

**City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
July 10, 2012**

The Architectural Design Review Committee (ADRC) held its regular monthly meeting on Tuesday, July 10, 2012, in the Second Floor Conference Room in City Hall, at 8:30 a.m.

Present at the meeting were members Elizabeth Durfee Hengen, James Doherty, Claude Gentilhomme, and Jennifer Czysz. Gloria McPherson, Steve Henninger, Becky Hebert, and Donna Muir of the City Planning Division were also present, as was Craig Walker, Zoning Administrator, and Mike Santa, Code Administrator.

The ADRC met in order to review the proposed design of certain sites, buildings, building alterations, and signs that are on the Planning Board's regular agenda for July 18, 2012, and which are subject to the provisions of the City of Concord's Zoning Ordinance in respect to Architectural Design Review.

Agenda Items

- **Application by DEW Properties, LLC, for Design Review approval for a new freestanding sign at 4 Crescent Street, Penacook, within the Opportunity Corridor Performance (OCP) District.**

Mr. Henninger explained that the application was for a new freestanding sign.

Mr. Russ Aubertin, from Advantage Signs, was present on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Aubertin stated that the tenant panels on the on the double-sided sign is changeable, but will only be used when building tenants change.

Ms. Hengen moved to recommend approval of the freestanding sign as submitted. Ms. Czysz seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- **Application by Jeff Chaplain / Village Street Garage for Design Review approval for two new affixed signs at 336 Village Street, Penacook, within the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.**

Mr. Henninger reported that the application was for two new affixed signs.

Ms. Liz Chaplain was present for the applicant. Ms. Chaplain stated that the signs are vinyl banner signs with slate blue letters on a white background, which will be affixed to a white-painted board backing. Ms. Chaplain showed the Board the vinyl sign that will be affixed to the north wall of the building. The vinyl will be affixed on a white board and then attached to the wall. The affixed sign on the canopy facing west will be slightly larger, but of the same color and materials.

Mr. Gentilhomme noted that the white backer board being mounted on the blue building would stand out, but the other white backer board is being mounted on a white canopy. He recommended that a 1" wide border in the same slate blue color as the letters be provided around

the sign, leaving sufficient white space between the lettering and the boarder. It was noted that the sign would look unfinished without the border and that the border was especially important in case the whites of the backer board and the canopy were slightly off color. Ms. Chaplain concurred with this recommendation.

Mr. Gentilhomme moved to recommend approval of the signs as submitted, with a painted border on the backer board of the canopy sign in the slate blue color of the lettering. Ms. Czysz seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Henninger asked the applicant to provide a photo of the proposed sign by Thursday July 12th so that it can be included in the Planning Board packet. Ms. Chaplain advised that she would provide the picture as requested.

- **Application by Total Sports Repair, Inc., for Design Review approval for a new affixed sign and a revised panel on an existing freestanding sign at 341 Loudon Road, within the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.**

Mr. Henninger stated that the application was for a new affixed sign and a panel on an existing freestanding sign.

Mr. Tim Walsh was present to respond to questions from the ADRC. Mr. Walsh stated that the affixed sign would be attached to an existing wood panel on the building.

Mr. Doherty moved to recommend approval of the new affixed sign and the revised panel on the existing freestanding sign. Ms. Hengen seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- **Application by Hertz for Design Review approval for a revised freestanding sign and two revised affixed signs at 71 Airport Road, within the Industrial (IN) District.**

Mr. Henninger explained that the application was for a revised freestanding sign and two revised affixed signs.

Mr. Rob McIntyre, from New England Signs, was present on behalf of the applicant. Mr. McIntyre stated that Hertz is changing the color scheme in their corporate logo, switching from a black background with yellow lettering to a yellow background with black lettering.

Mr. Gentilhomme moved to recommend approval of the revised freestanding sign and two revised affixed signs as submitted. Ms. Czysz seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- **Application by Forest Street Realty / Team KIA for Design Review approval for the construction of a new 14,170 square foot building and redesign of the parking and vehicle display layout, with related paving, landscaping, lighting, drainage, and associated site improvements, located at 94 Manchester Street (2012-0024)**

Mr. Henninger reported that the ADRC looked at the site and building plans last month and had a concern about the lack of mechanical equipment screening and a suggestion that the red panels across the top of the front façade of the building be continued around the side of the building.

