CITY OF PROVIDENCE
Angel Taveras, Mayor

December 27, 2012

Anna Stetson, City Clerk
City Hall
25 Dorrance Street
Providence, RI 02903

Dear Ms. Stetson:

Enclosed with this letter is the 2011-2012 Annual Report of the Providence Historic District Commission (PHDC). The report summarizes the PHDC's activities for the year October 1, 2009 to September 30, 2010. Please find attached fifteen (15) copies for each member of the City Council, and one (1) copy for your files.

No action is needed by the City Council regarding this report. Please contact me at 351-4300, ext. 517 should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Jason D. Martin
Principal Planner/PHDC Staff

IN CITY COUNCIL
JAN 17 2013
READ
WHEREUPON IT IS ORDERED THAT
THE SAME BE RECEIVED.
CLERK

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
444 Westminster Street, Providence, Rhode Island 02903
401 680 8400 ph | 401 680 8492 fax
www.providenceri.com

CITY OF PROVIDENCE

Angel Taveras, Mayor

December 19, 2012

Honorable Angel Taveras
Providence City Hall
25 Dorrance Street
Providence, RI 02903

Dear Mayor Taveras,

I am pleased to present this 2011-2012 Annual Report of the Providence Historic District Commission, covering the period from October 1, 2011 through September 30, 2012. The Annual Report is mandated by the Certified Local Government Program administered by the Rhode Island Historical Preservation & Heritage Commission and the National Park Service.

This report represents the Commission's activities in all eight of Providence's local historic districts, of which there are more than 2,500 properties listed. During 2011-2012, the Planning Department received 148 applications for Certificates of Appropriateness. The Commission reviewed 158 applications, 41 reviewed by the Commission and 118 reviewed and approved by the Commission's professional staff-person, demonstrating the Commission's timely and efficient review process.

The Department of Planning and Development proudly supports the Historic District Commission's role in protecting Providence's historic resources, while ensuring that historic preservation plays a significant role in the city planning process.

Sincerely,

Robert E. Azar, AICP, Acting Director

cc: Providence City Council
City Clerk
Rhode Island Historical Preservation Commission
Historic District Commission Members

RA/jm

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
444 Westminster Street, Providence, Rhode Island 02903
401 680 8400 ph | 401 680 8492 fax
www.providenceri.com

PROVIDENCE HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION ANNUAL REPORT

OCTOBER 1, 2011 – SEPTEMBER 30, 2012

PREPARED FOR:
CERTIFIED LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROGRAM
RHODE ISLAND HISTORICAL PRESERVATION & HERITAGE COMMISSION
OLD STATE HOUSE
150 BENEFIT STREET
PROVIDENCE, RI 02903

PREPARED BY:
CITY OF PROVIDENCE
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
444 WESTMINSTER STREET, SUITE 3A
PROVIDENCE, RI 02903

CERTIFIED LOCAL GOVERNMENT ANNUAL REPORT

OCTOBER 1, 2011 TO SEPTEMBER 30, 2012

Deadline for Submission: Friday, December 28, 2012

Please complete the enclosed forms. All questions pertain to the reporting period October 1, 2011 through September 30, 2012. Many of the answers require a "yes" or "no" answer or a brief statement. Continue your answers on additional pages if necessary. The forms may be handwritten or typed. Please check carefully to see that all required attachments are returned with this report.

Name of Certified Local Government: Providence

Name of Contact Person: Jason Martin, Preservation Planner

Address: Department of Planning & Development, 444 Westminster St. Ste 3A, Providence, RI 02911

Telephone Number: 401.680.8517 Fax Number: 401.680.8492

E-Mail Address: jmartin@providenceri.com

CRITERIA #1

LOCAL GOVERNMENTS MUST ENFORCE LOCAL LEGISLATION FOR THE DESIGNATION AND PROTECTION OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES.

1. Was the ordinance amended? No
   If YES, ATTACH a copy of the amendment.

2. Were procedural or design guidelines developed or amended? No
   If YES, ATTACH a copy of new or amended guidelines.

3. What are the current design standards being used by the Commission?

   S&G Armory, Broadway, CollegeHill, North Elmwood, South Elmwood & Stimson Avenue;S&G Jewelry HD; S&G Industrial & Commercial Buildings District; PHDC Rules & Regulations

4. **ATTACH** minutes of all HDC meetings for the year (**ATTACHMENT A**).

5. **ATTACH** a sample approval letter to an applicant (**ATTACHMENT B**).

6. Summarize the types of projects and their disposition on this chart

Type of Project	Total	Approved	Denied	Pending	Appealed
Alterations					
Demolitions	**SEE ATTACHED**				
New Construction					
Relocations					

7. Were any of these cases given automatic approval through expiration of the time limit for review? No

8. Were any petitions approved which did not conform to the Secretary of the Interior's **Standards** or other approved local standards? No
If YES, ATTACH an explanation of how the case(s) was reviewed and why an exception to the standards was permitted.

9. Was the district enlarged? (See #1)
a.. How many historic properties were added? No
If YES, ATTACH a copy of the revised district map.

10. Were any new Historic Districts added? No
If YES, ATTACH a copy of the district map(s).

11. Were any new properties designated? No
If YES, ATTACH a list of the properties and addresses (**ATTACHMENT C**).

CRITERIA #2

LOCAL GOVERNMENTS MUST HAVE ESTABLISHED AN ADEQUATE AND QUALIFIED HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION.

1. Membership

a. **ATTACH** an up-to-date address list of your commission's members and contact person. PLEASE INDICATE IF ANY NEW MEMBERS WERE APPOINTED, AND WHO THEY REPLACED. Please note the number of HDC meetings attended by each member (**ATTACHMENT D**).

b. **ATTACH A RESUME** for each new name added to the list since the last reporting period (**ATTACHMENT E**).

2. Vacancies

a. Total number of vacancies during the year. 3
b. Was each vacancy filled within ninety days? No
c. Were vacancies filled with professionals defined by 36CFR61 Professional Qualification Standards? n/a

d. Please explain **if you answered no** to either of the two previous questions.

The two City Council positions have not been filled

3. Meetings: Total number of meetings held: 15

4. Professional Training

List any meetings, informational meetings, conferences and workshops related to historic preservation attended by members of your commission. Include the name of the meeting and the name(s) of the member(s) who attended.

SEE ATTACHED

CRITERIA #3

LOCAL GOVERNMENTS MUST MAINTAIN A SYSTEM FOR THE SURVEY AND INVENTORY OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES.

1. Has any survey work been done? No

a. If yes, how many properties have been surveyed? _____
b. Has the RIHPHC had an opportunity to participate in the work? _____
c. Was the survey work recorded on RIPHC forms? _____
d. Did the RIHPHC receive duplicate forms, maps and photo negatives within sixty days of the completion? _____

CRITERIA #4

LOCAL GOVERNMENTS MUST SATISFACTORILY PERFORM THE RESPONSIBILITIES DELEGATED TO THEM UNDER THE ACT.

1. National Register

a. Did you evaluate the National Register eligibility of any properties? Yes
b. Did you prepare any National Register forms? No
c. Did you review and comment on any National Register nominations sent to you by the RIHPHC? Yes

PLEASE NOTE: If the RIHPHC requested the CLG to review a National Register nomination, the RIHPHC staff will comment on whether the CLG responded within the allotted time period.

2. CLG Grants

a. List any grant-in-aid projects completed or currently in progress. Briefly describe the current status.

Revisions to PHDC Standards & Guidelines (active):

Structural Evaluation of Trinity Church (active).

CRITERIA #5

LOCAL GOVERNMENTS MUST PROVIDE ADEQUATE PARTICIPATION IN THE LOCAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION PROGRAMS, INCLUDING TH PROCESS OF RECOMMENDING PROPERTIES FOR THE NATIONAL REGISTER.

1. Public Participation
   a. Are all records publicly accessible? Yes
   b. Are notices of meetings published or posted in advance? Yes
   c. Briefly describe how the public is given the opportunity to comment on National Register nominations.

   Comments on National Register Nominations are scheduled on regular public meeting agendas and noticed on the Secretaryof State's and the City's websites, and the City Clerk's office

2. Assurances

   a. ALL HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MEETINGS HAVE BEEN ANNOUNCED AND MEET THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE OPEN MEETINGS LAW, TITLE 42, CHAPTER 46, OF THE GEN. LAWS OF THE STATE OF RHODE ISLAND (1976, 1982, 1984).

   b. HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MEMBERS ARE IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE CONFLICT OF INTEREST LAW, TITLE 36, CHAPTER 14, R.I. GENERAL LAWS, WHICH REQUIRE THAT EACH MEMBER FILE A YEARLY FINANCIAL STATEMENT WITH THE CONFLICT OF INTEREST COMMISSION AND THAT THEY REFRAIN FROM CERTAIN PROHIBITED ACTIVITIES INLCUDING OFFICIAL CONDUCT WITH COULD RESULT IN PERSONAL FINANCIAL GAIN.

   c. I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MEET THE REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTIFICATION IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE RHODE ISLAND CERTIFIED LOCAL GOVERNMENTS PROGRAM REGULATIONS, AS AMENDED.

Signature, Historic District Chairman — Date

Signature, Chief Elected Official — Date 12/20/12

ATTACHMENT A
Criteria 1.4
Minutes

PHDC MEETING MINUTES
OCTOBER 24, 2011

A meeting of the Providence Historic District Commission was held on Monday, October 24, 2011 at the Department of Planning and Development, 444 Westminster Street, Providence, RI 02903.

REGULAR MEETING

A. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:55 PM, Mr. Glen Fontecchio, Chair, presiding. All testimony was sworn.

B. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Glen Fontecchio, Clark Schoettle, Catherine Lund, Kristi Agniel, Mildred Parrillo, Tina Regan & Cornelis de Boer
Members Absent: Jon-Paul Couture & Neal Kaplan
Staff Present: Jason Martin

C. MEETING MINUTES

Dr. Lund made a motion to table the minutes of the 8/22/11 & 9/26/11 meetings; Mrs. Agniel seconded; the motion passed unanimously.

D. PROJECT REVIEW

Mr. Schoettle recused himself from the next application.

1. **CASE 11.108 ▪ 61 PARADE STREET (ARMORY)** – Thom D'Ovidio, Providence Revolving Fund, representing the applicant/owner, appeared before the Commission requesting the approval of the modification of the rear stairs.

   Mr. Martin gave an overview of the staff report: The rear stairs are in need of replacement; the current stairs run from the rear-door's landing to the north towards Willow Street; the owner would like to install an additional run of steps to the south towards the yard

   The Chair asked for public comment; no public comment was made.

   Dr. Lund made a motion to grant Final Approval of the application as submitted, citing Standard 8; Mrs. Agniel seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Schoettle rejoined the Commission.

2. **CASE 11.087 ▪ 83 MESSER STREET (Armory)** – Rose Segal, applicant/owner, and Rouben Balagian, general contractor, appeared before the Commission requesting the installation of new railings, 2nd floor porch and two skylights.

   Mr. Martin gave an overview of the staff report: The applicant's are returning to the Commission with revised drawings. The applicant has stripped the vinyl-siding on the building and painted the shingles and clapboards as part of a rehabilitation of the property. The existing second floor porch's railing was previously removed and there is only plywood used as a barrier (that was covered in vinyl siding); drawings have been submitted showing the proposed straight balustrade; there is still a question as to the number of newel posts to use; the Commission suggested that the four post version which aligns with the columns below on the first floor porch is the most appropriate; The applicants would like to

install two skylights to the north slope of the roof; the roof is a cross-gable and one skylight is proposed on either side of the gable. The skylight on the front portion of the roof is in a location that has not typically been approved by the Commission; however it is staff's opinion that this proposed location is acceptable due to the nature of the roof and the closeness of the abutting property. Staff recommends approval of both skylights; The Commission had the following concerns/comments: the Commission stated that the location of the front skylight is acceptable because there is no other natural light for the room.

The Chair asked for public comment; no public comment was made.

Mrs. Agniel made a motion to approve the application as modified, with the balustrades to be as depicted in drawing "2A" with four newel posts, corresponding to the 1st-floor porches posts; both skylights are approved, the forward one due to the lack of any other source of natural light for the room; skylights to be 30" wide and centered on lower windows, citing Standard 8; Dr. Lund seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

The applicants for Item 3 were not present. The application was tabled until the applicants appeared.

4. **CASE 11.086 ▪ 403 SOUTH MAIN STREET (COLLEGE HILL)** – Andrew Metrellis, applicant/owner, and Mark Rapp, architect, appeared before the Commission requesting the construction of an approx 992 sq. ft. addition to the rear of the property.

   Mr. Martin gave an overview of the staff report: The applicant received approval for the proposal at the October 24, 2005 meeting; the approval has expired; the applicant is seeking to have the project re-approved. The applicant has restored the Tillinghast House utilizing the Investment Tax Credit. RIHPHC also has purview over the addition. Mr. Rapp has contacted the staff at RIHPHC seeking an opinion on the addition, although the rehabilitation was undertaken with the knowledge of RIHPHC that the PHDC had approved an addition to the property; RIHPHC would rather that an addition not be added to the property. The applicants are also of like mind and are currently attempting to purchase adjacent land to the rear of the property available as part of the I-195 relocation project where a free-standing new structure could be built as an alternative. The applicants have requested to table the application at this time.

   The Chair asked for public comment; no public comment was made.

   Mr. de Boer made a motion to table the application to a subsequent meeting; Mr. Schoettle seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

5. **CASE 11.099 ▪ 300 BENEFIT STREET (COLLEGE HILL)** – Frank Scotti, applicant/owner, and Scott Weymouth, Arris Design, architect, appeared before the Commission requesting the construction of a free-standing garage and modifications to the carriage house.

