



Historic District Commission Meeting
Thursday, August 23, 2018 6:30 PM
City Hall, Council Chambers

MINUTES
Approved 11/8/2018

Mr. Messier called the meeting to order at 6:41 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 July 26, 2018

Corrections: None

Motion: To approve the minutes of July 26, 2018

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

Vote: Unanimous in favor

III. Old Business

There was no old business.

IV. New Business

- A. **HDC 2018-00006 Lake Sunapee Baptist Church, Newport NH** – for adding a second exit and removing the small basement entry at **106 Broad Street**. Tax map 120, Lot 156. Zone: PR

Mr. Messier read the public notice.

Sean Glasscock presented the application on behalf of the Lake Sunapee Baptist Church. Mr. Glasscock explained that the Church needs to add a second exterior exit to comply with building and fire safety codes. They are proposing to create the new exit on the south side of the building. This location was chosen because the back of the building sits on the property line shared with the cemetery and the north side of the building sits on the property line shared with the fire department. There will be a new doorway cut into the brick wall next to an existing window with a wooden deck, railings, and stairway extending out from the building 105 inches. The deck will be 60 inches wide. The deck, railings and stairs will be constructed of pressure-treated lumber that will be stained a neutral brown color. The exit door will be a flat metal commercial-style door. (They would like to use this door because they already have it.) Due to the shape of the building on the south side, the door and all but 40 inches of the deck will not be visible from the road. There is a fence on the

site that runs perpendicular to the building in front of the proposed deck and stairs which further inhibits visibility.

The applicant is also proposing to remove the existing shed on the south side of the building and to replace it with a standard metal bulkhead. The shed currently covers up a part of one of the windows on that side of the building. By removing it, the window will be fully visible once again. It is believed that the brickwork and the portion of the window that is currently covered up are still intact.

There is an existing door on the same section of the building as the proposed second exit that will be repaired to the way it was.

Mr. Messier said the new doorway will need a header to support the brick above the new opening and advised having someone experienced with masonry do the work. Mr. Glasscock said they had someone who could do the work properly.

Mr. Messier said he was concerned about the appearance of the flat metal door, but was willing to allow it since it will not be visible from the road. The other Commissioners were in agreement with that.

There were no further questions. The Commission turned to their deliberations. Mr. Messier asked the Commissioners for their thoughts regarding the proposals.

Mr. Pope said that tearing off the shed will certainly improve the building. Mrs. Kenniston said the doorway in the back won't be seen from the street and only a minimal amount of the stairs will be visible. Mr. Messier said there is a fence and a small wall that further limit visibility. He said the door is required for the occupancy permit and he would rather see the building occupied than not. Mr. Pope and Mrs. Kenniston agreed that it was a good thing that the existing door (on the north side) is being repaired before it "falls in".

Mrs. Kenniston read the architectural inventory sheet:

106 Broad Street

Rating: 3 2 1 0

Significance: *An intriguing architectural combination – a Federal style brick church given a good Victorian Gothic remodeling. An appropriate use on east side of the park and an important visual element in the row of public and civic buildings which line that side in an unbroken row.*

Period/Style: *late Federal/Victorian Gothic*

Front tower added with very good Victorian Gothic stickwork and patterned slate roof to a Federal style brick church. Brick walls articulated by shallow arches containing round-headed windows. Both level and raking cornices are ornamented with metopes indicating present roof pitch is probably original. (as the metoped cornices should be of Federal date) Similar metoped cornices are found on another Claremont building – the brick Greek revival house at 39 Central Street. LV-97

Historical Information

Date(s): 1832, 1883

Original Owner: *Universalist Society*

Architect/Builder: *for 1883 remodeling – Hira Beckwith, architect and builder*

The church was built on the town common in 1832; before this the Universalists, Baptists, and Methodists had erected the “old round brick church” on the site of the Trinity Church in 1815.

According to 1883 Advocate account of remodeling, all that remains of the original building is the basic brick shell.

A painted fireboard (c. 1846) now in the Fiske Free Library shows the original appearance with a domed Federal style belfry capping the tower.

Mr. Messier noted that the building has been given the highest rating available in the (historic district). (He further noted that it was interesting that the inventory sheet references 39 Central Street which is currently under discussion with the City.) He said these are the only two buildings of which he is aware that have the cornice detail that they have. This was a “high-style detail” for that time period.

Mr. Messier stated that the arches are what differentiate this building as a Federal period building as that was very common in the period. The tower was changed to a Victorian tower at a later date.

The Commission then turned to the review criteria.

