

Technical Review Committee Minutes

April 27, 2023

1:00 PM

**Town Hall – Small Conference Room
93 Narragansett Avenue, Jamestown**

I. New Business

1. Gail and John Redmond, 148 Narragansett Avenue, Plat 8 Lot 76, Jamestown, RI – Development Plan Review for construction of a detached garage on an undersized lot in Jamestown Village Special Development District per Jamestown Zoning Ordinance Article 11 Section 82-1100 – Recommendation to the Zoning Board of Review for variances - Review, Discussion, and/or Action and/or Vote.

The meeting was called to order at 1:00pm and the following members were present: Lisa Bryer, Town Planner; Jean Lambert, Town Engineer; Peter Medeiros, Building and Zoning Official; Duncan Pendlebury, Planning Commission; Bernie Pfeiffer, Planning Commission; Christian Infantolino, Murphy, Prior & Infantolino; Julia Gerald, Architect; Bob Bailey, Lila Delman Compass. Also present: Carrie Kolb

Infantolino stated that the application is at TRC for a second time, with a similar set up. Julia Gerald, the project architect, has put the garage in line with existing house. It provides the turn around for entrance and egress of the property. Relief needed for the second frontage. The applicant wishes to preserve the tree; and backyard courtyard. Plans with five different layouts have been distributed.

Example 1 is the only area on the property that the structure can be placed without requiring any dimensional relief. The other examples would take away the tree and courtyard and would still need some relief. Gerald said that the least disturbance to the property is Example 1. Having a little garage is most gentle approach for the property, and it makes architectural sense because it is in line with the way the house was designed. The tree is a space maker for the backyard and the neighborhood.

Bryer asked why the structure could not be moved further south? That option would not require a variance and was not provided. Infantolino explained that moving the garage south would take out courtyard and the driveway.

In Example 2, the tree would need to be taken out and 7 feet of relief off the secondary front off of Lawn Avenue would be needed.

In Example 3, the structure is jammed up against the existing property line. This example does not give a good turnaround area for the driveway. Bryer asked if an “L” could be put in for turnaround? Gerald said it would be tight. Bailey said the applicant does not want the new structure attached to the existing structure because looking out of the kitchen window, the view would be obstructed by the new structure.

In Example 5, the structure is under the tree, which would destroy the tree. Bryer stated for the record that she is not in favor of taking down the tree.

Discussion of relief needed in Example 1 versus first set of plans. Example 1 needs 3’4” of relief on the secondary front where 35 feet is required and side setback relief of 7 feet where 10 feet is required. The original application asked for setback relief of 2 feet of secondary front where 35 feet is required and side setback relief of 4 feet where 10 feet is required. Pendlebury said that the Planning Commission listened to the application and were looking for the least relief possible. Infantolino felt that the Planning Commission should have looked at the application based on planning prospective not zoning. Bryer said that the Planning Commission is making recommendation to the Zoning Board of Review. All agree to disagree.

Section 82-1103 Site and Building Plans were reviewed:

The lot is an undersized lot. The parking is located on the rear of the lot. The building type is a smaller secondary form. The windows will blend into the façade. The garage design of the outbuilding is in harmony with the existing building as it is using the same pitch as the main residence, and massing of the house from 1899. It is a simple gable form like the main house. The garage doors are small 9 feet by 8 feet in a carriage style. Every detail is designed for small town accessory structure. The building materials will be clapboard to match the original house. The colors will blend and be harmonious.

Bryer asked if moving the structure/garage in a few feet will impact the tree? Bailey and Gerald said that two arborists have given their professional opinions that the garage should be built on Sonotubes and piers to avoid root damage.

Lambert asked if other garages in the area are placed close to the street as well? Bailey had photos showing multiple garages close to the street, and that lead to a discussion of historic homes. Bryer asked why this information was not provided to the members ahead of time. Bailey said that he would provide it to Zoning. Bryer noted that it would be useful for all reviewers to have.

Gerald said that zoning does not protect historic homes. Pendlebury said he appreciated what Gerald is saying, but Jamestown does not have historic districts.

Discussion of withdrawing the application until a change to the zoning section of setback relief is passed ensued. Infantolino and Medeiros discussed the setbacks prior to the application being submitted.

A motion was moved by Bryer and seconded by Lambert that the structure meets the intent of Article 11 in terms of standards for structures on an undersized lot. All in favor. It just did not meet the setbacks. Pendlebury suggested moving the garage/structure a little under the dripline of the tree to remove some of the setback relief requested. Infantolino asked for a continuance for the variance of setback relief required and he will speak to the applicant.

II. Adjournment

A continuance was granted at 1:41pm.
Application was withdrawn on 4/28/23