   Mr. Martin gave an overview of the staff report. Messrs. Scotti and Weymouth gave an overview of the proposal. Zoning variances have been granted regarding the parking; the footprint of the garage is restricted by that resolution;

   The Commission had the following comments:
   - Members feel that the garage's design feels "suburban"; could there be a double entrance? No because of restrictions on the lot; not enough space;

- Could the garage door be changed; yes;
- Can the building be made to appear taller? Perhaps a higher pitch? yes will investigate.

The Chair asked for public comment; no public comment was made.

Mr. Schoettle made a motion to grant Conceptual Approval of the new construction with the applicant to return with revised drawings, a foundation permit may be issued, citing Standard 8, Dr. Lund seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Schoettle made a motion to grant Final Approval of the major alterations to the carriage house, as submitted, citing Standard 8, Dr. Lund seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

6. **CASE 11.109 ▪ 5 COOKE STREET (COLLEGE HILL)** – Peter Scotti, applicant/owner, and Scott Weymouth, Arris Design, architect, appeared before the Commission requesting the construction of a third-floor addition based on historical precedent.

   Mr. Martin gave an overview of the staff report. Messrs. Scotti and Weymouth gave an overview of the proposal. there is only one staircase to the third floor and in order for the house to be true "family" house, the stair at the rear of the house should be extended to the third floor; there was once a third floor with a sleeping porch on the rear ell (historic photos show this).

   The Commission had the following comments: the design needs to stay subservient to the main body of the house, which it does, but issue of a "witch's hat" taking place; engagement of the cornice is tricky; could the design be modified to address these concerns? yes, will revise details.

   The Chair asked for public comment; no public comment was made.

   Mr. de Boer made a motion to grant Conceptual Approval of the application, as modified, with the applicant to return with revised detail drawings showing the described changes to the area of the sleeping porch, a framing permit may be issued, citing Standard 8, Dr. Lund seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. de Boer recused himself from the next application.

7. **CASE 11.110 ▪ 21 SHELDON STREET (COLLEGE HILL)** – Cornelis de Boer, architect, representing the owners, appeared before the Commission requesting the construction of a rear porch.

   Mr. Martin gave an overview of the staff report. Mr. de Boer gave an overview of the project; currently no access to the rather substantial rear yard; a window is being converted to a door for access/egress; the chimney on the rear elevation which is a later addition for the boiler which is now defunct would be removed; alterations would take advantage of the lot, make it a "family home".

   The Chair asked for public comment; no public comment was made.

   Mr. Schoettle made a motion to grant final approval of the application, as submitted, with details to staff, citing Standard 8; Mrs. Agniel seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. de Boer rejoined the Commission.

3. **CASE 11.058 ▪ 43 & 47 TRANSIT STREET (COLLEGE HILL)** – Charlie Samos, owner, and Glenn Jauros, general contractor, appeared before the Commission to request changes to the buildings as part of their rehabilitation, including the changing of fenestration and the modification of existing rear decks, etc.

   Mr. Martin gave an overview of the staff report. Mr. Jauros gave an overview of the proposal. The Commission had various comments/concerns related to the project including: continuing issues of documentation: drawings are not in-sync with each other; makes it confusing and difficult to understand; railing's pickets should be 3" on-center. Building code issues? Will the proposal pass muster with the building department? Have an engineer review and stamped plans before HDC will give further consideration.

Dr. Lund departed at 7:50 p.m.

The Chair asked for public comment; no public comment was made.

Mr. Schoettle made a motion to table the application with the applicant to reappear at a subsequent meeting with engineer-approved drawings; Mrs. Agniel; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

PRELIMINARY APPLICATION

8. Discussion of the West Broadway Neighborhood Association's West Side Solar Project with Kari Lang, Executive Director, WBNA. Commission members think that once RIHPHC has reviewed the application the Commission can have a special meeting to give necessary approvals; Staff is working with RIHPHC so there is coordination on the project.

OTHER BUSINESS

9. Discussion of potential 2012 CLG projects. Staff gave an overview of potential projects which included: General overhaul and revisions to the Standards & Guidelines which may include the creation of a sub-set of standards for Federal and Pre-Federal Building types, a revised window addendum to Standards & Guidelines and the creation of the "Providence Landmark List" which would include individually-listed National Register Buildings not currently under the PHDC's jurisdiction.

E. ADJOURNMENT

With no further business the meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

JASON D. MARTIN
Preservation Planner/PHDC Staff

PHDC MEETING MINUTES
NOVEMBER 21, 2011

A meeting of the Providence Historic District Commission was held on Monday, November 21, 2011 at the Department of Planning and Development, 444 Westminster Street, Providence, RI 02903.

REGULAR MEETING

A. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:55 PM, Mr. Glen Fontecchio, Chair, presiding. All testimony was sworn.

B. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Glen Fontecchio, Clark Schoettle, Catherine Lund, Kristi Agniel, Mildred Parrillo, Tina Regan & Cornelis de Boer
Members Absent: Jon-Paul Couture & Neal Kaplan
Staff Present: Jason Martin

C. MEETING MINUTES

Mr. de Boer made a motion to approve the minutes of the 8/22/11, 9/26/11 & 10/24/11 meetings; Mrs. Regan seconded; the motion passed unanimously.

D. PROJECT REVIEW

1. **CASE 11.088 ▪ 116 & 120 BROADWAY (BROADWAY)** – Rob DeBlois, representing the applicant/owner, and Steve Guglielmo, and Ron Stevenson, architects, Saccoccio & Associates, appeared before the Commission requesting the construction of an addition to the UCAP/Textron Charter School.

   Mr. Martin gave an overview of the project. The applicants are proposing to construct an addition to the UCAP/Textron Charter School to house a gymnasium and science labs. The Commission granted approval for demolition and conceptual approval of the proposed new construction at previous meetings. An update was given regarding the sun-committee meeting held on November 1st with the architects, sub-committee members Fontecchio and Schoettle (Mr. Couture was out-of-town and unavailable) and staff; Various elements of the proposal were discussed, in particular the "tower" element, the massing of the gymnasium, and the Broadway "storefront" entrances; the commission members thought that the tower could be more vertical and that it should slope to the south away from Broadway, so that it's tallest point would be on the Broadway elevation; there was the suggestion of adding additional (spandrel) glass to the elevation; there was also discussion regarding the gymnasium's massing

   Mr. Guglielmo gave a presentation of the proposed annex. Different aspects of the proposal were discussed including fenestration, potential materials, door openings and ramps; trees and tree pits; and the gymnasium's massing; these suggestion would be evaluated by the design team and revisions would be presented to the Commission at a subsequent meeting; overall the Commission was satisfied with the size, scale and massing.

The Chair asked for public comment; the following public comments were given:

- Kari Lang, Director, WBNA, made the comments that the applicants had presented the project to WBNA's Comm. Development Committee which included whether there will be a demolition schedule and that they would like there to be one; the Committee felt that the current design had a suburban "feel" to it and that there needs to be a more urban "feel".

Public comment was closed.

The Commission had the following comments: repetition could help unify the building's façade; possibly introduce pilasters to the storefronts; balance of the overall design and the subservience of the design elements. The members would like to see more massing sketches. Could be emailed and distributed to sub-com members with the applicants to return.

Dr. Lund made a motion to table the application, with the applicant to reappear at a subsequent meeting with revised drawings; Mr. Couture seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

2. **CASE 11.058 ▪ 43 & 47 TRANSIT STREET (COLLEGE HILL)** – Nelson Taylor, realtor, representing the applicant/owner, appeared before the Commission to discuss the proposed changes to the buildings as part of their rehabilitation, including the changing of fenestration and the modification of existing rear decks, etc.

   Mr. Martin gave an overview of the staff report. Mr. Taylor was at the meeting as the applicant/owner was unable to attend as they were currently out-of-state.

   The Chair asked for public comment. No public comment was taken. Public comment was closed.

   The Commission had the following comments: the rear ell doors on both buildings should have muntins (simulated-divided-lites); the sub-com will conduct a site after the holidays.

   Mr. Couture made a motion to table the application, with the applicant to reappear at a subsequent meeting with revised drawings; Dr. Lund seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

3. **CASE 11.114 ▪ 25 BOWEN STREET (COLLEGE HILL)** – Mr. Stephen Patore, window contractor, representing the applicant/owner, appeared before the Commission to request the replacement of twenty-four (24) 6/6, single-pane, double-hung wood windows with Harvey insulated, 6/6 aluminum-clad, double-hung, wood replacement windows.

Mr. Martin gave an overview of the staff report. Mr. Patore gave an overview of the proposal. The owners unit is half of the building and only those windows would be replaced.

The Chair asked for public comment. No public comment was taken. Public comment was closed.

The Commission had the following comments: due to the nature of the age of the building the proposed replacement windows appear acceptable; the Commission would like to see detail drawings and are open to the idea of a sample window being installed in an inconspicuous location on the property.

Dr. Lund made a motion to grant Conceptual Approval, citing Standard 8, with the applicant to reappear at a subsequent meeting with detail drawings, specifically showing the jamb, and the feasibility of installing a sample window on-site; Mr. Couture seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Couture recused himself from the next application.

4. **CASE 11.126 ▪ 37-39 ARNOLD STREET (COLLEGE HILL) –** Mr. Jon-Paul Couture, architect, appeared before the Commission to request the replacement of fifteen aluminum/wood replacement windows with Kolbe & Kolbe insulated, aluminum-clad, wood replacement windows, and the removal of existing skylights and construction of a roof dormer addition on the east and west with gable addition to the west over the west entry (later addition) as part of the rehabilitation of the property

   Mr. Martin gave an overview of the staff report. Mr. Couture gave an overview of the proposal. The project would be a phased project, with the window replacements to be the first stage along with the removal of the asbestos siding and reintroduction of cedar clapboards. The second stage would include the removal of skylights and the construction of a dormer. In addition a new deck is proposed for the rear of the property. The Commission will be presented with more details as they become available.

   The Chair asked for public comment. No public comment was taken. Public comment was closed.

   The Commission had the following comments: needed improvements to the property; the existing windows are a mismatch of different replacement windows and severely deteriorated wood windows.

   Mr. Schoettle made a motion to grant Final Approval, as submitted, citing Standard 8 with a sub-committee (Members Regan, Agniel & Schoettle) to review final details as they become available; Mr. Regan seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

E. ADJOURNMENT

With no further business the meeting adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

JASON D. MARTIN
Preservation Planner/PHDC Staff

PHDC MEETING MINUTES
DECEMBER 5, 2011

A meeting of the Providence Historic District Commission was held on Monday, December 5, 2011 at the Department of Planning and Development, 444 Westminster Street, Providence, RI 02903.

REGULAR MEETING

A. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:55 PM, Mr. Glen Fontecchio, Chair, presiding. All testimony was sworn.

B. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Glen Fontecchio, Clark Schoettle, Catherine Lund, Kristi Agniel, Tina Regan & Cornelis de Boer
Members Absent: Neal Kaplan, Mildred Parrillo & Jon-Paul Couture
Staff Present: Jason Martin

C. MEETING MINUTES

Dr. Lund made a motion to table the minutes of the 11/24/11 meeting; Mrs. Agniel seconded; the motion passed unanimously.

D. PROJECT REVIEW

1. **CASE 11.088 ▪ 95 CHESTNUT STREET (JEWELRY)** – John Macliver & Jay Macliver, MPM Property Mgmt., representing the applicant/owner, and, Michael de Sesto, window consultant, Advantage Glass Co., appeared before the Commission requesting the installation of replacement windows.

   Mr. Martin gave an overview of the project. Mr. Macliver and Mr. DelSesto gave a presentation of the proposed changes. The ground-floor storefronts will not be changed. The rear of the buildings is not currently schedule for replacement, but that may change.

   The Chair asked for public comment. No public comment was taken. Public comment was closed.

   The Commission had the following comments: the depth of the proposed windows is shallower than the existing windows; members asked if the proposed windows could more closely match the existing conditions; there was also a comment regarding the division of the windows, in particular the top of the proposed windows division is different from the existing conditions. Could the replacement windows more closely match the existing conditions? Mr. DelSesto stated that he did believe this could be done.

   Dr. Lund made a motion to table the application, with the applicant to reappear at a subsequent meeting with revised drawings; Mrs. Agniel seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

2. **CASE 11.099 ▪ 300 BENEFIT STREET (COLLEGE HILL)** – Scott Weymouth, Arris Design, architect, representing the applicant/owner, appeared before the Commission requesting the construction of a free-standing garage and modifications to the carriage house.

   Mr. Martin gave an overview of the staff report. Mr. Weymouth gave an overview of the proposal. The applicants had previously appeared at the October 24th meeting when the repairs and changes

to the carriage house were approved; also, the new garage was given conceptual approval but there were concerns about the proposed roof and door; color was also commented on.

The Chair asked for public comment; no public comment was made.

The Commission had the following comments: the revised plans were much improved along with the new proposed garage door.

Dr. Lund made a motion to grant Final Approval of the new construction, as submitted, citing Standard 8, Mrs. Regan seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

3. **CASE 11.058 ▪ 43 & 47 TRANSIT STREET (COLLEGE HILL)** – No one appeared before the Commission to discuss the proposed changes to the buildings as part of their rehabilitation, including the changing of fenestration and the modification of existing rear decks, etc.

   Mr. Martin gave an overview of the staff report. Mr. Martin suggested that the sub-committee be empowered to meet with the applicants and review final details associated with the project.

   The Chair asked for public comment. No public comment was taken. Public comment was closed.

