


CITY OF CLAREMONT
Historic District Commission Meeting
 Thursday, June 25, 2015 7:00 PM
 City Hall, Council Chambers

MINUTES
Approved 7/23/2015

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

I. Roll Call

Members Present: David Messier, Kristin Kenniston, James Reed

Absent: Richard Wahrlich

Mr. Messier stated that with only three members present, motions would require a unanimous vote to carry.

II. Review of Minutes from June 11, 2015

Corrections: None

Motion: To approve the minutes as written.

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

III. Old Business

- **HDC 2015-00009 David Laurin, 133 Broad Street** – for roof replacement at 133 Broad Street. Tax Map 120, Lot 93. Zone: MU (Cont. from 6/11/15)

Mr. Laurin brought new shingle samples for the Commission to look at. He gave the company name and price per 100 SF of each sample. After viewing the samples and discussing them with Mr. Laurin, the Commission reached a consensus on the Certainteed Highland Slate option.

Mr. Laurin asked if the Commission objected to leaving the snow guard off of the new roof. Mr. Messier stated that as the guard is not a contributing factor to the building's architectural value, there was no objection to its omission.

Mr. Messier opened the public hearing and asked for comments. None were received. The hearing was closed. The Commission turned to addressing their criteria. Mrs. Kenniston read the architectural inventory sheet for the property (the sheet shows this structure as being at 139 Broad Street). The inventory calls this the Farwell Building and assigns a rating of 3 to it.

HDC Criteria	
1. Does the building have historic, architectural or cultural value?	The consensus of the Commission was that the rating of 3 is appropriate based on the structure's historical and architectural value.
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 consensus of the Commission was that the texture and look of the proposed shingles is compatible with the other buildings in the surrounding setting.
3. Are the scale and size of the proposed	The consensus was that this criterion does not

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)	apply.
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 consensus was that this criterion does not apply.
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?	To the general public, the uniformity of the new shingles will be an improvement over the varying colors of the replacement slates that are there now. Repairing the roof, even though with non-slate shingles, will keep the building standing and useable. The consensus was that the impact would be positive.
6. Is the proposal in keeping with the Secretary of Interior's Guidelines for Rehabilitation?	The proposed shingles will match the existing color, design and texture as much as possible. The consensus was that the proposal meets the guidelines.

Motion: To approve the application for the Certainteed Highland Slate asphalt shingles.

Made by: Mrs. Kenniston

Second: Mr. Reed

Vote: Unanimous in favor

IV. New Business

- **HDC 2015-00011 Timothy and Jessica Akusis, 182 Main Street** – for exterior, freestanding sign at 182 Main Street. Tax Map 107, Lot 50. Zone: CR-2

Timothy and Jessica Akusis presented their application to the Commission. They stated that the proposed sign is painted plastic and will be placed on both sides of the existing sign post. The sign will not be lit. They are not proposing any additional signs. The signs on the building have been there for many years. The Commission had been given photos of the proposed sign and the sign post.

Mr. Messier opened the public hearing. No comments were received. The hearing was closed and the Commission turned to addressing their criteria.

There was no architectural inventory sheet for this building. Mr. Messier stated that the building is a 20th century garage-type building.

HDC Criteria	
1. Does the building have historic, architectural or cultural value?	The consensus of the Commission was that this building had no architectural, historic or cultural value and that its rating should be zero.
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 consensus of the Commission was that this criterion was not applicable.

<p>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)</p>	<p>The consensus of the Commission was that this criterion was not applicable.</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p>The consensus of the Commission was that placement of the sign will not have a negative affect as it indicates an open and active business in the neighborhood.</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p>The consensus of the Commission was that placement of the sign will have no impact on the setting.</p>
<p>6. Is the proposal in keeping with the Secretary of Interior's Guidelines for Rehabilitation?</p>	<p>The consensus of the Commission was that this criterion is not applicable.</p>

Motion: To accept the proposal as presented.

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

V. Other

VI. Correspondence

VII. Adjournment

Motion: To adjourn the meeting

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

Meeting adjourned at 7:28PM

Respectfully submitted by,

deForest Bearse

Resource Coordinator