


CITY OF CLAREMONT
Historic District Commission Meeting
Thursday, June 23, 2016 7:00 PM
City Hall, Council Chambers

MINUTES
Approved 7/21/2016

I. Roll Call

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

Absent:

II. Review of Minutes from May 26, 2016

Corrections: None

Motion: To accept the minutes of May 26th as written.

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

Vote: Unanimous in favor

III. Old Business

- A. There was no old business to discuss.

IV. New Business

- A. **HDC 2016-00007 New Socials Bar & Grill, 2 Pleasant Street** – for placement of a walk-in cooler behind the building at **2 Pleasant Street**. Tax Map 120, Lot 75. Zone: MU

Mr. Messier read the public notice and invited the applicants to present their application.

Applicant's Presentation

Christine Charest, new owner of the New Socials Restaurant, said they wanted to increase the number of taps at the bar and they need space to store the extra kegs. The basement of the building is rather small, so she is proposing placement of a 12 ft x 11 ft x 8 ft walk-in cooler behind the building. Lines would run from the cooler into the taps in the building. The exterior of the cooler is clad in metal and is currently painted brown. Mrs. Charest said there would be sufficient room for oil deliveries and to get around it.

Public Hearing

Marty Davis said he is in favor of business, but was concerned about what appeared to be happening to Broad Street. He said there will be logging occurring behind the Middle School that will no doubt alter the schools' setting, there will be parking allowed in front of the former Moose Lodge for another business, and now this "big box" would be added to the collection of dumpsters and trash bins that are already behind the building. "When do we stop picking away at the beauty of Broad Street?"

Mr. Messier read an email sent to the board by abutter, Matthew Nelson, who called the cooler an "eyesore" and expressed concern about the noise and vibration that may come from it. He stated that this is not a visual enhancement to the downtown. Mr. Messier stated that noise and vibration is not something the Commission can address.

There were no further comments from the public. Mr. Messier closed the public hearing.

The Commission turned to discussing the application. Mr. Messier said that the cooler will use the entire space between the two doors. He and Mr. Pope said that much work had gone into cleaning up this area and they did not want to see that work defeated. There was concern about the 2 "alleys" that the cooler would create. Mr. Charest said he had met with the fire and police chiefs and said they saw no problem with it. (No documentation was provided to corroborate the claim.) He said the tap lines would enter the building through the existing dryer vent.

After much discussion, the Charests agreed to cover the cooler with clapboard siding and trim to exactly mirror the siding and trim (and colors) that are currently on the building.

Review of Criteria

Mrs. Kenniston read the architectural inventory sheet for the building (the “Brown Block”). The sheet gave the building a rating of two because of its much altered condition in such a critical location. The building has great historical value because of the work that Mr. Brown did in developing the downtown. (The inventory was written in 1977.)

The building has been much restored since the inventory was written, increasing its architectural value. The Commission agreed that the building should now be rated as a three.

HDC Criteria	
1. Does the building have historic, architectural or cultural value?	The consensus of the Commission was that the building has high historical and architectural value and deserves a rating of 3.
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 structure will be sided and trimmed to match the existing building. The textures and materials will be compatible. The space that the cooler will occupy is flat space. The consensus was that this criterion has been met.
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 cooler is shorter than the existing wall; the massing is a little heavy and may not have adequate clearances; the back of the building has a stepped look to it already. It was agreed that this criterion was 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?	The Commission agreed that this criterion did not apply to this project.
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?	This project will allow a business to expand and attract more customers; the City is trying to be business-friendly; the structure is back far enough from the street that it should not be a distraction; it is not seen as an enhancement; visually its impact will be neutral.
6. Is the proposal in keeping with the Secretary of Interior’s Guidelines for Rehabilitation?	The structure is not attached to the building and could be removed at any time without affecting the building; it is not trying to recreate some other architectural period that would be inappropriate; thus the project is in keeping with the Secretary of the Interior’s guidelines.

Motion: To accept this application on the condition that the unit is sided to match the building with the appropriate matching trim, materials and colors. The siding cannot be vinyl siding; “trim” is taken to mean corner boards and fascia boards; trim along the bottom is not necessary.

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

Vote: Unanimous in favor.

- B. **HDC 2016-00008 Eagle Times, 401 River Road** – for signage for the Eagle Times newspaper at **45 Crescent Street**. Tax map 120, Lot 28. Zone: MU

Mr. Messier read the public notice and invited the application to present their application.

Applicant’s Presentation

Cameron Paquette, assistant editor at the Eagle Times, presented the application. They would like to hang the “Eagle Times” sign in the archway at the entrance to the building at 45 Crescent Street. The sign is painted wood measuring 62 inches long and 10 inches high. Mr. Paquette’s original proposal was to attach the sign to the cross-piece in the archway using the exiting holes in the sign. However, this would cover some of the trim which the Commission would not permit. It was agreed that the sign would be hung from eye hooks below the trim board. There will be no signs on the back of the building, although the Times may want to add a sign to the existing fixture in front of the building. As the current application has no information on that sign the Commission agreed to continue the hearing to give the applicant time to develop it. The Commission had no further questions.

Mr. Messier opened the public hearing. There were no comments so the hearing was closed and the Commission turned to discussing the application.

Mr. Pope read the HAER nomination sheet for the building (written in 1978) as there was no architectural inventory.

HDC Criteria	
1. Does the building have historic, architectural or cultural value?	The building has both high historical and architectural value because it was the office for the Monadnock Mills Co. It is one of the more attractive of the mill buildings. The building has not been altered since the addition in 1907. The Commission agreed that it warranted a rating of 3.
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 Commission agreed that this criterion was not applicable to this project.
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 Commission agreed that this criterion was not applicable to this 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?	The sign matches the building very well and will have a positive effect.
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 sign will be a nice addition to the building. It will be good to have someone back in the building.
6. Is the proposal in keeping with the Secretary of Interior’s Guidelines for Rehabilitation?	It is in keeping with the guidelines.

Motion: To accept the application for the sign for the Eagle Times with the condition that it be hung so as not to block any of the decorative trim of the building (i.e. hung below the trim board).

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

Vote: Unanimous in favor.

Motion: To continue the hearing to the July 28th meeting of the Commission to allow the applicant time to develop additional signage.

Made by: Mrs. Kenniston
Vote: Unanimous in favor

Second: Mr. Wahrlich

V. Other

A. Conceptual discussion with Red River regarding proposed changes to existing signage

Red River representative Lorna Rae Philleson, said that the company is very disappointed with their sign. Because it is mounted on railings away from the building, there are shadows cast by the sunlight that blur the letters and make it very difficult to read. The railings do not match the color of the building either. They would like to mount the letters on a flat, brick-colored background that would be flush with the building. The Commission saw no problem with the proposal and agreed that it could be handled as an amendment of the earlier sign application.

B. Master Plan Historic Resources Subcommittee

The Commission agreed to serve as the subcommittee for the historic resources chapter of the Master Plan. Work on the chapter will begin in October and end in January.

VI. Correspondence

VII. Adjournment

Motion: To adjourn the meeting

Made by: Mr. Pope

Second: Mrs. Kenniston

Vote: Unanimous in favor

The meeting adjourned at 8:19 PM.

Respectfully submitted by,

deForest Bearse