Mr. Peter Stewart, from Stewart Architects, was present on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Stewart stated that the rooftop mechanical equipment will now be located inside the building, so that rooftop screening was no longer necessary. He also stated that the plans now show the red panels across the top of the front façade of the building to be repeated around the side of the building.

Mr. Henninger brought up the fact that illegal signs, banners and flags are located onsite and recommended that Mr. Stewart advise the applicant that these must be removed.

Mr. Gentilhomme questioned whether the existing building onsite would remain as is. Mr. Stewart stated that the plan was to keep it white. The ADRC recommended that the existing building be painted to match the new building, so it looks more connected to the rest of the complex. Mr. Stewart thought this would be appropriate but he needs to consult with his client.

Ms. Hebert stated that the landscape plan needs to be prepared and stamped by a NH Licensed Landscape Architect and that concerns remain regarding the plantings on the west side of the site, some plantings needing to be shifted to work with the existing light poles, and that there needs to be a plan for the protection of existing trees during construction.

Mr. Gentilhomme moved to recommend approval of the application, with the recommendation that the existing building be painted to match the new building, the landscape plan be prepared and stamped by a NH Licensed Landscape Architect, and the landscape plan be reviewed and approved by Planning Staff. Mr. Doherty seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- **Application by Flomac Limited Partnership for Design Review approval for renovations to an existing building and Master Sign Plan, located at 8 Loudon Road, within the Gateway Performance (GWP) District (2012-0009)**

Mr. Henninger stated that the site and landscaping plans were previously approved and the applicant was before the ADRC for Design Review approval for renovations to the existing building and for the free standing sign.

Mr. Peter Gearhart, from Architectural Renovations, was present on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Gearhart stated that the ADRC had previously requested that the applicant come back before the Committee with finished elevations for the existing building. He said that the applicant is trying to coordinate the existing building with the Buffalo Wild Wings building. He added that the mechanical equipment for the existing building will be behind the proposed parapet.

Ms. McPherson asked the applicant about their plans for moving the building. Mr. Santa stated that the construction contractor had told Code Administration that the building would be sliding 20 feet to the west, and noted that the approved site plan does not provide any indication of the building being moved. Mr. Gearhart stated that the building is to be raised, but not moved and that it is the applicant's intention to leave the building location as approved in the site plan. Ms. McPherson stated that if the footprint of the building moves and changes the approved site plan with respect to parking, traffic flow or landscaping, the applicant will need to come back for site plan approval of the changes.

Mr. Doherty questioned if there were plans for screening on the side of the building where the exit for the six-story building is located. Mr. Gearhart stated that he believes that 6 Loudon Road will be relocating their entrance. Mr. Doherty suggested that windows and bushes and/or shrubs be added onto the west of the existing building to provide a more pedestrian friendly façade immediately opposite the main entrance to the Christian Mutual office building. He suggested that the canopy be carried around to the west elevation of the building as well.

Mr. Gentilhomme suggested that trim be added at the top and bottom of the horizontal band across the front elevation to break up the band and provide a shadow line. Mr. Gearhart stated that tenant signs would be affixed to the band.

Mr. Gentilhomme moved to recommend approval of the renovations of the existing building, with the recommendation that windows and landscaping be incorporated into the west side of the existing building. The ADRC suggested that the Planning staff review these changes in lieu of having the applicant return to another Architectural Design Review meeting. Mr. Doherty seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

The ADRC discussed the monument sign and suggested that the blank panels for building tenants be maroon to match the 8 Loudon Road at the top of the sign, until each tenant receives approval for their individual sign. The ADRC also discussed dropping the sign panels lower but decided that the landscaping within the sign planter was important to keep. The ADRC noted that the sign dimensions were not clear on the submitted plans.

