CITY OF PROVIDENCE
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

In Re: Consolidated Appeals from Historic District Commission decisions granting approval to 56 Pratt Street (Applications 26.101 and 26.138)

- **PHDC Resolution No. 26-07 Conceptual approval for Application 26.101.**
- **PHDC Resolution No. 26-12 Conceptual approval for Application 26.138.**
- **PHDC Resolution No. 26-14, Final approval for Application 26.101.**
- **PHDC Resolution No. 26-15, Final approval for Application 26.138.**

56 Pratt Street (Plat 10, Lot 163)

INTRODUCTION

Nathaniel Sliney, as the applicant (the "Applicant"), obtained Conceptual Approvals and Certificates of Appropriateness for the construction of a new structure and the addition to an existing structure at 56 Pratt Street (the "Project") by the City of Providence Historic District Commission ("PHDC"). Frank Faltus, Olivia Katz and Chris Borgstern, abutters to the Property, filed an appeal with the City of Providence Zoning Board of Review ("Board") appealing the Conceptual Approvals and Certificates of Appropriateness ("COA") with the Board.[1]

As discussed herein, the Conceptual Approvals and COA of the PHDC with respect to the Project should be sustained because the PHDC did not commit procedural error and there is sufficient support for such approvals by the weight of the evidence in the record.

SUMMARY

Matter: Consolidated appeals to the Providence Zoning Board from Historic District Commission (PHDC) approvals for 56 Pratt Street (Plat 10, Lot 163, College Hill Historic District). The brief is filed for the Applicant, Nathaniel Sliney.

[1] Because the Project has been bifurcated into the New Construction and the Addition to the existing structure, each has its own approval process; *i.e.*, Conceptual Approval and COA.

Project: The Applicant proposes to subdivide the 11,000 sq. ft. lot. He would build a new multi-family building on the south parcel (Case 26.101, "New Construction") and an addition to the historic house on the north parcel (Case 26.138, "Addition").

Appellants: Frank Faltus, Olivia Katz and Chris Borgstrom, who are abutters.

Approval history

- **July 27, 2026:** The PHDC granted unanimous conceptual approval of the New Construction. It denied conceptual approval of the Addition as too large in scale and mass.
- **August 24, 2026:** The PHDC found a revised Addition submission materially different from the denied one and granted conceptual approval unanimously. It continued the New Construction so the Applicant could return with revised drawings.
- **September 29, 2026:** The Applicant attended a design charrette hosted by the Providence Preservation Society. The changes discussed there included height reductions, façade and window changes, color and landscaping.
- **October 6, 2026:** The PHDC unanimously granted a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the New Construction. It also granted a COA for the Addition, unanimously.

Standard of review: Under R.I.G.L. § 45-24.1-9, the Board may not substitute its own judgment for the PHDC's. It may reverse only for prejudicial procedural error, clear error, or lack of support by the weight of the evidence. The brief describes the Board's role as deferential, like an appellate court's, relying on the "funnel" analysis in *Environmental Scientific Corp. v. Durfee*.

Summary of Arguments

1. **Waiver of notice defects.** The Appellants and their counsel appeared and objected at every hearing. Under *Zielstra* and *Bergman*, they waived any notice objection. They also lack standing to raise the rights of others who did not appeal.

2. **Notice was proper.** The agendas stated the date, time, place and nature of the business, and that items were for "vote or other action." That satisfies R.I.G.L. §§ 45-24.1-6 and 42-46-6(b) and the "fair notice" standard of *Tanner* and *Anolik*. The Appellants' zoning-notice cases (e.g., *Boggs*) do not apply to the PHDC, which approves construction and does not grant zoning "relief." The distinction between conceptual and final approval does not affect notice.

3. **Standard 8 is satisfied and the evidence supports the approvals.** Preservation Planner Jason Martin's staff reports and testimony found the work compatible in size, scale and form. The staff reports indicate Pratt Street supports contemporary design, and that the Addition is subservient to the historic house and minimally visible from the public rights-of-way. There are several Superior Court decisions upholding approvals grounded in municipal staff reports. The PHDC was deliberate: it denied one application, continued another, and required design revisions; ultimately providing approval for the New Constriction and the Addition.

Conclusion: The Applicant asks the Board to sustain the Conceptual Approvals and COAs because there was no procedural error and the weight of the evidence supports them.

Facts and Travel Relating to the Applications

The Project is located at 56 Pratt Street in Providence, Rhode Island, is identified as Lot 163 on Assessor's Plat 10, and is in the College Hill Historic District. It has an area of 11,000 square feet. The Applicant proposes to subdivide the Property into two parcels. On the proposed

North parcel, the Applicant seeks to build an addition on the existing historic house and on the proposed south parcel, the Applicant seeks to construct a new multi-family building. Although originally submitted as one application, the PHDC separated the proposal into two applications ("Applications") The new construction is known as Case 26.101 and the major alteration to the existing house is Case 26.138 (hereinafter, the "New Construction" and the "Addition," collectively, the "Applications" or the "Project").

July 27, 2026, PHDC Meeting

The Applicant appeared at the July 27, 2026, meeting of the PHDC seeking conceptual approval from PHDC on both the New Construction and the Addition. As indicated above, PHDC bifurcated the review process at this meeting and thereafter reviewed each proposal separately.

On the New Construction (Case 26.101), architect David Sission presented the Applicant's proposal. Thereafter, Jason Martin, Preservation Planner at PHDC, presented his staff report as set forth in the minutes of the meeting:

> Mr. Martin gave an introduction. This is a conceptual review. Staff recommends bifurcating review into two sections: new construction of a three-story with cellar multi-family residence (south); and major alterations: the construction of a three-story with cellar addition to the existing building (north). The applicant agreed, the application was bifurcated. Mr. Sisson gave an overview of the project. Mr. Martin continued with his staff report and recommendations. 56 Pratt Street is a parcel that contains a structure of historical and architectural significance that contributes to the significance of the College Hill local historic district, having been recognized as a contributing structure to the College Hill National Register Historic District. The parcel shall be subdivided to allow for a vacant parcel that the new construction will be built upon. The proposed building's form and siting are appropriate for the location. Pratt Street is a location that has minimal historical context as related to its streetscape, as the majority of buildings constructed on the street are from the mid-20th century and later. The Commission has approved multiple buildings of contemporary and modern design along the street, and this proposal is compliant within that context; The street

> hosts two properties designed by Friedrich St. Florian, who rightly referred to the street as a "laboratory" for architectural expression. The proposed structure will require some fenestration along the gas modified (sic) appears to be zoning compliant. Plans and photos have been submitted. The application for New Construction is considered complete for conceptual review. Mr. Martin noted that the cellar level's front (west) elevation would need some glazing to conform to zoning requirements. The work as proposed is in accord with PHDC Standard 8 as follows: as the proposed new construction is conceptually appropriate having determined that the proposed construction is architecturally and historically compatible with the property and district having an appropriate size, scale and form that will not have an adverse effect on the property or district, as Pratt Street has been identified by the Commission as a street that can support contemporary and modern architecture as the majority of properties on the street were constructed in the mid-20th century and later. (Emphasis added)

See Applicant's Exhibit A – Minutes of PHDC meeting of July 27, 2026; pg. 1.

After public comment, the PHDC gave their "UNAMIMOUS" approval to grant conceptual approval to the New Construction (Case 26.101) in the following motion:

> A motion was made stating: The application is considered complete. 56 Pratt Street is a parcel that contains a structure of historical and architectural significance that contributes to the significance of the College Hill local historic district, having been recognized as a contributing structure to the College Hill National Register Historic District. The parcel shall be subdivided to allow for a vacant parcel that the new construction will be built upon. The Commission grants Conceptual Approval of the new construction, citing Standard 8, having determined that the proposed construction is architecturally and historically compatible with the property and district having an appropriate size, scale and form that will not have an adverse effect on the property or district, citing and agreeing to the recommendations in the staff report, with the applicant to return for Final Approval once the parcel has been subdivided. (Emphasis added.)

RESULT:	**CONCEPTUALLY APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]**
MOVER:	Sumi Mukoyama, Regular Member
SECONDER:	Nathaniel Carden, Regular Member
AYES:	Brennan, Mukoyama, Carden, Lund, Fernandez

See Applicant's Exhibit A – Minutes of PHDC meeting of July 27, 2026, pg.2.

On the Addition (Case 26.138), the members of PHDC were of the opinion that the proposed addition was too large in scale and mass and not in accord with PHDC Standard 8. After public comment, the PHDC moved to deny conceptual approval to the Additon. *See* Applicant's **Exhibit A –** Minutes of PHDC meeting of July 27, 2026; pg. 3.

August 24, 2026, PHDC Meeting

The Applicant next appeared at the August 24, 2026, meeting of the PHDC seeking final approval on the New Construction (Case 26.101) and conceptual approval on the Addition (Case 26.138).

Jason Martin, Executive Director of the PHDC presented his staff report as set forth in the minutes of the meeting:

> Mr. Martin gave an introduction. 56 Pratt Street is a parcel that contains a structure of historical and architectural significance that contributes to the significance of the College Hill local historic district, having been recognized as a contributing structure to the College Hill National Register Historic District; The parcel shall be subdivided to create a vacant parcel that the new construction will be built upon. The proposal was granted conceptual approval at the July 27th meeting (Res. 26-07). The proposed building's form and siting are appropriate for the location. Pratt Street is a location that has minimal historical context as related to its streetscape, as the majority of buildings constructed on the street are from the mid-20th century and later. The Commission has approved multiple buildings of contemporary and modern design along the street, and this proposal is compliant within that context; The street hosts two properties designed by Friedrich St. Florian, who rightly referred to the street as a "laboratory" for architectural expression. The parcel shall be subdivided to create a vacant parcel that the new construction will be built upon. The proposed structure appears to be zoning compliant. Revised plans and photos have been submitted. The application for New Construction is considered complete for review. The work as proposed is in accord with PHDC Standard 8 as follows: having determined that the proposed new construction is appropriate as it is architecturally and historically compatible with the property and district having an appropriate size, scale and form that will not have an adverse effect on the property or district, as Pratt Street has been identified by the Commission as a street that can support contemporary and modern architecture as the majority of properties on the street were constructed

> in the 20th and 21st Centuries, most reviewed and approved by the Commission, and this proposal is congruous with the street's development. Mr. Sisson gave an overview of the proposed materials.

See Applicant's Exhibit A – Minutes of PHDC meeting of August 24, 2026; pg. 1.

After the Applicant's presentation by architect David Sisson and significant comments from Commission members and the members of the public, including the Appellants, a motion was made, with the agreement of the Applicant, to continue the Application for the New Construction, with the Applicant to return with revised drawings at a subsequent meeting.

See Applicant's **Exhibit A** – Minutes of PHDC meeting of August 24, 2026; pg. 3.

With respect to the Addition (Case 26.138). Jason Martin presented his staff report which is set forth in the minutes of the meeting:

> Mr. Martin gave an introduction. 56 Pratt Street is a structure of historical and architectural significance that contributes to the significance of the College Hill local historic district, having been recognized as a contributing structure to the College Hill National Register Historic District. The applicants previously appeared as a Preliminary Application at the Commission's June 22nd meeting where the previous proposal was discussed. The Commission's general consensus was that it was inappropriate as it is too large and needs to be subservient to the existing house. Suggestions were to reduce the mass and also to camouflage the addition with material color to help minimize its appearance. The applicant appeared at the July 27th meeting. The applicant had revised the drawings, and the proposal was slightly smaller in height but still too large in scale and mass. The upper floor of the addition is a full story above the historic resources' roofline. The submission is not zoning compliant, at minimum not conforming to section 402.A, exceeding the number of allowed stories. It is definitively not subservient to the historic resource. The application was denied (Res 26-08). The new submission is substantially and materially different from the denied application and is considered complete for review; Staff recommends a motion be made from the Commission stating this.

See Applicant's **Exhibit A** – Minutes of PHDC meeting of August 24, 2026; pg. 3.

Thereafter, PHDC granted an initial motion that the new submission was substantially and materially different from the denied application and considered complete for review. The Applicant, through it architect, David Sisson then presented a revised plan on the Addition. After significant public comment, the PHDC UNANIMOUSLY approved with the below motion to grant Conceptual Approval to the Addition (Case 26.138):

> A motion was made stating that the application for 56 Pratt Street, a structure of historical and architectural significance to the College Hill local historic district, recognized as a contributing structure to the College Hill National Register Historic District is considered complete for conceptual review. The Commission cites Standard 8 in granting Conceptual Approval for the proposed addition to 56 Pratt Street as it is in accord with PHDC Standard 8, being architecturally and historically compatible with the property and district having an appropriate size, scale and form that will not have an adverse effect on the property or district, being of a size where its height and width are minimally to not discernible from the public rights-of-way, citing and agreeing to the recommendations in the staff report, with the applicant to appear with revised drawings at a subsequent meeting for final approval.

RESULT:	**CONCEPTUALLY APPROVED [UNANIMOUS] Next: 10/6/2026 4:45 PM**
MOVER:	Catherine Lund, Vice-Chair
SECONDER:	James Verity, Deputy Vice-Chair
AYES:	Lund, Verity, Carden, Fernandez, Haggerty, Mukoyama

See Applicant's **Exhibit A** –Minutes of PHDC meeting of August 24, 2026; pg. 5.

September 29, 2026
Design Charette hosted by the Providence Preservation Society (PPS)

On Tuesday, September 29, 2026, the Applicant agreed to attend a design charette hosted by the Providence Preservation Society (PPS) to discuss proposed design changes that had been articulated by the Appellant's expert witness, Clarke Schoettle at the August 24, 2026 meeting , and comments from the Commission with respect to the New Construction (Case 26.101) and the Addition (Case 26.138). This meeting was attended by Councilwoman Jill

Davidson, the applicant's architect, David Sisson, Clark Schoettle, Glen Fontecchio, Joel Vanderweele, Marisa Brown and Elisabeth Seidel. The items discussed related to: Reduce height; Design changes at front and roofline to soften façade at front and reduce bulk; deemphasize verticality; Reduce actual and apparent height; Window changes; Color changes and Landscape changes. As a result of the charette, the Applicant prepared and submitted revised plans for both the New Construction (Case 26.101) and the Addition (Case 26.138).

