

  
**CITY OF CLAREMONT**  
**Historic District Commission Meeting**  
Thursday, August 28, 2014  
City Hall, City Manager's Office at  
7:00 p.m.

**MINUTES**  
**Approved 9/25/2014**

**I. Roll Call**

**Members Present:** David Messier, Brenda Hannah, Richard Wahrlich, and James Reed

**Absent:** Kristin Kenniston

**II. Review of Minutes from July 24, 2014**

**Motion:** To approve the minutes of July 24, 2014

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

**III. Old Business**

- **#2014-00004 Red River, 21 Water Street** – Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for two signs to be placed between the 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> floors of the building at 21 Water Street. Tax Map 120, Lot 6. Zone: MU.

This item was moved to later in the meeting.

**IV. New Business**

- **Farogh A. Wein, 49 Central Street** – for exterior staircase at 49 Central Street. Tax Map 119, Lot 357. Zone: CR-2

Kale Kolenda, contractor for the applicant, presented the application. He distributed photos of the property to the Commissioners. Mr. Kolenda explained that the applicant is being required to make changes to the exterior stairway, window exits and decking at 49 Central Street to comply with current building codes for life safety purposes. Mr. Kolenda said the safety inspector had approved the plans that were being presented.

Mr. Messier summarized the project:

- Extending the deck
- There will be a new exit (new exit 2 on the drawing)
- The size of exit 1 will be changed, but it is not visible from the street
- The stairs are being made up to code
- None of the work will extend out further from the building than it already does
- The deck railing is shown on the drawing with 1 ½” balusters; 4” on center; 3.25” openings; 4 x 4 posts and 2 x 4 (hand) rail
- Construction of pressure-treated lumber to be sealed after the first year
- The roof over the deck will not be finished as part of this project

Mr. Messier opened the public hearing after the commission completed their questioning. No one was present to comment. Mr. Messier closed the public hearing.

Mr. Reed read from the architectural inventory sheet for the property. It was given a rating of 2 in 1977. The Commission addressed the review criteria.

<b>HDC Criteria</b>	
<b>1 Does the building have historic, architectural or cultural value?</b>	The consensus of the Commission is that the building has historic value due to its earlier function as a parsonage for the Methodist Church. The Commission also agreed that it has architectural values because several of the architectural details are still on the building. All agreed that the rating of 2 is appropriate.
<b>2 Are the proposed exterior design, arrangement, textures, and materials compatible with the existing buildings or structures and to the setting and surrounding uses?</b>	Consensus of the Commission was that the project site is surrounded by residential buildings and the Claremont Soup Kitchen, which was built on the site of the foundation of the Methodist Church. The materials proposed for the project are compatible with the dominant materials in the immediate neighborhood.
<b>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)</b>	Consensus of the Commission was that this criterion was not applicable to this project. The project is constricted by existing conditions and life safety codes.
<b>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?</b>	The consensus was that this criterion is not applicable to this project.
<b>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?</b>	Consensus was that the project will have a neutral impact on the setting, because it won't enhance the qualities of the district or community, but it will not detract either. The project is necessary for life safety; without it, the property is not useable.
<b>6 Is the proposal in keeping with the Secretary of Interior's Guidelines for Rehabilitation?</b>	The project will not make the building look like something else. The project will not obscure any architectural details and could be removed without harming the building.

The consensus of the Commission was that the project meets the criteria and is eligible for a Certificate of Appropriateness.

**Motion:** To approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the project as outlined below and as shown on the drawing submitted with the application:

1. The existing deck will be extended to a length of 16 feet and a width of 84 inches and supported by 4 x 4 x 10 posts.
2. One window (exit 1 on drawing), that is not visible from the public right-of-way, will be modified for public egress. Such modification may include enlargement as needed.
3. A new staircase will be constructed to meet code requirements with 4 x 4 support posts that are attached to a 2 x 4 railing having 1 1/2" balusters that are 4" on center and 3.25" openings.
4. The improvements are to be constructed of pressure treated lumber that is to be sealed with paint, stain or other sealant after one year.

**Made by:** Mr. Reed

**Second:** Mrs. Hannah

**Vote:** Unanimous in favor

## V. Old Business

- **#2014-00004 Red River, 21 Water Street** – Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for two signs to be placed between the 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> floors of the building at 21 Water Street. Tax Map 120, Lot 6. Zone: MU.

