. Mr. Ferreira was trying to keep them at the same height or lower than the

existing structure, so the new structures weren't overshadowing the existing building. He could have put a 3-story multifamily property behind the existing structure to take up less space on the site, but it wouldn't be a good look. He didn't think it would do the existing house justice. Mr. Ferreira was okay with eliminating the garage and shifting the 3 townhouses back, but then he would need an additional use variance. He was okay with trying to push the Zoning Board to allow that, so the main house didn't look super long. Regarding drainage, Mr. Ferreira stated if he removed those structures, he would be meeting the same drainage requirements as he has now so he wouldn't have to do any additional engineering on the site.

Chairperson Lima suggested to Mr. Ferreira that he come back to the Commission with different alternatives. She stated that the Commission did not need detailed architectural designs, just conceptual designs. She was not making any recommendations but just thinking that the main house would stay because that was the historical part. She suggested that the rendering show outbuildings that were not clumped together. Mr. Ferreira stated that Zoning would have a hard time with it. He stated that Planning would ask him to do a Comprehensive Building Permit and he wanted to avoid it. He said it would take him down a path that would circumvent the HDC and Zoning and would go directly to Planning.

Mr. Ferreira said the HDC would still have the option to dictate the materials and things of that nature, but at that point he would have to provide affordable housing units and there would be fees and costs associated with him going down that path. It was a path that he did not want to take because he would have to increase the density. Mr. Ferreira stated it would get rid of all Zoning approvals and goes directly to the Planning Board. He stated it was not an option he wanted to do because it cost more and he would have to increase the density even more so he wouldn't financially take a loss on the project. Mr. Ferreira said he was only technically allowed 1 dwelling unit on the lot, and he was trying to do 2 in order to satisfy the neighbors and the HDC. Zoning advised Mr. Ferreira that they were amicable if the HDC wanted him to do 2 separate buildings. He liked the idea of doing 2 buildings, but Zoning wouldn't be happy if he tried to do 4 additional buildings on the site and eliminated the garage.

Member Millard felt that Mr. Ferreira was trying to put too many units on the property. She said that while the property seemed large, it was broken up with the old house way off on right side. She stated that people who live downtown were allowed to put an ADU on property and that's it, but that doesn't work. Member Millard said he was trying to put too many units in and didn't think it would pay off and would be extremely unattractive. She gave the example of the Longfield building where it had been moved on the property.

Member Millard said she could see Mr. Ferreira moving the house to the middle of the property then putting up an addition where he could have 2 families in it and then an ADU. Mr. Ferreira said because of the narrow lot, he repositioned it that way. He was told at the previous meeting that more of the townhouse style development was preferred. He stated the plans were based on previous recommendations. Mr. Ferreria was also previously advised by the Commission not to do too much to the existing house by making it like a duplex. Member Millard stated she wouldn't do a duplex but rather put an addition on the back. She said that he did put an addition in his drawings. Mr. Ferreira stated that it was the addition that was already existing which had been destroyed by the elements. Member Millard stated theoretically he could make it a 2 family. Mr. Ferreria stated he wanted to keep it as a single-family dwelling. He had people that were interested in renting that portion of the house.

Mr. Ferreira was trying to present the best-case scenario for the site. He was willing to shift the buildings over more and plant arborvitaes so that over time no one would know there were 3 townhouses back there. He reiterated that he was okay with removing garage so there would be only 2 structures on the site and put basements underneath for storage. Mr. Ferreira stated that 3 additional units was where things worked financially for him. He has spent a significant amount of money removing junk, and his plan would make the property look light years better than it has been in the last 3 to 4 decades. Mr. Ferreira was open to hearing everyone's thoughts.

Member Camara suggested that Mr. Ferreira take a current view of the property and do an overlay of a proposal on top. He stated it would be a helpful visual for the

Commission. He stated seeing what's proposed overlayed on what it currently looks like might make it more understandable. Mr. Ferreira said that it was a great idea and would put it together. Member Allen stated he would like to see it remain as a single-family home. He felt there was way too going on, and nothing should be higher than original house. Mr. Ferreira agreed that nothing should be higher than the original house. Member Allen stated that the garage should be removed. Mr. Ferreira was okay with that. His only concern was for the neighbors not seeing a bunch of cars and for the tenants to have storage, but he could simply do basements for storage. Member Allen stated that if Mr. Ferreira planted arborvitae no one would see the cars parked in the area anyway. He implored Mr. Ferreira not to do 4 units.

Mr. Ferreira stated although he hadn't received the final total for the cleanup costs, so far it has cost him close to \$80,000, so he needs 4 units in order to make a profit. He stated that some neighbors offered to buy back-end portion of property and he discuss that. Mr. Ferreira advised the Commission that he was also removing some soil from the site because of all of the cars and the debris that that was on the property. He wanted to make sure the property was clean and safe. So, he was going to eliminate about a 1ft to 1½ft of soil.

