



Historic District Commission Meeting

Thursday, April 12, 2016 7:00 PM

City Hall, Council Chambers

MINUTES

Approved as written 4/28/2016

Mr. Messier called the meeting order at 7:00 PM. Mr. Messier explained that this was a special meeting of the Commission to make up for the March 25th meeting, which was cancelled due to a lack of quorum.

I. Roll Call

Members Present: Scott Pope, Kristin Kenniston, David Messier, Richard Wahrlich

Absent:

II. Review of Minutes from February 25, 2016

Corrections: None.

Motion: To accept the minutes of February 25, 2016.

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

Vote: Unanimous in favor

III. Old Business

- **HDC 2016-00001 Real Steel Fitness LLC, 31 Lewis Place** – for signage at **66 Pleasant Street**. Tax Map 120, Lot 89. Zone: MU (cont. from 2/25/2016)

Robert Tatro, owner the building at 66 Pleasant Street, presented changes to the front doors. This latest change is not substantially different from the first proposal. There will be no changes required in the back of the building.

Motion: To accept the proposal as presented.

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

Vote: unanimous in favor.

IV. New Business

- **HDC 2016-00002 Elite Construction, 12 Continental Blvd, Merrimac NH** – for repairs due to fire at **208 Main Street**. Tax Map 107, Lot 81. Zone: CR2

Jeff Gordon presented the application to the Commission. Mr. Gordon said there are three structures on this property – the original brick house in the front, a wood-frame addition behind with an apartment, and an attached 3-bay garage. There was a structure fire that damaged the garage and the apartment. The garage will be demolished and re-built on the same footprint with similar materials – wood frame, metal roof, clapboards on side and back, and 3 garage doors on the front. The woodframe section has been gutted and interior repairs are being made. The windows will be replace with double-hung sash windows with external black mullions, in the same size and location. The door will be replaced with a 6-panel fiberglass exterior door painted black and a storm door. (The original door was wooden.) The electric meter will be re-located to the exterior front corner of the brick house.

There were no further questions from the Commission. There was no one present to speak on the application (aside from the applicant). The hearing was closed.

Mrs. Kenniston read the architectural survey for the main house. The survey describes the house as a traditional 5-bay central hallway, early 19th century Federal brick c. 1830 with a rating of three. It is “one of the most substantial Lower Village houses” of the period. One of the earliest owners of the house erected a mill not far from the house which was used to saw slate. Mr. Messier said that the rating of three is due to connections with architecture and history.

HDC Criteria	
1. Does the building have historic, architectural or cultural value?	The building has historic value because of its connections to the development of the area. It also has architectural value because it is a good example of 19 th century Federal traditional 5-bay dwelling. All agreed.
2. Are the proposed exterior design, arrangement, textures, and materials compatible with the existing buildings or structures and to the setting and surrounding uses?	Yes, in light of keeping what was originally present – configuration and appearance of replacement windows will match historic windows. All agreed.
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)	All agreed 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?	All agreed that this criterion is 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 proposed improvements are made as repairs to a fire. The end results will be improvements to the existing buildings, which has a positive effect on the original house and its setting.
6. Is the proposal in keeping with the Secretary of Interior’s Guidelines for Rehabilitation?	Nothing is really being changed by this project. The Guidelines are not applicable.

All of the criteria have been met for a review.

Motion: To allow:

- Demolition of the existing garage due to fire damage;
- To reconstruct said garage in the same footprint and design, using the same structural foundation, including the concrete blocks on partial walls, frame and wood clapboard siding on the other walls and a metal roof to replace the existing metal roof;
- Relocating the electrical entrance/meter on the brick house;

- New painted wood siding on the wood frame addition to the house;
- Replacement of windows with new windows with exterior mullions in a 6-over-6 pattern to match the existing windows;
- A new 6-panel fiberglass exterior door and a storm door

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

Vote: Unanimous in favor

➤ **HDC 2016-00003 April Woodman, 6 Red Water Brook Rd – for signage at 35 Pleasant Street.**
Tax Map 120, Lot 73. Zone: MU

April Woodman presented her application to the Commission. She provided pictures to the Commission of what the sign will look like and what the sign for “Simply Comfort” looked like that the new sign will replace. Ms. Woodman said she is using the same sign materials and the same sign hanger. Her business is named “100 Mile Market”. The green lettering on the bottom of the sign (reading “100 Mile Market”) will be repeated in vinyl lettering on the left-side front window of the building. The lettering will match exactly what was there before.

The Commission had no further questions for the applicant. Mr. Messier opened the public hearing. There was no one present to speak. The hearing was closed.

Mr. Messier said this project is located in the Odd Fellows building which has a rating of two. Several changes have been made to the building since that rating was given. Some pieces of the façade have not been replaced.

Mr. Messier said there are only two items in the review criteria that are applicable to signs

HDC Criteria	
1. Does the building have historic, architectural or cultural value?	All agreed with a two rating.
2. Are the proposed exterior design, arrangement, textures, and materials compatible with the existing buildings or structures and to the setting and surrounding uses?	This would be true as the new sign is simply a reworking of the previous sign.
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)	This criterion is not applicable to the project.
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?	It is always good to have an open, active business on Pleasant Street. It will have a positive effect on the district. All agreed.