Criterion #1: Historic, Architectural, and Cultural Value

a. Does the building have:

- i. Historic value**
- ii. Architectural value**
- iii. Cultural value?**

Mrs. Kenniston felt the building had all three values. Mr. Messier agreed, being that it was an early church associated with an earlier congregation; its architectural value was previously discussed (see above); cultural value as the Universalist Church and their influence on the community.

b. Does it relate and contribute to its setting?

Mrs. Kenniston said it creates a very important visual element in the row of the buildings on that side of the park. Everyone agreed with that finding.

Motion: I move that the building located at 106 Broad Street has important historical, architectural and cultural value and that it does relate and contribute to its setting.

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

Vote: Unanimous in favor

Criterion #2: How do the proposed exterior design, arrangement, texture(s), and materials relate to the existing buildings or structures in the project’s setting? Are they compatible?

The applicant is removing a non-historic element, which Mr. Messier described as “an eyesore”, thereby exposing more of the original building. It is to be replaced by a standard metal bulkhead. The applicant is also proposing an additional doorway and a deck to provide a second means of egress from the back of the building.

Motion: I move that the proposed new construction is compatible with the existing uses that

surround the project setting that is an improvement over the existing conditions (the bulkhead will be an improvement over the existing conditions).

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

Vote: Unanimous in favor

Criterion #3: Are the scale and general size of the proposed *improvements* compatible with and in keeping with the existing surroundings (other buildings)? (*Improvements* here is taken to mean a building's height, width, street frontage, number of stories, roof type, façade openings such as windows, doors, etc., and architectural details)

The project requires removing some of the brick to make a doorway. Mrs. Kenniston felt it is in keeping with the existing surroundings. She said it won't be seen from the road anyway.

Mr. Messier said the other doorways in the back addition of the church are square openings (as opposed to the arched openings elsewhere on the building). In that context, the proposed doorway is in keeping with what is back there.

Motion: I move that the scale and general size of the proposed improvements – meaning the opening and introduction of a metal door are compatible with and are in keeping with relationship of these same factors in the existing surroundings.

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

Vote: Unanimous in favor

Criterion # 4: How will the proposed *improvements* affect the character of any other building or structure within the district? (*Improvements* here is taken to mean yards, off-street parking, screening, fencing, entrance drives, sidewalks, signs, lights, and landscaping)

Mr. Messier said this would apply to the deck and the bulkhead. How would these affect the character of other buildings?

Mrs. Kenniston felt it would have a neutral effect on the surrounding buildings.

Mr. Pope felt that getting rid of the shed would have a positive effect on the whole line of buildings. Mr. Messier and Mrs. Kenniston agreed.

Motion: I move that the applicant's plans for the door and removing the bulkhead are keeping with and improving the character of the district.

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

Vote: Unanimous in favor

Criterion # 5:

Mr. Messier said criterion #5 relates to what the Commission had just discussed under criterion #4. He suggested finding criterion #4 as not applicable because none of the items listed in criterion #4 are part of this project and switching the motion to criterion #5.

The Commission agreed that criterion #4 is not applicable and the motion made for it will be for criterion #5: what impact will the proposal have on the setting neutral, negative or positive – everyone had agreed it would be positive.

Criterion #6: Is the proposal in keeping with the Secretary of Interior’s Guidelines for Rehabilitation?

1. *A property shall be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.*

The church will be used as a church once again. The proposed changes will have minimal effect on the character of the property or district.

2. *The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property shall be avoided.*

Placement of the new door and stairs at the back of the building and not very visible from the street will have a very minimal impact.

3. *Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.*

This is not being proposed in this project.

4. *Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.*

That would be true if someone were proposing to remove the Victorian tower and put it back to its original form. However, the Victorian tower has developed its own significance over time. Nothing to that effect is being proposed in this project.

5. *Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.*

6. *Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*

This is not being proposed.

7. *Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used.*

This is not being proposed.

8. *Archaeological resources shall be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.*

This is not applicable.

9. *New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing, to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*

The window in the back addition that will be next to the new door is being left intact. A new doorway is required to create the new access. Using pressure-treated wood – you would not use regular wood which would be more historical because there was no pressure treated wood at the time of the church. There are no issues here.

10. *New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*

The deck could be removed.

Motion: I move that the applicant's proposal is in keeping with the guidelines set out in the Secretary of the Interior's *Guidelines for Rehabilitation*.

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

Vote: Unanimous in favor

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 this project at 106 Broad Street, Map120, Lot 156.

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

Vote: Unanimous in favor

- B. **HDC 2018-00007 Goddard Block Limited Partnership, New Hampton NH** – for a complete rehabilitation of the existing building and constructing new additions on the Broad Street side of the building at **54-62 Pleasant Street**. Tax map 120, Lot 85. Zone: MU

Mr. Messier read the public notice.