   Mrs. Agniel made a motion to authorize the sub-committee composed of members Schoettle, Fontecchio and Agniel meet with the applicants on-site, review final details and issue final approval for the project, citing Standard 8; Dr. Lund seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

4. **CASE 11.114 ▪ 25 BOWEN STREET (COLLEGE HILL)** – Mr. Stephen Patore, window contractor, representing the applicant/owner, appeared before the Commission to request the replacement of twenty-four (24) 6/6, single-pane, double-hung wood windows with Harvey insulated, 6/6 aluminum-clad, double-hung, wood replacement windows.

   Mr. Martin gave an overview of the staff report. The applicants had appeared at the November 23rd meeting where the Commission granted Conceptual Approval. The Commission requested seeing drawings showing he existing and proposed conditions so as to better ascertain whether the proposed windows would replicate the existing conditions to a suitable degree for the Commission to grant Final Approval. Mr. Patore gave an overview of the proposal.

   The Chair asked for public comment. No public comment was taken. Public comment was closed.

   The Commission had the following comments: the Commission members were concerned with the casing at the head of the window; also the total loss of area of lite was significant; could these issues be rectified? There were also concerns about the brick mold and whether the proposed molding could be modified to better reflect the existing conditions. Mr. Patore stated that he would look into the Commission's concerns and determine whether the window could be modified to meet the Commission's requests.

Dr. Lund made a motion to table the application, with the applicant to reappear at a subsequent meeting with revised drawings; Mrs. Agniel seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

Mr.de Boer recused himself from the next application.

5. **CASE 11.130 ▪ 121 HOPE STREET (COLLEGE HILL)** – Mr. Cornelis de Boer, architect, representing the owners, appeared before the Commission to request the replacement of the existing windows and the replacement of the existing fire-escape with a new code-compliant fire escape.

   Mr. Martin gave an overview of the staff report. Mr. de Boer gave an overview of the proposal.

   The Chair asked for public comment. No public comment was taken. Public comment was closed.

   The Commission had the following comments:

   Mr. Schoettle made a motion to grant Final Approval, as submitted, citing Standard , with the secondary chimney to be eliminated with staff to review final window details as they become available; Mrs. Regan seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

E. ADJOURNMENT

With no further business the meeting adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

JASON D. MARTIN
Preservation Planner/PHDC Staff

PHDC MEETING MINUTES
JANUARY 23, 2012

A meeting of the Providence Historic District Commission was held on Monday, January 23, 2012 at the Department of Planning and Development, 444 Westminster Street, Providence, RI 02903.

REGULAR MEETING

A. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:50 PM, Mr. Clark Schoettle, Vice-Chair, presiding. All testimony was sworn.

B. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Clark Schoettle, Catherine Lund, Kristi Agniel, Neal Kaplan, Jon-Paul Couture &Tina Regan
Members Absent: Mildred Parrillo, Cornelis de Boer & Glen Fontecchio
Staff Present: Jason Martin

C. MEETING MINUTES

Dr. Lund made a motion to table the minutes of the 11/24/11 & 12/05/11 meetings; Mrs. Agniel seconded; the motion passed unanimously.

D. PROJECT REVIEW

1. **CASE 11.088 ▪ 95 CHESTNUT STREET (JEWELRY)** – Michael Del Sesto, window consultant, Advantage Glass Co., representing the applicant/owner, appeared before the Commission requesting the installation of replacement windows.

Mr. Martin gave an overview of the project. The applicant's appeared at the December 5, 2011 meeting where the item was tabled; the applicant's were asked to produce more details of the windows, specifically details for the head, meeting rails and sills of the windows; these drawings have been completed and are attached. Mr. Del Sesto gave a presentation of the revised drawings. Different aspects of the proposal were discussed including: details added to Window 1 and Window 2: panning and stops have been added. The requested mullion details were available;

The Chair asked for public comment; the following public comments were given:

- Arthur Salisbury, Jewelry District Association asked if Mr. Del Sesto represented the new owner. Mr. Del Sesto replied that he did represent the new owner.

Public comment was closed.

The Commission had the following comments: the revised drawings showed the requested changes by the Commission

Mrs. Agniel made a motion to grant Final Approval of the application, as submitted, citing Standard 8; Dr. Lund seconded; Mrs. Agniel seconded; Mr. Couture abstained. Members Schoettle, Lund, Agniel, Kaplan, Regan & de Boer voted in favor; the motion passed.

2. **CASE 11.088 ▪ 116 & 120 BROADWAY (BROADWAY)** – Rob DeBlois, representing the applicant/owner, and Steve Guglielmo, and Ron Stevenson, architects, Saccoccio & Associates, appeared before the Commission requesting the construction of an addition to the UCAP/Textron Charter School.

   Mr. Martin gave an overview of the project. The applicants are proposing to construct an addition to the UCAP/Textron Charter School to house a gymnasium and science labs. Demolition approval has been given for 116 & 120 Broadway; demolition of the buildings is not to occur until building permits for the new building had been issued; At the September 26th meeting, conceptual approval was given for the proposed new construction/addition; at this meeting a sub-committee was formed consisting of members Fontecchio, Schoettle and Couture; A sub-committee meeting was held on November 1st with the architects, sub-committee members Fontecchio and Schoettle (Mr. Couture was out-of-town and unavailable) and staff; Various elements of the proposal were discussed, in particular the "tower" element, the massing of the gymnasium, and the Broadway "storefront" entrances; the commission members thought that the tower could be more vertical and that it should slope to the south away from Broadway, so that it's tallest point would be on the Broadway elevation; there was the suggestion of adding additional (spandrel) glass to the elevation; there was also discussion regarding the gymnasium's massing; The applicants appeared at the November 21, 2011 meeting where comments were received from the Commission; overall the Commission was unsure of the proposed design, specifically the cohesiveness of the various parts of the building; there were also concerns that the proposed building did not look "urban" enough; The applicants have submitted a revised scheme for the building that addresses the Commission's concerns; Architectural elevations and revised drawings have been submitted and are attached.

   Mr. Guglielmo gave a walk-through of the revised plans which have evolved to address many of the Commission's concerns. There is more continuity with surrounding architecture and more cohesiveness of design with elevations being related. The gymnasium has been revised and the tower element has been minimized.

   The Chair asked for public comment; the following public comments were given:

   - Sara Emmenecker, Chair, WBNA, Community Development Committee, read her letter, which was submitted into the record, stating that the project is much improved and asked that the HDC finalize all details of the project before a certificate of Appropriateness is issued;
   - Kent Millard, 202 Broadway, member of WBNA CDC, stated that the design showed good progress; asked to have some details clarified: stone base? Brick with cast-stone cap; Dryvit at top; branding on Broadway/Service Road side (perhaps a clock/tower?); felt that maintenance of existing UCAP building is an issue; and,
   - Robert Berrillo, 409 Broadway, likes the idea of a clock tower.

   Public comment was closed.

Mr. Couture made a motion to grant Final Approval of the New Construction, as submitted, citing Standard 8, with details to a sub-committee; Mrs. Agniel seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

E. ADJOURNMENT

With no further business the meeting adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

JASON D. MARTIN
Preservation Planner/PHDC Staff

PHDC MEETING MINUTES
FEBRUARY 27, 2012

A meeting of the Providence Historic District Commission was held on Monday, February 27, 2012 at the Department of Planning and Development, 444 Westminster Street, Providence, RI 02903.

REGULAR MEETING

A. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:50 PM, Mr. Clark Schoettle, Vice-Chair, presiding. All testimony was sworn.

B. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Clark Schoettle, Catherine Lund, Kristi Agniel, Neal Kaplan, Tina Regan, Mildred Parrillo & Cornelis de Boer
Members Absent: Glen Fontecchio & Jon-Paul Couture
Staff Present: Jason Martin

C. MEETING MINUTES

Dr. Lund made a motion to table the minutes of the 11/24/11, 12/05/11 & 1/23/12 meetings; Mrs. Agniel seconded; the motion passed unanimously.

D. PROJECT REVIEW

1. **West Side Solar Project** – Ms. Kari Lang, Executive Director, WBNA, and Mr. Ben Swanson, Real Solar, representing the applicants/owners, appeared before the Commission requesting the installation of solar panels to six properties within the Armory local historic district.

Mr. Martin gave an overview of the project. The West Broadway Neighborhood Association has received a Providence Economic Development Corporation grant to install solar panels on the roofs of buildings within the West End neighborhood. The following houses are located within the Armory local historic district and the proposed installations will be reviewed:

Case 12.005 ▪ 80 Dexter Street – George M. Griffin House, 1886
Case 12.006 ▪ 51 Hammond Street – House, 1992
Case 12.007 ▪ 44 Sycamore Street – House, c1870
Case 12.008 ▪ 36 Harrison Street – Hook & Ladder#2, Atlantic Steamer#8 Fire Station, c1870
Case 12.009 ▪ 1192 Westminster Street – Charles Dudley House, c1856
Case 12.010 ▪ 1560 Westminster Street – Gas Station, c1930

The Commission decided that they would go over the specifics of each property and then make one motion for approval with the separation of those buildings from the resolution that were considered problematic or might need further study by the Commission.

Mr. Swanson gave a presentation on the general specifics of the project. 20% are on flat roofs. On sloped roofs typical installation consists of panels mounted parallel to roof; panels are mounted on extruded aluminum rail perpendicular to fall lines. System uses micro-inverter underneath each panel which allows for multiple roof surfaces; less than 1" conduit in PVC pipe to inside of building. A member had a question regarding visibility: the panels are 3' x 5' tempered glass sheets with solar panels laminated underneath; color is a dark blue/purple, almost black; there is a 5" space between the roof and panels. The panels are designed so that snow, rain & ice are not trapped between the panels and the roof. What is required for re-roofing? Disassembly and reassembly of the panels adds approximately 2 days to the length of the typical roofing job. The typical life of the panels is 30 years or more; no moving parts; there is a gradual decline in kW produced but guaranteed at year 25 to still produce 80% of original kW.

Case 12.005 ▪ 80 Dexter Street – George M. Griffin House, 1886
The Commission had the following comments: Lots of panels, but okay because of roof slopes; Commission concluded that the installation is appropriate.

The Chair asked for public comment; No public comment was given. Public comment was closed.

Case 12.006 ▪ 51 Hammond Street – House, 1992
The Commission had the following comments: Very visible, but the house is a newer structure; Issue with uneven pattern of the panels, which is caused by vent pipes on the roof; could they be modified to be more uniform in 3 groups of 6 for 18 panels? Commission concluded that the installation could be appropriate if modified to make the panels be more uniform.

The Chair asked for public comment; No public comment was given. Public comment was closed.

Case 12.007 ▪ 44 Sycamore Street – House, c1870
The Commission had the following comments: No issues, not visible from the public right-of-way; Commission concluded that the installation is appropriate.

The Chair asked for public comment; No public comment was given. Public comment was closed.

Case 12.008 ▪ 36 Harrison Street – Hook & Ladder#2, Atlantic Steamer#8 Fire Station, c1870
The Commission had the following comments: No issues; 18" parapet would obscure panels from public right-of-way; Commission concluded that the installation is appropriate.

The Chair asked for public comment; No public comment was given. Public comment was closed.

Case 12.009 ▪ 1192 Westminster Street – Charles Dudley House, c1856
The Commission had the following comments: No issues; flat roof with low pitch; minimally visible, if at all. Commission concluded that the installation is appropriate.

The Chair asked for public comment; No public comment was given. Public comment was closed.

Case 12.010 ▪ 1560 Westminster Street – Gas Station, c1930
The Commission had the following comments: No issues. Flat roof with 18" parapet will obscure panels; Commission concluded that the installation is appropriate.

The Chair asked for public comment; No public comment was given. Public comment was closed.

Mr. Kaplan made a motion to grant Final Approval of the Major Alterations, as submitted, citing Standard 8, for 80 Dexter, 44 Sycamore, 36 Harrison, 1192 Westminster & 1560 Westminster Streets; Dr. Lund seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. de Boer made a motion to table the application for 51 Hammond Street, to allow for investigation into whether the pattern of panels could be modified having more uniformity, with the applicant to submit revisions to Staff for approval; Mrs. Agniel seconded; Mr. Couture abstained. All voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

E. ADJOURNMENT
With no further business the meeting adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

JASON D. MARTIN
Preservation Planner/PHDC Staff

PHDC MEETING MINUTES
MARCH 26, 2012

A meeting of the Providence Historic District Commission was held on Monday, March 26, 2012 at the Department of Planning and Development, 444 Westminster Street, Providence, RI 02903.

REGULAR MEETING

A. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:46 PM, Mr. Glen Fontecchio, Chair, presiding. All testimony was sworn.

B. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Glen Fontecchio, Clark Schoettle, Catherine Lund, Kristi Agniel, Neal Kaplan, Tina Regan & Cornelis de Boer
Members Absent: Mildred Parrillo & Jon-Paul Couture
Staff Present: Jason Martin

C. MEETING MINUTES

Ms. Regan made a motion to approve the minutes of the 11/21/11, 12/05/11 & 01/23/12 meetings and to table the minutes of the 02/27/12 minutes; Dr. Lund seconded; the motion passed unanimously.

Staff informed the Commission that a letter to the Chairman had been received from Paul Evans, 109 Transit Street, requesting that the Commission consider revising their Standards and Guidelines, specifically in regard to replacement window of structures from the Colonial and Federal-era. A motion was made by Mr. de Boer, seconded by Ms. Regan, to place this as an item for discussion at the Commission's April meeting; all present voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

D. PROJECT REVIEW

1. **CASE 12.022 ▪ 42 COLLEGE STREET (COLLEGE HILL) –** , Ms. Kit Barum, representing the applicant/owner, and Mr. Michael Fox, Yardworks, appeared before the Commission requesting site improvements, to include the restoration of a driveway and courtyard and the installation of a handicap lamp to provide ADA-compliant egress.

