


CITY OF CLAREMONT
Historic District Commission Meeting
Thursday, March 26, 2015 7:00 PM
City Hall, Council Chambers

MINUTES
Approved 4/23/2015

I. Roll Call

Members Present: David Messier, James Reed, Richard Wahrlich

Absent: Brenda Hannah, Kristin Kenniston

II. Review of Minutes from September 25, 2014

Corrections: None

Motion: To accept the minutes as presented

Made by: Mr. Reed

Second: Mr. Wahrlich

Vote: Unanimous in favor

Review of Minutes from March 12, 2015

Corrections: None

Motion: To accept the minutes as presented

Made by: Mr. Reed

Second: Mr. Wahrlich

Vote: Unanimous in favor

III. Old Business

IV. New Business

Mr. Messier advised all of the applicants present that since only three members of the Commission were present at this meeting, all decisions would have to be unanimous to pass. He offered them the opportunity to have their applications continued to the next meeting if they preferred to be heard by a full commission. Everyone chose to proceed with the three commissioners.

- **HDC 2015-00002 Jeffrey Young, 220 Main Street** – for window replacement at 220 Main Street. Tax Map 107, Lot 84. Zone: CR2.

Carol Ackerman was the applicant's designated representative for this application. James Carignan, contractor for the project, assisted with the presentation.

The property owner has been directed by the Fire Department to change two of the windows on the street-facing side of the structure at 220 Main Street to windows that will comply with fire safety codes. The applicant is proposing to replace the current 6-over-6 sash windows with single-pane casement windows that open out. The opening size will not change.

Mr. Messier opened the public hearing. The hearing was closed when no public comments were received.

The Commission turned to addressing their review criteria for the project. There was no architectural survey available for this property.

This house is indicative of the 1830's – 1850's when this area was developed with its placement on the lot (gable end faces the street), its type of siding, and the placement and style of its windows. The consensus of the Commission was that it should have a rating of 1-2.

HDC Criteria	
1. Does the building have historic, architectural or cultural value?	The building has limited architectural value, though it does contribute to the neighborhood. It does not appear to have any historic or cultural value. It should have a rating of 1, because only the street-facing façade is intact. The Commission was in agreement.
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 current windows are vinyl replacements; they are being replaced with a vinyl window. The configuration will be different (awning in place of double-hung). The opening size remains unchanged. These are not compatible with the building, but the change is required for life-safety purposes, and the Commission agreed that the incompatibility is insufficient to deny the application.
3. Are the scale and size of the proposed improvements compatible with the existing surroundings? (including height, width, street frontage, number of stories, roof type, façade openings such as windows, doors, etc., and architectural details)	It was the consensus of the Commission that this criterion was not applicable, because the opening size will not change.
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 consensus of the Commission was that this criterion was not applicable.
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 consensus of the Commission was that the impact of this project will have a neutral impact on the setting (neither contribute nor detract).
6. Is the proposal in keeping with the Secretary of Interior's Guidelines for Rehabilitation?	The consensus of the Commission was that this proposal is in keeping with the guidelines, because the windows could be replaced with more original-style windows.

Motion: To approve the application with the condition that the replacement windows be outfitted with a 12-pane grid (to mimic the 6-over-6 configuration of the original sash windows).
Made by: Mr. Wahrlich **Second:** Mr. Reed **Vote:** Unanimous in favor

- **HDC 2015-00003 State of New Hampshire, 17 Water Street** – for repairs to existing retaining wall in the Sugar River at 17 Water Street. Tax Map 120, Lot 8. Zone: MU

Roger Dionne, Ron White, and Michael Mozer represented the applicant and presented the application to the Commission. The project proposes to make repairs to the section of brick and stone wall that is between 11 and 17 Water Street. It is the section upon which the former

“Picker House” used to sit. They are proposing to fill the void at the base of the wall, install a “training wall” in front of the historic wall (designed to keep the river away from the original wall), replace the brick course at the top with a concrete wall (to stabilize the upper part of the wall and protect the parking area and underground fuel tank there), and install new iron fencing at the top. The “training wall” will tie into and be identical to the other such walls that were constructed in 2008 just downstream from this project site. They are hoping to start construction in summer/fall of 2015 during the time of lowest water levels in the river. The wall is considered a contributing element to the Monadnock Mill site, which is listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

The applicants answered questions from the Commission regarding the project. The Commission expressed particular concern regarding the use of concrete in place of the brick.

Mr. Messier opened the public hearing. No comments were received, so the public hearing was closed.

The Commission turned to addressing their criteria. There is no architectural inventory available for this site. The Commission assigned the wall a rating of 2.