Mr. Gentilhomme moved to recommend approval of the monument sign as submitted, with the recommendation that the blank panels for building tenants be maroon until each tenant receives approval for the individual panels, and with the provision that a final review of the size of the sign be made by City staff. Ms. Czysz seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- **Application by the Concord Boys & Girls Club, Inc., for the renovation of an existing building and the construction of two additions, redesign of the parking lot and vehicular access, with related paving, drainage, landscaping, lighting, and associated site improvements, and the upgrade of Bradley Street, located at 55 Bradley Street (2012-0033)**

Ms. McPherson stated that the application was for renovations of an existing building, the construction of two additions, and other parking, drainage, and site improvements.

Mr. Frank Anzalone, from Frank Anzalone Associates, Erin Reardon, from Nobis Engineering, and Chris Emunds, from the Concord Boys & Girls Club, were present on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Anzalone provided the ADRC with an overview of the site plan and the architectural designs for the project. Ms. Reardon responded to questions regarding the parking and explained that this was a City / private partnership, with the Concord Boys & Girls Club leasing the space from the City.

Ms. McPherson stated that the application is scheduled for a determination of completeness review before the Planning Board in July and a public hearing in August. She stated that the applicant has only provided a conceptual landscape plan at this time.

Mr. Gentilhomme moved to recommend approval of the building elevations as submitted, and consideration of the site landscape and signage would be postponed to the August ADRC meeting. Ms. Hengen seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- **Application by Bindery Redevelopment, LLC, for Design Review approval for proposed revisions to the previously approved building elevations for the construction of a five-story office/retail building at 43-45 South Main Street (2011-0034)**

Ms. Hebert reported that the applicant had submitted a subsequent application wanting to change the color and materials of a previously approved site plan. This subsequent application showed the required mechanical screening, which was not included on the original application. She stated that the applicant no longer wishes to change the color and materials, but will be providing revised graphics to show the rooftop mechanical screening.

The ADRC discussed various ideas for rooftop screening, including the use of a brick parapet wall which would also strengthen the cornice, a weak point in the building's design.

Ms. Hebert explained that the applicant is talking about up-lighting the highway side of the building from the ground up. She stated that Mr. Duprey is also talking about installing LED lighting around the "Smile" building. The ADRC discussed the lighting ideas and agreed that it would be more appropriate to have a Master Plan for lighting, which would include the entire highway portion of downtown Concord and not just one or two buildings.

The ADRC agreed that it is important that the applicant come before the ADRC to discuss the mechanical screening, cornice, and lighting.

- **Preview of the State of New Hampshire's Tobey School project at 45 South Fruit Street, for the renovations to the building, parking, and grading of the site (2012-0034)**

Ms. Hengen recused herself from the discussion of this project.

Mr. Henninger provided an overview of the proposed building modifications and changes with the parking and grading, and reported that the plans are still preliminary. He stated that the application would come before the ADRC and Planning Board in August.

- **Update and discussion of the Design Review Guidelines project**

Ms. McPherson stated that the consultant, Terry Dewan, had completed a site visit to Concord, where he took photographs and organized them into various categories. She stated that he will be visiting another area of Concord in August. Mr. Dewan had asked the City to look at the Design Review Guidelines he has completed for Kittery, Maine, to get a feel for what he is looking to provide to the City. Some of the comments and suggestions are as follows:

- There is a need to address infill and renovations more than what was provided for in the Kittery guidelines, which are more focused on new construction.

- Context is most important in Concord – we want good architecture that fits the context of different areas.
- Organize the guidelines by district, and it was suggested that we look at Goffstown’s guidelines, which are broken up by districts.
- Develop levels or tiers of standards – minimum standards required across all districts, then higher or additional standards for certain districts and.
- Have the guidelines numbered in such a way that would make communicating the guidelines easier and allow for referring to previous sections.
- For any photographs that are included, include an analysis of the photo, as to what works and what doesn’t.
- Keep the guidelines simplified, streamlined, and user friendly.

Ms. McPherson stated that she would inform the ADRC of the upcoming August site visit date once that has been determined.

There was no further business to come before the Committee, and the meeting adjourned at 10:25 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Gloria McPherson
City Planner

GM / djm