   Mr. Martin gave an overview of the project. The Handicraft Club is considering installing a handicap-ramp to the outside of the property; They would also like to formalize a parking space for the docent. There is a gated "vehicular" entrance to the property at its southeast corner.

   The Commission had the following comments: Had the Club consulted with any of the landscape architects who have worked at the property over the years? Mr. Fox had spoken with Gray Thayer, who has done work at the property. A question was asked why the modifications were needed? Ms. Barnum stated that many of the Club's members are getting older and that the ramp would help facilitate ingress and egress to the Club. As for

the parking space, the docent frequently gets parking tickets and they hoped the addition of a small area to park her car would alleviate this problem. The members thought that enough details were not present in the plans to make a determination as to whether the proposed changes were appropriate. The suggestion was made that the item be tabled until more details drawings are available.

The Chair asked for public comment; No public comment was given. Public comment was closed.

Dr. Lund made a motion to table the application, with the applicant to return with more revised drawings detailing the site improvements, specifically the wheelchair-ramp; Mrs. Agniel seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

2. **CASE 12.021 ▪ 91 LLOYD AVENUE (COLLEGE HILL)** – Ms. Catherine Cummings, applicant/owner, and Mr. Jim Penta, General Contractor, appeared before the Commission requesting the construction of an approx. 10'x8' deck, rear, south elevation and the conversion of a window to an egress door.

   Mr. Martin gave an overview of the project. The proposed alterations are not visible from the public right-of-way.

   The Commission had the following comments: The Commission requested that drawings showing the proposed deck in context with the rear elevation be provided so as to better illustrate the proposed changes. The Commission requested that the applicants consider using brick or blocks coated with stucco at the posts; Proposed railings are to match the front porch railings.

   The Chair asked for public comment; No public comment was given. Public comment was closed.

   Mrs. Agniel made a motion to allow the conversion of the window to a door and temporary stairs so as to allow construction to begin, with details to staff, and the applicant to return at a subsequent meeting with revised drawings showing the proposed deck in context with the rear elevation, citing Standard 8; Dr. Lund seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

No applicant/representative was present for Item 3, 49 Thayer Street. The Commission tabled the item for the moment and moved on to the next item in the agenda

4. **CASE 12.019 ▪ 48 WHITMARSH STREET (NORTH ELMWOOD)** – Joyce & Michael Fournier, applicant/owner, appeared before the Commission requesting the modification of a window to an egress door, side porch, south elevation.

Mr. Martin gave an overview of the project. The proposed modification would be negligibly visible from the public right; Preliminary drawings have been submitted; staff has suggested that a door that keeps the existing trim and uses the whole opening, perhaps with a set of French-doors, would be better suited to the project.

The Commission had the following comments: The French doors would be more appropriate; there was concern as to why the door was needed. The applicant's explained that the house is actually two units and the unit that the door would service has no access to the porch. The commission requested that the original window be retained on the property so that if the modifications were ever reversed, the window could be reinstalled.

The Chair asked for public comment; No public comment was given. Public comment was closed.

Dr. Lund made a motion to grant Final Approval of the Major Alterations, as amended, citing Standards 8 & 9, with details and drawings to Staff; Mr. Kaplan seconded; Members Lund, Kaplan, Fontecchio, de Boer, Schoettle, & Agniel voted in favor; Ms. Regan was opposed; the motion passed.

5. **CASE 11.087 ▪ 72 DEXTER STREET (ARMORY)** – Ms. Amy Borak and Mr. Brian Webb, applicants/owners, and Mr, Joe Obin, Pella Windows, appeared before the Commission requesting the removal of the existing first floor windows and the installation of Pella replacement windows.

Mr. Martin gave an overview of the project. The applicants received approval for the installation of Kolbe & Kolbe replacement windows at the Sept. 2011 meeting; the applicant is now asking to switch to Pella windows. The project would be done in phases, with the first floor to be done first as the applicants are hoping to open the day-care soon. The second floor would be done at a later time. The applicants want to replace the windows primarily for lead considerations. They have a two-year old child and are planning on opening a day-care in the building. There is also a rental unit in the property. They are currently applying to the City's lead program. While most of the windows appear to be original (there are some obvious replacement windows), the windows on the main body of the house are 1/1. There are some 2/1 windows in the rear ell. The replacement windows would not be noticeable architecturally.

The Commission had the following comments: Why the switch from Kolbe to Pella? The applicants liked the Pella window better; Issues of loss of visible lite and details of window are still unclear. Would it be possible to have a sample on-site and/or install a window on-site and have the Commission convene at the house to review? This was acceptable to the applicants.

The Chair asked for public comment; No public comment was given. Public comment was closed.

Mr. Schoettle made a motion to grant allow for a sample window (color: black) to be presented on-site and/or installed, citing Standard 8, and a special meeting of the Commission to convene on-site to review and render judgment; Mr. Kaplan seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

A representative for Item 3 appeared. The Commission heard Item 3 as follows.

3. **CASE 12.024 ▪ 49 THAYER STREET (COLLEGE HILL)** – Mr. Robert Cagnetta, Heritage Restoration, representing the applicant/owner, appeared before the Commission requesting the modification of a window to an egress door from the ground level, north (side) elevation.

   Mr. Martin gave an overview of the project. The existing window is located under the entry porch. The proposed alterations are not visible from the public right-of-way.

   The Commission had the following comments: The Commission agreed the alterations were not visible from the public right-of-way.

   The Chair asked for public comment; No public comment was given. Public comment was closed.

   Mr. Schoettle made a motion to grant Final Approval of the Major Alterations, as submitted, citing Standard 8; Mr. de Boer seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

6. **CASE 12.012 ▪ 43 OAK STREET (ARMORY)** – Staff informed the Commission that the applicants had requested that their application be withdrawn.

7. **CASE 12.020 ▪ ▪ 26 DEXTER STREET (ARMORY)** – Rose Seigel, applicant/owner, appeared before the Commission requesting the removal of the rear, secondary chimney.

   Mr. Martin gave an overview of the project. The chimney is a secondary chimney at the rear of the house, not visible from the public right-of-way. The main, publically visible chimney will not be affected.

   The Commission had the following comments: The Commission agreed the chimney was a secondary chimney, not visible from the public right-of-way.

   The Chair asked for public comment; No public comment was given. Public comment was closed.

   Mr. de Boer made a motion to grant Final Approval of the Major Alterations, as submitted, citing Standard 8; Mr. Kaplan seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

8. **CASE 12.011 ▪ 27 HOLLYWOOD ROAD (ARMORY)** – Robert Stidstone, applicant/owner, appeared before the Commission requesting the removal of the brick façade applied to the clapboards of the house and the modification of the side entry porch.

   Mr. Martin gave an overview of the project. The brick façade and side porch were modified in the early-mid 20th C. and diminish the architectural significance of the residence

   The Commission had the following comments: The Commission commended the owner for removing these inappropriate alterations and restoring the structure to its original appearance.

   The Chair asked for public comment; No public comment was given. Public comment was closed.

   Mr. Schoettle made a motion to grant Final Approval of the Major Alterations, as submitted, citing Standard 8; Dr. Lund seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

E. ADJOURNMENT

With no further business the meeting adjourned at 7:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

JASON D. MARTIN
Preservation Planner/PHDC Staff

PHDC MEETING MINUTES
APRIL 5, 2012

A special meeting of the Providence Historic District Commission was held on Thursday, April 5, 2012 at 74 Dexter Street, Providence, RI 02909.

SPECIAL MEETING

A. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 5:05 PM, Mr. Glen Fontecchio, Chair, presiding. All testimony was sworn.

B. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Glen Fontecchio, Clark Schoettle, Jon-Paul Couture, Catherine Lund, Kristi Agniel, Neal Kaplan, Tina Regan & Cornelis de Boer
Members Absent: Mildred Parrillo
Staff Present: Jason Martin

D. PROJECT REVIEW

1. **CASE 11.087 ▪ 72 DEXTER STREET (ARMORY)** – Ms. Amy Borak and Mr. Brian Webb, applicants/owners, and Mr. Joe Obin, Pella Windows, appeared before the Commission requesting the removal of the existing first floor windows and the installation of Pella replacement windows.

Mr. Martin gave an overview of the project. The applicants had appeared at the March 26th meeting where the Commission had made a motion allowing for a sample window (color: black) to be presented on-site and/or installed, citing Standard 8, and a special meeting of the Commission to convene on-site.

The Commission had the following comments: There were still issues with the aluminum-clad window, specifically the double lines that were at the sides of the sash. The Commission members asked if Mr. Obin had a wood window sample available? Mr. Obin did have a wood window sample and the Commission members agreed that the wood windows were more acceptable than the aluminum-clad window. The applicants agreed that they could use the wood window instead of the clad

The Chair asked for public comment; No public comment was given. Public comment was closed.

Dr. Lund made a motion to grant Final Approval of the application, as modified, with the applicants using the Pella wood window, with the recommendation that a dark color be used, citing Standard 8; Mr. Couture seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

E. ADJOURNMENT

With no further business the meeting adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

JASON D. MARTIN
Preservation Planner/PHDC Staff

PHDC MEETING MINUTES
APRIL 23, 2012

A meeting of the Providence Historic District Commission was held on Monday, April 23, 2012 at the Department of Planning and Development, 444 Westminster Street, Providence, RI 02903.

REGULAR MEETING

A. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:50 PM, Mr. Clark Schoettle, Vice-Chair, presiding. All testimony was sworn.

B. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Clark Schoettle, Jon-Paul Couture, Catherine Lund, Neal Kaplan, Tina Regan & Cornelis de Boer
Members Absent: Kristi Agniel, Mildred Parrillo & Glen Fontecchio
Staff Present: Jason Martin

C. MEETING MINUTES

Mr. de Boer made a motion to table the minutes until after project review; Mr. Kaplan seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

D. PROJECT REVIEW

1. **CASE 12.034 ▪ 50 ALEPPO STREET (ICBD)** – Mr. Robert Mcmahon, Superintendent, Parks & Recreation Dept., City of Providence, Mr. Frank Shea, Executive Director, Olneyville Housing, Corporation, Alicia Lehrer, Executive Director, Woonasquatucket River Watershed Council, representing the applicant/owner, and Mr. Eric Bush, consultant, appeared before the Commission requesting the demolition of the existing building.

Mr. Martin gave an overview of the project. Mr. Bush and Ms. Lehrer gave a presentation detailing the history of the site including past efforts made to preserve the building. The City is in partnership with the Woonasquatucket River Watershed Council (WRWC), the RI Department of Transportation and the Federal Highways Administration (FHA) and has established a five-year program to support and expand the mission of the WRWC. Part of this program is the establishment of a new Urban Environmental Education Center at the current location of the Riverside Mill Office Building in Riverside Park. For over a decade the WRWC has been exploring ways to facilitate the reclamation of the Riverside Office Mill Building. While there have been numerous attempts to reuse the building, most recently in 2008 with the YMCA proposal, the economic and physical constraints of the site and building have made these proposals infeasible. Unfortunately the existing shell of the building has suffered greatly. The building has continued to deteriorate from the original fire that claimed the rest of the mill complex and subsequent smaller fires. This is combination with the inadequate roof that was installed on the building has lefty a structure beyond the agency's ability to rehabilitate; Meetings have been held with the RI Historical Preservation and Heritage Commission, the Providence Preservation Society, as well as current evaluations by Odeh Engineering. It is currently the intent of the WRWC and the City to

demolish the structure with the potential and intent to re-use the granite foundation as well as the to reclaim and reuse masonry elements from the building

The Chair asked for public comment; Letters from Councilwoman Sabina Mattos and Olneyville Housing Corporation, supporting the project were introduced into the record. Public comment was closed.

Mr. de Boer made a motion to approve the application as submitted, citing ICBD Standards for Demolition A, B & D; Mr. Couture seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

2. **CASE 12.014 ▪ 43 MESSER STREET (ARMORY)** – Mr. B.J. Dupre, representing the applicant/owner, appeared before the Commission requesting the construction of a rear deck with stairs and the conversion of a window to an egress door, rear elevation.

   Mr. Martin gave an overview of the project. Mr. Dupre gave an overview of the project.

   The Commission had the following comments: will the trim will match existing and will the porch be closed in with trellis? Mr. Dupre agreed to these suggestions.

   The Chair asked for public comment; No public comment was given. Public comment was closed.

   Mr. Couture made a motion to approve the application as modified, with the trim to match existing and the porch to be closed in with trellis, citing Standard 8, with details to Staff; Mrs. Regan seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

3. **CASE 12.021 ▪ 91 LLOYD AVENUE (COLLEGE HILL)** – Ms. Catherine Cummings, applicant/owner, and Mr. Jim Penta, General Contractor, appeared before the Commission requesting the construction of an approx. 10'x8' deck, rear, south elevation and the conversion of a window to an egress door.

   Mr. Martin gave an overview of the project. The applicants had appeared at the March 26th meeting where the Commission had given approval to convert the rear window to the door but return at a subsequent meeting with revised drawings showing the proposed deck in context with the rear elevation. The proposed alterations are not visible from the public right-of-way.

   The Commission had the following comments: the railing/lattice details should match the front porch.

   The Chair asked for public comment; No public comment was given. Public comment was closed.

Mr. Couture made a motion to approve the application as amended, with the railing and lattice details to match the front porch, citing Standard 8, with details to Staff; Dr. Lund seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Couture recused himself from the next application.

4. **CASE 12.035 ▪ 53 LLOYD AVENUE (COLLEGE HILL)** – Mr. Jon Paul Coutures, architect, representing the owner, appeared before the Commission requesting the installation of a window, first floor, west elevation.