Frank J. Barrett, Jr., architect with Barrett Architecture in White River Junction and architect for this project, presented the application. Kevin LaCasse, project owner, was also present.

Mr. Barrett explained that this project started last June with discussions about parking. The building was condemned by the City in March 2017 due to multiple building and fire safety code issues. Mr. LaCasse was invited to view the building along with others.

Mr. Barrett and Mr. LaCasse went to the zoning board and obtained two variances – one for parking and the other for allowing residential development on the ground floor of building on Pleasant Street. They then went to the Planning Board for site plan review. The review was

for the back side of the building as it faces a municipal parking lot and Broad Street where they propose substantive changes, landscaping, access to the building, re-doing the parking, etc.

Through the fall of 2017 Mr. Barrett was getting the building measured (there are no adequate drawings of the building) and trying to get the building “figured out a little bit”.

Project funders gave their approval of the project in January 2018 (\$7.4M). A construction manager was brought on board in March – April 2018. Trumbull-Nelson of Hanover, NH will be overseeing the construction. They are putting together final budgets for the project.

Plans have been submitted to the building and fire departments and they are starting their reviews.

“The project is heavily dependent upon the historic preservation tax credits.” Last fall they engaged historic preservation consultant, Lisa Mausolf, to assist. The Historic Preservation Certification Application Part 2, Description of Rehabilitation, has been submitted to the National Park Service. The Park Service has given the “green light” to certain parts of the project.

Subsequent to Ms. Mausolf’s submission, they have had 3 meetings with the Department of Historic Resources, specifically Peter Michaud. (Here Mr. Barrett stated that the “final application has not yet progressed to the Park Service”. He said, however, he was not anticipating any issues. He said he didn’t want to file for local review until Ms. Mausolf had completed her work and it had gone to Concord.)

Overview of the Project

Mr. Barrett turned to presenting the plans for the building. He used the same site plan that had been presented to the Planning Board. The project site fronts on Pleasant Street and is sandwiched between Daddy’s Pizza and Real Steel Fitness. The building was subdivided from the Real Steel Fitness building.

The building was difficult to figure out. They believe the original part of the building – on the back – was built as a 2-story bakery in 1920 by the Goddard Baking Company. An addition was later placed on the north side. The big three-story portion was added in 1926 and became the “Goddard Block” as is stated in the building’s keystone. In 1928 the so-called Kimble Building, which until recently housed “Nana’s” store, was added on. Other additions were added later. They estimate that the footprint of the building is comprised of eight different renditions of buildings.

There is a single-story addition on the back (the ‘dog-leg’) that was a later addition. What they are proposing and what the Planning Board approved is to put two stories onto it as well as to put a third story onto the two-story portion of the building adjacent to it. The dog-leg, however, extends to the property lines which gave rise to various fire code issues, e.g. the inability to have windows, which obviously would not work for apartments. To accommodate the codes, they proposed to remove the dog-leg and re-construct it 3-4 feet back from the property lines. He said the Park Service tentatively signed off on that proposal in June. This proposal will be in the final application to the Park Service.

The scope of the project is preserving, renovating, restoring the front three-story building, which includes all new electrical, plumbing, and heating systems. Mr. Barrett said the “roof is hot and the building is deteriorating, but nonetheless it’s still a good building.” It has a good steel frame in it with wood infill for walls and joists. It steps down to the two-story bakery building in the back that is going to receive a third story. The single-story portion in the very back that faces out will remain single-story but be heavily renovated to include some apartments. The Kimble Block to the south will remain the same as far as the massing and overall footprint, but it will be “heavily renovated”.

There will be 36 apartment units – a mix of studios, and 1- and 2-bedroom units.

By redesigning the dog-leg, an elevator can be added without having to place in the center of the main building and a second fire-rated stairway to serve the back portion of the building. They have worked with the fire and building departments to preserve the stairs in the front of the building. Ms. Mausolf identified these stairs as contributing features of the building. The building will be sprinkled as part of the means to preserving the stairs.

There has been a fair amount of deterioration of the masonry on the front of the building. “The parapets are a mess.” Cast concrete window sills are “kinda loose”. Therefore, there will be extensive masonry restoration on the front of the building. The masonry on the north side will be cleaned. There will be a substantial amount of repointing.

They have received preliminary approval from Historic Resources in Concord and the National Park Service for window replacement.

Skylights on the roof – original to the building, some “very nice period pyramid skylights” – several of them were replaced by “some pretty ugly-looking wooden doghouse things after the skylights had failed – others of them are close to failure – so all of the skylights will be replaced to match the original pyramid skylights. The skylights bring much light to the building interior.

There is concern about the amount of rot that may be in the roof.