<p>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?</p>	<p>All agreed that the signage will have a positive effect on the setting.</p>
<p>6. Is the proposal in keeping with the Secretary of Interior’s Guidelines for Rehabilitation?</p>	<p>There is nothing in the Guidelines applicable to this project.</p>

All agreed that the criteria for review had been met.

Motion: To approve the application to use the same hanger; the sign to be 21 inches tall and 42 inches long, the same size as the existing sign.

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

Vote: Unanimous in favor

- **HDC 2016-00004 Jeff & Sarah Barrette, 14 Bailey Ave** – for repairs and alterations (for code requirements) at **13 Water Street**. Tax Map 120, Lot 24. Zone: MU

Mr. Barrette was not present for reasons unknown.

Motion: To continue the hearing to the April 28th meeting.

Made by: Mr. Messier **Second:** Mr. Wahrlich

Vote: Unanimous in favor

Motion: To adjourn the meeting

Made by: Mr. Pope **Second:** Mr. Wahrlich

Vote: Unanimous in favor

The meeting adjourned at 7:30 PM.

Mr. Barrette appeared immediately after the meeting had adjourned. As Mr. Pope, Mrs. Kenniston and Mr. Messier were still present and willing to proceed, the meeting was called back to order. (Mrs. Kenniston consulted first with Lebanon City Clerk, who assured her that it was legal to reconvene the meeting.)

Mr. Messier called the meeting to order at 7:40 PM. The roll was called and a quorum was present.

Mr. Messier read the public notice.

Mr. Barrette presented his application to the Commission. Exterior alterations will include repointing of the bricks, a handicap accessible ramp; an exit that is required for life-safety code and one entrance that is necessary for a second business enterprise. Mr. Barrette is also proposing extensive signage for his business, *The Ink Factory*, a self-storage business to occupy the second floor of the building called “*Store House No. 5*”, and an undetermined third business that will share the ground floor with *The Ink Factory*. The signs will imitate the signage at *The Common Man* in coloring and style. He has already received a variance from the Zoning Board for the signs. Most of the signs will be lit by downcast gooseneck lights. The circular sign on the Broad Street façade will be back lit.

Mr. Barrette had scaled drawings that he presented to the Commission to detail his proposals. The plans presented were drawn by Barrett Architecture, entitled *Proposed Elevations* (dated 8 Mar 2015), *Ramp and Rail Details* (dated 5 April 2015), and *Proposed Building Sections* (dated 4 April 2015). Mr. Messier made extensive notes on the drawings to detail Mr. Barrette's proposals.

This project has qualified for 79-E tax credits so the project must meet National Park Service standards. The building is not currently on the National Register, but it is eligible for listing.

Mr. Barrette will place a plaque on the exterior of the building to commemorate the restoration.

As there is no architectural survey for this building, the Commission had to create its own rating. Mr. Messier said this was the second building built in the complex of structures that became Monadnock Mills. It was probably built in the 1830's – 1840's.

HDC Criteria	
1. Does the building have historic, architectural or cultural value?	All agreed on a rating of two as the building sit today.
2. Are the proposed exterior design, arrangement, textures, and materials compatible with the existing buildings or structures and to the setting and surrounding uses?	Yes on all accounts. The metal railings and steel mesh for the ramp are appropriate for the industrial setting.
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)	All agreed that this criterion had been met.
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?	All agreed that all of the proposed work will compliment the other buildings within the district. The project will create consistency and uniformity in the area.
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?	All agreed that this project will have a "major positive" impact on the neighborhood and district.
6. Is the proposal in keeping with the Secretary of Interior's Guidelines for Rehabilitation?	The Commission reviewed all ten of the Secretary's Guidelines and agreed that they were all being met by this project.

Motion: To approve:

- Addition of a handicapped ramp on the north side of the building main entrance, to be made of steel railings and mesh with wood decking;
- New railings on the far right entrance on the north side;

- Doors to be reconfigured to have glass upper panels and switched so that they can be pushed out from the interior for safety reasons;
- The old entrance that is currently blocked on the east side of the building will be opened up to create an entrance/exit with the landing and railing matching the others and a new wooden overhang that will be slightly different to differentiate it from the originals; the door will be wood bead board with glass upper windows painted the same as everything else;
- On the south side of the wooden addition the roofline will be changed to accommodate an interior ramp;
- On the west side of the wooden addition will be a new door;
- Several existing wooden windows are being repaired;
- Some new windows will be added which will be wood, the configuration of which will match as closely as possible the original design;
- The existing T-111 and wood clapboard siding will be repaired and painted; however the Commission gives permission to replace the T-111 with clapboard siding if it becomes feasible to do so;
- Several new signs to be erected as indicated on the plans – mainly wood and one stainless steel back-lit sign on the east gable; several signs to be lit as indicated on the drawing with goose-neck lights;
- Doorways to be lit with a modification of the sign gooseneck lighting in accordance with the designs submitted to the Commission;
- The addition of a plaque on the northeast corner of the building indicating the historic significance of the building;
- Re-pointing of the brick with appropriate mortar.

Made by: Mr. Messier **Second:** Mrs. Kenniston
Vote: Unanimous in favor

V. Other

VI. Correspondence

VII. Adjournment

Motion: To adjourn the meeting.

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

Vote: Unanimous in favor

The meeting adjourned at 8:35 PM.

Respectfully submitted by,
deForest Bearse