

**Exeter Historic District Commission
September 19, 2013**

Call meeting to order: Chairwoman Pam Gjettum called the meeting to order at 7:04 pm in the Nowak Room of the Town Office building. Members present were: Pete Cameron, Patrick Gordon, Selectwoman Julie Gilman, Fred Kollmorgen and Len Benjamin

New Business: Public Hearings

The application of Julie DiCarlo (d/b/a All Beads Considered) for new signage on the building located at 163 Water Street (Unit #C-3). The subject property is located in the WC-Waterfront Commercial zoning district. Tax Map Parcel #72-17-3. Case #13-09

Ms. DiCarlo spoke to her application for a carved wood sign to be located above her establishment at 163 Water St. A detailed drawing of the sign hanging from a newly designed/constructed bracket accompanied the application. The drawing illustrated a “swag” of turned wood beads extending beneath the sign from one end to the other. The drawing also included the placement of a (purple) wood bead at the end of the bracket. A second enlarged drawing illustrated the design, the logo, and the colors to be used on the sign.

(Mr. Gordon noted the statement acknowledging the applicant had read the Applications Requirement was not initialed and asked he do so. Ms. DiCarlo signed the appropriate space on the original application in the possession of the Chair.)

Mr. Kollmorgen moved to *accept* the application; seconded by Mr. Benjamin. Motion carried.

Continuing the discussion toward approval, Mr. Kollmorgen inquired if the hanging beads (on the sign) met the 8 foot requirement (from sidewalk) of the ordinance; Ms. DiCarlo replied it did. He also suggested the eyelets holding the sign be of stainless steel or she will experience rust bleeding stains onto her sign.

Mr. Gordon stated he was not in favor of the proposed signage; did not feel it was in keeping with the signage in Historic District. It was agreed there were existing signs in the design of their offerings/profession, but did not feel this met that category. She disagreed and felt “beads” were very much a part of history and felt they were promoting the spirit of craftsmanship by offering the works of local craftsmen. Ms. Gjettum reading from Article 5.26 on Trademarks and Product Names noting it just referenced a review by HDC to various conditions and are they consistent with the goals of the district and she felt the application did.

Ms. Gilman expressed her concern of the amount of verbiage on the sign; graphically a lot going on. Ms. DiCarlo stated they added their tag line around “Beads” on the sign to let passer-bys know they offer more than beads but an activity; something they could do. Also, from a marketing viewpoint, it is her logo and helps visitors identify her shop.

Mr. Gordon after reading from Exeter Zoning Ordinance 5.7.6 B-10 referencing Lettering, he feels it is very busy and in his interpretation it is not in keeping with the Historic District. Ms. Gilman did not object to the use of the logo but of the varied colors

The sign design submitted with the application states “weather protection rating and plexiglass”. Discussion continued on was it a sprayed UV protective shield or was it a plexiglass overlay. If it is to be a sheet of plexiglass

you would lose the 3 dimensional qualities of the carved sign. Ms. Gjettum was familiar with the local artisan making the sign, Mr. Ivan Stanek, and felt it was a sprayed UV finish

Mr. Kollmorgen moved to *approve* the application subject to the provision the weatherproofing application is a sprayed UV coating in lieu of plexiglass; seconded by Mr. Benjamin. The application was approved with four members voting in favor and one opposed.

The application of Elliot Berkowitz for window replacement in the building located at 119-125 Water Street. The subject parcel is located in the WC-Waterfront Commercial zoning district. Tax Map Parcel#72-23. Case #13-10.

Mr. Kollmorgen moved to table the application as the applicant was not present; seconded by Mr. Benjamin. Motion carried.

The application of Keith and Kathy Lemerise (d/b/a/Trends Gift Gallery) for new signage on the building located at 85A Water Street. The subject property is located in the WC-Waterfront Commercial zoning district. Tax Map Parcel #72-29. Case #13-11.

Mr. Keith Lemerise addressed the members stating Trends was relocating down the street to 85A Water Street. The application included the graphics and coloration for two signs proposed for the new location; one to be placed on the face of the building, the other on the existing hanging bracket.