   Mr. Martin gave an overview of the project. The proposed alterations are not visible from the public right-of-way.

   The Chair asked for public comment; No public comment was given. Public comment was closed.

   Mr. de Boer made a motion to approve the application as submitted, citing Standard 8, with details to Staff; Dr. Lund seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Couture rejoined the Commission.

C. MEETING MINUTES

Mr. de Boer made a motion to approve the minutes of the 02/27/12, 03/26/12 & 04/05/12 meeting; Mrs. Regan seconded; the motion passed unanimously.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

5. **National Register Nomination** – Heating & Cowing Mill, 1115 Douglas Avenue, Providence
   Dr. Lund made a motion stating that the HDC has read, reviewed and commented on the Heating & Cowing Mill, 1115 Douglas Avenue, National Register nomination and believes that the building meets the eligibility criteria for the National Register of Historic Places. The HDC recommends that the State Historic Preservation Officer nominate this building to the National Register. Mrs. Regan seconded; the motion passed unanimously.

6. **Window discussion** –
   The HDC had a brief discussion regarding windows and their policies towards them. The discussion was focused on the Commission being awarded a Certified Local Government grant from the RIHPHC to hire a consultant to evaluate and revise the Commission's Standards and Guidelines. An item of discussion was the potential of creating a set of Standards & Guidelines for structures from the Colonial and Federal-era. Mr. Paul Evans, Transit Street, was present at the meeting and gave testimony that structures of this age and significance should have greater protection due to their limited numbers and importance particularly in the type of building construction that they represented.

E. ADJOURNMENT

With no further business the meeting adjourned at 7:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

JASON D. MARTIN
Preservation Planner/PHDC Staff

PHDC MEETING MINUTES
MAY 23, 2012

A meeting of the Providence Historic District Commission was held on Wednesday, May 23, 2012 at the Department of Planning and Development, 444 Westminster Street, Providence, RI 02903.

REGULAR MEETING

A. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:50 PM, Mr. Glen Fontecchio, Chair, presiding. All testimony was sworn.

B. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Glen Fontecchio, Kristi Agniel, Mildred Parrillo, Jon-Paul Couture, Catherine Lund, Tina Regan & Cornelis de Boer
Members Absent: Clark Schoettle & Neal Kaplan
Staff Present: Jason Martin & Adrienne Southgate

C. MEETING MINUTES

Mrs. Agniel made a motion to table the minutes; Mr. Couture seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

D. PROJECT REVIEW

Mrs. Regan recused herself from the next application.

1. **CASE 12.039 ▪ 26 BAINBRIDGE AVENUE (BROADWAY)** – Mr. George Richards, applicant/owner, appeared before the Commission requesting the installation of three skylights to the north slope of the roof.

   Mr. Martin gave an overview of the project. The applicants re-shingled the roof of the building in March 2004; A Certificate of Appropriateness was issued for the re-shingling; During the job, three skylights were installed on the north slope of the roof; the applicant's have stated that the installation of the skylights was a last minute decision and that at the time they called the Department of Inspection & Standards and asked if any further approvals were needed, however they were told no, no further approvals were required; The location of the skylights is not a typically approved location. The typically approved solution by the Commission to allow more light into that location would be the construction of a dormer. The item is currently before Housing Court.

   Mr. Richards described the project. He reiterated that he had contacted the Department of Inspection & Standards and asked if any further approvals were needed, however they were told no, no further approvals were required so they had proceeded with work.

   The Chair asked for public comment; No public comment was given. Public comment was closed.

Dr. Lund made a motion to deny the application as submitted, citing Standard 8; Mr. Couture seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Fontecchio explained that due to the high visibility of the skylights, it was typical decision of the Commission to not allow skylights to be installed in such a location. The Chair asked Ms. Southgate, counsel, if it would be appropriate for a letter to be sent to the Housing Court stating that while the Commission did not approve the application, they had heard credible testimony from the applicant regarding the applicant's attempt to determine if the work had needed further approvals and that if some administrative remedy could be applied in the case. Ms. Southgate agreed that this was appropriate and would draft a letter for the Chair's signature.

Mrs. Regan rejoined the Commission.
Mr. Couture recused himself from the next application.

- **2. CASE 12.048 ▪ 326 BENEFIT STREET (COLLEGE HILL)** – Mr. Mike Powers, owner, and Jon-Paul Couture, architect, appeared before the Commission requesting the construction of a wood porch on the south and west elevations, first floor, with painted trim and railing systems, changes to the west-facing bay to create a more appropriate architectural fenestration with more glass and a pair of French doors to access the porch; and, the removal of windows and the installation of French doors on the south elevation in the kitchen to incorporate a pair of French doors to the west and a double-window to the east.

  Mr. Martin gave an overview of the project. Mr. Couture gave an overview of the project. In regards to the construction of a wood porch on the south and west elevations, first floor, with painted trim and railing systems, it is believed that a porch once existed in this location, however the design of the railing and the spacing of the balusters aims at creating a porch that is the appropriate scale for the house but does not attempt to recreate an element whose prior appearance is unsure. With regards to the removal of windows and the installation of French doors on the south elevation in the kitchen to incorporate a pair of French doors to the west and a double-window to the east, interior evidence suggests that the windows were replaced at some time with windows that do not conform to the upper-floor fenestration. The proposal aims to place one window and one door of the proposed new units under the second floor windows to improve the harmony of the openings on that façade

  The Chair asked for public comment; No public comment was given. Public comment was closed.

  Dr. Lund made a motion to approve the application as submitted, citing Standard 8; Mrs. Agniel seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Couture rejoined the Commission.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

3. **National Register Nomination** – Downtown Providence National Register Historic District Amendment, Providence
   Dr. Lund made a motion stating that the HDC has read, reviewed and commented on the Downtown Providence National Register Historic District Amendment National Register nomination and believes that the building meets the eligibility criteria for the National Register of Historic Places. The HDC recommends that the State Historic Preservation Officer nominate this building to the National Register. Mrs. Regan seconded; the motion passed unanimously.

4. **Certified Local Government Standards & Guidelines** –
   The HDC had a brief discussion regarding the Commission being awarded a Certified Local Government grant from the RIHPHC to hire a consultant to evaluate and revise the Commission's Standards and Guidelines. The Commission indicated that they felt there was a need to further expand documentation examples for applications to the Commission for Major Alterations so that this process is better explained to applicants & owners.

E. ADJOURNMENT

With no further business the meeting adjourned at 7:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

JASON D. MARTIN
Preservation Planner/PHDC Staff

PHDC MEETING MINUTES
JUNE 21, 2012

A special meeting of the Providence Historic District Commission was held on Thursday, June 21, 2012 at 477 Broadway, Providence, RI 02909.

SPECIAL MEETING

A. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 2:10 PM, Mr. Glen Fontecchio, Chair, presiding. All testimony was sworn.

B. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Glen Fontecchio, Jon-Paul Couture, Kristi Agniel, Tina Regan & Cornelis de Boer
Members Absent: , Clark Schoettle, Catherine Lund, Neal Kaplan & Mildred Parrillo
Staff Present: Jason Martin & Adrienne Southgate

D. PROJECT REVIEW

1. **CASE 12.068 ▪ 477 BROADWAY, JOHN E. TROUP HOUSE II, 1881, (BROADWAY) –** Mr. Anthony Manzo, President, Mr. Ray Dettore, Mr. Peter Lombardi, representing the applicants/owners, and Mr. Vin Polisena and Todd Dumas, contractors, appeared before the Commission requesting the removal of the existing slate roof and the installation of an architectural shingle roof.

Mr. Manzo gave an overview of the project. The Club had been able to raise a significant amount of money to deal with roof repairs. The Club had been working for months with Mr. Martin to come to an acceptable solution. The existing slate roof is in extreme disrepair and appears to be failing. Mr. Martin had suggested speaking with contractors experienced with slate roofs to determine if the roof was salvageable. It appears the roof may be salvageable, but cost is an issue. The Club is also concerned that that their insurance company has threatened to cancel their policy if repairs are not made to the roof in a timely manner.

The Commission suggested that a compromise might be acceptable to the Commission and requested that the applicant investigate the feasibility of replacing the main roof with the architectural-shingle (while retaining the slated turret) and to also retain and repair the veranda's slate roof; the applicant's were amenable to this although they were still concerned that cost would be an obstacle. The applicant's were securing cost estimates for this proposed scope-of-work and it was agreed that the June regular meeting agenda would be amended to include this item so that it could be reviewed in a timely manner.

Mrs. Regan departed at 2:30 PM. The Commission lost its quorum. No further action was taken. The meeting adjourned at 2:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

JASON D. MARTIN
Preservation Planner/PHDC Staff

PHDC MEETING MINUTES
JUNE 25, 2012

A meeting of the Providence Historic District Commission was held on Monday, June 25, 2012 at the Department of Planning and Development, 444 Westminster Street, Providence, RI 02903.

REGULAR MEETING

A. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:50 PM, Mr. Glen Fontecchio, Chair, presiding. All testimony was sworn.

B. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Glen Fontecchio, Clark Schoettle, Cornelis de Boer, Jon-Paul Couture, Catherine Lund, Neal Kaplan, Tina Regan, Kristi Agniel & Mildred Parrillo
Staff Present: Jason Martin

C. MEETING MINUTES

Dr. Lund made a motion to table the 04/23/12 & 05/23/12 minutes; Mr. Couture seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

D. PROJECT REVIEW

1. **CASE 12.068 ▪ 477 BROADWAY, JOHN E. TROUP HOUSE II, 1881, (BROADWAY) –** Mr. Anthony Manzo, President, Mr. Ray Dettore, Mr. Peter Lombardi, representing the applicants/owners, and Mr. Vinny Polisena and Todd Dumas, contractors, appeared before the Commission requesting the removal of the existing slate roof and the installation of an architectural shingle roof.

Mr. Manzo gave an overview of the project. The Club had been able to raise a significant amount of money to deal with roof repairs. The Club had been working for months with Mr. Martin to come to an acceptable solution. The existing slate roof is in extreme disrepair and appears to be failing. Mr. Martin had suggested speaking with contractors experienced with slate roofs to determine if the roof was salvageable. It appears the roof may be salvageable, but cost is an issue. The Club is also concerned that that their insurance company has threatened to cancel their policy if repairs are not made to the roof in a timely manner.

The Commission suggested that a compromise might be acceptable to the Commission and requested that the applicant investigate the feasibility of replacing the main roof with the architectural-shingle (while retaining the slated turret) and to also retain and repair the veranda's slate roof; the applicant's were amenable to this although they were still concerned that cost would be an obstacle. The applicant's were securing cost estimates for this proposed scope-of-work and it was agreed that the June regular meeting agenda would be amended to include this item so that it could be reviewed in a timely manner.

The Chair asked for public comment. The following public comment was given:

1) Robert Berrillo, 409 Broadway, a phased repair of the slate roof would seem to be a good compromise;
2) Richard Scialto, Broadway, used mesh to repair his gutters; thinks could work here as well;
3) A letter was introduced from Jessica Jennings, 265 Knight Street, was read; she was opposed to the removal of the slate roof;
4) An email was introduced from Robyn Ericsson, Parade Street, was read; she was opposed to the removal of the slate roof;
5) A letter was introduced from the West Broadway Neighborhood Association who was opposed to the removal of the slate roof.

Public comment was closed.

Dr. Lund mad a motion to table the application, with the applicant to reappear at a subsequent meeting with additional information regarding the potential for repairing the roof in-kind; Mrs. Regan seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

2. **CASE 12.061 ▪ 33 OAK STREET (ARMORY)** – Mr. Noel Sanchez, Casa Buena Builders, representing the applicant/owner, appeared before the Commission requesting the construction of a rear deck with stairs and the conversion of a window to an egress door, rear elevation.

   Mr. Martin gave an overview of the project. This review could be considered a conceptual review as full documentation is not available and the applicants have some questions for the Commission regarding parts of the scope-of-work and whether or not the Commission feels these items are appropriate for their project. Mr. Sanchez gave an overview of the project: there are five items that he would like feedback from the Commission: 1) removal of a rear chimney: okay given its location and lack of visibility; 2) skylight: its location is not typically approved by the Commission, given its visibility from the public right-of-way; 3) windows: the Commission would want the windows configuration to remain as is, 1/1. 4) rear porch: should be okay; two-stories would be more appropriate; and, 5) balustrade over front entry: no, unless a precedent could be found.

   The Chair asked for public comment; No public comment was given. Public comment was closed.

   Mrs. Agniel made a motion to table the application, with the applicant to appear at a subsequent meeting with additional information; Dr. Lund seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

3. **CASE 12.064 ▪ 27 WILLOW STREET (ARMORY)** – Mary Cappello & Shirley Watson, applicants/owners, appeared before the Commission requesting the installation of a skylight to the rear, south slope of the roof.

   Mr. Martin gave an overview of the project.

The Chair asked for public comment; No public comment was given. Public comment was closed.

Mr. de Boer made a motion to approve the application as submitted, citing Standard 8, with details to Staff; Mr. Couture seconded; Members de Boer, Couture, Fontecchio, Lund, Agniel, Parrillo and Schoettle voted in favor; Member Regan was opposed; the motion passed.

4. **CASE 12.065 ▪ 150 LEXINGTON AVENUE (SOUTH ELMWOOD)** – Ward Weather and Renee de Montaigne, applicants/owners, appeared before the Commission requesting the installation of two skylights to the rear, south slope of the roof.

   Mr. Martin gave an overview of the project. The proposed alterations are not visible from the public right-of-way.

   The Chair asked for public comment; No public comment was given. Public comment was closed.

