



## Historic District Commission Meeting

Thursday, May 26, 2016 7:00 PM

City Hall, Council Chambers

### MINUTES

APPROVED 6/23/2016

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

#### I. Roll Call

**Members Present:** Kristin Kenniston, Scott Pope, David Messier

**Absent:** Richard Wahrlich

#### II. Review of Minutes from April 28, 2016

**Corrections:** None.

**Motion:** To approve the minutes of April 28, 2016 as written.

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

**Vote:** Unanimous in favor

#### III. Old Business

There was no old business to discuss.

#### IV. New Business

- A. **HDC 2016-00006 Robert Tatro, Jr. DMD, 20 Cindy Avenue** – for installation of air conditioning units at **66 Pleasant Street**. Tax Map 120, Lot 89. Zone: MU

##### Public Hearing Opened

Mr. Messier read the public notice and opened the public hearing.

##### Applicant Presentation

Mr. Tatro said he is putting in air conditioning and air exchange mechanicals to benefit his new tenant (Real Steel Fitness). He distributed pictures of the back of the building and the air conditioning units to the board. Mr. Tatro explained that four units and associated duct work would be placed on top of the cement structure (the “bunker”) in the back of the building as the bunker roof is at the optimum height for getting the plenums into the second floor. Duct work will be going through the back wall of the building. Each unit is 4 ft x 4 ft. There will be one or two vents to vent the air from the air handler, but they will probably not be visible. The bunker is only minimally visible from the parking areas behind the building or from Glidden Street.

The bunker is in a very utilitarian location behind the main building. There is a loading dock and several dumpsters there as well (these do not belong to Mr. Tatro). He said his tenant may place a small dumpster in the shed next to the bunker.

##### Public Hearing Closed

There were no abutters present and no one wishing to speak to this application. The Commission turned to reviewing their criteria.

According to the architectural inventory for the property, this 1930 building was once used by Montgomery Ward. According to the inventory, the blank façade of the second floor (where signage is now placed) “hurts” the historical integrity of the building. It does, however, have interesting marble panels and trim. The marble panel at the top of the building depicts the “goddess of commerce” and was used as a symbol on all Montgomery Ward buildings. The building is given a rating of two, primarily because of the second floor façade. The consensus of the Commission is that the rating is appropriate.

HDC Criteria	
<b>1. Does the building have historic, architectural or cultural value?</b>	The Commission agreed that the building has architectural value because of the marble panels and trim (and the association with Montgomery Ward); the interesting features are mainly at the top of the building front, but it adds interest to the downtown. The link with Montgomery Ward might be considered a cultural and historical 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>	The Commission agreed that this criterion is not applicable to this project.
<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>	The Commission agreed that this criterion is not applicable to this project.
<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>	The Commission agreed that the project is utilitarian in nature and facilitates full use of the building. The effect is neutral.
<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>	The building will be in use and bringing in income which will allow for its upkeep and thus its preservation. The project has no affect on the architecture.
<b>6. Is the proposal in keeping with the Secretary of Interior’s Guidelines for Rehabilitation?</b>	The project is in keeping with the Secretary’s guidelines.

**Motion:** To accept the application as presented.

**Made by:** Mr. Pope

**Second:** Mrs. Kenniston

**Vote:** Unanimous in favor

## V. Other

Kevin Klaphaak, partner in Amore di Mona (chocolate company that purchased 40 Union Street) approached the Commission for guidance on changes the company would like to make to the building. He talked about painting the exterior of the building, removing the black vinyl window shutters, installing air conditioning units, replacing windows and using the second floor for residential purposes (which would require a second means of egress). The Commission provided some broad guidance, but Mr. Messier cautioned that their guidance does not constitute approval.

## **VI. Correspondence**

## **VII. Adjournment**

**Motion:** To adjourn the meeting

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

**Vote:** Unanimous in favor

The meeting adjourned at 7:28 PM.

**Respectfully submitted by,**  
*deForest Bearse*