


CITY OF CLAREMONT
Historic District Commission Meeting
Thursday, June 11, 2015 7:00 PM
City Hall, Council Chambers

MINUTES
Approved 6/25/2015

I. Roll Call

Members Present: Kristin Kenniston, David Messier, James Reed, Richard Wahrlich

Absent:

II. Review of Minutes from April 23, 2015

Corrections: None.

Motion: To accept the minutes of April 23, 2015 as presented.

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

III. Old Business

IV. New Business

➤ **Certificate of Appropriateness Application:**

- i. **HDC 2015-00009 David Laurin, 133 Broad Street** – for roof replacement at 133 Broad Street. Tax Map 120, Lot 93. Zone: MU

David Laurin, acting as representative for Mascoma Bank, presented the application. The proposal is to replace the slate roof of the white painted brick portion of the two Mascoma Bank buildings with architectural asphalt shingles. (He provided samples for the Commission to view.) The proposal includes a slight modification to the roof edge detail to improve insulation and ventilation. The existing snow guards and copper band will not be replaced. (He provided drawings to the Commission.)

Mr. Laurin stated that the adjacent building and the drive-up window are already three-tab asphalt shingle. They may be re-shingling these roofs as well so that all three buildings will look the same. These shingles were possibly installed when the gambrel roof was replaced sometime in the 1900's (possibly 1980's).

Mr. Laurin stated:

- the current slate roof is multi-colored because various slates have been replaced;
- there are places where you can see daylight through the roof and it is time to make a change;
- he and the bank have considered replacing the slate with slate or synthetic slate, but they feel it is too costly;
- the current roof is composed of board sheathing with slate on it with “plenty of holes through the sheathing and the slate”;
- he has not inspected the slate himself.

Mr. Messier asked if he had considered other types of asphalt shingles that more closely resemble slate, to which Mr. Laurin said he had, but that the cost would be twice that of the shingles he is proposing. Mr. Messier countered that the cost may be greater, but that the lifespan of the shingles is doubled as well. Mr. Laurin stated that the shingles he is proposing are the heaviest weight (of their type) and will last for 40 years.

Mr. Messier stated that replacing the current slate shingles with the proposed architectural shingles will not comply with the *Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Rehabilitation*. He further stated that this building has an architectural rating of 3, which allows less flexibility in the application of the standards and that cost is not a consideration.

After much discussion, it was agreed that the applicant should return to the next meeting with a different proposal.

Motion: To continue the hearing to the June 25th meeting.

Made by: Mrs. Kenniston **Second:** Mr. Reed **Vote:** unanimous in favor

Mr. Messier further stated that the shingles on the other (Mascoma Bank) buildings could be replaced with asphalt shingles as desired, because they already are covered with asphalt shingles now. What's critical on this building is the change from slate to asphalt.

➤ **Certificate of Appropriateness Application:**

- i. **HDC 2015-00010 Sean Donahue 40 Central Street** – for exterior stairway, door and window changes at 40 Central Street. Tax Map 119, Lot 250. Zone: CR-2

Mr. Donahue presented the application to the Commission. The Commission had photos of the building and a scale drawing of the proposed work. The work is required by the fire department for life safety. The work is proposed for the back section of the building. The railing height and tread on the stairs will be brought up to current code. One window will be replaced with a mechanical exhaust fan.

The Commission had no further questions of the applicant. The public hearing was opened. No comments were received so the hearing was closed. The Commission turned to addressing their review criteria.

Mrs. Kenniston read the architectural inventory sheet for this property. The sheet assigns a rating of 1 to the building. Mr. Messier stated that since the inventory sheet was done, the Commission has approved vinyl siding and replacement windows for the building.

HDC Criteria	
1. Does the building have historic, architectural or cultural value?	The building has no outstanding values. The consensus of the Commission was that the rating of 1 is appropriate for this building.
2. Are the proposed exterior design, arrangement, textures, and materials compatible with the existing buildings or structures and to the setting and surrounding uses?	There are several other apartment buildings in the immediate area, many of which have these required exterior staircases; they match other nonhistoric elements, but the arrangements and textures match the other nonhistoric features.
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 scale is what it is to meet the requirements for the life safety features that are required; all agreed.
4. How will the proposed improvements	The consensus was that this criterion is not

(signs, lights, yards, off-street parking, screening, fencing, entrance drive, sidewalks, and landscaping) affect the character of any building or structure within the district?	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?	It is a required feature that will have a neutral impact on the district and neighborhood.
6. Is the proposal in keeping with the Secretary of Interior's Guidelines for Rehabilitation?	These changes could be removed without damage to the integrity of the building. Therefore it is in keeping with the guidelines.

Motion: To accept this application as proposed.

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

➤ **Sign Ordinance Discussion**

The Commission received copies of a draft sign ordinance that is being worked on by the City Center Initiative Committee. Mr. Wahrlich stated that the Planning Board has been discussing the sign ordinance as well.

Concerns discussed were the size of hanging signs (in the historic district), illumination of signs, and the new types of lighting.

V. Other

VI. Correspondence

.

VII. Adjournment

Motion: To adjourn the meeting

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

The meeting adjourned at 7:41 PM.

Respectfully submitted by,

deForest Bearse

Resource Coordinator