   Mr. Schoettle made a motion to approve the application as submitted, citing Standard 8, with details to Staff; Mr. de Boer seconded; Members de Boer, Couture, Fontecchio, Lund, Agniel, Parrillo and Schoettle voted in favor; Member Regan was opposed; the motion passed.

5. **CASE 12.066 ▪ 175 CONGRESS AVENUE (SOUTH ELMWOOD)** – Elizabeth McDonnell and Dylan Vale Cofei-Shabica, applicants/owners, appeared before the Commission requesting modifications to the fenestration, west elevation and the installation of French doors and a deck, rear elevation.

   Mr. Martin gave an overview of the project.

   The Commission had the following comments: the project itself was feasible, however, drawings would be needed that are to scale, legible and represent the conditions on-site and proposed changes.

   The Chair asked for public comment; No public comment was given. Public comment was closed.

   Mr. de Boer made a motion to table the application, with the applicant to appear at a subsequent meeting with additional information; Mr. Couture seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

6. **CASE 12.067 ▪ 26 JENCKES STREET (COLLEGE HILL)** – Eamon Brown and Catherine Bothe, applicants/owners, and Anastasia Congdon, architect, appeared before the Commission

requesting the construction of a dormer, the installation of French-doors, rear elevation, and the installation of Pella replacement windows.

Mr. Martin gave an overview of the project. The applicants and architect gave a presentation regarding the project. They would like to connect the house to the rear yard. They have a young child and are concerned about lead issues with the windows. They have had Site Specific evaluate the windows. It was their evaluation that the windows are in poor condition and are poor candidates for repair. The dormers would enhance the space and allow better access to their view of downtown and Capital Center.
The Commission had the following comments: The dormer wall should be set back from the edge of the house and shingled as opposed to clapboards to better blend in with the roof; difficult because of the siting of house. Prominent site: on a corner, on a hill. The windows should remain 6/6, not 2/2. Not enthusiastic about the skylights on east side of roof; would prefer another dormer, help to balance roof.

The Chair asked for public comment; No public comment was given. Public comment was closed.

Mr. de Boer made a motion to approve the cedar siding; replacement of windows in-kind w/custom wood windows or comparable to original (Brosco) to match 6/6 configuration; north elevation changes as submitted to include patio door and new window, citing Standard 8, with details to Staff; Dr. Lund seconded; Members de Boer, Couture, Fontecchio, Lund, Agniel, Parrillo and Schoettle voted in favor; Member Regan was opposed; the motion passed.

E. ADJOURNMENT

With no further business the meeting adjourned at 8:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

JASON D. MARTIN
Preservation Planner/PHDC Staff

PHDC MEETING MINUTES
JULY 23, 2012

A meeting of the Providence Historic District Commission was held on Monday, July 23, 2012 at the Department of Planning and Development, 444 Westminster Street, Providence, RI 02903.

REGULAR MEETING

A. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:50 PM, Mr. Glen Fontecchio, Chair, presiding. All testimony was sworn.

B. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Glen Fontecchio, Cornelis de Boer, Jon-Paul Couture, Catherine Lund, Tina Regan, Kristi Agniel & Mildred Parrillo
Members Absent: Clark Schoettle & Neal Kaplan
Staff Present: Jason Martin & Lincoln Lennon

C. MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Couture made a motion to approve the 04/23/12, 05/23/12 & 06/21/12 (spcl mtg) minutes as amended; Mrs. Agniel seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

D. PROJECT REVIEW

1. **CASE 12.068 ▪ 477 BROADWAY, JOHN E. TROUP HOUSE II, 1881, (BROADWAY)** – Mr. Anthony Manzo, President, Mr. Ray Dettore, Mr. Peter Lombardi, representing the applicants/owners, and Mr. Lukas Rei, contractors, appeared before the Commission requesting the removal of the existing slate roof and the installation of an architectural shingle roof.

Mr. Martin gave an overview. The applicants were returning to the Commission. At the June 25th meeting the Commission had requested that the applicants investigate further into the possibility of retaining and repairing the existing slate roof. As part of their investigation they had contacted Mr. Rei who had evaluated the roof and it was his professional determination that the roof was beyond salvage. He recommended using the symphony composite slates as a good alternative to natural slate. The cost would be acceptable to the applicants and the aesthetic would be acceptable to the Commission.

The Commission had the following comments: Mrs. Regan asked Mr. Rei how much experience he had with slate roofs? Mr. Rei responded that he had 15 years experience working with slate roofs; The Commission asked if it would be possible to match the width of the existing slate with the synthetic slate? After some discussion it was determined that this was possible. There was concern about the treatment of the valleys and ridges. It was agreed that the valleys would be treated in a consistent manner and that the ridges would be butted, not capped. A bent-metal drip edge was acceptable. Dr Lund asked what the difference was in cost between real and composite slate? The price is comparative for the materials, however the labor cost is typically 3-4 times more for traditional slate than synthetic (this accounts for the stripping and salvaging of the existing slate material when

possible). The clubs finances for the project are okay. They needed a small loan to supplement their budget in order to purchase the synthetic slates, but the bank had approved request. Mr. Fontecchio stated that he thought the proposal was an appropriate compromise and that the details needed to be worked on, which the Commission would assist with.

The Chair asked for public comment; No public comment was given. Public comment was closed.

Mrs. Agniel made a motion to approve the application as submitted, citing Standard 8, with details to be submitted to Staff to include details of the drip edge, cap, turret, hip details; A sub-com comprised of Members Schoettle, Fontecchio and de Boer, along with staff, are available to meet on-site and go over the required details. Mr. de Boer seconded; Members de Boer, Fontecchio, Lund, Agniel, Parrillo and Schoettle voted in favor; Members Regan and Couture were opposed; the motion passed.

2. **CASE 12.061 ▪ 33 OAK STREET (ARMORY)** – Dianne and Jackie Poulios, applicant/owner, Noel Sanchez, Casa Buena Builders, Chris Pilar, designer, Jodi Gladstone, Esq. and Nelma Prada, 29 Oak Street, appeared before the Commission requesting the construction of a rear deck with stairs and the conversion of a window to an egress door, rear elevation.

   Mr. Martin gave an overview of the project. Mr. Fontecchio asked if any new evidence had been found indicating that the fenestration was something other than 1/1. There was a long, drawn out conversation in which the applicant's architect and lawyers tried to convince the Commission that stylistically, a 6/6 window would be compatible with the residence. The Commission explained to the applicants, et. al., that the Commission's policy, based on the Secretary of Interior's Standards for the rehabilitation of historic resources, does not allow for the "historification" of properties. If there was no additional evidence that the windows on the building were not the 1/1 type on the structure (of which it was agreed appeared to be of the correct construction and material to be the original windows installed when the house was constructed) then the Commission would require the replacement windows to be the same in configuration. The skylight was in a location not typically allowed, so the Commission was inclined not to approve.

   Ms. Gladstone asked if Ms. Prada could be allowed to give testimony. The Chair agreed. Ms. Prada testified that she did not understand why there were issues with the owner's request. The Chair asked for public comment; No public comment was given. Public comment was closed.

   Mrs. Agniel made a motion to table the application, with the applicant to appear at a subsequent meeting with additional information; Dr. Lund seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Lennon departed.

3. **CASE 12.066 ▪ 175 CONGRESS AVENUE (SOUTH ELMWOOD)** – The applicants had contacted Staff and requested that the item be tabled.

   Mr. de Boer made a motion to table the application, with the applicant to appear at a subsequent meeting with additional information; Mr. Couture seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

4. **CASE 12.076 ▪ 127 TRANSIT STREET (COLLEGE HILL)** – Ed Acosta, applicant and contractor, representing the owners, appeared before the Commission requesting the construction of a landing and stair and the conversion of a window to a door for egress, rear ell (east elevation), the retention of the trim and the infill of the body with clapboards of a window on the rear ell (south elevation), and the construction of a deck and balustrade on the rear ell's roof.

   Mr. Martin gave an overview of the project. Mr. Acosta gave a presentation on the project. The Commission and the following comments: they would like some of the details on the plan clarified including details of how the deck would be constructed. There were questions over relocating the rear egress door and window, as the Commission thought that this would enhance the design and interior flow of the project. Also requested was to investigate the possibility of adding a casement window as opposed to blocking in the windows on the south elevation of the ell. Additionally requested that all pressure-treated structural elements be wrapped in a finish material. Azek would be acceptable. Mr. Acosta was agreeable to the changes and stated he would return at the next meeting with revised drawings.

   The Chair asked for public comment; No public comment was given. Public comment was closed.

   Mr. Couture made a motion to table the application, with the applicant to appear at a subsequent meeting with additional information; Dr. Lund seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

E. ADJOURNMENT

With no further business the meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

JASON D. MARTIN
Preservation Planner/PHDC Staff

PHDC MEETING MINUTES
AUGUST 27, 2012

A meeting of the Providence Historic District Commission was held on Monday, August 27, 2012 at the Department of Planning and Development, 444 Westminster Street, Providence, RI 02903.

REGULAR MEETING

A. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:55 PM, Mr. Glen Fontecchio, Chair, presiding. All testimony was sworn.

B. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Glen Fontecchio, Cornelis de Boer, Jon-Paul Couture, Neal Kaplan, Clark Schoettle, Tina Regan, & Mildred Parrillo
Members Absent: Catherine Lund & Kristi Agniel
Staff Present: Jason Martin

C. MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Couture made a motion to table the minutes of the June 25th and July 23rd meetings; Mr. de Boer seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

D. PROJECT REVIEW

1. **CASE 12.061 ▪ 33 OAK STREET (ARMORY)** – Jackie Poulios, applicant/owner, Noel Sanchez, Casa Buena Builders, appeared before the Commission requesting the construction of a rear deck with stairs and the conversion of a window to an egress door, rear elevation.

   Mr. Martin gave an overview of the project. Mr. Sanchez gave an update on the project. The applicants have decided to go with replacement windows that would match the existing fenestration. There was a discussion regarding the visibility of the proposed skylight. Some members thought that the proposed skylight was too visible from the public right-of-way, while others thought that the impact would be minimal. The current bathroom jalousie windows on the first and second floors would be 1/1 windows.

   The Chair asked for public comment; No public comment was given. Public comment was closed.

   Mr. de Boer made a motion to approve the application as submitted, citing Standard 8, with details to be submitted to Staff; Mr. Couture seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

2. **CASE 12.091 ▪ 50 HARRISON STREET (ARMORY)** – Anthony Caprio, applicant/owner, appeared before the Commission requesting the construction of a rear deck and the conversion of a window to an egress door.

   Mr. Martin gave an overview of the project. Mr. Caprio gave a description of the property and project. The Commission had the following comments: There was a comment that the deck color should complement the house, and for the railings to have a differentiating color

from the deck, that a slight contrast between the deck and railing would be beneficial; also the Commission recommended using the Azek composite railing system.

The Chair asked for public comment; No public comment was given. Public comment was closed.

Mr. Schoettle made a motion to approve the application as modified, citing Standard 8, with an Azek composite railing system to be used on the deck; Mrs. Regan seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

3. **CASE 12.066 ▪ 22 MESSER STREET (SOUTH ELMWOOD)** – Michael Bedard and Kevin Graham, applicant, Tia Kilday, Ian Henderson, owners, appeared before the Commission requesting the removal of the existing mansard slate roof and the installation of an asphalt shingle roof.

   Mr. Martin gave an overview of the project. Work had begun on the project without a Certificate of Appropriateness. Messrs. Bedard and Graham explained that there had been a lapse in communication and that the project crew had gotten ahead of the permitting process. The Commission had the following comments: would there be some possibility of introducing a simple cornice element back to the mansard? The change in materials to the mansard would be more palatable if the cornice element could be reintroduced. The applicants and owners agreed that this could be done.

   The Chair asked for public comment; No public comment was given. Public comment was closed.

   Mr. Schoettle made a motion to approve the application as modified, citing Standard 8, with details to be submitted to Staff; Mr. Couture seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

4. **CASE 12.066 ▪ 175 CONGRESS AVENUE (SOUTH ELMWOOD)** – Elizabeth McDowell, representing the applicant/owner, appeared before the Commission requesting modifications to the fenestration, west elevation and the installation of French doors and a deck, rear elevation.

   Mr. Martin gave an overview of the project. Revised drawings have been submitted. The Commission thanked the applicants for providing the revised documentation. The specific window has not been selected, but a Pella or Windsor new construction window would be appropriate.

   The Chair asked for public comment; No public comment was given. Public comment was closed.

Mr. Couture made a motion to approve the application as modified, citing Standard 8, with final window details to be submitted to Staff once the window selection has been made; Mr. de Boer seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

5. **CASE 12.076 ▪ 127 TRANSIT STREET (COLLEGE HILL)** – Ed Acosta, applicant and contractor, representing the owners, appeared before the Commission requesting the construction of a landing and stair and the conversion of a window to a door for egress, rear ell (east elevation), the retention of the trim and the infill of the body with clapboards of a window on the rear ell (south elevation), and the construction of a deck and balustrade on the rear ell's roof.

   Mr. Martin gave an overview of the project. Mr. Acosta gave a presentation on the project. Revised drawings had been submitted. The two side windows would be 6-lite awning windows that would be the size of the upper sash on the building. The Commission had the following comments: the deck should be cedar of mahogany stained or painted; the door will be a simulated-divided 15-lite aluminum-clad door.

   The Chair asked for public comment; No public comment was given. Public comment was closed.

   Mr. Couture made a motion to approve the application as modified, citing Standard 8, with final details to be submitted to Staff; Mr. Kaplan seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

6. **CASE 12.086 ▪ 2 KEENE STREET (COLLEGE HILL)** – Adrienne Benz, applicant/architect, and Eric Huban, owner, appeared before the Commission requesting the construction of a detached garage with a roof deck, south (front) elevation; the construction of a deck, north (rear) elevation; and, the installation of replacement windows.