See Applicant's **Exhibit A** –Minutes of PHDC meeting of October 6, 2026; pg. 1.

October 6, 2026, PHDC Meeting

The Applicant appeared at the October 6, 2026, meeting of the PHDC seeking a COA on the New Construction (Case 26.101) and Conceptual Approval on the Addition (Case 26.138).

With respect to the New Construction (Case 26.101) Jason Martin, Executive Director of the PHDC presented his staff report which was set forth in the minutes of the meeting and summarized here:

> Mr. Martin gave a staff report. 56 Pratt Street is a parcel that contains a structure of historical and architectural significance that contributes to the significance of the College Hill local historic district, having been recognized as a contributing structure to the College Hill National Register Historic District. The parcel shall be subdivided to allow for a vacant parcel that the new construction will be built upon;
>
> At the July 27th meeting the application was granted conceptual approval (Res26-07). The proposed building's form and siting are appropriate for the location. Pratt Street is a location that has minimal historical context as related to its streetscape, as the majority of buildings constructed on the street are from the mid-20th century and later. The Commission has approved multiple buildings of contemporary and modern design along the street, and this proposal is compliant within that context; The street hosts two properties designed by Friedrich St. Florian, who rightly referred to the street as a "laboratory" for architectural expression;
>
> At the August 24th meeting in agreement with the applicant the matter was continued. The applicants also agreed to attend a design charette

hosted by the Providence Preservation Society (PPS) to discuss proposed design changes that had been articulated by an expert witness, Clarke Schoettle, and comments from the Commission;

On Tuesday, September 29th, staff attended the charrette at PPS. This meeting was attended by Councilwoman Jill Davidson, the applicant's architect, David Sisson, Clark Schoettle, Glen Fontecchio, Joel Vanderweele, Marisa Brown and Elisabeth Seidel. It was a productive session and the items discussed for this project related to the following: Reduce height; Design changes at front and roofline to soften façade at front and reduce bulk; Deemphasize verticality; Reduce actual and apparent height; Window changes; Color changes; Landscape changes;

Revised plans, photos and renderings have been submitted. Additional documentation of a memo detailing changes made since conceptual review to this review, and a section drawing have also been submitted and distributed. The application for New Construction is considered complete;

The proposed new construction has been changed substantially stylistically in an attempt to minimize the verticality while maintaining volume. The overall height has been reduced by 4'. The building is still tall, but below the buildable envelope allowed by zoning and smaller than what the Commission granted conceptual approval for. The changes to the front, having open porches that emulate a more traditional double- or triple-decker design is helpful; fenestration changes help reduce the verticality and improve the composition; and,

The work as proposed is in accord with PHDC Standard 8 as follows: having determined that the proposed new construction is appropriate as it is architecturally and historically compatible with the property and district having an appropriate size, scale and form that will not have an adverse effect on the property or district, as Pratt Street has been identified by the Commission as a street that can support contemporary and modern architecture as the majority of properties on the street were constructed in the 20th and 21st Centuries, most reviewed and approved by the Commission, and this proposal is congruous with the street's development.

After public comment, the PHDC **UNANIMOUSLY** approved the below motion to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness to New Construction (Case 26.101)

A motion was made stating that: the application is considered complete. 56 Pratt Street is a parcel that contains a structure of

historical and architectural significance that contributes to the significance of the College Hill local historic district, having been recognized as a contributing structure to the College Hill National Register Historic District. The parcel shall be subdivided to allow for a vacant parcel that the new construction will be built upon. The Commission grants Final Approval of the proposal, citing Standard 8, having determined that the proposed new construction is appropriate as it is architecturally and historically compatible with the property and district having an appropriate size, scale and form that will not have an adverse effect on the property or district, as Pratt Street has been identified by the Commission as a street that can support contemporary and modern architecture as the majority of properties on the street were constructed in the 20th and 21st Centuries, most reviewed and approved by the Commission, and this proposal is congruous with the street's development, citing and agreeing to the recommendations in the staff report, with staff or a sub-committee to review any additional details.

RESULT:	**APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]**
MOVER:	Pabel Fernandez, Regular Member
SECONDER:	Matthew Brennan, Regular Member
AYES:	Fernandez, Brennan, Bay, Carden, Haggerty

See Applicant's **Exhibit A** - Minutes of PHDC meeting of October 6, 2026; pg. 2-3.

With respect to Addition (Case 26.138).

Mr. Martin gave a staff report. 56 Pratt Street is a parcel that contains a structure of historical and architectural significance that contributes to the significance of the College Hill local historic district, having been recognized as a contributing structure to the College Hill National Register Historic District. The parcel shall be subdivided to allow for a vacant parcel that the new construction will be built upon; The applicants previously appeared as a Preliminary Application at the Commission's June 22nd meeting where the previous proposal was discussed. The Commission's the general consensus was that it was inappropriate as it is too large and needs to be subservient to the existing house. Suggestions were to reduce the mass and also to camouflage the addition with material color to help minimize its appearance; The applicant appeared at the July 27th meeting. The applicant had revised the drawings, and the proposal was slightly smaller in height but still too large in scale and mass. The upper floor of the addition is a full story above the historic resources' roofline. The submission is not zoning compliant, at minimum not conforming to section 402.A, exceeding the number of allowed stories. It is definitively not subservient to the historic resource. The application was denied (Res 26-08); At the August 24th meeting a new

> application that was deemed materially and substantially different was reviewed by the Commission. The Commission granted conceptual approval (Res 26-12) at the bequest of the applicant. The (sic) as the proposed addition is subservient to the historic resource, being of a size where its height and width are minimally to not discernible from the public rights-of-way. The applicants also agreed to attend a design charette hosted by the Providence Preservation Society (PPS) to discuss proposed design changes that had been articulated by an expert witness, Clarke Schoettle, and comments from the Commission; On Tuesday, September 29th, staff attended the charrette at PPS. This meeting was attended by Councilwoman Jill Davidson, the applicant's architect, David Sisson, Clark Schoettle, Glen Fontecchio, Joel Vanderweele, Marisa Brown and Elisabeth Seidel. It was a productive session and the items discussed for this project related to the following: Aligning floors, Window changes, Canopy add at front door, Front door change, Unique siding at 'transition' portion of addition, Color changes; Revised plans, photos and renderings have been submitted. Additional documentation of a memo detailing changes made since conceptual review to this review has also been submitted and distributed. The application for Major Alterations is considered complete; The revised design reflects most of the comments discussed at the charette. The design is now more cohesive. The addition's floors have been lowered and match existing; the fenestration and materials, along with color choices have enhanced the design; and, The work as proposed is in accord with PHDC Standard 8 being architecturally and historically compatible with the property and district having an appropriate size, scale and form that will not have an adverse effect on the property or district, as the proposed addition is subservient to the historic resource, being of a size where its height and width are minimally to not discernible from the public rights-of-way.

See Applicant's **Exhibit A** - Minutes of PHDC meeting of October 6, 2026; pg. 2-3.

After public comment, the PHDC **UNANIMOUSLY** approved the below motion to grant COA for the Addition (Case 26.138):

> A motion was made stating that: The application for 56 Pratt Street, a structure of historical and architectural significance to the College Hill local historic district, recognized as a contributing structure to the College Hill National Register Historic District is considered complete. The Commission cites Standard 8 in granting final approval for the proposed addition to 56 Pratt Street as it is in accord with PHDC Standard 8, being architecturally and historically compatible with the property and district having an appropriate size,

> scale and form that will not have an adverse effect on the property or district, being of a size where its height and width are minimally to not discernible from the public rights-of-way, citing and agreeing to the recommendations in the staff report, with staff to review any additional details.

RESULT:	**APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]**
MOVER:	Nathaniel Carden, Regular Member
SECONDER:	Pabel Fernandez, Regular Member
AYES:	Carden, Fernandez, Bay, Brennan, Haggerty

See Applicant's **Exhibit A -** Minutes of PHDC meeting of October 6, 2026; pg. 4.

The resolutions adopted by PHDC for the Conceptual Approval and the COA for the New Construction and the Conceptual Approval and the COA for the Additon is attached hereto as **Exhibit B.** Thereafter, the Appellants brought this Appeal challenging the issuance of the Conceptual Approval and the COA of the New Construction (Case 26.101) and the Conceptual Approval and the COA of the Addition. (Case 26.138).

STANDARD OF REVIEW

R.I.G.L. Section 45-24.1-9 of the Historical Area Zoning Act ("Act") provides the standard upon which the Zoning Board of Review reviews decisions from the PHDC. It provides:

> "When hearing appeals from commission decisions, the zoning board of review shall not substitute its own judgment for that of the commission but must consider the issue upon the findings and record of the commission. The zoning board of review shall not reverse a commission decision except on a finding of prejudicial procedural error, clear error, or lack of support by the weight of the evidence in the record."

In the context of administrative appeals, the two-step procedure outlined above — from the PHDC to the Zoning Board - has been likened to a funnel. *Environmental Scientific Corp. v. Durfee,* 621 A.2d 200, 207-08 (R.I. 1993). Similar to a hearing officer in the administrative forum, the PHDC sits "as if at the mouth of the funnel" and analyzes all of the evidence,

opinions, and issues in order to arrive at a decision. *Id*. at 207. The Board of Appeal, at the "discharge end" of the funnel, does not receive the information considered by the PHDC personally. *Id*. at 207-08. The Rhode Island Supreme Court has held that the "further away from the mouth of the funnel that an administrative official is . . the more deference should be owed to the fact finder." *Id*. at 208. In this context, the Board of Appeals gives deference to the findings of a historic district commission because it is presumed to have knowledge concerning those matters which are related to the preservation of structures of historic and architectural value. Such knowledge together with the fact that PHDC has heard evidence and testimony directly from those who have an interest in the matter reinforces the prescription of R.I.G.L Section 45-24.1-9 that the Board of Appeal shall not substitute its own judgment for that of PHDC but must consider the issue upon the findings and record of PHDC.

ARGUMENT

A. A party who appears before a Board and avails himself of the Opportunity to present his position to the Board waives his right to object to any alleged deficiencies of the notice.

The Appellants contend that the PHDC failed to provide the precise character of the relief sought by the Applicant in its public notices and therefore committed procedural error. This argument fails because, even if notice was lacking (which it was not), the Appellants and/or their counsel were present at every hearing and as a matter of law, waive any defect in the notice and the Appellants do not have standing to raise an issue of others who did not appeal the Decisions. The law in Rhode Island is clear. A party is deemed to waive his or her right to alleged deficiencies of notice on appeal if the aggrieved party participated in the prior proceeding. *Zielstra v. Barrington Zoning Board of Review*, 417 A.2d 303, 307 (R.I. 1980). *See also*

Bergman v. City of Providence Board of Appeals, C.A. No. PC-2018-4604 (R.I. Super. May 8, 2020).

The minutes of the July 27,th August 24,th and October 6th PHDC meetings in which the Project was considered clearly indicate the full knowledge of and participation by the Appellants in this matter. Below are excerpts of the participation of the Appellants/and or their counsel from the minutes of each meeting. [2]

At the July 27th Meeting, the minutes reflect the following:

With respect to Case 26.101:

- An email in opposition to the proposal from Olivia Katz and Chris Borgstrom, 54 Pratt Street, was submitted as part of Exhibit 1;
- Dr. Frank Faltus, 124 Congdon Street, was opposed, objecting to the scale of the proposed construction;

July 27th minutes of PDHC at Pg 1.

With respect to Case 26.138:

- Chris Borgstrom, 54 Pratt Street, was opposed to the proposal, concerned with size and scale; also submitted email (Exhibit 1);

July 24th minutes of PDHC at Pg 2.

At the August 24th meeting, the minutes reflect the following:

With respect to Case 26.101:

- Chris Borgstrom, 54 Pratt Street, was in opposition to the proposal;
- Amy Goins, Esq., Ursillo, Teitz & Ritch, Ltd., representing Frank Faltus, Olivia Katz and Chris Borgstrom, introduced Clark Schoettle as an expert witness. Mr. Schoettle was accepted by the Commission as an expert witness. The witness contends that the proposed design was not in keeping with the surrounding properties; that the roof form was flat as opposed to gabled and

[2] The minutes of the PHDC 's meetings in this matter reflect many other comments – we have only included in the body of this memorandum the participation of the Appellants an/or their counsel. See Applicant's Exhibit A - Minutes of PHDC meeting of July 27, 2026, August 24, 2026 and October 6, 2026.

that the openings and fenestration is out of character with its surroundings. Mr. Schoettle suggested the following changes to the design: floor height could be reduced from the proposed 12', with a reduction to 10' allowing for a reduction in height by 6½ feet; more continuity to materials; 6-lite windows instead of four would help align and carry design throughout; rethinking how third floor roof overhangs the porch: remove roof, would create a lower sense of front plane of the building; reduce the vertical elements overall;
- Dr. Frank Faltus, 124 Congdon Street, was opposed, objecting to the scale of the proposed construction;
- Olivia Katz, 54 Pratt Street, was in opposition to the proposal;

With respect to Case 26.138:

- An email in opposition to the proposal from Olivia Katz and Chris Borgstrom, 54 Pratt Street, was submitted as part of Exhibit 1;
- Amy Goins, Esq., Ursillo, Teitz & Ritch, Ltd., representing Frank Faltus, Olivia Katz and Chris Borgstrom, disputed that the application is materially and substantially different; introduced Clark Schoettle as an expert witness. Mr. Schoettle was previously accepted by the Commission as an expert witness. He stated that this design is much better than the new construction design. Addition is large, perhaps larger than the house, but allowed by zoning; no site plan showing abutting properties, questioned whether an engineer's drawing is required showing proposal and abutting properties; thought this would help in better understanding the projects and how they interact with the surrounding built environment; Ms. Goins argued that Commission is missing a step because not conceptual, but final approval is being requested/given;
- Chris Borgstrom, 54 Pratt Street, was in opposition to the proposal;
- Olivia Katz, 54 Pratt Street, was in opposition to the proposal;

From the October 6th meeting;

With respect to Case 26.101:

- David Marks, Esq., Ursillo, Teitz & Ritch, Ltd., representing Frank Faltus, Olivia Katz and Chris Borgstrom, was in opposition to the proposal; also had procedural objections;
- Chris Borgstrom, 54 Pratt Street, warned about AI- generated public comment;

- David Marks, Esq., Ursillo, Teitz & Ritch, Ltd., representing Frank Faltus, Olivia Katz and Chris Borgstrom, was in opposition to the proposal; also had procedural objections.