The back of the building was last renovated in the 1980’s. The exterior Sto installation system was put on and now looks dated and worn and will be stripped off and replaced with metal paneling that will match the metal paneling on the new construction (on the dog-leg).

Inside on the first floor they are keeping the retail spaces in the front. There will be three spaces. They are maintaining access through the building to the rear, although the rear of the building will be reconfigured. A management office, a maintenance office, tenants’ storage cubicles, a residential community room, and six apartments will be on the first floor behind the retail spaces.

Trees, greenspace, and small outdoor porches will be added in the back.

They have been working with the City on parking and handicap access in the back.

Front Elevation

There will be extensive repairs to the parapet. The masonry will be washed and repointed. Current windows are a “mishmash” with some originals and some replacements. They will all be replaced for consistency as long as they can get something that matches the width of the existing sash. Comparison drawings were provided in the Commission packet.

In the 1950s there was a metal band that went across the front of the ground floor of the Goddard Block that extended to the bottom of the 2nd floor windows. The original face brick is behind it. Wooden strapping “was shot into the brick” that apparently did minimal damage. Below that was a simple wooden sign band. The metal paneling will be peeled off and the brick repaired as necessary. The sign board will be restored to something more period.

There was a door to the 2nd floor apartments installed on the extreme right front of the Goddard. It was original to the building. When the metal paneling was put on, “they rejiggered and they hacked away the brick coming down the side” of the pilaster next to it. They “did a pretty wretched job of it and covered it with metal.” The pilaster will be restored with brick matched as well as possible so the line of the pilaster will come straight down.

They have not been able to find a photograph of the store front from 1926 or before any renovations to provide guidance on the appearance under the storefront windows. There is currently about 24 inches of concrete block that was also covered with “that same wretched paneling”. They propose to put a stucco finish on it. (Stucco is used elsewhere in the building.) The storefront will be replaced in kind (it is not original to the building and was probably replaced in the mid 80’s.) Door locations are not changing. An appropriate glass door will be placed in the doorway to the 2nd floor stairwell.

The Kimball Building has glass above the storefront windows. Some of it is broken and there is no way of matching it. They removed some of it and it appears that when the building was built in 1928 that there was a stucco sign panel there. The storefront will also be replaced.

The windows on the north side of the 3-story Goddard Building will be replaced. The masonry is in good shape, but it needs to be cleaned and a bit of repointing done. Masonry work has to be done to the Secretary of Interior standards.

The skylights will be restored as closely as possible as they are “character-defining features”.

The 2-story original bakery building and its addition have some large window openings that are original to the building. They would like to preserve them but they have been filled in with some “real cheap poor windows maybe 30-odd years ago”. There was a stairwell piece that was also added on. The single-story annex piece will be coming off and made 3-stories.

Mr. Barrett turned to a larger scale drawing of the north elevation for this portion of the presentation. The brickwork will be cleaned on the older two-story portion. New sash will be put into the existing masonry openings.

Mr. Barrett said there were several discussions with Ms. Mausolf and Mr. Michaud regarding the new addition on the back. The addition will be a combination of wood and steel framing with corrugated metal paneling. They were “very on board” with something that was very dissimilar with the existing buildings. There was much discussion regarding the window

pattern. The windows will have an industrial feel about them in honor Claremont's industrial heritage. There will be a combination of awnings and fixed units to make it look more "factory-like". Awning windows are hinged and flip out. On the lower floors the awning portion will be on the bottom of the window; it will be the reverse on the upper story for safety purposes.

The first floor is solid masonry wall that sits right on the property line. The inside space is suitable for several apartments, however having glass on the property line was a problem. They have chosen to create some openings in the masonry headed with steel channels and rivets which will create porch areas for the new units. This allows windows in the recessed areas.

A panel of glass bricks will be added on that wall at the end of an interior hallway.

Mr. Messier asked about the cable rails shown on the plan (Elevation 2 of 3). The cable rail is part of the recessed balcony areas accessed from an interior door.

Mr. Messier asked if there were dumpsters behind the Daddy's Pizza building and if they owned any property directly behind their (Daddy's Pizza) building. Mr. Barrett stated that they did. Mr. Messier then asked if the new balconies would then be overlooking the dumpster. Mr. Barrett said he was hoping they could work with Daddy's Pizza to clean up the alleyway and work together on it.

Mr. Messier asked the same question about the balconies on the back of the building – wouldn't they be overlooking the dumpsters behind the Legion? Mr. Barrett agreed that it is "a little bit unkept" in that area.