   Mr. Martin gave an overview of the project. Ms. Benz gave a presentation regarding the proposed construction. The Commission had the following comments: There was an overall concern regarding the height of the garage. The Commission feels that the height needs to decrease by two-three feet. The top of the garage should not be taller than the roofline of the residence. Commission members suggested looking at reducing some height with the proposed garage door height and the structure of the garage. Also excavating below grade at the garage location might also be a potential solution. Ms Benz stated that she would look into the various options and develop a revised design and return to the Commission.

   The Chair asked for public comment; No public comment was given. Public comment was closed.

   Mr. Couture made a motion to approve the portions of the application related to replacement windows and the rear deck and to table the portion of the application related to the garage, citing Standard 8; Mr. de Boer seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Couture departed.

7. **CASE 12.092 ▪ 112 CONGDON STREET (COLLEGE HILL)** – Alice Berresheim, applicant/architect, appeared before the Commission requesting the removal of the rear paved parking lot in backyard and the introduction of an unsealed garden area; the removal of the existing entrance and porch at south elevation and the introduction of a new entrance through east elevation; and a new deck to replace existing on west elevation.

   Mr. Martin gave an overview of the project. Ms. Berresheim gave a presentation regarding the proposed construction. The Commission had the following comments: the members had difficulty with the proposal to move the side entrance as they feel it is a character-defining element of the building; Ms. Berresheim understood. There was a discussion regarding modifying the wrap-around porch; the Commission felt that it could be possible, but the part of the porch that deals with the stairs should be retained; as one moved along the side there could be some modification to allow for parking. The Commission was okay with converting the bay window on the first floor, rear elevation into a door to lead to the porch.

   The Chair asked for public comment; No public comment was given. Public comment was closed.

   Mr. de Boer made a motion to approve the portions of the application related to converting the back window to a door, with details to be submitted to Staff, citing Standard 8; Mr. Kaplan seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

8. **CASE 12.093 ▪ 130 CONGDON STREET (COLLEGE HILL)** – No one appeared before the Commission for to discuss the proposed removal of the existing shingles and the installation of clapboards with appropriate details.

   Mr. Martin gave an overview of the project. The owner, Ronald Anthony, is unable to attend the meeting as he is traveling on a family matter. Staff would like to know how the Commission feels about his proposal. A letter has been submitted from William Kite, Jr., FAIA, abutter, regarding the proposal. Mr. Kite is the architect of the rear addition to the building and to his knowledge the property has always been shingled. He designed the addition with the shingling of the house in mind and is against the proposal. It was the opinion of a majority of members that unless evidence could be introduced showing that the building was once covered with clapboards, that shingles should stay on the building.

   The Chair asked for public comment; No public comment was given. Public comment was closed.

   Mr. de Boer made a motion to table the application; Mr. Kaplan seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

E. ADJOURNMENT

With no further business the meeting adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

JASON D. MARTIN
Preservation Planner/PHDC Staff

PHDC MEETING MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 24, 2012

A meeting of the Providence Historic District Commission was held on Monday, September 24, 2012 at the Department of Planning and Development, 444 Westminster Street, Providence, RI 02903.

REGULAR MEETING

A. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:55 PM, Mr. Glen Fontecchio, Chair, presiding. All testimony was sworn.

B. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Glen Fontecchio, Cornelis de Boer, Jon-Paul Couture, Neal Kaplan, Tina Regan, Catherine Lund & Mildred Parrillo
Members Absent: Clark Schoettle & Kristi Agniel
Staff Present: Jason Martin

C. MEETING MINUTES

Dr. Lund made a motion to approve the minutes of the June 25th and July 23rd meetings and table the minutes of the August 27th meeting; Mr. de Boer seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

D. PROJECT REVIEW

1. **CASE 12.086 ▪ 2 KEENE STREET (COLLEGE HILL)** – Adrienne Benz, applicant/architect, appeared before the Commission requesting the construction of a detached garage with a roof deck, south (front) elevation; the construction of a deck, north (rear) elevation; and, the installation of replacement windows.

Mr. Martin gave an overview of the project. At the August 27th meeting the Commission had requested that the applicants try to reduce the scale of the garage as much as possible, approximately 2-3' in height. Ms. Benz gave an update regarding the proposed construction. She was able to reduce the roofline as requested by the Commission. The Commission had the following comments: The Commission sated that trying to excavate to further reduce the height of the garage would have been optimal; they understood the budget considerations and thought that overall the design of the garage had improved. There was a question regarding the framing of the garage's roof deck: what method was being used? If they framed it traditionally it may help with the transition from the structure to the bridge leading from the main house. Ms. Benz stated that they had not determined which method would be used, but were open to using a traditional framing for the deck.

The Chair asked for public comment; No public comment was given. Public comment was closed.

Mr. Couture made a motion to approve the application, as modified, with the garage's roof deck to be framed traditionally, citing Standard 8, with a sub-committee to review final details as they become available; Dr. Lund seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

2. **CASE 12.092 ▪ 112 CONGDON STREET (COLLEGE HILL)** – Alice Berresheim, applicant/architect, appeared before the Commission requesting the removal of existing windows and the installation of replacement windows.

   Mr. Martin gave an overview of the project. Ms. Berresheim gave a presentation regarding the proposed modifications. The Commission had the following comments: would it be possible to replace some windows on the building, primarily on the west and north elevations, and retain the original windows on the more prominent south and east elevations? Ms. Berresheim agreed that this was possible. There was a discussion regarding the windows in the bay on the northeast corner of the first floor. The windows were obvious replacement windows dating back to the 1970s or early 1980s. Did the applicant know what the fenestration was in the bays? Ms. Berresheim did not but would look further into it and see if she could find documentation.

   The Chair asked for public comment; No public comment was given. Public comment was closed.

   Mr. de Boer made a motion to approve the application as modified, with replacement windows approved for the windows on the north and west elevations and original windows being rehabilitated and retained on the south and east elevations, citing Standard 8; Mr. Kaplan seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

3. **CASE 12.093 ▪ 130 CONGDON STREET (COLLEGE HILL)** – Ronald Antony, applicant/owner, appeared before the Commission requesting the removal of the existing shingles and the installation of clapboards with appropriate details.

   Mr. Martin gave an overview of the project. Mr. Anthony gave a presentation detailing his efforts to make the house more energy efficient. He had removed the old insulation, which had failed, and installed new insulation. This process damaged a substantial number of shingles in bands around the residence. Instead of re-shingling the house he would like to install clapboards with the appropriate details, which he feels is appropriate to the style of the house, would be more aesthetically pleasing and would make any further is unable to attend the meeting as he is traveling on a family matter. A letter has been submitted from William Kite, Jr., FAIA, abutter, regarding the proposal. Mr. Kite is the architect of the rear addition to the building and to his knowledge the property has always been shingled. He designed the addition with the shingling of the house in mind and is against the proposal. It was the opinion of a majority of members that unless evidence could be introduced showing that the building was once covered with clapboards, that shingles should stay on the building.

   The Chair asked for public comment; No public comment was given. Public comment was closed.

Mr. Couture made a motion to table the application; Mrs. Regan seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

4. **CASE 12.103 ▪ 43 CONGDON STREET (COLLEGE HILL)** – Ivan Ferguson, Project Manager, Parker Construction Company Inc., representing the owner, appeared before the Commission requesting the conversion of a window, side (south) elevation, to a double door for access from the kitchen to a side patio.

   Mr. Martin gave an overview of the project. The proposed changes are minimally visible from the public right-of-way, and are not noticeable given the location. Mr. Ferguson gave a presentation regarding the proposed modifications. The Commission had the following comments: the doors called for true-divided lites, the Commission stated that a simulated-divided-lite would be more appropriate as it would allow the muntins to stay slimmer. Mr. Ferguson agreed.

   The Chair asked for public comment; No public comment was given. Public comment was closed.

   Mr. Couture made a motion to approve the application as modified, with a 15-lite, simulated-divided-lite door, citing Standard 8; Mr. de Boer seconded; Members Fontecchio, de Boer, Couture, Kaplan, Lund & Parrillo voted in favor; Member Regan was opposed; the motion passed.

5. **CASE 12.104 ▪ 44 HIDDEN STREET (COLLEGE HILL)** – Bruce Schulbaum, Venture Windows, Alice Berresheim, applicant/architect, representing the owner, appeared before the Commission requesting the removal of existing windows and the installation of replacement windows.

   Mr. Martin gave an overview of the project. The applicant inadvertently began installation of the windows a few weeks ago. Staff arrived on-site and stopped work. Three windows on the front of the house had been replaced. Staff was impressed with the window being installed and advised the applicants to leave the windows in-place and submit a formal application to the Commission. Mr. Schulbaum gave a presentation regarding the proposal. In consultation with Staff, the installation was completed for three windows on the front of the house, which could be compared with the existing windows on the house, which are in a sever state of disrepair. The Commission had the following comments: documentation showing cross-sections of the existing and proposed windows should be submitted to Staff before the Certificate of Appropriateness is issued.

   The Chair asked for public comment; No public comment was given. Public comment was closed.

   Dr. Lund made a motion to approve the application as a non-precedent, with drawings to be submitted before the Certificate of Appropriateness is issued, citing Standard 8; Mr. Kaplan

seconded; Members Fontecchio, de Boer, Couture, Kaplan, Lund & Parrillo voted in favor; Member Regan was opposed; the motion passed.

6. **CASE 12.105 ▪ 368 BENEFIT STREET (COLLEGE HILL)** – Courtney Taylor, owner/applicant, appeared before the Commission requesting the construction of an approx. 19' 4" wide x 12' deep single-story deck to the rear (west) elevation with the conversion of an existing window to an egress door.

   Mr. Martin gave an overview of the project. Ms. Taylor gave a presentation regarding the proposed construction. The Commission had the following comments: the members felt that an intermediate pole should be introduced to the railing system which would help with structural rigidity and aesthetically look more appropriate; Recommended using the Azek railing system and adding balustrades to reach the appropriate number. There was a discussion regarding modifying the wrap-around porch; the Commission felt that it could be possible, but the part of the porch that deals with the stairs should be retained; as one moved along the side there could be some modification to allow for parking. The Commission was okay with converting the bay window on the first floor, rear elevation into a door to lead to the porch.

   The Chair asked for public comment; No public comment was given. Public comment was closed.

   Mr. Couture made a motion to approve the application as modified, with additional balustrades to be introduced to the railing system and additional structural poles added on the north and south elevations, citing Standard 8; Mrs. Regan seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

7. **CASE 12.111 ▪ 146 PROSPECT STREET (COLLEGE HILL)** – Florin Luca, architect, representing the owner, appeared before the Commission requesting the demolition and rebuilding of the existing two-bay garage.

   Mr. Martin gave an overview of the project. Mr. Luca gave a presentation regarding the proposed construction. The Commission had the following comments: could some of the existing masonry walls be reused, particularly on the rear and south elevations? Mr. Luca thought that this could be possible as the condition of the masonry seems repairable. The Commission was okay with a synthetic material being used on the north wall. The Commission requested that the roofline be kept as close to the original; also that the parapet and front wall be retained and repaired if possible, or rebuilt to match the existing conditions.

   The Chair asked for public comment; Mr. Kenneth Carpenter, 65 Halsey Street, the abutter to the rear of the property was present and stated his concerns on what impact the construction would have on his property and would the rear wall need to be changed. His preference was for it to remain as is; Mr. Luca understood Mr. Carpenter's concerns and

stated that he hoped to retain the rear wall and that all construction would be sympathetic to the abutting properties; Public comment was closed.

Mr. de Boer made a motion to table the application with the applicant to return with revised drawings showing he proposed structure with the recommendations made by the Commission, primarily to re-use the existing masonry where possible and retain the original roofline and detailing; Mr. Kaplan seconded; all voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

E. ADJOURNMENT

With no further business the meeting adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

JASON D. MARTIN
Preservation Planner/PHDC Staff

ATTACHMENT B
Criteria 1.5
Sample Approval Letter

CITY OF PROVIDENCE
Angel Taveras, Mayor

August 27, 2012

Peter Landolfi
Italo-American Club
477 Broadway
Providence, RI 02909

Re: App. # 12.068, 477 Broadway, Broadway Local Historic District

Dear Mr. Lombardi:

Please find attached the Providence Historic District Commission's Resolution 12-25 for the major alterations at 477 Broadway. The details we discussed at the site visit are detailed out in the resolution. Please let me know if there are any issues and I can issue the Certificate of Appropriateness (CA) at your convenience, once your contractor is ready to begin work.

Warms Regards,

Jason D. Martin
Principal Planner/PHDC Staff

Attachments

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
444 Westminster Street, Providence, Rhode Island 02903
401 680 8400 ph | 401 680 8492 fax
www.providenceri.com

Providence Historic District Commission

ANGEL TAVERAS
Mayor

August 27, 2012

APPLICANTS/OWNERS
Italo-American Club
477 Broadway
Providence, RI 02909

RESOLUTION 12-25
Application 12.068

WHEREAS, the applicants, Italo-American Club, applied to the Providence Historic District Commission for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Alterations at 477 Broadway, Plat 33, Lot 310 and,

WHEREAS, the Commission held a Special Meeting and Regular Meeting on the matter on 6/21/2012 (Special Meeting, held on-site at 477 Broadway), 6/25/2012 and 7/23/2012 at the Department of Planning & Development, 444 Westminster Street, during which Anthony Manzo, Peter Landolfi & Raymond Dettore, representing the applicants/owners, and Lukas Rei, REI Roofing and Todd Dumas, T.A. Dumas Company, roofing contractors, appeared before the Commission for the scheduled item; and,

WHEREAS, the Commission members individually viewed the site which is the subject of the application; and,

WHEREAS, based upon the evidence presented, the Commission made the following findings of fact:

1. 477 Broadway is a structure of historical and architectural significance, and contributes to the significance of the Broadway Historic District;

2. The application for Major Alterations is complete;

3. The work as proposed consists of Major Alterations and the removal of the existing slate roof and the installation of a composite slate roof. The existing natural slate turret is to remain;

4. The alterations are congruous with the structure, its appurtenances, and the surrounding historic district; and,

5. The work is consistent with PHDC Standard 8 as follows: the work will be done so that it does not destroy the historic character of the property and/or the district.