With respect to Case 26.138:

- Chris Borgstrom, 54 Pratt Street, warned about AI- generated public comment;
- David Marks, Esq., Ursillo, Teitz & Ritch, Ltd., representing Frank Faltus, Olivia Katz and Chris Borgstrom, was in opposition to the proposal; also had procedural objections;
- Olivia Katz, 54 Pratt Street, this design is better, still concerns over overall proposal;

See Applicant's Exhibit A - Minutes of PHDC meeting of July 27, 2026, August 24, 2026 and October 6, 2026;

It is therefore well documented in the public record that the Appellants had full knowledge of the hearing on the Applications and appeared, participated and voiced their concerns at every possible opportunity. For them now to complain that the notices were defective is just preposterous.

In addition, any person or entity seeking to vindicate a public right to adequate notice does not have a cause of action under zoning decisions issued by our courts. Save the Bay has tried and has failed to assert standing in a number of cases:

> "It is well established that a person is aggrieved when he or she has suffered an "injury in fact, economic or otherwise." *In re Town of New Shoreham Project*, 19 A.3d 1226, 1227 (R.I. 2011). An injury in fact is defined as "an invasion of a legally protected interest which is (a) concrete and particularized . . . and (b) actual or imminent, not conjectural or hypothetical." *Mruk v. Mortg. Elec. Registration Sys., Inc.*, 82 A.3d 527, 535 (R.I. 2013) (quoting *Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife*, 504 U.S. 555, 560 (1992)). *This injury in fact requirement is "essential even in cases that are brought allegedly to protect the public interest*." *Operation Clean Gov't v. R.I. Comm'n on Judicial Tenure & Discipline*, 741 A.2d 257, 262 (R.I. 1999)." (Italics added).

Save the Bay, Inc. v. State, C.A. No. PC 2014-1685 (R.I. Super. Sep 29, 2014).

The minutes of the July 27th, August 24th and October 6th PHDC meetings clearly indicate the full knowledge of and participation by the Appellants in this matter and as a result they have waived any contention relating to defective notice.

B. The PHDC gave proper notice of the Project each time PHDC considered it and did not commit procedural error in its review.

Even if the Appellants did not waive notice (which they did) the notice provided by the PHDC clearly identified the fact that it was considering a request by the applicant "to construct a new residential building and a multi-story addition to the existing house." And that PHDC may "vote or take other action on the applications. *See* Appellants' Exhibit 7; *See also* Appellant Memorandum at pg. 6. In this matter, the Appellants confuse the kind of notice required by a zoning board of review hearing where "relief" is being sought under a specific section of the zoning ordinance with an approval being considered by the PHDC for the construction or alteration of a structure located within a local historic district.[3] Importantly, the PHDC's enabling legislation and statutory charge is separate and apart from zoning. Its function is not to consider whether to grant relief from the literal terms of the zoning ordinance but rather, the PHDC's charge is to consider whether or not new construction or changes to existing structures are appropriate in a historic district. Furthermore, the statutory form of notice required by local historic district commissions under the Act is different and the cases cited by the Appellant such as *Boggs v. Zoning Bd. of Rev. of City of Newport,* 107 R.I. 80, 84, 264 A.2d 923, 926 (1970) is not applicable. The requirement in zoning cases *that* notice is only sufficient when it "contain[s] information that reveals the precise character of the relief sought by the application and the

[3] Although the Appellants cite the "zoning" type notice requirement and the cases supporting it in their memorandum in this matter, they do acknowledge in the same document that R.I.G.L. § 45-24.1-6 is the applicable statutory notice provision. At page 7 of their memorandum, they state, "[t]he PHDC is required to "provide notice of its meetings and comply in all respects with the requirements of the open meetings law." R.I.G.L. § 45-24.1-6." *See* Appellants' Memorandum at page 7.

specific properties for which such relief is sought," is not the applicable legal standard. The notice requirements are different under the Act because, unlike zoning matters, there is no relief sought - approval of the construction/addition of property in the historic district is sought and the Agendas/notice in this matter indicate exactly that.

Here, the required and provided notice in the meeting agendas clearly included the date, time, and place of the meeting; and had a statement specifying the nature of the business to be discussed as required by R.I.G.L. § 45-24.1-6 and Section § 42-46-6.

R.I.G.L. § 45-24.1-6 provides as follows:

> All meetings of the [historic district] commission are open to the public, and any person or his or her duly constituted representative is entitled to appear and be heard on any matter before the commission before it reaches its decision. The commission shall keep a record, open to public view, of its resolutions, proceedings, findings, decisions, and actions. The commission shall provide notice of its meetings and comply in all respects with the requirements of the open meetings law.

R.I.G.L. § 42-46-6(b) provides in pertinent part:

> (b) Public bodies shall give supplemental written public notice of any meeting within a minimum of forty-eight (48) hours, excluding weekends and state holidays in the count of hours, before the date. This notice shall include the date the notice was posted; the date, time, and place of the meeting; and a statement specifying the nature of the business to be discussed….

Section 4.2 of PHDC Rules and Regulations provides as follows:

> Notice of the hearing shall be given to the applicant, property owner, and other persons listed on the application form, to abutting property owners, to the HDC members, and to other persons requesting notice, at least seven (7) days prior to the public hearing, by regular mail. The applicant shall supply the HDC with a list of the names and addresses of all abutting property owners from the most current records of the City Tax Assessor.[4]

[4] It is important to point out that, unlike the Zoning Enabling Act (Chapter 24 of Title 45 of the General Laws), the Act does not require mailed notice to abutters when a historic district commission is considering an application for

In *Tanner v. Town Council of Town of East Greenwich* (880 A.2d 784), the Rhode Island Supreme Court opined upon whether a notice indicating "Interviews for Potential Board and Commission Appointments" provided by the East Greenwich Town Council was sufficient under R.I.G.L. § 42-46-§ 42-46-6(b) to inform the public that the Council would vote on the appointment of various persons to town boards and commissions, the Court said that "whether the notice provided by the town council fairly informed the public, under the totality of the circumstances, of the nature of the business to be conducted. In addition to satisfying the date and time requirements of § 42-46-6(b), the contents of the notice reasonably must describe the purpose of the meeting or the action proposed to be taken." *Id.* Finding it did not, the Court found the notice inadequate primarily because it did not indicate that votes would be taken on the appointment of interviewees to boards and commissions.

In contrast to *Tanner*, the notices at issue here indicate plainly as to what was happening at each of the Commission's 'meetings in this matter and that votes may be taken with respect to the construction of a new residential building and an addition to a multi-story addition at 56 Pratt Street. The Notices "(Notices") provide the following:

For the July 27 meeting agenda, the Applications' agenda item provides:

"PROJECT REVIEW
1. CASE 26.101, 56 PRATT STREET, House, 1857-75 (COLLEGE HILL)
The applicant is requesting the construction of a new residential building and a multi-story addition to the existing house."

For the August 24th and October 6th meetings, the Notice items are identical. It provides:

work to property in a historic district. Notwithstanding, the cited PHDC regulation goes beyond what is required by state law and provides for abutter notification - which was provided in this case.

"**PROJECT REVIEW**

1. CASE 26.101, 56 PRATT STREET, House, 1857-75 (COLLEGE HILL)
The applicant is requesting the construction of a four-unit, three-story with cellar residential building.
2. CASE 26.138, 56 PRATT STREET, House, 1857-75 (COLLEGE HILL)
The applicant is requesting the construction of a two-unit, three-story with cellar addition to rear of existing building."

In addition to the foregoing all of the agendas provide:

"All items on this agenda are for vote or other action unless otherwise noted"

The July 27th PHDC agenda is set forth below.[5] All agendas/Notices in this matter are attached to the Appellant's Memorandum at Exhibit 7.

5

CITY OF PROVIDENCE
MAYOR BRETT P. SMILEY

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING
All items on this agenda are for vote or other action unless otherwise noted.

Monday, July 27, 2026. 4:45 P.M.
Joseph A. Doorley, Jr. Municipal Building, 444 Westminster Street, 1st Floor meeting room, Providence RI 02903

The public and applicants may also participate and remotely view the meeting on the Zoom platform using the following link: https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84116008514 Participation is also available by telephone by dialing one of the following toll-free numbers: 301 715 8592, 305 224 1968, 309 205 3325, or 646 931 3860. The Webinar ID is: 841 1600 8514

OPENING SESSION/ROLL CALL

MINUTES
Approval of the June 22, 2026, meeting minutes.

PROJECT REVIEW
1. **CASE 26.101, 56 PRATT STREET, House, 1857-75 (COLLEGE HILL)**
   The applicant is requesting the construction of a new residential building and a multi-story addition to the existing house.

2. **CASE 26.105, 113 BROADWAY, Commercial Building, pre1875, 1921 (BROADWAY)**
   The applicant is requesting the demolition of the existing, non-contributing building.

3. **CASE 26.107, 42 HIDDEN STREET, Simeon Klein House, 1912-13 (COLLEGE HILL)**
   The applicant is requesting the demolition of the existing 1912 garage and the construction of a new two-story garage with ADU, and installation of an in-ground, therapeutic pool.

OTHER BUSINESS
Staff updates/reports.

ADJOURNMENT

POSTED 07/20/26

IMPORTANT INFORMATION
- All documents for the agenda items can be found no later than Friday, July 24th at: http://www.providenceri.gov/planning/providence-historic-district-commission-phdc/ Those who cannot access the documents electronically may call 401.680-8517 to make other arrangements to view the documents.
- Virtual access options are being provided only as a convenience and not as an official "location" where access to the meeting is guaranteed. Being physically present at the meeting is the only way to guarantee access to the meeting.
- The Commission encourages comments to be submitted no later than 24 hours before the meeting. Comments received after noon on the day of the meeting will not be considered. Comments accepted via email will be discussed at the meeting.
- The City of Providence is committed to providing individuals with disabilities an equal opportunity to participate in and benefit from the City's programs, activities, and services. If you have a disability and require accommodations in order to fully participate in this activity, contact Leonela Felix, Esq., Ethics Education and ADA Coordinator at 401.680.5333 or LFelix@ProvidenceRI.gov. Providing at least 72 hours' notice will help to ensure availability.
- Contact Jason Martin with the Department of Planning and Development at 401.680.8517, jmartin@providenceri.gov if you have any questions regarding this meeting.

The Appellants make much of the fact that the Notices does not indicate whether the PHDC was considering the Project for Conceptual Approval or a final Certificate of

Appropriateness and because of this, "there was no way to prepare for the meeting." Such argument is without merit. In their memorandum, the Appellant cite the Rhode Island Supreme Court case of *Anolik v. Zoning Bd. of Rev. of City of Newport,* 64 A.3d 1171, 1176 (R.I. 2013) for the proposition that an agenda item violated the Open Meetings Act despite including date, time and place of the meeting, because it failed to specify the nature of business to be discussed.

In *Anolik*, the following agenda item was listed on the Newport City Council docket:

> "IV. Communications]
> Request for Extension from Turner Scott received 1 1/3 0/08
> Re Petition of Congregation Jeshuat Israel"

In addressing the agenda item's compliance with the Open Meetings Act, the Court said,

> The agenda item further fails to provide any information as to exactly what was the reason for the requested extension or what would be its duration. In no way does the agenda item give notice that the request for extension was to extend the temporal parameters then in effect for the purpose of completing or substantially completing the improvements. Accordingly, we hold that this agenda item "does not reasonably describe the purpose of the meeting or the action proposed to be taken * * *" *See Tanner* 880 A. 2d at 798.

Anolik v. Zoning Bd. of Rev. of City of Newport, 64 A.3d 1171, 1176 (R.I. 2013).

However, in finding Newport's vague agenda item noncompliant, the Court also said the following in its opinion in *Anolik:*

> We have previously expressed our opinion that, when the General Assembly included in § 42-46-6(b) a requirement that there be "a statement specifying the nature of the business to be discussed," without explicitly indicating what such a statement should include, it "intended to establish a flexible standard aimed at providing fair notice to the public under the circumstances*** * * .**" *Tanner*, 880 A. 2d at 796**.** Accordingly, while declining to provide "specific guidelines or magic words," we held in *Tanner* that §42-46-6(b) requires the "public body to provide fair notice to the public under the circumstances, or such notice based on the totality of the circumstances as would fairly inform the public of the nature of the business to be discussed or acted upon." *Tanner*, 880 A. 2d at 797.

Anolik v. Zoning Bd. of Rev. of City of Newport, 64 A.3d 1171, 1176 (R.I. 2013).

In this matter, the Notices provided compliant notice to the public of the nature of the business to be discussed – that the Applicant was requesting the construction of a new residential building and a multi-story addition to the existing house at 56 Pratt Street in the College Hill Historic District of Providence, Rhode Island and that votes or other action may be taken on the matter. This is what R.I G. L. § 42-46-6(b) requires and PHDC has complied with its Open Meetings Act obligations. The distinction between conceptual and final approval is of no import with respect to public notice because the public is informed of the time and place of the meeting and the nature of the business to be discussed at the meeting. No more or less is required.

C. The weight of the evidence clearly demonstrates that the Project satisfies PHDC Standard 8, and the Board should affirm the PHDC.