Mr. Messier acknowledged that the Goddard Project does not own these pieces, but connections between parking and Pleasant Street is what he was actually alluding to. There is a great deal of parking behind the building but it is difficult to access Pleasant Street from the parking area. This alleyway is a potential means of solving that problem. He said it would be great if all the owners could come together and create a common dumpster area - perhaps surrounded by some fencing - and facilitate a clear passage to the street. Mr. Barrett responded that it was his understanding that Pleasant Street will be rebuilt next year, which is good for hooking in the project's utilities. He said currently they are a mess, even causing a sewer line break in the adjacent building last winter. He said Nancy Merrill has been instrumental helping this project move along. He said, "If a recommendation wanted to be made to try to encourage action through ...". Mr. Messier said that was a different part of a project because it would require getting other people coordinated, but it would be great to create that.

Mr. Messier asked if any lighting were being proposed on this side. Mr. Barrett said not along the northerly side other than in the recessed balcony areas. He said they might work with some of the other property owners to get some lighting in the area.

Mr. Barrett turned to the rear elevation (sheet 2 of 3). He pointed out the various portions of the buildings on the drawing. He distributed copies of a photograph showing the grey corrugated metal paneling that he wants to use on the exterior of the annex and portions of

the rear buildings. The windows will be trimmed in a brighter aluminum. Coming across the top of the existing two-story building will be metal-clad wood frame new construction. There is existing terracotta coping across the parapets of the original bakery building – it will be retained.

There is a “peculiar” alleyway between the Goddard and the Kimball buildings. Its purpose is to get light and ventilation into the building. If the budget allows, they would like to put a glass roof over it because it traps snow and ice and causes roof problems.

It is presumed that the back of the Kimball was clad in wooden clapboards, of which no trace remains. The wall in the alleyway is stuccoed., which is original to the building and in very good shape. It does need some minor repairs.

The windows on the back of the Kimball will be replaced. The Broad Street face will be re-clapboarded with wood clapboards. When cleaned up and repaired it should like what it did in 1928 when it was built.

There will be new doorways created in the lower level of the Kimball (back side). There will space for a small office in this section.

Exterior insulation covers the brickwork on the single-story portion. The insulation will be removed and the windows and doors redone with the same industrial theme. Because the brick cannot be completely cleaned of the insulation, it will be covered with vertical corrugated metal paneling (same color as the horizontal paneling).

Mr. Barrett said construction will begin in the fall. He submitted to the Commission a copy of Ms. Mausolf's *Part 2*.

Discussion turned to parking once again. Mr. LaCasse said the parking areas will be reconfigured. He will repave the portion of the parking area that he owns as part of the project.

Mr. Messier asked about exterior lighting for the back of the building. Mr. Barrett said there would be “some amount of down light” in the entrance to the elevator lobby. There will be “a little bit of downlighting” in each of the balconies, porches, and patios. He said “idea is not to flood the back of the building” with light.

Mr. Messier said the Commission needs to approve any outside lighting and offered to continue the hearing until they are ready to present them.

Mr. Messier asked for clarification that “everything has been submitted to the state, but they have not gotten back to you?” Mr. LaCasse said, “From the historic perspective, yes.”

Part 1 – took inventory of the building – was approved by state and federal “to be in the National Registry ... They said it was a significant building.”

Part 2 was developed – identifies exactly what we’re going to be doing with the building from a historic perspective – that’s what was submitted and was sitting with DHR right now – DHR was involved with the process the whole time.

Peter Michaud has left DHR – his replacement will need time to get up to speed with the project.

Mr. LaCasse said he is scheduled to close on September 19th. The response from National Park Service is needed prior to closing because the historic tax credits are a big piece of the funding. Construction will begin as soon as Trumbull Nelson can mobilize on site following the closing (by end of September). Construction should complete in 12-15 months.

Mr. Barrett said they are working on completing a boundary line survey and a finalized site plan for recording.

Mr. Barrett said City Council and all of the staff – building, police, fire, planning & economic development- have all been excellent to work with. He said the Claremont taxpayers should be aware of that. Mr. LaCasse said he seconded Mr. Barrett’s statement. He said he does a lot of projects in other towns and the reception he has received in Claremont for this particular project has been great – every board and Council, even the abutters. He said thank you. He said he looks forward to doing more projects after this one.

Mr. LaCasse said he would be happy to advocate for access to Pleasant Street from the parking areas on the Broad Street side. He also was appreciative of the dumpster issue being raised.

Mr. Messier asked what wording will go in the sign block on the Kimball building. Mr. Barrett said it would be reserved for whatever retail business occupies that space.

There were no further questions. The Commission turned to their review criteria.

