



**Historic District Commission Meeting**  
Thursday, March 27, 2014 7:00 p.m.  
City Hall, Council Chambers

**Minutes**  
**APPROVED April 24, 2014**

Chairman Messier called the meeting to order at 7:03 PM.

**I. Roll Call**

**Members Present:** David Messier, Kristin Kenniston, James Reed and Richard Wahrlich  
**City Staff:** deForest Bearse, Resource Coordinator

**II. Review of Minutes from December 19, 2013**

**Discussion:** Page 2, "Board Discussion" paragraph, 3<sup>rd</sup> sentence – replace "heavily arched corniced beads (heads?)" with "arched, hood moldings". Page 3, HDC Criteria #2; add "in #2-rated buildings" to the end of the sentence.

**Motion:** to approve the minutes from December 19, 2013 with the suggested changes as discussed.

**Made By:** Mrs. Kenniston **Second:** Mr. Wahrlich **Vote:** Unanimous

**III. New Business**

- **Gordon Black, 31 Pleasant Street** – A Certificate of Appropriateness has been submitted to install new signs at **Sugar River Family Practice, 31 Pleasant Street**. Map 120, Lot 73, Zone MU. Property owners of record, Goodfellas Properties, LLC.

Dr. Black presented his proposed signs to the Commission. The Commission discussed concerns regarding the name plates at the bottom of the protruding sign; the filler panel on the front of the building; and the size, height, and extent of protrusion of the protruding sign (relative to the other protruding signs on that side of the street).

Chairman Messier opened the hearing to public comment. There were no comments and no abutters were present. Chairman Messier closed the public hearing.

**Board Discussion**

Chairman Messier read the architectural sheet on this building. The block is identified as the Odd Fellows block. The building is a major element of the Pleasant Street commercial area. The Odd Fellows built it in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. It is brick, metal, cast-concrete façade with fine, Corinthian pilasters. The elaborate cornice on the side is now missing on the front. This is an elaborate classical revival design that adds much visual character to the west side of Pleasant Street, though the cornice is sorely missed. It has a rating of 2.

Chairman Messier stated that when the (architectural) sheet was done in the 1980's, the existing store fronts were not there. There was a conglomerate of differently-designed store fronts in each of the openings. Since then, the front has been restored very closely to its original look. The board discussed the idea of raising the rating of the building from 2 to 3 in light of the improvements that have been made since the original 2-rating had been assigned. Chairman Messier stated that if the cornice were ever restored, the Commission should consider raising the rating of the building to a 3. Ultimately, however, the Commission acknowledged that while substantial improvements have been made to the building, a significant architectural feature is still missing. Therefore the consensus was to leave the rating of the building at 2.

<b>HDC Criteria</b>	
<b>1. Does the building have historic, architectural and/or cultural value?</b>	It has cultural value because of the Odd Fellows connection. It definitely has architectural value. It is one of the most beautiful buildings on Pleasant Street. A lot of good features are still intact. It does not appear to have any known historic value.
<b>2. Are the proposed exterior design, arrangement, textures, and materials compatible with the existing buildings or structures and to the setting and surrounding uses?</b>	Consensus is that the sign is in keeping with other signs in the district.
<b>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)</b>	There was no consensus regarding the scale of the sign. Of the four commission members, two felt the sign was fine, while two felt that the height could be reduced.
<b>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?</b>	It's always good to have a business on Pleasant Street. Mixed consensus.
<b>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?</b>	Consensus is that the sign will have a positive impact on the setting.
<b>6. Is the proposal in keeping with the Secretary of Interior's Guidelines for Rehabilitation?</b>	The sign will not cover up any architectural features. Its removal in the future will not cause harm to the building.

**Motion:** to accept 3 of the proposed signs (the facade sign was withdrawn)

**Made by:** Mrs. Kenniston                      **Second:** Mr. Wahrlich

**Vote:** Mrs. Kenniston, Mr. Messier, Mr. Wahrlich in favor. Mr. Reed opposed. Motion carries.

➤ **Conceptual review of sign for Red River Computer Co. at 21 Water Street**

Ms. Lorna Rae Philleon presented for Red River. Red River would like a sign at the top of the building that can be seen by motorists driving off of Route 120. The company does not rely on local foot traffic for its business. They want a sign that is visible at night by some means of lighting, although the type of proposed lighting was unclear. They are working with various designs, but have not made a decision. Ms. Philleon is before the Commission to solicit feedback on some of the proposed designs.

Chairman Messier said the Commission would

- not ask them to change the font of the lettering, particularly since the proposed font matches the company's logo or "brand";
- be looking at size and location of the sign;
- not want any distinguishing architectural features to be covered;

- look favorably on goose-neck lighting
- no permit internally-lit signage

Ms. Philleon said she would take this information and continue working with the designers and come back to the Commission again at another time.

➤ **Conceptual review of sign for Mascoma Savings Bank at 137-139 Broad Street**

Donald Reed, senior designer at Barlo Signs, presented proposed signs for Mascoma Savings Bank at 137-139 Broad Street. Mr. Reed stated that his office had been told by the Planning & Development Department that the number of signs being proposed was more than the zoning laws would permit.

The consensus of the Commission was that what was being proposed was acceptable. The Commission would be amenable to adding appropriate lighting.

#### **IV. Other Business**

Mr. Reed mentioned that the City Council is concerned about the appearance of the Unitarian Church on Broad Street and wanted to know if the HDC had funding to paint the building. Chairman Messier said they have no funding, but that grants may be possible. He further mentioned that three of the slates on the roof are missing and that this, in his opinion, was of greater concern to the long-term stability of building than the paint. He further mentioned the state of the vegetation in the yard of the building.

#### **V. Correspondence**

There was no correspondence.

#### **IV. Adjournment**

**Motion:** to adjourn

**Made by:** Mr. Wahrlich

**Vote:** Unanimous

**Second:** Mrs. Kenniston

The meeting adjourned at 8:39 PM.

Respectfully submitted by,  
deForest Barse

G:\Historic District Commission\3 27 2014\_DRAFT.doc

P:\Bldg Plng and Zoning\Boards\Frequent Boards LAND USE BOARDS\HDC\2014\Minutes\3 27 2014\_DRAFT.doc