Member Allen agreed with Chairperson Lima that the townhouses should be separated from the main building. Mr. Ferreira said that was shown on Option B and he would need additional zoning approval for it. He said if Zoning approved of it, he would not have a problem with it. Member Allen said if the Commission didn't approve of what he wanted to do, then what was Zoning going to do about it. Mr. Ferreira said he could deal with it when that time came, but if Zoning said they wanted it joined together, he would do a breezeway to connect the buildings. Member Allen said it wouldn't serve a purpose. Mr. Ferreria said that it would still look like 2 separate buildings with a little breezeway. Member Allen didn't agree with it. Mr. Ferreira said that's how he would handle it to accommodate Zoning and the Commission as much as possible. However, he liked the idea of having it separated and if the Commission made the strong recommendation to the Zoning Board then Zoning might be more open to allowing it.

Member Allen asked if Mr. Ferreira could take the 3 townhouses and push them back towards the back of the property. Mr. Ferreira said he could as long as he stayed within 150ft of the property line. Mr. Sisson stated that it could be looked at. Mr. Ferreira said he could push it back as far as it would go to provide more separation and he could move the building to the 10ft setback which was required by Zoning. Member Allen said it would look better from the street. Mr. Ferreira agreed.

5B. CRHD-26-2: 721 Hope St, Mosa Al Zoweilei Discuss proposed 2 story addition to detached garage to create ADU.

Olivia Spence and Mosa Al Zoweilei were present.

Ms. Spence advised the Commission of Mr. Al Zoweilei's proposal to do a 2-story addition to his existing detached 2-car garage to create an ADU which he intends to live in. She stated the design as proposed asks for the least dimensional variance possible. Member Allen asked about the size of the lot. Ms. Spence stated the lot was 3,770sqft. Member Allen asked Attorney Marks if it qualified for an ADU. Attorney Marks stated that a lot size of 20,000sqft. qualified. Ms. Spence stated under the Bristol Zoning Ordinance 1 ADU was allowed per lot when the proposed ADU was located within the existing footprint of the primary structure or the existing attached or detached structure and did not extend the footprint of the structure. She said they were going to be looking for a zoning variance because it did extend the footprint, but they should be allowed to build an ADU by right. Attorney Marks said if they received the dimensional variance, then they could build the ADU. Member Allen though the homeowner needed 20,000sqft. Attorney Marks said there were 3 ways he could get it on that statute and 1 was to get a dimensional variance.

Member Allen stated it was a tight lot and going over the garage would not look appropriate. Chairperson Lima said it was a very compact area. She wasn't saying that something couldn't be put there but thought the dimensions and height of what was being proposed were overwhelming. Member Allen felt the cantilever over existing garage didn't look right.

Chairperson Lima asked if the house on Hope Street was part of the lot and Ms. Spence said it was. Chairperson Lima asked if the ADU was going to be above the garage and Ms. Spence said yes. Chairperson Lima asked Ms. Spence how many feet there were between garage and house. Ms. Spence said there was approximately 6ft between the two and they would be asking for the minimum of 3ft 6 inches to get a set of stairs up to the first floor. She agreed that it was a bit tall for the space, but they were open to the Commission's feedback.

Ms. Spence advised the Commission that the original design was based on zoning, and part of the zoning component was to meet parking requirements. She said in order to meet those parking requirements; the garage had to stay a garage and because of the flood zone. She stated that's why they proposed the addition on the top and not consuming the existing garage. Ms. Spence said she proposed cantilevers to get Mr. Al Zoweilei an adequate living space that was within zoning requirements for the size of an ADU but also to stay within the applicable setbacks. Member Allen stated it was not appropriate for lot.

Member Millard asked if it could be moved in to back yard at all. Ms. Spence said it was a very tight corner lot. Member Camara asked what the height of the proposal versus the height of the existing house. Ms. Spence said the existing house height was 37ft and they were proposing approximately 33½ft. She said the height could be brought down a bit as a gable roof was currently proposed to keep the style consistent and for storage, but they could switch to a flat roof. That would bring them down 5ft or 6ft.

Chairperson Lima said it was a tight fit and asked if Zoning would approve it. Ms. Spence said they would need to go before Zoning once they received approval from the Commission. She said their design was based on asking for as little of a zoning variance as possible. However, since they were expanding the footprint, they would need to ask for a zoning variance for it. She stated the garage was within the required setbacks. Ms. Spence advised the Commission that the 2 stories being setback and cantilevered out is so they're within the building setback lines and they wouldn't have to ask for a variance for it. She said that by building out over the driveway, they were still within the setbacks and

wouldn't need a variance for the proposed addition and were able to maintain 4 parking spots, 2 in the driveway and 2 in the garage. However, they needed a variance for the 5th parking spot that was required. Chairperson Lima asked if there was room for the 5th parking space. Ms. Spence said there wasn't room and that's why they were asking for the variance. Chairperson Lima asked where they were going to put the 5th parking space. Ms. Spence said they weren't going to put a 5th spot, that's why they were asking for the variance, so they didn't have to do a 5th spot. She said they were currently proposing a 2-bed ADU, but if they reduced it to a 1-bed, they could eliminate the need for the 5th parking spot.