Mr. Messier read the architectural inventory sheets (each building was inventoried separately):

54-62 (1) Pleasant Street (Goddard Block)

Rating 3 2 1 0

Significance: Typical 20’s commercial block; little changed; an urban building in context

Period/Style: 1926

Brick and cast concrete; Typical sparsely detailed red brick commercial block of the 1920’s

Historical Information - None

Date(s):

Original Owner:

Architect/Builder:

54-62 (2) Pleasant Street (formerly 64-66 Pleasant Street) (Kimball Block)

Rating 3 2 1 0

Significance: Typical 20’s commercial block; has suffered some alterations, but is distinctly urban building

Period/Style: c. 1930’s; Relates well to two adjacent buildings; May be an addition to the Goddard Block (1926) next north; details are identical

Historical Information

Date(s):
Original Owner:
Architect/Builder:

It was agreed to review the criteria for both buildings simultaneously.

Criterion #1: Historic, Architectural, and Cultural Value

a. Does the building have:

- i. Historic value**
- ii. Architectural value**
- iii. Cultural value?**

Mr. Pope felt the buildings have developed a historic value that is at or even above the ratings given. Mrs. Kenniston agreed. Mr. Messier said the Commission has to differentiate between the existing conditions from the proposed conditions. He said he didn't think the value should be increased because currently it has been altered with the glass, metal, etc.

Mr. Messier felt there was some historic value owing to the Goddard Bakery was well established well before this building was put up (there are pictures of the site with a wooden building – probably a house and bakery from the late 19th century – the bakery was probably the original portion of this building). The Goddard Bakery was moved to Maple Avenue for several years. Just the name “Goddard” – (think Goddard mansion) - there is historic context relating to the building and the name.

Architectural value is probably not the highest, but it certainly has for the period. Mrs. Kenniston agreed.

Cultural value – this was the original site of the Fishman's store, which was a five and dime with a soda fountain – it was a part of the 1920s- 1940s downtown department store culture. There is some cultural value related to that.

Mr. Messier said he felt they buildings had a moderate value in each of the three categories. Everyone agreed.

b. Does it relate and contribute to its setting?

Everyone agreed that they do – they continue the line of three-story buildings in the downtown streetscape and historic district. They relate well and have a good contribution.

Motion: I move that the buildings located at 54-62 Pleasant Street have moderate historical, architectural and cultural value and that they relate and contribute to their setting.

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

Criterion #2: How do the proposed exterior design, arrangement, texture(s), and materials relate to the existing buildings or structures in the project's setting? Are they compatible?

Mrs. Kenniston felt they are very compatible; nice complementary material next to the brick; she liked that the project is bringing the industrial history of Claremont into the design such that it can be seen it is a separate part of the building. She felt it will "fit very well".

Mr. messier agreed, "even though we are introducing some new materials to the downtown area". He said he liked the contrast between the old and the new.

If the project involves new construction, how will it relate to the surrounding uses in the project setting? Is it compatible?

The surrounding uses are residential and retail, which this always has been and will continue to be.

Motion: I move that the exterior design, arrangement, texture(s), and materials proposed to be used in this project are compatible with the existing buildings and structures in the project's setting.

Made by: Mr. Messier **Second:** Mr. Wahrlich
Vote: Unanimous in favor

(For the new construction)

Motion: I move that the proposed new construction is compatible with the existing uses that surround the project setting.

Made by: Mr. Messier **Second:** Mr. Pope
Vote: Unanimous in favor

Criterion #3: Are the scale and general size of the proposed *improvements* compatible with and in keeping with the existing surroundings? (*Improvements* here is taken to mean a building's height, width, street frontage, number of stories, roof type, façade openings such as windows, doors, etc., and architectural details)

Mr. Messier said that careful consideration has been given to keeping the existing window openings intact. The new design is compatible with that. There are "some interesting rhythms in detail in the new parts of the construction". The height of the new construction is compatible with surrounding buildings. "It will be a very interesting building."

Motion: I move that the scale and general size and proportions of the proposed improvements such as the height, width, street frontage, number of stories, roof

type, façade openings such as windows, doors, etc., and architectural details are compatible with and are in keeping with relationship of these same factors in the existing surroundings.

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

Vote: Unanimous in favor

Criterion # 4: How will the proposed *improvements* affect the character of any other building or structure within the district? (*Improvements* here is taken to mean yards, off-street parking, screening, fencing, entrance drives, sidewalks, signs, lights, and landscaping.)

They are adding some greenspace to the back – it will be a very welcome site in that “concrete jungle” that is that area of the City. It will make it more welcoming.

No real screening, fencing or entrance drives. The parking will be part of a coordinated effort with the City.

Signage is being restored back to the original signage areas of the buildings.

Mr. Messier asked if there would be any lighting over the signage areas. Mr. Barrett said not at this time.

Landscaping is on the back of the building at the entrances.