HDC Criteria	
1. Does the building have historic, architectural or cultural value?	The wall is not a building, but it is part of the fabric of what used to be there and is a contributing element and has some historical 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 foundation of the adjacent building is made of concrete, so the proposed concrete is not incompatible. The consensus of the Commission was that the proposed materials are consistent with the surroundings.
3. Are the scale and size of the proposed improvements compatible with the existing surroundings? (including height, width, street frontage, number of stories, roof type, façade openings such as windows, doors, etc., and architectural details)	The consensus of the Commission was that this criterion is not applicable.
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 proposed new fencing will be an improvement.
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 consensus of the Commission was that the impact will be neutral – the repairs will help stabilize and preserve the historic elements.
6. Is the proposal in keeping with the Secretary of Interior’s Guidelines for Rehabilitation?	The consensus of the Commission was that the proposal is in keeping with the Guidelines.

Motion: To accept the application for repairs to the wall with the condition that the upper portion of the wall be faced with red brick.

Made by: Mr. Wahrlich **Second:** Mr. Reed **Vote:** Unanimous in favor

- **HDC 2015-00004 Charles & Georgia O’Brien, 217 Main Street** – for window replacements at 217 Main Street. Tax Map 107, Lot 218. Zone: CB2

Mr. & Mrs. O’Brien presented their application to the Commission. The Fire Department has directed them to replace four windows in the building at 217 Main Street to comply with fire safety codes. Two of the windows that must be replaced face the street.

Mr. Messier noted that the windows in the building had been replaced by a prior owner without approval from the Commission.

After much discussion, the consensus of the Commission was that they had insufficient information with which to review the project. The applicants were asked to obtain the specific sizes of the windows and openings (before and after) that are affected by this project.

Motion: To continue this application to the April 23, 2015 meeting.

Made by: Mr. Reed **Second:** Mr. Wahrlich **Vote:** unanimous in favor

- **HDC 2015-00005 James & Lori Roy, 7 Pleasant Street** – for commercial signage at 7 Pleasant Street. Tax Map 120, Lot 53. Zone: MU

Mr. Wahrlich asked to be recused from review of this application on the grounds that he will be working for the applicants. Due to the recusal, the Commission did not have a quorum. The Commission will schedule a special meeting to hear it.

- **HDC 2015-00006 Claremont Spice & Dry Goods LLC, 12 Tremont Street** – for commercial signage at 12 Tremont Street. Tax Map 120, Lot 47. Zone: MU

David Lucier, co-owner of Claremont Spice and Dry Goods presented the application to the Commission. Mr. Lucier stated that he is expanding his business from 10 Tremont Street to 12 Tremont Street (next door, same building). He would like to move his existing vinyl signage to the new location and replace the existing wooden and glass door with an anodized aluminum (silver color) and glass door. The original door consists of two doors that have been bolted together as a single door. The opening is much wider than a modern door. He said the new door would have side glass panels (to fill in the extra space) and a transom. It will match the other new doors on Tremont Street.

Mr. Messier opened the public hearing. No public comment was received, so the hearing was closed.

Mr. Messier read the architectural inventory sheet for this building. The building was assigned a rating of 2 by the inventory done in 1977. The Commission agreed with the rating.

1. Does the building have historic, architectural or cultural value?	The consensus of the Commission was that the building has value in all three of these areas – historic because of its uses as noted in Waite’s <i>History of Claremont</i> ; architectural because of the features still remaining on the building (though many are gone); and cultural because it was owned by the Masons for many years.
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 project requires changing the arrangement and materials of the door, which is not compatible with the existing door or the building, but consistent with trends within the downtown. However this can be mitigated by making the door a darker color.
3. Are the scale and size of the proposed improvements compatible with the existing surroundings? (including height, width, street frontage, number of stories, roof type, façade openings such as windows, doors, etc., and architectural details)	It would be very difficult to install a new door that would match the dimensions of the original door. The proposal is an acceptable compromise.
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 consensus of the Commission was that this criterion was not applicable.
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 consensus of the Commission was that the overall impact will be neutral (both negative and positive).
6. Is the proposal in keeping with the Secretary of Interior’s Guidelines for Rehabilitation?	Since there are no permanent changes, the consensus was that it is in keeping with the Guidelines.

Motion: To approve the design and materials (for the door and signage) with the condition that the color (of the aluminum parts of the new door) be a dark green that coordinates with the existing colors of the building as closely as possible.

Made by: Mr. Wahrlich **Second:** Mr. Reed **Vote:** Unanimous in favor

V. Other

- **Election of Chair and Vice Chair**
This was tabled to the next meeting.

VI. Correspondence

VII. Adjournment

Motion: To adjourn the meeting.

Made by: Mr. Reed **Second:** Mr. Wahrlich **Vote:** Unanimous in favor

Meeting adjourned at 8:47PM

Respectfully submitted by,
deForest Bearse
Resource Coordinator