> ***"The proposed building's form and siting are appropriate for the location. Pratt Street is a location that has minimal historical context as related to its streetscape, as the majority of buildings constructed on the street are from the mid-20th century and later. The Commission has approved multiple buildings of contemporary and modern design along the street, and this proposal is compliant within that context; The street hosts two properties designed by Friedrich St. Florian, who rightly referred to the street as a "laboratory" for architectural expression".***
>
> ***PHDC Staff Report – CASE 26.101, 56 PRATT STREET, House, 1857-75 (COLLEGE HILL)***

The Appellants argue that the weight of the evidence in the record does not support the PHDC's Decision, but that is clearly and unambiguously not the case. The Appellants contend that the Applications do not satisfy PHDC Standard 8, because it provides that for additions and new construction, "the new work may be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural features of the property and the surrounding neighborhood, to protect the historic integrity of the property and the site." *See* Appellants'

Memorandum at pg. 9. Further, Appellants contents that "additions must be "subservient to the historic resource." *Id.* at pg.10. And that that "neither the Addition nor New Construction qualifies.[6]

In evaluating, a project for a Certificate of Appropriateness, Section 6.1 of PHDC's Rules and Regulations provides that it shall use the criteria set forth in the Act and the Standards and Guidelines designed and approved by PHDC. Standard 8 and the Design Criteria for new Construction and Additions are set forth below[7]:

STANDARD 8

> 8. New additions, exterior alterations or new construction shall not destroy historic materials or general features that characterize the property. The new work may be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural features of the property and the surrounding neighborhood, to protect the historic integrity of the property and the site

---

[6] Appellants presented the testimony at the Clarke Schoettle, a former PHDC member, as an expert witness at the August 24, 2026, PHDC meeting to make the point that in his opinion the New Construction was not in keeping with the surrounding properties and suggested several changes to the design. With respect to the New Addition, Mr. Schoettle opined that although the Addition was large, it was allowed by zoning and much better than the New Construction. *See* August 24, 2026, PHDC Minutes. As discussed herein, the Applicant agreed to attend a design charette on September 29, 2026, hosted by the Providence Preservation Society (PPS) to discuss proposed design changes that had been articulated by Mr. Schoettle at the August 24, 2026, and comments from the Commission with respect to the New Construction (Case 26.101) and the Addition (Case 226.138) The October 6th Meeting minutes reflect the fact that the Applicant made significant changes to the New Construction and the Addition in response to comments made by Mr. Schoettle at the design charette and Commission members at the August 24, 2026 meeting. The record reflects that members commended the Applicant for attending design charette and responding to comments made by Mr. Schoettle and the Commission. *See* October 6, 2026 PHDC Minutes. Mr. Schoettle did not testify at the October 6th PHDC meeting and as a result the opinions offered regarding the Applicant's revised plans compliance with Standard 8 for the New Construction and the Addition contained in the Appellants' memorandum lack any probative value as it is not supported by the record. "Statements of counsel made in the course of argument, whether written or oral, do not constitute evidence, regardless of the form in which they are presented." Wood v. Ford, 525 A.2d 901, 903 (R.I. 1987) (holding that administrative decision based upon counsel's unsupported assertion was clearly erroneous)). Furthermore, the Appellants indicate that the "testimony of neighbors was equally critical." Appellants Memorandum at pg. 12. Such testimony also has no probative value. *Toohey v. Kilday*, 415 A.2d 732, 737 (R.I. 1980), citing *Smith v. Zoning Board of Review of Warwick*, 103 R.I. 328, 334, 237 A.2d 551, 554 (1968). *See also Goldstein v. Zoning Bd. of Review of Warwick*, 101 R.I. 728, 733, 227 A.2d 195 (1967) (testimony by nonexpert witnesses that erection of gasoline station would depreciate neighborhood property and that increasing flow of traffic would result in such congestion as to be hazard are lay judgments, lacking in expertise and therefore without probative force).

[7] [7] https://www.providenceri.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/Planning-PHDC_StandardsGuidelines2.pdf

In the section of the Standards and Guidelines entitled "New Constructions & Additions," the following criteria is found:

DESIGN CRITERIA

> Historic districts in Providence contain a wide variety of building types and architectural styles. While some streets demonstrate great similarity of building sizes, shapes, materials and setbacks, others are characterized by great diversity, demonstrating how a neighborhood has grown over time or how different activities were carried out in the same area. This variety makes it impossible to mandate a specific design for new construction. These guidelines therefore deal with general issues of building height, mass, scale, siting, rhythm, materials, etc. They are intended to provide a framework within which design creativity and the needs of the property owner can co-exist with respect for designated historic districts.
>
> New construction should reflect the design trends and concepts of the period in which it is created, while recognizing that a new building or addition must fit into an existing framework of a variety of older buildings. New structures should harmonize with existing older structures, and at the same time be distinct from the old so that the evolution of the district can be interpreted correctly. When designing an addition or a new building, consider the following architectural and site features in relationship to the existing structure and/or the surrounding structures:
>
> Height · Scale · Massing, form, proportions · Topography · Parking · Directional expression · Siting and setbacks · Landscaping · Roof shape · Height of foundation platform · Views · Sense of entry, porches, doors, stairs · Rhythm and size of openings · Known archeological features · Color and texture of materials · Architectural detail · Development patterns (Emphasis Added).

PHDC, Standards and Guidelines pg. 6 and pg. 48. *(Emphasis added).*

In an appeal of a decision of the PHDC, the Zoning Board "shall not substitute its own judgment for that of the commission but must consider the issue upon the findings and record of the commission." R.I. Gen. Laws § 45-24.1-9. Only when there is a lack of support by the

weight of the evidence in the record, can the zoning board reverse the decision of the PHDC. R.I. Gen. Laws § 45-24.1-9. In plain terms, this language means that an appeal is not a "do-over" or a brand-new hearing. Instead, a zoning board acts like an appellate court and must give high deference to the Commission's original ruling. A zoning board cannot overturn a decision simply because its members personally disagree with the Commission or would have voted differently if they had been in the Commission's shoes. Furthermore, in *Schofield v. Zoning Board of Review of the City of Cranston,* 99 R.I. 204, 208–09, 206 A.2d 524, 527 (1965), the Rhode Island Supreme Court held that a board decision is supported by legally competent evidence when members base their conclusions on knowledge acquired through personal observation of the Project and the specialized expertise imputed to them by virtue of their appointment. PHDC is a specialized body specifically appointed to safeguard the architectural and historical integrity of the historic districts in Providence. During the public hearings on this matter, PHDC did not rely on arbitrary preference or unstated assumptions. Rather, the members placed their specific observations, architectural analysis, and reasoning directly onto the record, relied on the Staff recommendation and granted the Applications both conceptual approvals and Certificates of Appropriateness.

In an appeal of this nature, appellant bodies-a zoning board of appeals and courts - routinely uphold local land use decisions grounded in the factual findings and technical evaluations of professional municipal staff. When a city planner, town engineer, or public works official provides a reasoned analysis supported by concrete site facts and applicable ordinance standards, reviewing courts treat that analysis as competent, probative, and substantial evidence. Rhode Island Superior Court precedent squarely enforces this principle. In *Asa S. Davis III v. Town of Exeter Zoning Board of Review*, C.A. No. WC-2019-0383 (R.I. Super. Ct. Sept. 28,

2022) (Taft-Carter, J.), cert. denied (R.I. Nov. 18, 2022), the Court affirmed a planning board's master plan denial where the board incorporated the Town Planner's analytical memorandum into its written findings of fact and relied upon a technical letter from the Town Public Works Director. Judge Taft-Carter held that the Town Planner's written review — which evaluated wetland impacts, Comprehensive Plan consistency, and factual discrepancies in the applicant's buffer renderings — alongside the Public Works Director's access determination provided competent, substantial record evidence that outweighed the applicant's unsubstantiated assertions. *Id.*

Judge Taft-Carter reached the same conclusion in upholding municipal approvals backed by reasoned staff reviews. In *Curtis H. Fisher v. Zoning Board of Review of the Town of North Kingstown*, C.A. No. WC-2022-0134 (R.I. Super. Ct. Feb. 13, 2023) (Taft-Carter, J.), the Court affirmed the grant of zoning relief where the board's written decision expressly incorporated the municipal Staff Report and Planning Commission Memorandum tying the project's physical scope and infrastructure upgrades to the Comprehensive Plan, holding that those reports constituted "substantial and probative evidence on the record." Similarly, in *Frenchtown Investors, LLC v. Zoning Board of Review of the Town of North Kingstown*, C.A. No. WC-2019-0237 (R.I. Super. Ct. Sept. 17, 2020) (Taft-Carter, J.), the Court upheld a board's reliance on the Supervising Planner's zoning and wellhead-protection analysis and the Planning Commission's technical report, ruling that those evaluations satisfied the "reliable, probative, and substantial evidence" standard. And in *United States Investment & Development Corp. v. The Platting Board of Review of the City of Cranston*, C.A. No. PC-2016-5739 (R.I. Super. Ct. Dec. 27, 2017) (Licht, J.) the Court affirmed Master/Preliminary Plan approval for a 10 MW solar array, relying directly on the City Planning Department Staff Report presented by Principal Planner Jason

Pezzullo and the Comprehensive Plan analysis of Planning Director Peter Lapolla. Judge Richard Licht noted that the Planning Staff "took great lengths in enumerating its reasoning for its finding that the use is consistent with the comprehensive plan" and that the Staff Report's ecological and land-management findings — unrebutted by contrary evidence—provided the "great weight of the competent evidence in the record."

There can be no doubt that the decision of PHDC to grant Conceptual Approvals and Certificates of the Applications is clearly supported by the weight of the probative evidence in the record. In this case, the significant probative evidence that PHDC relied upon in coming to its conclusion was the testimony and staff reports of PHDC Jason Martin, the Preservation Planner for the City of Providence. [8] It is the well-established procedure of PHDC for Mr. Martin, as its preservation planner, to prepare a staff report and to provide project review comments on applications before it, as required by Section 6.2 (A) of PHDC Rule and Regulations. As the record indicates in the matter, Mr. Martin prepared a staff report and provided his project review comments on the Applications at each stage of approval on each hearing date.

And what makes Mr. Martin's testimony and reports particularly credible is that municipal planners, unlike applicant-retained or objector-retained experts, owe their professional duty to the municipality and the general public.

With respect to New Construction (Case 26.101) and the Addition (Case 26.138), Mr. Martin took great lengths to enumerate his reasons why the New Construction and the Addition are consistent with Standard 8 and articulated those reasons in his staff report and in testimony

[8] Jason Martin is the Preservation Planner at the City of Providence, RI, and has been in this position for 25 years. He has a Master of Science degree from The School of the Art Institute of Chicago. He is the primary staff person for the PHDC.

before the PHDC at its meetings.

In evaluating the Applications, it is evident that the Commission members were thoughtful, deliberate, discerning and faithful to their obligation to the Act and the Standard and Guidelines of the PHDC. They did not rubber stamp the Applications. To the contrary, after granting Conceptual Approval for the New Construction on July 27th, the PHDC continued the COA hearing on the New Construction from the August 24th meeting to attend a design charette hosted by the Providence Preservation Society (PPS) to discuss proposed design changes that had been articulated by an expert witness, Clarke Schoettle, and comments from the Commission. The Applicant incorporated many of the suggestions received in revised plans and it was not until the October 6th meeting that the new Construction obtained the COA from PHDC. With respect to the Addition, the PHDC denied Conceptual Approval to the Applicant's original proposal on July 27th and only granted Conceptual Approval to the Addition after the new submission was found substantially and materially different from the denied application. After still further revisions as a result of the design charette, the Addition obtained the COA from PHDC. Accordingly, there is sufficient support in the record to support the weight of the evidence that approvals in this matter were properly issued.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set of the herein, the Conceptual Approvals and COA of the PHDC with respect to the Applications should be sustained because the PHDC did not commit procedural error and there is sufficient support for such approvals by the weight of the evidence in the record.

Respectfully submitted,

Applicant,
Nathaniel Sliney

By his Attorneys,

/s/ John J. Garrahy

John J. Garrahy (3113)
John J. Garrahy Law LLC
2088 Broad Street
Cranston, Rhode Island 02908
(401) 383-3830
jgarrahy@garrahylaw.com

/s/ Mark Liberati
Mark Liberati, Esquire (1909)
2 Old Walcott Avenue
Jamestown, Rhode Island 02835
mark@lp.legal

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that on the 16th day of November 2026, this document was emailed to the following parties:

David Marks, Esquire
Ursillo, Teitz & Ritch, Ltd.
2 Williams Street
Providence, Rhode Island 02903
davidmarks@utrlaw.com

Sharon Garner, Esquire
444 Westminster Street
Providence, Rhode Island 02903
sgarner@providenceri.gov

Alexis Thompson
444 Westminster Street
780 Allens Avenue
Providence, Rhode Island 02905
athompson@providenceri.gov

Boupha Sath
780 Allens Avenue
Providence, Rhode Island 02905
bsath@providenceri.gov

Megan DiSanto, Esquire
444 Westminster Street
Providence, Rhode Island 02905
mdisanto@providenceri.gov

Mark Liberati, Esquire
2 Old Walcott Avenue
Jamestown, Rhode Island 02835
mark@lp.legal

/s/ John J. Garrahy

EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT A

CITY OF PROVIDENCE

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

MINUTES ● JULY 27, 2026

Regular Meeting | **444 Westminster St., 1st Fl., Conf. Room** | **4:49 PM**

Joseph A. Doorley, Jr. Municipal Building, Providence, RI 02903

OPENING SESSION

PRESENT: Brennan, Mukoyama, Carden, Lund, Fernandez, Martin
ABSENT: Sharma, Bay, Haggerty, Verity
Staff Present: Jason Martin, Sharon Garner, esq., Blake Horne

MINUTES

Approval of June 22, 2026, Historic District Commission Regular Meeting Minutes

RESULT:	**APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]**
MOVER:	Matthew Brennan, Regular Member
SECONDER:	Pabel Fernandez, Regular Member
AYES:	Brennan, Mukoyama, Carden, Lund, Fernandez

PROJECT REVIEW

1. CASE 26.101, 56 PRATT STREET, House, 1857-75 (COLLEGE HILL)

Mr. David Sisson, architect, and Mr. Mark Liberati, esq., representing the owner, appeared before the Commission requesting that as part of the subdivision of the property into two parcels, the applicant is requesting the construction of a three-story addition with cellar to the existing building (north parcel), and the new construction of a three-story with cellar, multi-family residence (south parcel).