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

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

Vote: Unanimous in favor

Criterion # 5:

(A) What impact will the proposed project have on the setting? (Positive, negative, neutral)

All agreed that the project will have a positive impact on the setting.

(B) To what extent will the proposed project help to preserve and enhance the:

- a. historic,
- b. architectural, and
- c. cultural qualities of the district and the community?

The threat is a condemned, leaking building isn't going to exist for very long if not put back into use. Restoring it will help preserve the historic site line of the street, the architecture as it exists, and bringing more housing into the City.

Motion (A): I move that the proposed project will have a positive effect on the project setting. I further move that the proposed project will greatly help to preserve and enhance the historic, architectural and cultural qualities of the district and community.

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

Vote: Unanimous in favor

Criterion #6: Is the proposal in keeping with the Secretary of Interior's Guidelines for Rehabilitation?

1. *A property shall be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.*

The project continues the residential and retail use of this property. The project requires some rather extensive changes, but they are not disrupting the original fabric of the building. It puts the building into a "higher use" that it was previously.

2. *The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property shall be avoided.*

The project is in keeping with the character of the buildings. It is enhancing and taking care of the buildings. They are not removing distinctive materials. Some details are remaining even though adding stories to the buildings.

3. *Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.*

None of this is being proposed for this project. The use of different materials shows that the project is not attempting to continue the existing buildings.

4. *Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.*

This has been demonstrated in everything that was presented. The Commission especially appreciates the restoration of the pilasters on the front of the Goddard building and the addition of the glass roof over the alleyway between the Goddard and Kimball buildings.

5. *Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.*

Nothing presented would lead to a negative on this standard.

6. *Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*

They have done some exploring on the facades to see what was underneath newer materials; they could not find any historical photographs of the buildings' fronts; putting stucco there is appropriate. Vinyl siding is being removed from the back of the Kimball and wooden clapboards put back on.

7. *Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used.*

The brick on this building is newer and is oil- or coal-fired, making it a harder brick than earlier versions that were wood-fired. Every indication is that it can withstand a vigorous cleaning without any potential damage. They would use a water-based cleaner. No sand-blasting. For the most part, it is not deeply stained. The cleaning is more for facilitating repointing where needed.

8. *Archaeological resources shall be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.*

None of this will come into play in this project.

9. *New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing, to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*

New materials are being added that may be more historic on industrial, but the Commission has discussed how it is compatible for Claremont.

10. *New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*

It is unlikely that any of this project will be undone in the future. However, the applicant has taken care to keep everything that was original intact and is building around it.

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 project at 54-62 Pleasant Street, known as the Goddard Block Limited Partnership, Tax Map 120, Lot 85, subject to final approval of plans and details by the State Historic Preservation Office and to continue any exterior lighting details to the November meeting.

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

Vote: Unanimous in favor

V. Other

A. Philip & Ernest Montenegro to present plans for a 12-ft high mural to be placed on the north wall of the Latchis Theater building at 51-59 Pleasant Street (Map 120, Lot 72)

Mr. Montenegro said he was before the HDC in honor of youth, art, future and trends, to apply a mural that Kevin (Mr. LaCasse) gave him permission to do (if it has HDC's approval) to the side of the Latchis building. It is "a huge brick wall". It won't be painted on – it will be attached. He said Ryan McNutt and Nancy Merrill gave him and his son the initiative to start a mural project in conjunction with the BrewFest on September 15th. He has ten artists lined up to for a day event of painting murals on the bridge. The murals will be displayed in windows on Pleasant Street "to liven it up".

Mr. Montenegro brought with him a picture of his proposed mural that he shared with the Commission.

He said, "A brick wall may be historic. A big brick wall, like the one Kevin owns – is just a brick wall and if you put something on it, it might liven it up. And it might liven up interest from the street."

He said the portion that will be painted on the bridge is about 12 feet high. He said, "It looks fairly miniscule on that big brick wall."

Mr. Messier said he was confused as to how the mural related to the bridge. Mr. Montenegro said that was just a mock-up of what he and his son would be doing on the bridge.

Mr. Messier noted "there are a lot of red lines going beyond that" (the edges of the mural). Mr. Montenegro explained that the lines on the mural will be painted on; those extending off the edges of the mural would be red wire. "It's not damaging the building at all."

Mr. Montenegro said Lee Stevens had volunteered to "get me up there". He said the mural will be bolted to the wall. The holes are to be filled in and repaired when the mural is taken down per the owner's request. The mural will up there indefinitely.

Mr. Messier asked about the significance of the image. Mr. Montenegro said, "The significance of the image – and that's why I wanted to do my PowerPoint and couldn't (see note below) – is to enhance a brick wall. And to enhance – you know, it's a ... something of interest from the street and I brought a picture of what my son did" (he shared photos with the Commission.)