Before moving on with approving the application, Mr. Gordon inquired what the plans for lighting were. Mr. Lemerise stated they would like a spot light to shoot onto the hanging sign; for the long sign, lighting at the bottom to illuminate the sign. He illustrated the location of spot light to Ms. Gjettum. Ms. Gilman added her concern with the spot in that location is safety; light/reflection into traffic at that intersection.

Mr. Kollmorgen moved to defer action on the lighting fixtures/placement and to come back with a sketch with location of sign(s) in relation to the intersection and type of lighting. Mr. Gordon suggested researching a “cone” lighting fixture centered on the bracket with the light shining down.

Mr. Kollmorgen moved to *accept* the application with the exception of the illumination as stated on page 2 of the application and not accept that; seconded by Mr. Gordon. Motion carried.

Discussion return to signage and means of attachment: used the neighboring Verizon sign as an example of what is not desired for attaching the long sign to surface of hip roof. Mr. Gordon commented the shingles on the hip roof are not in the best of repair; knows there are eyelets would hold a linear signs. Would he consider hanging from those brackets. (Mr. Gordon provided a picture of the bldg. on his ipad to illustrate the location he was referencing) Mr. Lemerise thought it worthy of consideration; would like check on visibility and how much window display space might be lost.

In discussing materials of sign, it was determined Dibond panels as listed on the sketch provided by sign contractor are aluminum sheets with a polyethylene core in between; a material the Commission would not accept. Mr. Gordon felt the characteristics of his original sign were exactly what the Commission wished to emulate in terms of materials; carved wood or MDO. Mr. Lemerise stated he was not happy with the construction of his present sign and wasn't sure he wanted to upgrade to carved wood; perhaps a later time. It was suggested

to consult with his sign maker to see if his could be rehabilitated as compared to a new sign. Perhaps a sprayed UV protective would lengthen the life of the sign.

Before moving to approve the application, Mr. Cameron wanted to identify what exactly was being voted on. Because of the different discussions on a variety of issues, it was agreed to take each sign and develop a motion to include all the conditions discussed.

1. Hanging 30" x 36" sign

Mr. Gordon summarized the options discussed. Mr. Kollmorgen then moved to *approve* the hanging sign provided it is (constructed) of one of three options; carved wood, MDO or applicant rehab original sign.

Mr. Gordon asked to include in the motion the existing sign bracket be touched up (with paint). Ms. Gilman seconded. Motion carried.

2. 24" x 144" sign

After summarizing the options discussed, Mr. Gordon motioned the Commission prefers the option to use the existing eyelets to suspend the sign from the wood soffit (so to not damage the wooden singled roof and prevent snow buildup behind a roof mounted sign). However the applicant has the option to mount the sign onto the hip-roof similar to the neighboring Verizon sign. Ms. Gilman seconded. Motion carried.

The applicant was reminded he would return with a schematic design for lighting.

Continued discussion on the application of Green Bean on Water LLC for new construction and exterior changes to the structure located at 33 Water Street. The subject parcel is located in the WC-Waterfront Commercial zoning district. Tax Map Parcel #72-37. Case #12-17.

Mr. Jeff Turner returned to continue the discussion from the February meeting when the Commission members felt they needed a better representation of the façade and his plans for renovations. Referring to the accompanying sketch of proposed facade, Mr. Turner outlined the proposed design and building materials; wood shingles, rectangle plate glass and wood trim.

Ms. Gilman, responding as Chairman of the Heritage Commission, wished to comment on the yellow aluminum treatment at the former Trends shop that will now be a part of the expansion for Green Bean. Although not all appreciated its "beauty" it was a building trend/treatment in former times and thinks it is the last of this treatment in Town. She asked Mr. Turner to take pictures before its removal.

The question of paint color was brought up. Mr. Turner's choice at this time is a "charcoally" black with a pearl finish; not glossy. Mr. Kollmorgen reminded the Commission does not recommend color choice but as a consult. Mr. Gordon suggested the final color be "historically sensitive".

Mr. Turner offered he will be returning when a more definite decision is made on signage.

Mr. Kollmorgen motioned to *accept* the application; seconded by Mr. Gordon. Motion passed.