Mr. Martin gave an introduction. This is a conceptual review. Staff recommends bifurcating review into two sections: new construction of a three-story with cellar multi-family residence (south); and major alterations: the construction of a three-story with cellar addition to the existing building (north). The applicant agreed, the application was bifurcated. Mr. Simmons gave an overview of the project.

Mr. Martin continued with his staff report and recommendations. 56 Pratt Street is a parcel that contains a structure of historical and architectural significance that contributes to the significance of the College Hill local historic district, having been recognized as a contributing structure to the College Hill National Register Historic District. The parcel shall be subdivided to allow for a vacant parcel that the new construction will be built upon. The proposed building's form and siting are appropriate for the location. Pratt Street is a location that has minimal historical context as related to its streetscape, as the majority of buildings constructed on the street are from the mid-20th century and later. The Commission has approved multiple buildings of contemporary and modern design along the street, and this proposal is compliant within that context; The street hosts two properties designed by Friedrich St. Florian, who rightly referred to the street as a "laboratory" for architectural expression. The proposed structure will require some fenestration along the gas modified appears to be zoning compliant. Plans and photos have been submitted. The application for New Construction is considered complete for conceptual review. Mr. Martin noted that the cellar level's front (west) elevation would need some glazing to conform to zoning requirements. The work as proposed is in accord with PHDC Standard 8 as follows: as the proposed new construction is conceptually appropriate having determined that the proposed construction is architecturally and historically compatible with the property and district having an appropriate size, scale and form that will not have an adverse effect on the property or district, as Pratt Street has been identified by the Commission as a street that can support contemporary and modern architecture as the majority of properties on the street were constructed in the mid-20th century and later.

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

- An email in opposition to the proposal from Hank Heneghan and Elizabeth Porter, 109 Pratt St, was read and submitted as part of Exhibit 1;
- An email in opposition to the proposal from Olivia Katz and Chris Borgstrom, 54 Pratt Street, was submitted as part of Exhibit 1;
- Dr. Frank Faltus, 124 Congdon Street, was opposed, objecting to the scale of the proposed construction;
- Maris Brown, Executive Director, Providence Preservation Society, commented that modern architecture was appropriate for Pratt Street. Noted that the design seemed "dark, foreboding" and that a change to "lighter" materials

would be helpful;
- Hank Henegran, 109 Pratt Street, was opposed to the proposal, concerned with size and scale reinforced comments made as part of his email entered, previously entered as part of Exhibit 1; and,

Public comment was closed.

The Commission had the following comments: overall well received by the Commission, the phrase "dare to be different" was used to illustrate what could be appropriate for Pratt Street given its historical and architectural context. Agreed materials could be "lighter".

A motion was made stating: The application is considered complete. 56 Pratt Street is a parcel that contains a structure of historical and architectural significance that contributes to the significance of the College Hill local historic district, having been recognized as a contributing structure to the College Hill National Register Historic District. The parcel shall be subdivided to allow for a vacant parcel that the new construction will be built upon. The Commission grants Conceptual Approval of the new construction, citing Standard 8, having determined that the proposed construction is architecturally and historically compatible with the property and district having an appropriate size, scale and form that will not have an adverse effect on the property or district, citing and agreeing to the recommendations in the staff report, with the applicant to return for Final Approval once the parcel has been subdivided.

RESULT:	**CONCEPTUALLY APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]**
MOVER:	Sumi Mukoyama, Regular Member
SECONDER:	Nathaniel Carden, Regular Member
AYES:	Brennan, Mukoyama, Carden, Lund, Fernandez

Discussion turned to the proposed Major Alterations. Mr. Martin gave a staff report and recommendations. 56 Pratt Street is a parcel that contains a structure of historical and architectural significance that contributes to the significance of the College Hill local historic district, having been recognized as a contributing structure to the College Hill National Register Historic District. Plans and photos have been submitted. The application for Major Alterations is considered complete for conceptual review. The application has been bifurcated to remove the separate proposed new construction of a three-story with cellar on the lot (lot to be subdivided), which is being reviewed separately. The applicant's appeared as a Preliminary Application at the Commission's June 22nd meeting where the proposal was discussed. The Commission's the general consensus was that it was inappropriate as it is too large and needs to be subservient to the existing house. Suggestions were to reduce the mass and also to camouflage the addition with material color to help minimize its appearance. The applicant has revised the drawings, and the proposal is slightly smaller in height but still too large in scale and mass. The upper floor of the addition is a full story above the historic resources' roofline. It is definitively not subservient to the historic resource. The submission is not zoning compliant, at minimum not conforming to section 402.A, exceeding the number of allowed stories. The work as proposed is not in accord with PHDC Standard 8 being architecturally and historically incompatible with the property and district having an inappropriate size, scale and form that will have an adverse effect on the property or district, as the proposed addition is not subservient to the historic resource, being too large in scale for both height and width, being a full-story above the historic resource and being wider than the existing resource. It is Staff's recommendation that the application be denied. The applicant must wait one-year to return to the Commission, or the applicant can return to the Commission with a materially different submission that ideally conforms to zoning as if the Commission votes and accepts that submission.

The Chair asked for public comment. The following public comment was taken:
- Chris Borgstrom, 54 Pratt Street, was opposed to the proposal, concerned with size and scale; also submitted email (Exhibit 1);
- Hank Heneghan, 109 Pratt Street, reinforced comments made as part of his email entered, previously entered as part of Exhibit 1;
- Zehra Rizvi, Pratt Street, was opposed to the proposal, concerned with size and scale of the addition; and,

Public comment was closed.

The Commission had the following comments: members were in agreement with staff that the proposed addition was too large "dwarfs the building" and was clearly not subservient to the historic resource. Agreed denial was the best route, with the applicant able to return with a substantially different application at a future meeting.

A motion was made stating: The application for 56 Pratt Street, a structure of historical and architectural significance to the College Hill local historic district, recognized as a contributing structure to the College Hill National Register Historic District is

considered complete for conceptual review. The application has been bifurcated to remove the proposed separate new construction of a three-story with cellar on the lot, which is being reviewed separately. The Commission cites Standard 8 in denying the application for the proposed addition to 56 Pratt Street as it is not in accord with PHDC Standard 8, being architecturally and historically incompatible with the property and district having an inappropriate size, scale and form that will have an adverse effect on the property or district, as the proposed addition is not subservient to the historic resource, being too large in scale for both height and width, being a full-story above the historic resource and being wider than the existing resource.

RESULT:	**DENIED [4 TO 1]**
MOVER:	Matthew Brennan, Regular Member
SECONDER:	Pabel Fernandez, Regular Member
AYES:	Brennan, Mukoyama, Lund, Fernandez
NAYES:	Carden

2. CASE 26.105, 113 BROADWAY, Commercial Building, pre1875, 1921 (BROADWAY)

Mr. Pedro Borda, applicant/architect, and Mr. Scott Acedo, owner, appeared before the Commission requesting the demolition of the existing building, a non-contributing structure.

Mr. Martin gave a staff report. **Significance:** The building proposed for demolition is a non-contributing structure with minimal architectural or historical merit. The existing building is not within the Armory/Broadway National Register Historic District. This National Register district was expanded in 2008, specifically looking at the properties east of Dean Street and this property was not included, being deemed ineligible. Research within the included structural report and of Sanborn maps show the original wood-frame building was constructed before 1875 and was primarily a residence with some commercial use below. Post 1962 the building was modified to its current configuration which included CMU additions and a brick façade applied to the front elevation (1922). As detailed in the structural report the structure has significant structural deterioration and is a potential hazard to the public. The owner's intent is to build a commercial/hotel property on this location. The removal of the building will not irreparably diminish the architectural or historical character of the property or district as a whole. **Demolition Alternatives:** Staff is satisfied that given the minimal architectural and historical significance, there are no alternatives to demolition because no reasonable expectation exists that the structure can be sold for preservation either on or off site. It is staff's recommendation that the documentation requirements relative to demolition alternatives and financial information for the garage be waived as it pertains to a non-contributing structure. **Demolition Criteria:** Staff has determined that the building slated for demolition is a non-contributing structure and would use the PHDC's secondary criteria for approving demolition. This proposal meets these criteria, in that it will have little effect on surrounding buildings or on the district as a whole, having been modified in a way that has caused its structural integrity to be impacted, creating a public hazard that cannot be remedied at a reasonable cost to the owners

Staff made the following recommendations as findings of fact:

a) The building at 113 Broadway is a non-contributing structure and has minimal to no historical and architectural significance, both on its own merit and in relation to the surrounding Broadway local historic district, having been evaluated for inclusion into the Broadway/Armory National Register Historic District and found to be ineligible. The removal of the building is consistent with the non-contributing criteria of the PHDC demolition guidelines, in that it would have little impact on the property and the district as a whole, having been modified in a way that has caused its structural integrity to be impacted, creating a public hazard that cannot be remedied at a reasonable cost to the owners;
b) The application for demolition is complete. The PHDC waives the requirement for documenting financial information relative to the demolition, because the building slated for demolition is a non-contributing structure;
c) The PHDC is satisfied that there are no alternatives to demolition because no reasonable expectation exists that the non-contributing structure can be sold for preservation either on or off site;
d) The review of the proposed demolition is hereby completed in one meeting, as allowed for non-contributing structures under the PHDC demolition guidelines; and,
e) The work as proposed is in accord with PHDC Standard 8 in the following way: the work will be done so that it does not destroy the historic character of the property or the district, having been modified in a way that has caused its structural integrity to be impacted, creating a public hazard that cannot be remedied at a reasonable cost to the owners.

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

A motion was made stating: 113 Broadway is a non-contributing structure and has minimal to no historical and architectural

significance, both on its own merit and in relation to the surrounding Broadway local historic district, having been deemed ineligible for inclusion in the Broadway/Armory National Register Historic District. The application for demolition is complete. The Commission waives the requirement for documenting financial information relative to the demolition, because the building slated for demolition is a non-contributing structure. The Commission is satisfied that there are no alternatives to demolition because no reasonable expectation exists that the secondary structure can be sold for preservation either on or off site. The review of the proposed demolition is hereby completed in one meeting, as allowed for secondary and non-contributing structures under the Commission's demolition guidelines. The Commission grants Final Approval of the application as submitted, citing Standard 8, as its removal would have little impact on the property and the district as a whole, being a non-contributing structure that has been deemed ineligible for inclusion in the Broadway/Armory National Register Historic District, citing and agreeing with the recommendations in the staff report, with staff to review any additional required details.

RESULT:	**APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]**
MOVER:	Sumi Mukoyama, Regular Member
SECONDER:	Matthew Brennan, Regular Member
AYES:	Brennan, Mukoyama, Carden, Lund, Fernandez

3. CASE 26.107, 42 HIDDEN STREET, Simeon Klein House, 1912-13 (COLLEGE HILL)

Mr. Peter Casale, applicant, appeared before the Commission requesting the demolition of the existing garage, a secondary structure, not identified in the College Hill NRHD; the construction of a new two-story garage with Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU); and minor alterations (site improvements) installation of an in-ground, therapeutic pool.

Mr. Martin gave a staff report. The scope of work proposed consists of Demolition, New Construction, and Minor Alterations (Site Improvements). Staff recommends bifurcating the application between the demolition and the new construction/minor alterations. The applicant agreed, the application was bifurcated. Mr. Martin gave a staff report regarding the proposed demolition. **Significance:** The building proposed for demolition is a secondary structure with minimal architectural or historical merit. The existing wood, two-bay, one-story with hip roof garage is not identified within the College Hill . The removal of the building will not irreparably diminish the architectural or historical character of the property or district as a whole. **Demolition Alternatives:** Staff is satisfied that given the minimal architectural and historical significance, there are no alternatives to demolition because no reasonable expectation exists that the structure can be sold for preservation either on or off site. It is staff's recommendation that the documentation requirements relative to demolition alternatives and financial information for the garage be waived as it pertains to a secondary, non-contributing structure. **Demolition Criteria:** Staff has determined that the building slated for demolition is a secondary, non-contributing structure and would use the PHDC's secondary criteria for approving demolition. This proposal meets these criteria, in that it will have little effect on surrounding buildings or on the district as a whole, having been separated and no longer associated with its original property.

Staff made the following recommendations as findings of fact:

a) The wood, two-bay, one-story with hip roof garage at 42 Hidden Street is a secondary, non-contributing structure and has minimal to no historical and architectural significance, both on its own merit and in relation to the surrounding College Hill local historic district. The removal of the building is consistent with the secondary non-contributing criteria of the PHDC demolition guidelines, in that it would have little impact on the property and the district as a whole, having not been identified in the College Hill NRHD;
b) The application for demolition is complete. The PHDC waives the requirement for documenting financial information relative to the demolition, because the building slated for demolition is a secondary non-contributing structure;
c) The PHDC is satisfied that there are no alternatives to demolition because no reasonable expectation exists that the secondary structure can be sold for preservation either on or off site;
d) The review of the proposed demolition is hereby completed in one meeting, as allowed for secondary and non-contributing structures under the PHDC demolition guidelines; and,
e) The work as proposed is in accord with PHDC Standard 8 in the following way: the work will be done so that it does not destroy the historic character of the property or the district.

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

- An email from Emily Wright, 165 Prospect Street, in support of the proposal was read and entered into the record (Exhibit 2); and,

Public comment was closed.