Mr. Messier asked about what Mr. Montenegro's son had done overseas. Mr. Montenegro said photos were on the PowerPoint. Mr. Pope suggested sending the PowerPoint to the P&D office where it could then be shared with the Commissioners. Mr. Montenegro said he could do that.

Mr. Pope said he was confused about the murals on the bridge. Mr. Montenegro said the largest access to the Brewfest is across the bridge. Chief Chase will provide cones to divide the bridge lengthwise so traffic will flow on one side and the artists will be on the other.

Mr. Montenegro said this was also under the auspices of the Maker Space, as well. He repeated that “this was initiated by Ryan and Nancy”.

Murals will be displayed on Pleasant Street indefinitely.

Mr. Pope asked if Mr. Montenegro worked “with the people well in advance of the idea” before coming to the HDC? Mr. Montenegro replied that he tries to. Mr. Messier said, “I just saw you introduce yourself to Mr. LaCasse, so have you not met with him?” Mr. Montenegro said they had spoken to each other on the telephone. Mr. Montenegro said Mr. LaCasse was more interested in painting “the whole wall”.

Mr. Messier said the HDC doesn’t really have a mechanism for approving murals because he didn’t know if the Commission gets into the subjectivity of a mural and its visual elements, so he really wasn’t sure how to proceed.

Mr. Montenegro said, “I guess my assumption was that it was that it wasn’t necessarily – well I guess it really is ultimately up to you and maybe someone else in the City to approve of an image. But nonetheless if an image isn’t you know whatever abusive in any way. Coming to you was to get permission to actually attach it to the wall. I understand to paint on the wall is a whole different thing.”

Mrs. Kenniston and Mr. Wahrlich thought it could be viewed as a temporary sign. She felt the HDC didn’t have much say over what is actually put on the sign. Mr. Pope said there should be a letter from the owner stating that it was alright. Mrs. Kenniston added that if the owner is ok with the image going on his building, she looks at it like a sign proposal.

Mr. Messier felt there should be some committee that makes these decisions.

Mr. Messier said he didn’t have any objections to murals.

He said that wall on the Latchis has small vertical notches where another building’s roof timbers went into the wall. He asked if there were a way to place the mural such that it could be bolted into those existing holes so new holes aren’t made. Mr. Montenegro said, “Probably.” Mr. Messier said the bolts should be non-rusting – aluminum perhaps – something that doesn’t rust and expand (which would damage the brick).

Mr. Pope wondered what Newport does in their approval process and what their requirements are.

Mr. Messier said he was in favor of public art, but that he needed to speak with Ms. Merrill and see what sort of process should be set up. He said HDC would be primarily concerned with attachment and placement issues.

Mr. Montenegro said he had been told by Ms. Merrill to bring his proposal to the HDC. Mr. Messier said that Mr. Montenegro didn’t have an application in front of the Commission so there was nothing for them to approve. He said he didn’t know what that would look like because the Latchis is not Mr. Montenegro’s building. Would the owner have to make the application? He said he just didn’t know what those processes are.

Mr. Montenegro said he would get something in writing from Mr. LaCasse. Mr. Wahrlich asked that the letter states that he, Mr. LaCasse, accepts the image.

Mr. Montenegro said, “This kind of stuff is almost formulaic now as far as cities go. Portsmouth, Portland, Boston, New York...it’s everywhere. Just to put it in a little perspective – I’ve had a lot of shows in a lot of different places – sculpture shows – so I have a lot of visitors that come to my house and often – unfortunately people make their way through Pleasant Street and the first thing they ask is ‘what happened?’ So, I guess the reason Philip and I chose that wall is because it is sort of in the center of things and it’s something people will notice. When people see art, it sends a message – a message that something’s happening.”

Mr. Messier said a similar idea had been implemented in the early 2000s when there were a lot of empty store fronts.

Mr. Montenegro said he would talk to Ms. Merrill. Mr. Messier suggested that he research how other towns handle public art. Mr. Montenegro said he would definitely do that.

(NOTE: Council chambers does not have Mac equipment which is what Mr. Montenegro required for his presentation. He did not make prior arrangements for accommodations.)

VI. Correspondence

Mr. Messier said he plans to attend a 2-day workshop in White River Junction in September and invited others to do so.

No reports from City Council or Planning Board.

VII. Adjournment

Motion: To adjourn the meeting

Made by: Mrs. Kenniston

Second: Mr. Pope

Vote: Unanimous in favor

Meeting adjourned at 8:42 PM.

Respectfully submitted by,

deForest Bearse

Resource Coordinator