


CITY OF CLAREMONT
Historic District Commission Meeting
Thursday, August 25, 2016 7:00 PM
City Hall, Council Chambers

MINUTES
Approved 10/6/2016

I. Roll Call

Members Present: Kristin Kenniston, Scott Pope, Richard Wahrlich

Absent: David Messier

II. Review of Minutes from July 21, 2016

Corrections: None

Motion: To accept the minutes of July 21, 2016 as written.

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

Vote: Unanimous in favor

III. Old Business

There was no old business to discuss.

IV. New Business

A. Certificate of Appropriateness application for:

- i. HDC 2016-00009 DeGlace, LLC, 601 Cloverlea Rd, Louisville, KY** – for signage, window replacements, and other exterior changes at **40 Union Street**. Tax map 107, lot 13. Zone: MU.

Ms. Kenniston read the public notice and invited the applicant to present the application.

Applicant's Presentation

Mona Changaris, representing Deglace LLC, presented an extensive list of renovations that the company would like to make to the building. Deglace is a Kentucky-based company that makes luxury chocolates. They are opening a test kitchen in Claremont to develop a line of maple syrup sweetened chocolates.

The list of proposed renovations included (taken from the application and presented by the applicant):

- Replace the second floor double hung windows with double hung vinyl (or wood if possible) thermopane windows including exterior overlay mullions. The 6-over-6 configuration would remain.
- Replace the second floor decorative shutters with similar new shutters of appropriate width and materials.
- Replace the aluminum & glass door with a wood door and casing to match the existing wood doors.
- Add casing similar to the existing casing around the two store front windows.
- Remove the header casing between the two existing wood doors.
- Paint all previously painted surfaces.
- Tuck point the three chimneys (or replace in kind if needed).

- Mount two HVAC compressor units on the ground against the south end of the building and construct a screen around the units using vertical board fence style and paint to match the building.
- Paint the concrete ramp to complement the building color.
- Construct a planter box on two sides of the existing ramp using a horizontal board construction (or appropriate material) and painted to match the building.
- Install window flower boxes on the second floor facing the river.
- Remove the two existing signs and replace with a single sign affixed to the building between the existing wood doors – dimensions 24” x 36”, non-illuminated, painted wood.
- Install three canvas awnings over the existing doors.
- Remove the wood-frame out-building at the south end of the property because it is not in good shape; serves no purpose in the business; and is causing erosion of the river bank.

Ms. Changaris stressed that all replacement materials will match the existing materials as closely as possible. She said she would like to remove the paint entirely from the brick sides; but if this is not possible, they will be re-painted a warm, maple-brown color. The proposed renovations will restore the building to its earlier, more historically accurate appearance.

Ms. Kenniston said that Mr. Messier had encouraged the applicant to consider replacing the recessed lintels over the windows using plaster if necessary. The old mill building across Main Street has a good example of the window lintels to which Mr. Messier was referring.

There was discussion regarding removal of the outbuilding. The Commission had no objection to removing the building as it is a much later addition; however they requested more details about what would be left in its place after it is removed. Ms. Changaris said a fence at the very least or perhaps a retaining wall for safety reasons as the building sits at the top of the river bank; however exact details were not yet available. The Commission asked Ms. Changaris to return when final details are available. The Certificate could be amended with the new information.

Public Hearing

There was no one from the public, so Ms. Kenniston closed the hearing. The Commission turned to addressing the review criteria.

Mr. Pope read the architectural survey for the building. It is described as a “distinctive early 19th century store building, somewhat altered; with an unusual recessed porch on the gable end; built for an important local firm (Claremont Mfg.) between 1832 and 1834, situated on a critical Lower Village corner. It was given a rating of 3, with which the Commission agreed.

HDC Criteria	
1. Does the building have historic, architectural or cultural value?	The building has historic and cultural value because of its connection with the Claremont Mfg Co; it has architectural value because of the unusual recessed porch.
2. Are the proposed exterior design, arrangement, textures, and materials compatible: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • with the existing buildings or structures and • to the setting and surrounding uses? 	The proposed renovation materials and designs are fully compatible with the existing building as they will restore the building to its earlier, historic appearance; they are compatible with the other historic buildings in the Lower Village. This criterion is satisfied.
3. Are the scale and size of the proposed improvements compatible with the existing	Every effort is being made to return this building to its correct appearance as an 1830’s

surroundings? (including height, width, street frontage, number of stories, roof type, façade openings such as windows, doors, etc., and architectural details)	commercial building, so this criterion is more than satisfied.
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 renovations to this building will greatly enhance the overall appearance of the Lower Village and emphasize the historic character of all of the buildings in this district.
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 renovations will have positive impact on its. It will be a vast improvement over the building's current appearance.
6. Is the proposal in keeping with the Secretary of Interior's Guidelines for Rehabilitation?	Yes.

Motion: To accept this application as presented at this hearing with the option to return with details of the out-building removal and fence or retaining wall.

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

Vote: Unanimous in favor

- B. Conceptual Discussion** – Discuss proposed exterior mural for **40 Union Street** (Phil Montenegro)
Phil Montenegro asked the Commission for their opinion on him painting a mural on the Main Street side of the building at 40 Union Street. He said the mural would not be painted directly on the building but would be mounted onto it.

The Commission had no objections although they were not clear that their approval is required for art work. The Commission preferred that any proposed design be historic in nature as this building is in the Historic District and carries the highest possible rating. They asked Mr. Montenegro to come back to the Commission if/when more details are available.

V. Other

VI. Correspondence

VII. Adjournment

Motion: To adjourn the meeting.

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

Vote: Unanimous in favor

Meeting adjourned at 7:56 PM

Respectfully submitted by,

deForest Bearse