A motion was made stating: The wood, two-bay, one-story with hip-roof garage at 42 Hidden Street is a secondary, non-

contributing structure and has minimal to no historical and architectural significance, both on its own merit and in relation to the surrounding College Hill local historic district, having not been identified in the College Hill NRHD. The application for demolition is complete. The Commission waives the requirement for documenting financial information relative to the demolition, because the building slated for demolition is a secondary non-contributing structure. The Commission is satisfied that there are no alternatives to demolition because no reasonable expectation exists that the secondary structure can be sold for preservation either on or off site. The review of the proposed demolition is hereby completed in one meeting, as allowed for secondary and non-contributing structures under the Commission's demolition guidelines. The Commission grants Final Approval of the demolition portion of the application as submitted, citing Standard 8, as its removal would have little impact on the property and the district as a whole, having not been identified in the College Hill NRHD, citing and agreeing with the recommendations in the staff report, with staff to review any additional required details.

RESULT:	**APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]**
MOVER:	Matthew Brennan, Regular Member
SECONDER:	Pabel Fernandez, Regular Member
AYES:	Brennan, Mukoyama, Carden, Lund, Fernandez

Discussion turned to the proposed new construction and minor alterations. Mr. Martin gave a staff report and recommendations. 41 Hidden Street is a structure of historical and architectural significance that contributes to the significance of the College Hill local historic district, having been recognized as a contributing structure to the College Hill National Register Historic District. The application for New Construction is considered complete for review. The proposed building's form and siting are appropriate for the location. The proposed structure appears to be zoning compliant. The installation of a below ground pool is appropriate. Plans and photos have been submitted. The work as proposed is in accord with PHDC Standard 8 as follows: as the proposed new construction is appropriate having determined that the proposed construction is architecturally and historically compatible with the property and district having an appropriate size, scale and form that will not have an adverse effect on the property or district.

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

A motion was made stating that: The application is considered complete. 42 Hidden Street is a structure of historical and architectural significance that contributes to the significance of the College Hill local historic district, having been recognized as a contributing structure to the College Hill National Register Historic District. The Commission grants Final Approval of the new construction and minor alterations, citing Standard 8, having determined that the proposed construction is architecturally and historically compatible with the property and district having an appropriate size, scale and form that will not have an adverse effect on the property or district, citing and agreeing to the recommendations in the staff report, with staff to review any additional details.

RESULT:	**APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]**
MOVER:	Matthew Brennan, Regular Member
SECONDER:	Sumi Mukoyama, Regular Member
AYES:	Brennan, Mukoyama, Carden, Lund, Fernandez

ADJOURNMENT 6:05PM (PF, MB)

CITY OF PROVIDENCE

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

MINUTES ● AUGUST 24, 2026

Regular Meeting | **444 Westminster St., 1st Fl., Conf. Room** | **4:50 PM**

Joseph A. Doorley, Jr. Municipal Building, Providence, RI 02903

OPENING SESSION

PRESENT: Mukoyama, Carden, Haggerty, Lund, Verity, Fernandez, Chaudhary
ABSENT: Sharma, Brennan, Bay
Staff Present: Jason Martin, Megan DiSanto, Blake Horne

MINUTES

Approval of July 27, 2026, Historic District Commission Regular Meeting Minutes

RESULT:	**APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]**
MOVER:	Pabel Fernandez, Regular Member
SECONDER:	James Verity, Regular Member
AYES:	Fernandez , Verity, Carden, Haggerty, Lund, Mukoyama

PROJECT REVIEW

1. CASE 26.101, 56 PRATT STREET, House, 1857-75 (COLLEGE HILL)

Mr. David Sisson, architect, via Zoom, Mr. Steve Gilbert, architect, and Mr. Mark Liberati, Esq., representing the owner, appeared before the Commission requesting that as part of the subdivision of the property into two parcels, the construction of a new three-story with cellar, four-family residence (aka south parcel).

Mr. Martin gave an introduction. 56 Pratt Street is a parcel that contains a structure of historical and architectural significance that contributes to the significance of the College Hill local historic district, having been recognized as a contributing structure to the College Hill National Register Historic District; The parcel shall be subdivided to create a vacant parcel that the new construction will be built upon. The proposal was granted conceptual approval at the July 27th meeting (Res26-07). The proposed building's form and siting are appropriate for the location. Pratt Street is a location that has minimal historical context as related to its streetscape, as the majority of buildings constructed on the street are from the mid-20th century and later. The Commission has approved multiple buildings of contemporary and modern design along the street, and this proposal is compliant within that context; The street hosts two properties designed by Friedrich St. Florian, who rightly referred to the street as a "laboratory" for architectural expression. The parcel shall be subdivided to create a vacant parcel that the new construction will be built upon. The proposed structure appears to be zoning compliant. Revised plans and photos have been submitted. The application for New Construction is considered complete for review. The work as proposed is in accord with PHDC Standard 8 as follows: having determined that the proposed new construction is appropriate as it is architecturally and historically compatible with the property and district having an appropriate size, scale and form that will not have an adverse effect on the property or district, as Pratt Street has been identified by the Commission as a street that can support contemporary and modern architecture as the majority of properties on the street were constructed in the 20th and 21st Centuries, most reviewed and approved by the Commission, and this proposal is congruous with the street's development. Mr. Simmons gave an overview of the proposed materials.

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

- An email in opposition to the proposal from Qingqing "Cath" Cai and Henry Hawk, 105 Pratt St, was submitted as part of Exhibit 1;
- An email in opposition to the proposal from Laura Donahue, 101 Pratt St, was submitted as part of Exhibit 1;
- An email in opposition to the proposal from Anne Hart, 162 Pratt St, was submitted as part of Exhibit 1;
- An email in opposition to the proposal from Stephen Lynch, 100 Pratt St, was submitted as part of Exhibit 1;
- An email in opposition to the proposal from Michael Sandoval, 97 Pratt St, was submitted as part of Exhibit 1;

- An email in opposition to the proposal from Peter Andrews, 41 Pratt St, was submitted as part of Exhibit 1;
- An email in opposition to the proposal from Charles and Joy Wharton, 4 Jenckes St, was submitted as part of Exhibit 1;
- An email in opposition to the proposal from Karen Hebb, 120 Pratt St, was submitted as part of Exhibit 1;
- An email in opposition to the proposal from Hank Heneghan and Elizabeth Porter, 109 Pratt St, was submitted as part of Exhibit 1;
- An email in opposition to the proposal from Michael Sandoval, 97 Pratt St, was submitted as part of Exhibit 1;
- An email in opposition to the proposal from Olivia Katz and Chris Borgstrom, 54 Pratt Street, was submitted as part of Exhibit 1;
- An email in opposition to the proposal from Karen Borger, 11 Jenckes St, was submitted as part of Exhibit 1;
- An email in opposition to the proposal from Helen Grundman, 169 Pratt St, was submitted as part of Exhibit 1;
- An email in opposition to the proposal from Karim Khanbhai, 103 Pratt St, was submitted as part of Exhibit 1;
- An email in opposition to the proposal from Douglas Grundman, 169 Pratt St, was submitted as part of Exhibit 1;
- An email in opposition to the proposal from Sarah "Sally" Herreid, 37 Pratt St, was submitted as part of Exhibit 1;
- A petition titled “PETITION OF RESIDENTS OPPOSING THE 56 PRATT STREET APPLICATIONS” containing approximately 33 signatures was submitted as part of Exhibit 1;
- George Wichart, 147 Benefit Street, was in opposition to the proposal;
- Julia Katz, 16 Pratt Street, was in opposition to the proposal;
- Steven & Sue Lynch, 100 Pratt Street, was in opposition to the proposal;
- Joyce Lilly, Williams Street, was in opposition to the proposal;
- Andy Robbins, 44 Pratt Street, was in opposition to the proposal;
- Chris Borgstrom, 54 Pratt Street, was in opposition to the proposal;
- Geraldine Killilea, 93 Pratt Street, was in opposition to the proposal;
- Sue Lynch, 100 Pratt Street, was in opposition to the proposal;
- Helen Grundman, 169 Pratt Street, was okay with proposal but thought building should be set back more;
- Councilor Jill Davisdson, Ward 2, expressed that a sidewalk should be installed as part of the development;
- Amy Goins, Esq., Ursillo, Teitz & Ritch, Ltd., representing Frank Faltus, Olivia Katz and Chris Borgstrom, introduced Clark Schoettle as an expert witness. Mr. Schoettle was accepted by the Commission as an expert witness. The witness contends that the proposed design was not in keeping with the surrounding properties; that the roof form was flat as opposed to gabled and that the openings and fenestration is out of character with its surroundings. Mr. Schoettle suggested the following changes to the design: floor height could be reduced from the proposed 12’, with a reduction to 10’ allowing for a reduction in height by 6½ feet; more continuity to materials; 6-lite windows instead of four would help align and carry design throughout; rethinking how third floor roof overhangs the porch: remove roof, would create a lower sense of front plane of the building; reduce the vertical elements overall;
- Dr. Frank Faltus, 124 Congdon Street, was opposed, objecting to the scale of the proposed construction;
- Sara Bell was in favor of the development;
- Hank Heneghan, 109 Pratt Street, had concerns regarding the ability to negotiate the proposed parking spaces and concern regarding an existing pole-mounted transformer;
- Elizabeth Porter, 109 Pratt Street, was in opposition to the proposal;
- Alex Prosti, 102 Pratt Street, was in opposition to the proposal;
- Laura Donahue, 101 Pratt Street, was in opposition to the proposal;
- Olivia Katz, 54 Pratt Street, was in opposition to the proposal; and,

Public comment was closed.

The Commission has the following comments: articulation of the form that has been granted conceptual can still be modified; agreed with Mr. Schoettle’s points towards massing and emphasizing horizontality over verticality; symmetry is a formal gesture, less memorable; long glazing elements emphasize verticality, could be modified; too many materials: reduce and tone down; examine other material colors so building seems less “masculine”, lighter,

brighter would help; reduction/removal of the third floor porch roof element would be helpful in in reducing appearance of verticalness

With agreement form the applicant, a motion was made to continue the application, with the applicant to return with revised drawings at a subsequent meeting.

RESULT:	**CONTINUED [UNANIMOUS] Next: 10/6/2026 4:45 PM**
MOVER:	Catherine Lund, Vice-Chair
SECONDER:	Sumi Mukoyama, Regular Member
AYES:	Lund, Mukoyama, Carden, Fernandez, Haggerty, Verity

2. CASE 26.138, 56 PRATT STREET, House, 1857-75 (COLLEGE HILL)

Mr. David Sisson, architect, via Zoom, Mr. Steve Gilbert, architect, and Mr. Mark Liberati, Esq., representing the owner, appeared before the Commission requesting that as part of the subdivision of the property into two parcels, the applicant is requesting the construction of a two-unit, three-story with cellar addition to the existing building (aka north parcel).

Mr. Martin gave an introduction. 56 Pratt Street is a structure of historical and architectural significance that contributes to the significance of the College Hill local historic district, having been recognized as a contributing structure to the College Hill National Register Historic District. The applicants previously appeared as a Preliminary Application at the Commission's June 22nd meeting where the previous proposal was discussed. The Commission's general consensus was that it was inappropriate as it is too large and needs to be subservient to the existing house. Suggestions were to reduce the mass and also to camouflage the addition with material color to help minimize its appearance. The applicant appeared at the July 27th meeting. The applicant had revised the drawings, and the proposal was slightly smaller in height but still too large in scale and mass. The upper floor of the addition is a full story above the historic resources' roofline. The submission is not zoning compliant, at minimum not conforming to section 402.A, exceeding the number of allowed stories. It is definitively not subservient to the historic resource. The application was denied (Res26-08). The new submission is substantially and materially different from the denied application and is considered complete for review; Staff recommends a motion be made from the Commission stating this.

A motion was made stating that the new submission is substantially and materially different from the denied application and is considered complete for review.

RESULT:	**APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]**
MOVER:	James Verity, Deputy Vice-Chair
SECONDER:	Nathaniel Carden, Regular Member
AYES:	Verity, Carden, Fernandez, Haggerty, Lund, Mukoyama

Mr. Sisson gave a presentation highlighting the changes in the proposal.

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

- An email in opposition to the proposal from Qingqing "Cath" Cai and Henry Hawk, 105 Pratt St, was submitted as part of Exhibit 1;
- An email in opposition to the proposal from Laura Donahue, 101 Pratt St, was submitted as part of Exhibit 1;
- An email in opposition to the proposal from Anne Hart, 162 Pratt St, was submitted as part of Exhibit 1;
- An email in opposition to the proposal from Stephen Lynch, 100 Pratt St, was submitted as part of Exhibit 1;
- An email in opposition to the proposal from Michael Sandoval, 97 Pratt St, was submitted as part of Exhibit 1;
- An email in opposition to the proposal from Peter Andrews, 41 Pratt St, was submitted as part of Exhibit

1;
- An email in opposition to the proposal from Charles and Joy Wharton, 4 Jenckes St, was submitted as part of Exhibit 1;
- An email in opposition to the proposal from Karen Hebb, 120 Pratt St, was submitted as part of Exhibit 1;
- An email in opposition to the proposal from Hank Heneghan and Elizabeth Porter, 109 Pratt St, was submitted as part of Exhibit 1;
- An email in opposition to the proposal from Michael Sandoval, 97 Pratt St, was submitted as part of Exhibit 1;
- An email in opposition to the proposal from Olivia Katz and Chris Borgstrom, 54 Pratt Street, was submitted as part of Exhibit 1;
- An email in opposition to the proposal from Karen Borger, 11 Jenckes St, was submitted as part of Exhibit 1;
- An email in opposition to the proposal from Helen Grundman, 169 Pratt St, was submitted as part of Exhibit 1;
- An email in opposition to the proposal from Karim Khanbhai, 103 Pratt St, was submitted as part of Exhibit 1;
- An email in opposition to the proposal from Douglas Grundman, 169 Pratt St, was submitted as part of Exhibit 1;
- An email in opposition to the proposal from Sarah "Sally" Herreid, 37 Pratt St, was submitted as part of Exhibit 1;
- A petition titled “PETITION OF RESIDENTS OPPOSING THE 56 PRATT STREET APPLICATIONS” containing approximately 33 signatures was submitted as part of Exhibit 1;
- Jennifer Laurelli, 16 Pratt Street, was in opposition to the proposal;
- Amy Goins, Esq., Ursillo, Teitz & Ritch, Ltd., representing Frank Faltus, Olivia Katz and Chris Borgstrom, disputed that the application is materially and substantially different; introduced Clark Schoettle as an expert witness. Mr. Schoettle was previously accepted by the Commission as an expert witness. He stated that this design is much better than the new construction design. Addition is large, perhaps larger than the house, but allowed by zoning; no site plan showing abutting properties, questioned whether an engineer’s drawing is required showing proposal and abutting properties; thought this would help in better understanding the projects and how they interact with the surrounding built environment; Ms. Goins argued that Commission is missing a step because not conceptual, but final approval is being requested/given;
- Syed Rizvi, 107 Pratt Street, was in opposition to the proposal;
- Chris Borgstrom, 54 Pratt Street, was in opposition to the proposal;
- Joyce Lilly, 59 Williams Street, was in opposition to the proposal;
- Rachel Bell, was in opposition to the proposal;
- Hank Heneghan, 109 Pratt Street, was in opposition to the proposal;
- Olivia Katz, 54 Pratt Street, was in opposition to the proposal;
- Laura Donahue, 101 Pratt Street, was in opposition to the proposal; and,

Public comment was closed.