In discussing toward approval, Mr. Gordon pursued the use of the wood paneling above the windows and perhaps adding some texture or molding to break up the expanse. Mr. Turner thought perhaps he might want to place his

sign in that location, but is in agreement to add some texture or molding. Mr. Kollmorgen suggested it be included in the signage application.

Mr. Gordon moved to *approve* the application as presented; seconded by Ms. Gilman. Motioned passed.

The application of the Inn by the Bandstand LLC for the installation of a leaded glass window over the main entry of the building at 6 Front St. The subject property is located in the C-1, Central Area Commercial zoning district. Tax Map Parcel #72-16. Case #13-12.

Mr. Joe Cammarata appeared for the applicants and explained the foyer to the Inn receives very little light and the applicants wished to install a leaded glass window to replace the existing solid wood transom. Mr. Cammarata distributed photos of the entrance of the Inn as it is at this time.

They proposed to replace the solid wood transom with glass as it was some time ago. The application proposed an elliptical window design of white glass with leaded support. Mr. Cammarata said that design is no longer being considered as he suggested to the owners a similar design to extend and match the existing side lights. He presented his concept to the members and there was discussion on the suitability of the design. Ms. Gilman felt the building, historically, called for a fan design but was concerned with the muntins and the glass between, but had concerns Mr. Cammarata's alternative proposal was too modern.

Mr. Cammarata, Mr. Gordon and Ms. Gilman exchanged sketches of possible design solutions. The resulting sketch provided by Mr. Gordon was a spider-window with clear glass set in lead to fill the whole space. Mr. Cammarata agreed and felt it accomplished what the owners wished; more light and looks good.

Ms. Gilman moved to *accept* the application; seconded by Mr. Kollmorgen. Motion carried.

Mr. Kollmorgen moved to approve the application subject to the entire area above the transom to be replaced with a spider-web design window with clear glass using the rough sketch provided by the HDC as the basic design; seconded by Mr. Benjamin. Motion carried.

Other Business:

- Approval of Minutes of August 15, 2013 meeting.

Mr. Cameron moved to accepted draft minutes as presented; Mr. Kollmorgen seconded. Motion passed with Mr. Benjamin abstaining as he was not present for meeting.

- Third public reading of proposed changes to Article VII (Minutes and Records) of the HDC Rules and Regulations of Procedure.

Mr. Kollmorgen read the proposed change to the procedure on how minutes are to be prepared and approved. For the record: **Minutes of all meetings shall include the names of the members present, persons appearing before the Commission a brief description of the subject matter discussed and final decisions. Minutes drafted during a meeting of the Historic District Commission are presented to the Commission for their approval, and amendment if necessary, at the next meeting. If Commission members who were at the meeting when the minutes were recorded are not available during the subsequent meeting when the minutes are to be approved, approval of the minutes is tabled until the next meeting. Approval of the minutes may be tabled for up to three subsequent meetings if members who were at the meeting when they were recorded are not available to approve them. If the minutes**

have not been approved after three (3) subsequent meetings, they may be approved and amended, if necessary, by the Commission members at the fourth meeting after the minutes were recorded.
Minutes of meetings and records of the decisions shall be filed with the town clerk. The records shall be open for public inspection during regular business hours of the clerk within 72 hours of the meeting, except those matters which are excepted from the scope of RSA 91-A:3.

(Changes to the article appear in italics)

With the final reading this proposed change to Rules and Procedures becomes the working Article VII.

- Review of the HDC application form and format

Mr. Gordon stated he continues to work on the present application. Ms. Gilman expressed her feeling the information desired is on the present application and with review by staff at PB to ensure all necessary items are addressed there would not be a need to send the applicant back for more information and a month delay in processing the application. Mr. Benjamin asked if the HDC can impose the responsibility to do that; does it have the authority. Mr. Gordon felt it was a good proposal if it could be done but feels a revised application could be more of a check list and user friendly. This might accomplish both objectives; ease of review for PB staff (for completion) and ease for applicant to enclose all necessary information needed to act upon the application. Mr. Gordon has the digital template from PB department and will continue to work on an update; will email members for their review. Document may be sent to members for review but any discussion will be at the public HDC meeting.

With no further business Mr. Benjamin moved to adjourn; seconded by Ms. Gilman.

Meeting adjourn at 8:30 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Ginny Raub
Recording Secretary