Member Millard asked how many units Mr. Al Zoweilei wanted to build. Ms. Spence said he wanted just one unit for himself. Member Millard agreed with Member Allen that the cantilever looked awkward. Ms. Spence said it was designed for Zoning and the idea of going in front of HDC hadn't been discussed and they were open to the Commission's feedback. They understood that the cantilever was very modern. Chairperson Lima suggested that they stayed within the footprint of the garage. She understood that Ms. Spence couldn't make it look smaller than what it was going to be, but it was a large building on a small lot.

Member Millard asked if it could be done off the back of the garage. Ms. Spence said they could do the cantilever off of the back as they had about 4x6. She said they would go just about up to the property line which they were allowed to do by Zoning, but that might not be okay with the neighbors. Ms. Spence said with the current design, the neighbors still had some breathing room.

Ms. Spence asked the Commission if they wanted to see something smaller in height and within the footprint. Chairperson Lima suggested another concept review when there were more Commission members present because if the applicant comes back with an application and the Commission votes no, then they would have to wait a year before filing a new application. Chairperson Lima said she would probably approve it as long as it was within the footprint of the garage and not any bigger.

Member Millard asked for the dimensions of the interior space. Ms. Spence said they were going to take off the gable roof and add 2 floors. She said the ceiling

heights of the 2 floors were going to be approximately 8ft 6 inches. She stated they could go down to 8ft which would save a foot of space. Ms. Spence said they could do a flat roof but that would make it look more modern and not match the existing structure. Member Millard said she could do a railing around the flat roof. Ms. Spence said they could do an ornate dental molding.

Chairperson Lima suggested another concept review with different options. Ms. Spence said there was a suggestion for doing a visual overlay. Member Allen said doing a rendering compared to what was there would be helpful. Member Millard suggested doing a view from the street would also be helpful. Chairperson Lima said to do views from both Thames Street and Oliver Street to put it in perspective. Member Allen said turning it into a one-bed unit would make it fit better within the framework of the garage. Ms. Spence said it would eliminate 1 bedroom and 1 bathroom and then she could change the living space to reduce the footprint. Member Allen asked if there was a maximum number of square feet for an ADU. Ms. Spence said it was 1,200ft for a 2-bed or 60% for a primary dwelling living space and they were well within that amount.

Ms. Spence stated they were going to come back with new design concepts. She asked if the Commission wanted a materials list next time or if they wanted to wait for the actual application. Chairperson Lima said she could indicate what the materials would be and go from there.

Dr. Catherine Zipf came forward to speak. Dr. Zipf stated that it was a situation where they were trying to get too much house in too small of a space. She asked if it needed to be a 2-bed, 2-bath house or could it be a 1-bed, 1-bath house in confines of the garage. Dr. Zipf said the actual old house was a survivor of the British raids. She said the project was exactly what the spirit of an ADU was supposed to be, but if they could do something more historical.

Mr. Al Zoweilei asked the Commission's opinion about window styles. Member Millard said for certain styles of homes, the Commission would prefer 6 over 6. She said for earlier homes, they prefer 12 over 12. She stated there were other styles as well. Member Allen stated they preferred wood frame window with an clad exterior.

Mr. Al Zoweilei said the windows on the main house were vinyl.

Ms. Spence said the building was offset about 5ft to keep the addition within setback lines. She said they thought about putting a deck on the existing roof, but they would have to go in front of Zoning for. Member Allen said they could do it off the back. Ms. Spence said they would do it towards water side and asked if there was a recommendation for railing styles. Member Allen stated they had approved of cable railings. Chairperson Lima advised Ms. Spence to look at the Elks Lodge and Member Allen said there were a few houses on Thames Street with cable railings as well. Member Allen said the posts would need to be wood, but the decking could be a composite since it would be on a second level.

Chairperson Lima asked if they would like to come back for another concept review. Ms. Spence said they would like another concept review. Nick said he would put it on for another concept review and they could continue to upload new documents.

6. Monitor Reports & Project Updates

Nick asked the Commission for any updates or Monitor reports. He sent an email out stating that any new applications that are received, he will be implementing closeout inspections. He will try to involve the Project Monitor when possible. This will help to close out building permits. He will work with the Solicitor. He will also consider doing a refundable fee just to encourage people to do the inspections. The Commission thought it was a great idea.

Nick also advised the Commission that Arnold Robinson's draft standards was sent to everyone for their review. Member Allen asked when he needed the Commission's feedback. Nick stated that sooner would be better. He wanted Mr. Robinson to number the standards to referencing them would be easier. He asked the Commission Members to send their comments over all at once so it could be forwarded to Mr. Robinson at the same time.

7. HDC Coordinator Reports & Project Updates

8. HDC Coordinator Approvals**9. Other Business**

Nick requested to add the Santa House as an item for discussion.

Member Allen made the motion to be added for a discussion; Seconded by Chairperson Lima.

Voting Yea: Allen, Lima, Camara, and Millard

Opposed: None

Motion carries.

Nick advised the Commission that the Santa House was going to request from the Town Council to be permanently located on the Common and will be coming before the Commission. He just wanted to make the Commission aware of the issue.

10. Adjourned at 9:57PM

APPROVED
BRISTOL HISTORIC
DISTRICT COMMISSION
DATE: May 7, 2026