The Commission has the following comments: reinforced that the proposal was substantially and materially different; removed height and width, now visually behind the historic resource; the addition is, in some ways, emulating the historic resource, and in other ways, not; it could potentially benefit from taking it a step further to think about what the gesture is, or that we see in the existing home, which seems to be defined by more of a balanced asymmetry versus another kind of symmetrical and vertically oriented architectural language; would encourage the design team to think about particularly the bay window, and how the bay window is a really defining gesture of the architecture for the edition, and if that might benefit from learning from the existing house a little bit more, how the elevations of the front side are not just a grid of windows, for instance, at the street or the sides, and that maybe there could be more of a rhythm to the openings, or maybe the bay window would better serve living rooms and bedrooms versus bathrooms and closets, which seem to be, at least for the upper floors, what part of the building plan, that element is serving; materiality of

that connector; widow's walk details; Grant conceptual approval? Perhaps (Staff explained conceptual approval, how this term is primarily for new construction projects, not additions like this one. That being said the Commission can grant a conceptual approval although in this case the applicant had requested final approval and the applicant would need to agree to conceptual approval. The applicant did agree they would accept a conceptual approval.

A motion was made stating that the application for 56 Pratt Street, a structure of historical and architectural significance to the College Hill local historic district, recognized as a contributing structure to the College Hill National Register Historic District is considered complete for conceptual review. The Commission cites Standard 8 in granting Conceprtual Approval for the proposed addition to 56 Pratt Street as it is in accord with PHDC Standard 8, being architecturally and historically compatible with the property and district having an appropriate size, scale and form that will not have an adverse effect on the property or district, being of a size where its height and width are minimally to not discernible from the public rights-of-way, citing and agreeing to the recommendations in the staff report, with the applicant to appear with revised drawings at a subsequent meeting for final approval.

RESULT:	**CONCEPTUALLY APPROVED [UNANIMOUS] Next: 10/6/2026 4:45 PM**
MOVER:	Catherine Lund, Vice-Chair
SECONDER:	James Verity, Deputy Vice-Chair
AYES:	Lund, Verity, Carden, Fernandez, Haggerty, Mukoyama

3. CASE 26.139, 132-136 PROSPECT STREET, vacant lot (COLLEGE HILL)
This applicant has requested the item be continued**.**

A motion was made to continue the application, with the applicant to appear at a subsequent meeting.

RESULT:	**CONTINUED [UNANIMOUS] Next: 9/28/2026 4:45 PM**
MOVER:	Sumi Mukoyama, Regular Member
SECONDER:	Pabel Fernandez, Regular Member
AYES:	Mukoyama, Fernandez, Carden, Haggerty, Lund, Verity,

ADJOURNMENT (NC, PF; 6:35 PM)

CITY OF PROVIDENCE

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

MINUTES ● OCTOBER 6, 2026

Special Meeting **444 Westminster St., 1st Fl., Conf. Room** **4:45 PM**

Joseph A. Doorley, Jr. Municipal Building, Providence, RI 02903

CALL TO ORDER
PRESENT: Haggerty, Bay, Brennan, Carden, Fernandez
ABSENT: Lund, Mukoyama, Sharma, Verity
Staff Present: Jason Martin, Sharon Garner, Blake Horne

PROJECT REVIEW

1. **CASE 26.101, 56 PRATT STREET, House, 1857-75 (COLLEGE HILL)**
   Mr. David Sisson, architect, and Mr. John Garrahy, Esq., representing the owner, appeared before the Commission requesting that as part of the subdivision of the property into two parcels, the construction of a new three-story with cellar, four-family residence (aka south parcel).

   Mr. Martin gave a staff report. 56 Pratt Street is a parcel that contains a structure of historical and architectural significance that contributes to the significance of the College Hill local historic district, having been recognized as a contributing structure to the College Hill National Register Historic District. The parcel shall be subdivided to allow for a vacant parcel that the new construction will be built upon;

   At the July 27th meeting the application was granted conceptual approval (Res26-07). The proposed building's form and siting are appropriate for the location. Pratt Street is a location that has minimal historical context as related to its streetscape, as the majority of buildings constructed on the street are from the mid-20th century and later. The Commission has approved multiple buildings of contemporary and modern design along the street, and this proposal is compliant within that context; The street hosts two properties designed by Friedrich St. Florian, who rightly referred to the street as a "laboratory" for architectural expression;

   At the August 24th meeting in agreement with the applicant the matter was continued. The applicants also agreed to attend a design charette hosted by the Providence Preservation Society (PPS) to discuss proposed design changes that had been articulated by an expert witness, Clarke Schoettle, and comments from the Commission;

   On Tuesday, September 29th, staff attended the charrette at PPS. This meeting was attended by Councilwoman Jill Davidson, the applicant's architect, David Sisson, Clark Schoettle, Glen Fontecchio, Joel Vanderweele, Marisa Brown and Elisabeth Seidel. It was a productive session and the items discussed for this project related to the following: Reduce height; Design changes at front and roofline to soften façade at front and reduce bulk; Deemphasize verticality; Reduce actual and apparent height; Window changes; Color changes; Landscape changes;

   Revised plans, photos and renderings have been submitted. Additional documentation of a memo detailing changes made since conceptual review to this review, and a section drawing have also been submitted and distributed. The application for New Construction is considered complete;

   The proposed new construction has been changed substantially stylistically in an attempt to minimize the verticality while maintaining volume. The overall height has been reduced by 4'. The building is still tall, but

DRAFT

below the buildable envelope allowed by zoning and smaller than what the Commission granted conceptual approval for. The changes to the front, having open porches that emulate a more traditional double- or triple-decker design is helpful; fenestration changes are help reduce the verticality and improve the composition; and,

The work as proposed is in accord with PHDC Standard 8 as follows: having determined that the proposed new construction is appropriate as it is architecturally and historically compatible with the property and district having an appropriate size, scale and form that will not have an adverse effect on the property or district, as Pratt Street has been identified by the Commission as a street that can support contemporary and modern architecture as the majority of properties on the street were constructed in the 20th and 21st Centuries, most reviewed and approved by the Commission, and this proposal is congruous with the street's development.

Mr. Garrahy gave an introduction, and Mr. Sisson gave an overview of the proposal and changes.

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

- An email from Ian Saxine, 500 Wickenden Street, in support of the proposal was submitted as part of Exhibit 1;
- An email from Mel Rainsberger, 15 Glendale Avenue, in support of the proposal was submitted as part of Exhibit 1;
- An email from Tyler Macmillan, 183 Elmgrove Avenue, in support of the proposal was submitted as part of Exhibit 1;
- Laura Donahue, 101 Pratt Street, was in opposition to the proposal;
- Paul Flynn was in support of the proposal;
- Syed Rizvi, 107 Pratt Street, was in opposition to the proposal;
- David Marks, Esq., Ursillo, Teitz & Ritch, Ltd., representing Frank Faltus, Olivia Katz and Chris Borgstrom, was in opposition to the proposal; also had procedural objections;
- Sara Bell was in favor of the development;

Public comment was closed.

The Commission has the following comments: members commended the applicants for going through the charrette procedure; Pratt Street is a street of varied architectural designs; responded to comments made by the Commission and from the expert witness (Clark Schoettle at previous 08/24 meeting); reduction in height; new changes are materially simple and refined; better proportion of windows (windows proposed to be Pella Lifestyle; still deciding on door systems; Hardie plank, smooth side out; composite trim; full brick; roof: standing seam metal) there are small details that can discussed with staff (materiality of retention walls: reduce Versa-Lok in front, perhaps fieldstone; removal of corbels; color suggestions; finalization of window and door systems); new revisions have helped reduce verticality.

A motion was made stating that: the application is considered complete. 56 Pratt Street is a parcel that contains a structure of historical and architectural significance that contributes to the significance of the College Hill local historic district, having been recognized as a contributing structure to the College Hill National Register Historic District. The parcel shall be subdivided to allow for a vacant parcel that the new construction will be built upon. The Commission grants Final Approval of the proposal, citing Standard 8, having determined that the proposed new construction is appropriate as it is architecturally and historically compatible with the property and district having an appropriate size, scale and form that will not have an adverse effect on the property or district, as Pratt Street has been identified by the Commission as a street that can support contemporary and modern architecture as the majority of properties on the street were constructed in the 20th and 21st Centuries, most reviewed and approved by the Commission, and this proposal is congruous with the street's development, citing and agreeing

to the recommendations in the staff report, with staff or a sub-committee to review any additional details.

RESULT:	**APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]**
MOVER:	Pabel Fernandez, Regular Member
SECONDER:	Matthew Brennan, Regular Member
AYES:	Fernandez, Brennan, Bay, Carden, Haggerty

2. CASE 26.138, 56 PRATT STREET, House, 1857-75 (COLLEGE HILL)

Mr. David Sisson, architect, and Mr. John Garrahy, Esq., representing the owner, appeared before the Commission requesting that as part of the subdivision of the property into two parcels, the applicant is requesting the construction of a two-unit, three-story with cellar addition to the existing building (aka north parcel).

Mr. Martin gave a staff report. 56 Pratt Street is a parcel that contains a structure of historical and architectural significance that contributes to the significance of the College Hill local historic district, having been recognized as a contributing structure to the College Hill National Register Historic District. The parcel shall be subdivided to allow for a vacant parcel that the new construction will be built upon;

The applicants previously appeared as a Preliminary Application at the Commission's June 22nd meeting where the previous proposal was discussed. The Commission's the general consensus was that it was inappropriate as it is too large and needs to be subservient to the existing house. Suggestions were to reduce the mass and also to camouflage the addition with material color to help minimize its appearance;

The applicant appeared at the July 27th meeting. The applicant had revised the drawings, and the proposal was slightly smaller in height but still too large in scale and mass. The upper floor of the addition is a full story above the historic resources' roofline. The submission is not zoning compliant, at minimum not conforming to section 402.A, exceeding the number of allowed stories. It is definitively not subservient to the historic resource. The application was denied (Res26-08);

At the August 24th meeting a new application that was deemed materially and substantially different was reviewed by the Commission. The Commission granted conceptual approval (Res26-12) at the bequest of the applicant. The as the proposed addition is subservient to the historic resource, being of a size where its height and width are minimally to not discernible from the public rights-of-way. The applicants also agreed to attend a design charette hosted by the Providence Preservation Society (PPS) to discuss proposed design changes that had been articulated by an expert witness, Clarke Schoettle, and comments from the Commission;

On Tuesday, September 29th, staff attended the charrette at PPS. This meeting was attended by Councilwoman Jill Davidson, the applicant's architect, David Sisson, Clark Schoettle, Glen Fontecchio, Joel Vanderweele, Marisa Brown and Elisabeth Seidel. It was a productive session and the items discussed for this project related to the following: Aligning floors, Window changes, Canopy add at front door, Front door change, Unique siding at 'transition' portion of addition, Color changes;

Revised plans, photos and renderings have been submitted. Additional documentation of a memo detailing changes made since conceptual review to this review has also been submitted and distributed. The application for Major Alterations is considered complete;

The revised design reflects most of the comments discussed at the charette. The design is now more cohesive. The addition's floors have been lowered and match existing; the fenestration and materials, along with color choices have enhanced the design; and,

The work as proposed is in accord with PHDC Standard 8 being architecturally and historically compatible with the property and district having an appropriate size, scale and form that will not have an adverse effect on the property or district, as the proposed addition is subservient to the historic resource, being of a size where its height and width are minimally to not discernible from the public rights-of-way.

Mr. Garrahy gave an introduction, and Mr. Sisson gave an overview of the proposal and changes.

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

- An email from Ian Saxine, 500 Wickenden Street, in support of the proposal was submitted as part of Exhibit 1;
- An email from Mel Rainsberger, 15 Glendale Avenue, in support of the proposal was submitted as part of Exhibit 1;
- An email from Tyler Macmillan, 183 Elmgrove Avenue, in support of the proposal was submitted as part of Exhibit 1;
- Chris Borgstrom, 54 Pratt Street, warned about AI- generated public comment;
- Paul Flynn was in support of the proposal;
- Syed Rizvi, 107 Pratt Street, not opposed to housing, this design is better, still concerns over overall proposal;
- David Marks, Esq., Ursillo, Teitz & Ritch, Ltd., representing Frank Faltus, Olivia Katz and Chris Borgstrom, was in opposition to the proposal; also had procedural objections;
- Sara Bell was in favor of the development;
- Olivia Katz, 54 Pratt Street, this design is better, still concerns over overall proposal; and,

Public comment was closed.

The Commission has the following comments: members commended the applicants for going through the charrette procedure; improvement to design; volume's mass has been helped by aligning floors, minimalization of elements; materiality of walls along with differentiation at connector piece is appreciated; noted how shingles will eventually age and be similar in color to the roof; questions of materiality (windows proposed to be Pella Lifestyle; still deciding on door systems; Hardie plank, smooth side out; composite trim; full brick; roof: standing seam metal), there are small details that can discussed with staff (materiality of retention walls: reduce Versa-Lok in front, perhaps fieldstone; color suggestions; finalization of window and door systems); overall well received.