Denis Maltais, Senior Business Development for Barlo Signs was present to demonstrate to the Commission the type of sign he is recommending for Red River. The letters “Red River” would be constructed of a material called “black/white lenses” that appear black during the day, but become soft white in the dark. They are internally lit with LED fixtures. They have a virtually maintenance-free life expectancy of 20+ years. The low maintenance requirement is important because the sign will be affixed to the outside of the building, five stories above the Sugar River. The size of the sign is necessary given the size of the building and the height of the sign above the ground. The letters will be mounted on brackets that will match the color of the brick. The letters will not obscure any architectural features of the building and will not touch any of the windows.

There are no architectural inventory sheets for the mill buildings. Consensus is that the building should have a rating of 3 (especially in light of the historic tax credits it received for its renovation). This is a very intact mill building with later additions that is one of the most important sites in the Historic District because it really defines the character of Claremont. This building was a part of the Monadnock Mills complex.

<b>HDC Criteria</b>	
<b>1 Does the building have historic, architectural or cultural value?</b>	The building has historic value within the community; it is a beautiful example of 19 <sup>th</sup> century mill architecture. It has cultural value because of the many ethnic groups that moved to Claremont and found employment there. All agreed.
<b>2 Are the proposed exterior design, arrangement, textures, and materials compatible with the existing buildings or structures and to the setting and surrounding uses?</b>	Consensus of the Commission was that this criterion was not applicable to this project.
<b>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)</b>	The scale of the proposed sign is very appropriate for the size of the building.
<b>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?</b>	The consensus was that this project will have a positive impact on the area because it will show that the building is being used.
<b>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?</b>	The consensus was that this project will have a positive impact on the area because it will show that the building is being used and that the area is being revitalized.
<b>6 Is the proposal in keeping with the Secretary of Interior’s Guidelines for Rehabilitation?</b>	The signage will not cover any of the lintels or the windows. It can also be removed with no harm to the building.

The Commission agreed that the proposed signage should be granted a Certificate of Appropriateness, but wanted the record to show that approving this internally-lit sign is an exception to their previous standards solely because the proposed signage is so appropriate in every way for the location and building. These signs are also different from other “typical” internally lit signs in that these signs are composed of individual letters that are lit and not letters that are completely encased in a type of frame which is internally lit.

**Motion:** To approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for the project as presented at the hearings on July 24 and August 28, 2014 , as described below, and as shown on Barlo Signs drawing B-14-02-12599, Sheet 1.0B (dated 4/16/14, latest revision 4-16) and Sheet 1.1B (dated 4/16/14, no revisions):

- Two internally-lit signs using black-white lenses with LED lighting
- Brackets of ¼” aluminum painted with an acrylic polyurethane finish to reasonably match the brick color (of the building)
- The brackets will match the architecture of the building
- The signs are to be centered between the fifth and sixth floors of the east side and north side of the building with the caveat that nothing will be touching the lintels or architectural details of the windows

This approval constitutes an exception to the HDC policy (of prohibiting internally lit signs) due to the difficulty of accessibility (for maintenance purposes) and because the signs are only visible from a distance.

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

#### **VI. Other**

The Commission had discussed developing criteria that would exempt certain life-safety projects under certain circumstances at the last meeting. Mr. Messier presented draft language for the exemption to the Commission. It was agreed that the language should be sent to City Solicitor, Jane Taylor, for review and edit before proceeding further. For future discussion – should the exemption constitute an amendment to the City Ordinance or simply be a policy for the Commission?

Mr. Reed stated that the roof of the (former) Unitarian Church on Broad Street has been repaired. He would still like to pursue the idea of using a portion of the application fees for a preservation fund for City-owned properties.

#### **VII. Correspondence**

The Commission had no correspondence to discuss.

#### **VIII. Adjournment**

**Motion:** to adjourn the meeting

**Made by:** Mrs. Hannah    **Second:** Mr. Reed    **Vote:** Unanimous

Meeting adjourned at 8:16 PM

Respectfully submitted by,  
*deForest Bearse*  
Resource Coordinator