


CITY OF CLAREMONT
Historic District Commission Meeting
 Thursday, March 12, 2015 7:00 PM
 City Hall, City Manager's Office

MINUTES
Approved 3/26/2015

I. Roll Call

Members Present: David Messier, Kristin Kenniston, Richard Wahrlich, Brenda Hannah

Absent: James Reed

II. New Business

- **Steve Bernash** – application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a sign at **42 Opera House Square**. Property owner of record, River Ridge Realty, LLC. Tax Map 120, Lot 45.

Mr. Messier opened the public hearing.

Mr. Bernash presented his application to the Commission for a sign for his storefront business at 42 Opera House Square. He said the design measures 3 ft. high by 10 ft. 6 in. long and that most of it fits within the existing sign frame on the building – only the very top of the serpent’s head goes above the frame. Two designs for the sign are shown in his application. Mr. Bernash stated the top one of the two would be the design they would like to place on the building. According to the application, the sign is composed of etched aluminum with gold anodized molding.

Mr. Messier asked for comments from the public. When none were received, he closed the public hearing. The Commission turned to addressing their review criteria. Mrs. Kenniston read the architectural inventory sheet for this building, which stated that, the building:

- has “excellent decorative brickwork and granite trim that are largely intact above the storefronts”;
- is a “good late Victorian Gothic commercial block”;
- is an “integral part” of the Opera House Square north wall;
- is known as the “Dickinson Block”;
- formerly housed a pharmacy in the late 1800’s to early 1900’s;
- has been given a rating of 3 (the highest).

HDC Criteria	
1. Does the building have historic, architectural or cultural value?	Consensus of the Commission was that the building has architectural and historic value based on the above points from the architectural inventory, but no cultural value.
2. Are the proposed exterior design, arrangement, textures, and materials compatible with the existing buildings or structures and to the setting and surrounding uses?	The Commission agreed that this criterion was not applicable to this application.
3. Are the scale and size of the proposed improvements compatible with the existing	The Commission agreed that this criterion was not applicable to this application.

surroundings? (including height, width, street frontage, number of stories, roof type, façade openings such as windows, doors, etc., and architectural details)	
4. How will the proposed improvements (signs, lights, yards, off-street parking, screening, fencing, entrance drive, sidewalks, and landscaping) affect the character of any building or structure within the district?	The Commission agreed that the sign will have a positive effect on the character in the district because it shows there is an open and active business in the building as opposed to an empty storefront.
5. What impact will the proposal have on the setting? To what extent will the proposal help to preserve and enhance the historic, architectural, and cultural qualities of the district and the community?	The Commission cited the same reasoning as in criterion #4 above.
6. Is the proposal in keeping with the Secretary of Interior's Guidelines for Rehabilitation?	The Commission agreed that this criterion is not applicable to this application. However, all agreed that the sign will not cover any of the architectural details of the building nor harm them if it were to be removed.

Motion: To accept the proposal as presented.

Made by: Mrs. Hannah

Second: Mr. Wahrlich

Vote: Unanimous in favor

III. Other

The Commission did not discuss any other business.

IV. Correspondence

The Commission did not discuss any correspondence.

V. Adjournment

Motion: To adjourn the meeting.

Made by: Mrs. Kenniston

Second: Mrs. Hannah

Vote: Unanimous in favor

Meeting adjourned at 7:08 PM.

Respectfully submitted by,
deForest Bearse
Resource Coordinator