WHEREAS, based upon the above findings of fact the Commission determined that the Major Alteration specified above is appropriate and hereby grant approval to the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness as submitted, with the following conditions:

a) A site-visit will be made by members of the Commission and Staff to determined a "punch-list" of details regarding the flashing, finials, etc.;
b) On August 8, 2012 a site-visit was conducted by Member Fontecchio and staff with Peter Lombardi. The following details were finalized:
   - Finials: it was agreed that the finials that are on the building would remain and replacements for missing finials would be a close match to what is currently on building;
   - The hip corners of the roof would be mitered with step flashing;
   - The valleys would either all be open or closed;
   - Flashing to be copper; could be aluminum if needed; issue of galvanic reaction would be treated with an ice barrier; and,
   - Azak could be used to replace trim along the roof where appropriate.
c) Any changes to the project are to be submitted to Staff for review before work begins.

WHEREAS, Mrs. Agniel made a motion to grant Final Approval of the application, as modified, citing Standard 8; Mr. de Boer seconded; Members Agniel, de Boer, Fontecchio, Lund & Parrillo voted in favor; Members Regan and Couture were against; The motion passed.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the application is approved. Parties wishing to appeal a decision made by the PHDC have 20 days from the date of the resolution to file with the Zoning Board of Review. The Zoning Board of Review may be contacted at 401.680.8517. This approval is valid for one year from the date of this Resolution.

Glen Fontecchio (JAM for)

Glen Fontecchio
Chair

cc: Jeff Lykins, Director, Department of Inspection and Standards
Jeffrey Padwa, City Solicitor, Department of Law

Criteria 1.6
Summary of Projects

PROJECT SUMMARIES - OCTOBER 1, 2011 through SEPTEMBER 30, 2012

Summary of Projects

Total Applications Reviewed: 158

Applications Reviewed by HDC: *(Alterations, Demolition, New Construction, Relocation)* 41 (1 application reviewed by PHDC & Staff[1])

Applications Reviewed by Staff: *(Repairs, Replacements in Kind, Restorations, Minor Alterations)* 118 (1 application reviewed by PHDC & Staff.)

Breakdown by Project Type[2]

Project Type	Totals	Approved	Denied	Pending[3]	Withdrawn	Appealed
In-House[4]	**118**	118	0	0	0	0
Alterations	**40**	37	2	0	1	1
Demolitions	**1**	1	0	0	0	0
New Construction	**0**	0	0	0	0	0
Relocations	**0**	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS[5]	**159**	**156**	**2**	**0**	**1**	**1**

[1] Indicates number of applications which have multiple components that are reviewed by the PHDC and Staff separately [i.e.: Major Alteration, New Construction, etc. (PHDC) & Repair/Replacement In-Kind, Major Alterations, etc. (Staff)].
[2] Some applications might cover two types (i.e.: fences & sign). This would account for any discrepancy in the number of applications by type and number of total application reviewed.
[3] Pending includes applications that are either incomplete or that are complete and the review is ongoing.
[4] In-House projects include repairs, replacement in kind, awnings, signs, storm windows, fences and gates, site improvements, mechanical equipment, shutters and blinds, roofs and gutter systems, and other minor alterations. All in-house projects are reviewed by Staff; no public meeting is required.
[5] The discrepancy here is due to the fact that some applications are reviewed by both Staff and the PHDC (i.e.: Prep-for-Paint (RIK-Staff) and a new side addition (Major Alteration-PHDC). This results in a slight inflation of the totals.

PROJECT SUMMARIES - OCTOBER 1, 2011 through SEPTEMBER 30, 2012

Breakdown by District

District	Totals	Approved[1]	Denied	Pending	Withdrawn	Appealed
Armory	**15**	15	0	0	0	0
Armory (expansion)	**25**	25	0	0	0	0
Broadway	**10**	9	1	0	0	0
College Hill	**89**	87	1	0	1	1
ICBD[2]	**1**	1	0	0	0	0
Jewelry	**2**	2	0	0	0	0
North Elmwood	**8**	8	0	0	0	0
South Elmwood	**8**	8	0	0	0	0
Stimson Avenue	**1**	1	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	**158**	**155**	**2**	**0**	**1**	**1**

Total applications compared from October, 1996-October, 2012:

	Totals	PHDC Reviewed	Staff Reviewed
1996-1997	**220**	64 [29%][3]	156 [71%]
1997-1998	**186**	53 [28%]	133 [72%]
1998-1999	**176**	64 [36%]	112 [64%]
1999-2000	**203**	67 (9)[4] [33%]	145 (9) [67%]
2000-2001	**191**	65 [34%]	126 [66%]
2001-2002	**213**	58 [27%]	155 [73%]
2002-2003	**181**	51 (8)[5] [24%]	138 (8) [76%]
2003-2004	**183**	54 (5) [27%]	133 (5) [73%]
2004-2005	**204**	50 (6) [27%]	148 (6) [73%]
2005-2006	**186**	37 (7) [20%]	142 (7) [80%]
2006-2007	**197**	38 (4) [20%]	153 (4) [80%]
2007-2008	**163**	28 (3) [20%]	132 (3) [80%]
2008-2009	**135**	26 (2) [19%]	109 (2) [81%]
2009-2010	**168**	31 (7) [18%]	137 (7) [82%]
2010-2011	**148**	25 (4) [17%]	123 (4) [83%]
2011-2012	**158**	41 (1) [26%]	118 (1) [74%]
16 year total	**2912**	763 [26%]	2171 [74%]
16 year average	**182**	48 [26%]	136 [74%]

[1] The discrepancy here is due to the fact that some applications are reviewed by both Staff and the PHDC, and the Staff reviewed item may be approved, while the Commission reviewed portion may be denied. There was one instance of this happening this past CLG year. This in combination with the number of applications that went through joint-review, but were approved by both the Commission and staff leads to a slight discrepancy in the numbers.

[2] Industrial & Commercial Buildings District-A non-continuous district designated in 2002 with less restrictive Standards & Guidelines than the seven other historic districts which are primarily residential in composition.

[3] Represents percentage of total applications reviewed by PHDC or Staff.

[4] Indicates number of applications which have multiple components that are reviewed by the PHDC and Staff separately [i.e.: New Construction (PHDC) & Site Improvements (Staff)].

[5] Ibid.

ATTACHMENT D
Criteria 2.1-a
Membership

PHDC Membership List and Meeting Attendance Record
October 1, 2011 – September 30, 2012

Name	Appointment (Status)	Meetings Attended	Resume on File
Glen Fontecchio (Chair)	re-appointed; term expires 9/15	12	yes
Clark Schoettle (Vice Chair)	term expires 9/14	10	yes
Cornelis de Boer	term expires 9/14	13	yes
Mildred Parrillo	term expires 9/14	8	yes
Catherine Lund	re-appointed; term expires 9/15	13	yes
Jon Paul Couture	re-appointed; term expires 9/15	11	yes
Neal Kaplan	term expires 9/13	9	yes
Kristi Agniel	term expires 9/13	10	yes
Tina Regan	term expires 9/13	14	yes
Michael Marino (Alternate)	term expires 9/13	0	yes

2 VACANCIES: City Council Members – Councilman Lombardi's and Councilwoman Nolan's appointments expired 01/03/05

Staff

Robert Azar, AICP, Director of Current Planning	1	-
Jason Martin, MSHP, Preservation Planner, PHDC Staff	15	-
Adrienne Southgate, Deputy City Solicitor, counsel	1	-
Lisa Dinerman, City Solicitor, counsel	1	-
Lincoln Lennon, City Solicitor, counsel	1	-

ATTACHMENT E
Criteria 2.1-b
New Member Resume

Michael S. Marino

Providence Office: 50 Exchange Terrace, Suite 320, Providence, RI 02903
Telephone: (401) 453-0550, ext. 222 Fax: (401) 421-7806
E-mail: mmarino@pbmmlegal.com

Boston Office: 171 Milk Street, Suite 32, Boston, MA 02109
Telephone:(617) 542-0600 Fax: Centralized at RI Office

Education

New England School of Law, Boston, Massachusetts
Juris Doctor, 1999 *cum laude*
New England Scholar, 1998-99 Class Rank in the top 10th percentile

University of Connecticut, Storrs, Connecticut
Masters of Arts, Economics, 1995

Norwich University, The Military College of Vermont, Northfield, Vermont
Bachelor of Science, Business Administration, 1992
Bachelor of Science, Economics, 1991

Admitted to Practice

Commonwealth of Massachusetts, 1999
State of Rhode Island, 2000
United States District Court, for Districts of Massachusetts and Rhode Island, 2000
United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, 1999
United States Court of Federal Claims, 2009
United States Tax Court, 1999
Mashantucket Pequot Tribal Court, 1999

Experience

Partner
Plourde, Bogue, Moylan + Marino LLP, Boston, Massachusetts
July 2006-present Providence, Rhode Island
Tax Controversies: Represent taxpayers, individuals and corporations in judicial proceedings at the U.S. Tax Court, U.S. District Court, U.S. Bankruptcy Court (Special Tax Counsel), Rhode Island 6th Division District Court, the Massachusetts Appellate Tax Board, at audits or investigations phases and post-assessment at Administrative hearing before the Internal Revenue Service and State taxing authorities on various issues including fraud investigations, liability for understatement of income, Responsible Person/Trust Fund determinations and assessments, refund claims, as well as a multitude of compliance and collections matters.
General litigation: Manage business/fiduciary litigation matters and conduct both jury and bench trials in U.S. District Court and the Massachusetts and Rhode Island Superior and District Courts.

Associate
Truelove, Dee & Chase LLP, Boston, Massachusetts
June 1999-July 2006
Tax Controversies: Represent taxpayers, individuals and corporations, in judicial proceedings at the U.S. Tax Court and the Massachusetts Appellate Tax Board, and before the Internal Revenue Service and State taxing authorities on issues ranging from refund and collections matters to fraud investigations. Further representation of taxpayers at audits, at the Internal Revenue Services' Appeals Division by negotiating and settling taxpayer liabilities through collection alternatives (Offers in Compromise and Installment Payment Agreements), as well as, at Appeals by negotiating pre-trial settlements.

General litigation: Manage business litigation matters and conduct both jury and bench trials in U.S. District Court and the Massachusetts and Rhode Island Superior and District Courts.

Principal
Law Office, Michael S. Marino, Providence, Rhode Island
January 2001-July 2006
Conduct real estate conveyancing practice – Residential and Commercial by providing title and settlement services to national and local banking institutions, as well as, individual clients. Presently an approved closing attorney for most national lending institutions. Title Agent for First American Title Insurance Company (both Rhode Island and Massachusetts).

Summer Associate
Downs, Rachlin & Martin, Burlington, Vermont
May 1998-August 1998
Litigation department: prepared jury instructions, dispositive and non-dispositive motions. participated in trials, mandatory mediation and depositions.
In the corporate law department, drafted warranties for a nationally distributed product.

Clerk (Intern)
United States District Court, Providence, Rhode Island
May 1997-February 1998
Chambers of Magistrate Judge Robert W. Lovegreen
Drafted opinions, memoranda, recommendations and orders after conducting legal research and evaluating factual records. Specific research and writing in Title VII, Title IX, CERCLA, and ERISA. Participated in hearings, settlement conferences and other court activities.

Graduate Lecturer
Civic Education Project (CEP),Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut
December 1996-August 1997
While residing in the Ukraine, was a full member of the economics faculty, Kharkov State University, Kharkov, Ukraine. Prepared and presented courses in macroeconomics and law & economics.

Military Experience

Captain
United States Army
May 1991-2005
Served in units, both active and reserve components, of the U.S. Army. Held various leadership positions at company, battalion and brigade levels. Graduate of the Military Intelligence Officer Basic Course, the Officer Infantry Advanced Course, the Airborne Course, the Air Assault Course, the Mountain Warfare School, the Small Arms Instructor Course and the Staff Officer's Course.

Reported Cases

Mashantucket Pequot Gaming Enterprise v. Tahajian,
No. MPTC-CV-2000-140
Food Service Associates, Inc. et al v. Commissioner of Revenue,
2001 Mass. Tax LEXIS 27;
Moulton v. United States, 2003 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 22007;
Moulton v. United States, 429 F.3d 352 (1st Cir. 2005).

Memberships

F&AM, Rhode Island Bar Association and Massachusetts Bar Association

Criteria 2.4
Professional Training

Event	Attendee(s)
Attended & presented at the National Trust for Historic Preservation, National Conference Buffalo, NY, October 2011	Clark Schoettle
Rhode Island State Historic Preservation Conference Woonsocket, April 2012	Clark Schoettle Cornelis de Boer Tina Regan
Architectural Tours for Roger Williams University Bristol & Providence, Fall/Spring 2011-12	Tina Regan
Providence Preservation Society Fall Symposium Providence, October 2012	Jon-Paul Couture Clark Schoettle Cornelis de Boer Tina Regan Kristi Agniel Catherine Lund