


CITY OF CLAREMONT
Historic District Commission Meeting
 Thursday, April 28, 2016 7:00 PM
 City Hall, Council Chambers

MINUTES
Approved 5/26/2016

Mr. Messier called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

I. Roll Call

Members Present: Scott Pope, Kristin Kenniston, David Messier

Absent: Richard Wahrlich

II. Review of Minutes from April 12, 2016

Corrections: None.

Motion: To accept the minutes as presented.

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

Vote: Unanimous in favor

III. Old Business

- A. HDC 2015-00014 Victor & Dawna Jangel, 7 Marcotte Avenue** – for demolition of the building at **139 Main Street**. Tax Map 107, Lot 15. Zone: MU (Cont. from 2/25/2016)

Mr. Messier read the public notice. The applicant was not present at the meeting.

The Commission received a letter from Jennifer Shea, attorney from Buckley & Zopf, representing the applicants, requesting to withdraw the Jangels’ application and reserving the right to re-submit the application at a future date.

No further action was required by the Commission.

IV. New Business

- A. HDC 2016-00005 Christopher LaClair, 32 Opera House Square** – for signage at **32 Opera House Square**. Tax Map 120, Lot 43. Zone: MU

Mr. Messier read the public notice. The applicant was not present at the meeting.

Mr. Messier stated that the sign is already in place without prior approval of the Commission. He said he assumed the applicant did not know that approval was required for the vinyl letters they have attached to their window, which serve as their sign.

The applicant provided photographs of the lettering in the windows with the application. The signs are in the windows of one of the storefronts of the Moody Building.

| HDC Criteria | |
|---|--|
| 1. Does the building have historic, architectural or cultural value? | The architectural inventory for 32 Opera House Square rates the building as a “3”, highest possible rating, noting its key location and describing it as a “distinctive building”. The |

| | |
|--|---|
| | Commission agreed with the 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? | The Commissioners agreed that this criterion was not applicable. |
| 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 Commissioners agreed that this criterion was 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? | An open, active business on the Square has a positive effect on the other businesses in the district; the style of the lettering does not detract at all. |
| 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? | An open, active business has a positive effect, but it does nothing to enhance the nature of the building. Therefore the impact is neutral. |
| 6. Is the proposal in keeping with the Secretary of Interior's Guidelines for Rehabilitation? | These signs do not make a change to the building and are completely reversible. This criterion is not applicable. |

There were no questions from the Commission. There was no one from the public at the hearing. The proposal met the criteria with no adverse effects.

Motion: To approve the application as presented.

Made by: Mr. Pope **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

Meeting adjourned at 7:09 PM

Respectfully submitted,
deForest Bearse