



Historic District Commission Meeting

Thursday, February 28, 2013
City Hall, Council Chambers at
7:00 p.m.

MINUTES Approved 3.28.13

I. Members

Present: David Messier, Kristin Kenniston, Richard Wahrlich

Absent: Deborah Cutts

II. Review of Minutes:

Minutes from November 2012 and January 2013 were reviewed. Neither meeting had a quorum. The November meeting was presentation of plans for new windows in Library lower level, which didn't need a certificate of appropriateness (city building). Plans were presented as a courtesy and for input. The January meeting was a discussion of sign review for the revised city center ordinance. Since neither meeting was able to be called to order due to no quorum, the minutes were presented only for information of items discussed informally. Therefore, there was no need to approve the minutes.

III. Election of officers:

Motion: David Messier was nominated and elected as Chair.

Made By: K. Kenniston **Second:** Mr. Wahrlich **Vote:** Unanimous

Motion: Kristin Kenniston was nominated and elected Vice Chair.

Made By: D. Messier **Second by:** Mr. Wahrlich **Vote:** Unanimous

IV: New Business:

- **HDC (2013-0001) Randall & Mona DiStefano, Claremont, N.H.** – Applicant is requesting permission for the addition of (1) door and (1) window to match existing door and window.
Property Location: 40 Union Street Tax Map: 107, Lot: 13, Zone MUM.

Applicants DiStefano request permission to add window and new door in locations where these items once existed in the building. Window will be plate glass with wood frame to match the existing window on this level and the door will be aluminum to match the existing door. Application also included two signs.

Discussion centered on the fact that these elements once existed on the building and were later closed in with bricks. The proposed improvements would be returning the facade to an earlier appearance. There was also consensus that it makes sense to allow the new door to be metal to match the existing door, rather than require it to be made of wood in a design more appropriate to the period of the

building, and thereby having mis-matched doors. The doors could always be replaced with more appropriate doors in the future.

The applicant did not have specific sign designs at this time. It was suggested that this portion of the application be continued to a future meeting when plans have been resolved. The application agreed and asked for this to be continued to the March 2013 meeting.

There were no members of the public present to comment on the application.

Review of criteria:

HDC Criteria	
1 Values of the building and contribution to the surrounding area	<p>Noted from the Historic Building inventory were read into record which rates the building at the highest level (#3) and describes the architectural and historical merit of the building. The most unique architectural element of the building is the elliptical porch in the gable end of the structure. Mr. Messier explained the significance of this porch style as being unique to the Connecticut River Valley and is now known as a Connecticut River Valley Porch. Mr. Messier then read portions of the nomination papers for the National Register of Downtown and Lower Village Historic Districts which describe the development of the lower village by the business ventures of the Claremont Manufacturing Company beginning in 1832. This building was constructed by this group, a portion of which once held their offices. It is also listed individually in the nomination and is one of the primary contributing structures in this historic district.</p> <p>There was consensus that this building is significant for its architectural and historical value and agreed that the rating of #3 is appropriate.</p>
2 Compatibility with the existing bldg/structure to setting/surrounding uses	<p>Consensus that the proposed design, arrangement, and materials are appropriate for the existing building.</p>
3 Scale and size compatibility with surroundings	<p>Consensus that the scale and size of the window and door openings are compatible with the existing surroundings.</p>
4 Affect of the proposed improvement on other buildings/structures	<p>Not applicable at this time, but will be when the applicant returns with their sign designs.</p>
5 Proposed impact on setting & extent of proposal to preserve/enhance surrounding	<p>Consensus that the proposal will have a positive impact on the historic and architectural qualities of the historic district and the community as a whole.</p>

	Installing a window and door which have been bricked-In will return the façade to an earlier original appearance and will enhance the qualities of the historic district.
6 Are the Secretary of Interior's Guidelines for Rehabilitation met?	Consensus that the proposal is in keeping with the Secretary of Interior's Guidelines for Rehabilitation.

Motion: to approve the application as presented with continuation the sign design portion of the application to be continued to the March 2013 meeting.

Made by: Kristin Kenniston

Second by: Mr. Wahrlich

Vote: Unanimous

Correspondence from the State Preservation Office was discussed regarding the replacement of the roof on the Moody Building. No adverse effect was concluded in this matter. Since there is no proposed change in design or materials, the matter will not come before the HDC as it is regarded as general maintenance.

Motion: to adjourn

Made By: Mr. Wahrlich

Second by: Ms. Kenniston

Vote: Unanimous.

Minutes Respectfully Submitted By,
David Messier, Chair