


CITY OF CLAREMONT
Historic District Commission Meeting
Thursday, August 27, 2015 7:00 PM
City Hall, Council Chambers

MINUTES
Approved 12/23/2015

I. Roll Call

Members Present: Kristin Kenniston, David Messier, Richard Wahrlich

Absent: James Reed

II. Review of Minutes from July 23, 2015

Corrections: None.

Motion: To approve the minutes (as written).

Made by: Mrs. Kenniston

Second: Mr. Wahrlich

Vote: Unanimous in favor

III. Old Business

IV. New Business

- a. **HDC 2015-00012 New Branch Properties, 729 East Street, Cornish, NH** – for replacement of existing flat roof with new hip roof at **37 Main Street**. Tax Map 120, Lot 29. Zone: MU

Eugene Lattuga, managing partner for New Branch Properties, presented the application to the Commission. He would like to replace the flat roof with a hip roof. The beams have sagged in the existing roof with the result that water ponds and freezes, which has resulted in the roof leaking. The beams have sagged so much that it would be difficult to replace the existing roof. A hip roof will divert the snow and water off of the roof. An overhang will also be created around the building which will keep water from running down the face of the building and damaging the mortar.

The plans submitted show more detail than the previous plans (7/23/2015 HDC meeting) . Mr. Lattuga said it will be necessary to build up the two side walls to meet the parapet on the front and rear of the building. The plans show a wood frame wall with some trim work which will reflect the existing building and look like original features. Mr. Lattuga said he was uncertain as to the type of roofing shingles that would be used. He said it would probably be grey or black. He did not have a sample with him to show the Commission. The pitch of the new roof will be 5/12. The new roof will be 11 feet higher than the existing roof.

Mr. Messier stated that the purpose of the Historic District is not to have buildings remain static, but rather to ensure that the natural progression of buildings be undertaken in a sensitive manner. Buildings that are unique examples of their period (e.g. some residential buildings) are viewed differently than a warehouse building that is a part of a collection of mill buildings. These buildings changed over time as their needs and uses changed. This is reflected in the original Dept. of Interior nominating form (HAER Inventory sheet, 1978) for this building, which Mr. Messier read to the Commission, highlighting the multiple changes to the appearance and use of the building since its original construction in 1880. Given the evolution of this building, Mr. Messier stated that he was more open to the proposed changes. He stated that he finds the proposed design to be very attractive and will fit the building well. Ms. Kenniston and Mr. Wahrlich agreed.

Mrs. Kenniston read the Architectural Inventory sheet.

HDC Criteria	
<p>1. Does the building have historic, architectural or cultural value?</p>	<p>The building has historic value as part of the Mill complex. It has architectural value as an example of mill buildings of that period. It has cultural value as an example of how Claremont developed as a community. The rating of 2 is appropriate as the building is somewhat altered, but still in somewhat original condition. All agreed.</p>
<p>2. Are the proposed exterior design, arrangement, textures, and materials compatible with the existing buildings or structures and to the setting and surrounding uses?</p>	<p>The building is located in a mixed neighborhood. There are a lot of buildings with flat roofs, the original material of which is not visible (probably tar and stone or rubber). The Common Man has been similarly altered and has architectural shingles. This is in keeping with development over the last ten years. The proposal is a change from the original, but compatible with what's happening in this area. All agreed.</p>
<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 proposed roof height appears to be appropriate to the scale of the building (according to the drawings submitted with the application). All agreed.</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>All agreed that this criterion was not applicable.</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 proposed project will help to preserve the building as a whole. The overhang will protect the brickwork on the building facades. Improving the building has a positive effect on the neighborhood. Most will see this as an improvement to the building. All agreed.</p>
<p>6. Is the proposal in keeping with the Secretary of Interior's Guidelines for Rehabilitation?</p>	<p>Since this project is a major change to the building, the Commission addressed each of the ten standards.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Commission is comfortable with this project as presented. 2. The building mass is not being altered or changed to make it indistinguishable from what it is now. 3. This is not an attempt to disguise this building as something else. 4. Mill buildings were meant to be altered

	<p>as needs change.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. (Skipped) 6. Replacement is required in this case. The design of the replacement is acceptable. 7. Not applicable to this project. 8. Not applicable to this project. 9. The roof is the only structural feature of this building that is being changed. It is a necessity and the project will address it in a good way. 10. This project will not prohibit the reconstruction of a flat roof in the future if so desired.
--	---

All agreed that this application is right for this building.

Motion: To approve the replacement of the existing flat roof with a new hip roof and to approve the use of an architectural shingle in a neutral color as the roofing material.

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

- b. **HDC 2015-00013 New Branch Properties, 729 East Street, Cornish, NH** – for alterations to Certificate of Appropriateness issued on 4/26/12 for redevelopment at **40 Main Street**. Tax Map 107, Lot 50. Zone: MU

Mr. Lattuga presented the application to the Commission. Mr. Lattuga drew the Commission’s attention to the “Addendum to Amended Site Plan Application” portion of the application. He stated that the cost of the project as originally approved has become “unwieldy”. He is proposing these amendments to bring the cost of the project down. He presented the following proposed changes:

1. Elimination of the side porch. (Details of the remaining porch will remain unchanged.)
2. Eliminate the post-mounted lanterns, to be replaced with (Eversource) pole-mounted floodlights (directed toward the building; will affect the church and back of the parking garage) and down-cast floodlights mounted on the building.
3. Eliminate landscaping, except for the lawn areas. The landscaping will be installed as funds allow.
4. Eliminate the sidewalk (walkway) from Main Street until funding is available. People will walk up the driveway instead.
5. Change the retaining wall from concrete block to pressure-treated timbers. The wall won’t be more than 4 feet high, so it shouldn’t be highly visible.
6. The hours of operation will be 6 AM to 9 PM, 7 days a week.

He stated that once the project is completed, he will phase in these original features as funds allow. He stated that these changes had already been approved by the Planning Board.

The Commission saw no outstanding issues of concern and agreed that it was unnecessary to address the criteria since the project has already been approved.

Motion: To approve the amended site plan for this project as described in the addendum.

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

V. Other

VI. Correspondence

VII. Adjournment

Motion: To adjourn the meeting.

Made by: Mrs. Kenniston

Second: Mr. Wahrlich

Vote: Unanimous in favor.

Meeting adjourned at 7:40 PM

Respectfully submitted by,

deForest Bearse

Resource Coordinator