A motion was made stating that: The application for 56 Pratt Street, a structure of historical and architectural significance to the College Hill local historic district, recognized as a contributing structure to the College Hill National Register Historic District is considered complete. The Commission cites Standard 8 in granting final approval for the proposed addition to 56 Pratt Street as it is in accord with PHDC Standard 8, being architecturally and historically compatible with the property and district having an appropriate size, scale and form that will not have an adverse effect on the property or district, being of a size where its height and width are minimally to not discernible from the public rights-of-way, citing and agreeing to the recommendations in the staff report, with staff to review any additional details.

RESULT:	**APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]**
MOVER:	Nathaniel Carden, Regular Member
SECONDER:	Pabel Fernandez, Regular Member
AYES:	Carden, Fernandez, Bay, Brennan, Haggerty

ADJOURNMENT (MB, PF; 6:10 PM)

EXHIBIT B

Providence Historic District Commission

Brett P. Smiley
Mayor

August 7, 2026

APPLICANT/OWNER
Nathaniel Sliney
56 Pratt Street
Providence, RI 02906

RESOLUTION 26-07
Application 26.101

WHEREAS, the applicant, Nathaniel Sliney, applied to the Providence Historic District Commission for a Certificate of Appropriateness for New Construction at 56 Pratt Street, Plat 10, Lot 163, and,

WHEREAS, the Commission held a properly noticed Regular Meeting on the matter on July 27, 2026, with the following members present: Lund, Brennan, Carden, Fernandez and Mukoyama; and

WHEREAS, Mr. David Sisson, architect, and Mr. Mark Liberati, esq., representing the owner, 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. 56 Pratt Street is a parcel that contains a structure of historical and architectural significance that contributes to the significance of the College Hill local historic district, having been recognized as a contributing structure to the College Hill National Register Historic District. The parcel shall be subdivided to allow for a vacant parcel that the new construction will be built upon.

2. The application for New Construction is considered complete for conceptual review.

3. The work as proposed consists of New Construction and includes the construction of a three-story with cellar, multi-family residence.

4. The alterations are congruous with the structure, its appurtenances, and the surrounding historic district. The proposed building's form and siting are appropriate for the location. Pratt Street is a location that has minimal historical context as related to its streetscape, as the majority of buildings constructed on the street are from the mid-20th century and later. The Commission has approved multiple buildings of contemporary and modern design along the street, and this proposal is compliant within that context.

5. The proposed work as submitted is in accord with PHDC Standard 8 as follows: the proposed construction is architecturally and historically compatible with the property and district having an appropriate size, scale and form that will not have an adverse effect on the property or district, having determined that the proposed new construction is appropriate being architecturally and historically compatible.

6. The Commission accepts and agrees with the findings in the Staff Report.

WHEREAS, based upon the above findings of fact, the Commission determined that the New Construction as proposed by the Applicant is appropriate. Upon motion made by Ms. Mukoyama, seconded by Mr. Carden, the Commission unanimously voted (5 to 0) to grant Conceptual Approval of the proposal as proposed having determined that the alterations are aesthetically appropriate having determined that the proposed demolition is architecturally and historically compatible with the property and district having an appropriate size, scale and form that will not have an adverse effect on the property or district (Standard 8), as Pratt Street is a location that has minimal historical context as related to its streetscape, as the majority of buildings constructed on the street are from the mid-20th century and later. The Commission has approved multiple buildings of contemporary and modern design along the street, and this proposal is compliant within that context, with the applicant to return to the Commission at a subsequent meeting for final approval.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the application for New Construction as described in the above findings of fact **IS CONCEPTUALLY APPROVED**. Parties wishing to appeal a decision made by the PHDC have 20 days from the date of the resolution to file an appeal with the Zoning Board of Review.

Ryan Haggerty (SBM for)
Ryan Haggerty
Chair

Providence Historic District Commission

Brett P. Smiley
Mayor

August 7, 2026

APPLICANT/OWNER
Nathaniel Sliney
56 Pratt Street
Providence, RI 02906

RESOLUTION 26-08
Application 26.101

WHEREAS, the applicant, Nathaniel Sliney, applied to the Providence Historic District Commission for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Alterations at 56 Pratt Street, Plat 10, Lot 163, and,

WHEREAS, the Commission held a properly noticed Regular Meeting on the matter on July 27, 2026, with the following members present: Lund, Brennan, Carden, Fernandez and Mukoyama; and

WHEREAS, Mr. David Sisson, architect, and Mr. Mark Liberati, esq., representing the owner, 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. 56 Pratt Street is a parcel that contains a structure of historical and architectural significance that contributes to the significance of the College Hill local historic district, having been recognized as a contributing structure to the College Hill National Register Historic District.

2. The application for Major Alterations is considered complete for conceptual review.

3. The application has been bifurcated to remove the proposed New Construction of a three-story with cellar on the lot (lot to be subdivided), which is being reviewed as a separate matter.

4. The work as proposed consists of Major Alterations and includes the construction of a three-story with cellar addition.

5. The work as proposed is not in accord with PHDC Standard 8 being architecturally and historically incongruous with the property and district having an inappropriate size, scale and form that will have an adverse effect on the property or district, as the proposed addition is not subservient to the historic resource, being too large in scale for both height and width, being a full-story above the historic resource and being wider than the existing resource.

6. The Commission accepts and agrees with the findings in the Staff Report.

WHEREAS, based upon the above findings of fact, the Commission determined that the Major Alterations proposed by the Applicant are inappropriate. Upon motion made by Ms. Mukoyama, seconded by Mr. Fernandez, the Commission voted (4 to 1, Members Mukoyama, Fernandez, Lund and Brennan were in favor, Member Carden was against) to deny approval of the proposal as proposed having determined that the alteration is aesthetically inappropriate having determined that the proposed alteration is architecturally and historically incongruous with the property and district having an inappropriate size, scale and form that will have an adverse effect on the property or district (Standard 8), as the proposed addition is not subservient to the historic resource, being too large in scale for both height and width, being a full-story above the historic resource and being wider than the existing resource.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the application for Major Alterations as described in the above findings of fact **IS DENIED**. Parties wishing to appeal a decision made by the PHDC have 20 days from the date of the resolution to file an appeal with the Zoning Board of Review.

Ryan Haggerty (Chair for)

Ryan Haggerty
Chair

Providence Historic District Commission

Brett P. Smiley
Mayor

September 23, 2026

APPLICANT/OWNER
Nathaniel Sliney
56 Pratt Street
Providence, RI 02906

RESOLUTION 26-12
Application 26.138

WHEREAS, the applicant, Nathaniel Sliney, applied to the Providence Historic District Commission for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Alterations at 56 Pratt Street, Plat 10, Lot 163, and,

WHEREAS, the Commission held a properly noticed Regular Meeting on the matter on August 24, 2026, with the following members present: Haggerty, Lund, Verity, Carden, Fernandez and Mukoyama; and

WHEREAS, Mr. David Sisson, architect, via Zoom, Mr. Steve Gilbert, architect, and Mr. Mark Liberati, esq., representing the owner, 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. 56 Pratt Street is a parcel that contains a structure of historical and architectural significance that contributes to the significance of the College Hill local historic district, having been recognized as a contributing structure to the College Hill National Register Historic District. The parcel shall be subdivided to allow for a vacant parcel that the new construction will be built upon.

2. The application for Major Alterations is considered complete for conceptual review.

3. The work as proposed consists of Major Alterations and includes the construction of a two-unit, three-story with cellar addition to the existing building.

4. The proposed work as submitted is in accord with PHDC Standard 8 as follows: the proposed construction is architecturally and historically compatible with the property and district having an appropriate size, scale and form that will not have an adverse effect on the property or district, having determined that the proposed alteration is of a size where its height and width are minimally to not discernible from the public rights-of-way.

5. The Commission accepts and agrees with the findings in the Staff Report.

WHEREAS, based upon the above findings of fact, the Commission determined that the Major Alterations as proposed by the Applicant is appropriate. Upon motion made by Dr. Lund, seconded by Mr. Verity, the Commission unanimously voted (5 to 0) to grant Conceptual Approval of the proposal as proposed having determined that the alterations are aesthetically appropriate having determined that the proposed is architecturally and historically compatible with the property and district having an appropriate size, scale and form that will not have an adverse effect on the property or district (Standard 8), as the proposed alteration is of a size where its height and width are minimally to not discernible from the public rights-of-way, with the applicant to return to the Commission at a subsequent meeting for final approval.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the application for Major Alterations as described in the above findings of fact **IS CONCEPTUALLY APPROVED**. Parties wishing to appeal a decision made by the PHDC have 20 days from the date of the resolution to file an appeal with the Zoning Board of Review.

Ryan Haggerty (JAM for)
Ryan Haggerty
Chair

Providence Historic District Commission

Brett P. Smiley
Mayor

October 7, 2026

APPLICANT/OWNER
Nathaniel Sliney
56 Pratt Street
Providence, RI 02906

RESOLUTION 26-14
Application 26.101

WHEREAS, the applicant, Nathaniel Sliney, applied to the Providence Historic District Commission for a Certificate of Appropriateness for New Construction at 56 Pratt Street, Plat 10, Lot 163, and,

WHEREAS, the Commission held a properly noticed Special Meeting on the matter on October 6, 2026, with the following members present: Haggerty, Bay, Brennan, Carden and Fernandez; and

WHEREAS, Mr. David Sisson, architect, and Mr. John Garrahy, esq., representing the owner, 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. 56 Pratt Street is a parcel that contains a structure of historical and architectural significance that contributes to the significance of the College Hill local historic district, having been recognized as a contributing structure to the College Hill National Register Historic District. The parcel shall be subdivided to allow for a vacant parcel that the new construction will be built upon.

2. The application for New Construction is considered complete.

3. The work as proposed consists of New Construction and includes the construction of a three-story with cellar, multi-family residence.

4. The alterations are congruous with the structure, its appurtenances, and the surrounding historic district. The proposed building's form and siting are appropriate for the location. Pratt Street is a location that has minimal historical context as related to its streetscape, as the majority of buildings constructed on the street are from the mid-20th century and later. The Commission has approved multiple buildings of contemporary and modern design along the street, and this proposal is compliant within that context.

5. The proposed work as submitted is in accord with PHDC Standard 8 as follows: the proposed construction is architecturally and historically compatible with the property and district having an appropriate size, scale and form that will not have an adverse effect on the property or district, having determined that the proposed new construction is appropriate being architecturally and historically compatible.

6. The Commission accepts and agrees with the findings in the Staff Report.

WHEREAS, based upon the above findings of fact, the Commission determined that the New Construction as proposed by the Applicant is appropriate. Upon motion made by Mr. Fernandez, seconded by Mr. Brennan, the Commission unanimously voted (5 to 0) to grant Final Approval of the proposal as proposed having determined that the alterations are aesthetically appropriate having determined that the proposed demolition is architecturally and historically compatible with the property and district having an appropriate size, scale and form that will not have an adverse effect on the property or district (Standard 8), as Pratt Street is a location that has minimal historical context as related to its streetscape, as the majority of buildings constructed on the street are from the mid-20th century and later. The Commission has approved multiple buildings of contemporary and modern design along the street, and this proposal is compliant within that context, agreeing with the staff report and with staff to review any additional details.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the application for New Construction as described in the above findings of fact **IS APPROVED**. Parties wishing to appeal a decision made by the PHDC have 20 days from the date of the resolution to file an appeal with the Zoning Board of Review.

Ryan Haggerty (CJRM for)
Ryan Haggerty
Chair

Providence Historic District Commission

Brett P. Smiley
Mayor

October 7, 2026

APPLICANT/OWNER
Nathaniel Sliney
56 Pratt Street
Providence, RI 02906

RESOLUTION 26-15
Application 26.138

WHEREAS, the applicant, Nathaniel Sliney, applied to the Providence Historic District Commission for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Alterations at 56 Pratt Street, Plat 10, Lot 163, and,

WHEREAS, the Commission held a properly noticed Special Meeting on the matter on October 6, 2026, with the following members present: Haggerty, Bay, Brennan, Carden and Fernandez; and,

WHEREAS, Mr. David Sisson, architect, and Mr. John Garrahy, esq., representing the owner, 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. 56 Pratt Street is a parcel that contains a structure of historical and architectural significance that contributes to the significance of the College Hill local historic district, having been recognized as a contributing structure to the College Hill National Register Historic District. The parcel shall be subdivided to allow for a vacant parcel that the new construction will be built upon, which is being reviewed separately.

2. The application for Major Alterations is considered complete.

3. The work as proposed consists of Major Alterations and includes the construction of a two-unit, three-story with cellar addition to the existing building.

4. The proposed work as submitted is in accord with PHDC Standard 8 as follows: the proposed construction is architecturally and historically compatible with the property and district having an appropriate size, scale and form that will not have an adverse effect on the property or district, having determined that the proposed alteration is of a size where its height and width are minimally to not discernible from the public rights-of-way.

5. The Commission accepts and agrees with the findings in the Staff Report.

WHEREAS, based upon the above findings of fact, the Commission determined that the Major Alterations as proposed by the Applicant is appropriate. Upon motion made by Mr. Carden, seconded by Mr. Fernandez, the Commission unanimously voted (5 to 0) to grant Final Approval of the proposal as proposed having determined that the alterations are aesthetically appropriate having determined that the proposal is architecturally and historically compatible with the property and district having an appropriate size, scale and form that will not have an adverse effect on the property or district (Standard 8), as the proposed alteration is of a size where its height and width are minimally to not discernible from the public rights-of-way, agreeing with the staff report and with staff to review any additional details.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the application for Major Alterations as described in the above findings of fact **IS APPROVED**. Parties wishing to appeal a decision made by the PHDC have 20 days from the date of the resolution to file an appeal with the Zoning Board of Review.

Ryan Haggerty (JSM for)
Ryan Haggerty
Chair