



Historic District Commission Meeting
Thursday, May 24, 2018 6:30 PM
City Hall, Council Chambers

MINUTES
Approved 6/28/2018

Mr. Messier called the meeting to order at 6:34 PM and asked for a roll call.

I. Roll Call

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

II. Review of Minutes from April 26, 2018

Corrections: None

Motion: To approve

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

Vote: Unanimous in favor

III. Old Business

A. HDC 2018-00002 Angel Jarvis, Claremont NH – for signage at 36 Opera House Square. Tax Map 120, Lot 44. Zone: MU (Cont. from 4/26/2018)

Mr. Messier read the public notice and noted that the applicant was not present. The Commission reviewed the materials submitted with the application and felt there was sufficient information contained in it for the Commission to act on it without the applicant being present.

The application seeks approval for signage, specifically a suspended sign above the door at 36 Opera House square, lettering on the door itself listing procedures offered by the business, and an additional sign in the window on the second floor. The business is located on the second floor at 36-38 Opera House Square. The applicant claimed in a letter to the Commission that people have a hard time finding her business because she doesn't have a storefront at street level and the outdoor seating at Revolution Cantina in the summer months further blocks visibility of her business entrance.

Mr. Messier noted that the signs were already up and that this is an after-the-fact permit application.

Comments from the Commission:

- A very similar metal bracket is being used by another business on the same street;
- It is a common and historically appropriate means of hanging a sign;

- It doesn't take up a lot of space visually because of the open spaces in it;
- It's discreet.

The Commission turned to its review criteria.

Mr. Messier read the architectural survey, which described this building as a “stunning little Victorian Gothic commercial block” and an “integral part of the Tremont (Opera House) Square north wall”. It was awarded the highest rating of 3. The building, however, has been much remodeled at the street level. Mr. Messier noted that the iron crest rails referenced in the survey have been removed (without approval) since the survey was done (1977).

Criteria #1 Consider the level of historical, architectural, or cultural value of the building, and whether it relates and contributes to the setting.

Historical: Not really a lot of information of anything important historically that happened at this building.

Architectural: It has been given a very high rating for its architectural elements.

Cultural: It is not really connected to any specific people or cultural elements.

Motion: I move that the building located at 36-38 Opera House Square has a very important architectural value and it relates and contributes to its setting.

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

This building is part of the north wall (of Opera House Square), which is very important. The north wall is a continuous series of buildings that are all on the same plane. This building is very contributing to that. This building's relationship and contribution to its setting are considered of high importance.

Vote: Unanimous in favor

Criteria #2 Consider how the proposed exterior design, arrangement, texture(s), and materials relate to existing buildings or structures in its setting, or if new construction, to the surrounding use.

Nothing is being done to the building – just signage being added. The building itself is not being changed. The consensus of the Commission was that this criterion was not applicable.

Criteria #3 Consider the proposed scale and general size of buildings or structures and whether they relate to the existing surroundings. Consider such factors as the building's overall height, width, street frontage, number of stories, roof type, window/door openings, and architectural details.

This criterion relates to building elements that would be proposed. These things are not being proposed in this application. The consensus of the Commission was that this criterion was not applicable.

Criteria # 4 Consider how the signs might affect the character of any building or structure within the district.

Comments:

- What's being proposed fits right in with what is there now;
- The signs are in keeping with the character.

Motion: I move that the applicant's plans for signs are in keeping with the character of the district and do not adversely affect the character of any other building or structure within the district.

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

Vote: Unanimous in favor

Criteria # 5 Consider the impact that the sign will have on the setting and the extent to which it will preserve and enhance the historic, architectural, and cultural qualities of the district and community.

Comments:

- The proposal is not trying to create a historical-looking sign – it is a contemporary sign;
- The sign works with everything else that's happening within the district;
- Mr. Messier likes the hanging sign coming off the building;
- What is on the door is appropriate to explain what her business is about.

Motion: I move that the applicant's proposal will have a positive effect on the setting and will help to preserve and enhance the historic, architectural, and cultural qualities of the district and community.

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

Vote: Unanimous in favor

Criteria # 6 Consider how the proposal relates to the "Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Rehabilitation"

Mr. Messier explained that the Secretary's Guidelines address making a change to a building and ensuring that the change is appropriate to that building or if significant changes are proposed, that they could be reversed in the future. Adding a sign to a building really isn't part of the review of that and would cause no damage to the building if it were removed. The consensus of the Commission was that this criterion was not applicable.

Having no negative reviews in the criteria, Mr. Messier called for a final motion.

FINAL MOTION

Motion: Based on our preceding findings of fact, I move that the Historic District Commission approve the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the property located at 36-38 Opera House Square, Map120, lot 44

Made by: Mr. Pope
Vote: Unanimous in favor

Second: Mrs. Kenniston

IV. New Business

A. Santagate plaque and signage – pedestrian bridge

Mr. Pope said this project is still a work in progress. The committee has not yet met to come up with a design proposal. The topic was continued to the next HDC meeting on June 28th.

V. Other

VI. Correspondence

VII. Adjournment

Motion: To adjourn the meeting

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

Vote: Unanimous in favor

Meeting adjourned at 6:47 PM.

Respectfully submitted by,
deForest Bearse
Resource Coordinator

ADDENDUM TO THE MINUTES

Keith Raymond, member of the Santagate Bridge Signage Committee, came to discuss the project with the Commission. (Scott Pope is also a member of this committee, as well as the Council representative on the Historic District Commission.) The committee had not yet created a vision for the signage, so the Commission and Mr. Raymond spent time sharing ideas on how the signage might be done. Everyone seemed to agree that the name “Santagate Bridge” (or something similar) should be placed directly on the bridge at both ends and a boulder with a brass plaque explaining why the bridge has been so named should be placed on the ground next to the bridge on the Common Man side of the bridge.

Mr. Scott asked to have someone tell him what type of metal the bridge is made of so he can determine how difficult it will be to drill through.

It was suggested that Mr. Raymond check with Stringer Funeral Home, Don Chabot, and/or Bob Landry for suitable sources of brass plaques.

It was agreed to continue the discussion at the June 28th HDC meeting, with the Bridge Signage Committee (hopefully) having met in the interim.

deForest Bearse