

**City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
December 11, 2012**

The Architectural Design Review Committee (ADRC) held its regular monthly meeting on Tuesday, December 11, 2012, in the Second Floor Conference Room in City Hall, at 8:30 a.m.

Present at the meeting were members James Doherty, Ron King, and Claude Gentilhomme. Steve Henninger and Donna Muir of the City Planning Division were also present, as was Craig Walker, Zoning 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 December 19, 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 Roy Nails & Spa requesting Architectural Design Review approval of a replacement affixed sign located at 31A South Main Street, within the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.**

Mr. Henninger reported that the application is for a replacement affixed sign. He stated that at last month's ADRC meeting, the Committee had concerns with the lack of border on the sign, the background façade that the sign would be installed upon, and the placement of the sign.

Jimmy Vu and Roy Nguyen were present. Mr. Vu stated that the sign company is waiting for the go-ahead to create the new sign.

Mr. Walker explained that the applicant received a temporary sign permit and removed the banners.

Mr. King suggested that the words "Nails & Spa" be moved to the left to keep the letter "y" in the word Roy and the ampersand from touching.

Mr. Doherty asked what color was chosen for the façade background. Mr. Vu responded that he had met with both Ms. McPherson and Ms. Hebert and the decision was made to paint the façade a bronze color to match the window frames.

The Committee discussed the proposed size of the sign and the lighting to be used.

Mr. King moved to recommend Architectural Design Review approval for the revised sign as submitted. Mr. Doherty seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- **Application by Beaver Meadow Village Condominium Association requesting Architectural Design Review approval of a replacement freestanding sign located at the intersection of Second Street and Piscataqua Road, within the Single Family Residential (RS) District.**

Mr. Henninger explained that the application is for a replacement freestanding sign.

John Sokul and Betsy Rodd were present on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Sokul provided some background information relating to the current sign. He explained that the sign will be a sage green with a brown and yellow border, matching Graphic C which was submitted with the application. Mr. Sokul explained that the fancy letter “E” in the word Village will no longer be used.

Mr. Walker stated that the height of the sign in a single family residential district cannot exceed six feet. Mr. Sokul responded that he will work with the sign installer to work around the rock in the front of the sign, as the rock stands about three feet tall.

Mr. Doherty asked about ground lighting for the sign. Mr. Sokul said that they have not looked into lighting at this time. Mr. Walker stated that lighting in this zoning district is allowed; however, the sign cannot be lit between the hours of 9:00 p.m. through 7:00 a.m.

Mr. King moved to recommend Architectural Design Review approval for the sign as submitted, with the recommendation that the height of the sign not exceed six feet. Mr. Doherty seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- **Application by Aaron’s requesting Architectural Design Review approval of replacement panels in an existing freestanding sign and an affixed sign located at 163 Loudon Road, within the General Commercial (CG) District.**

Mr. Henninger reported that the applicant is seeking approval for replacement panels in an existing freestanding sign and an affixed sign. He also noted that the sign was installed this week.

Marc Hortie was present on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Hortie said that he asked Mr. Walker for permission to install the sign prior to Planning Board approval, as Aaron’s is having a 100th year celebration this week.

Mr. Hortie said that the awning has been removed and the cinder block portion of the building has been painted off white. He explained that the red address panel on the top of the freestanding sign has been painted blue, as well as the sign posts. Mr. Hortie showed the Committee more current pictures and provided copies of the revised graphics at the end of the ADRC meeting.

Mr. Doherty asked why the trademark symbol was at the top right of the letter “S” for the freestanding sign and at the bottom right for the affixed sign. Mr. Hortie responded that is the way that Aaron’s corporate office designed the signs.

Mr. Doherty suggested that the applicant change the sign to include what the company does, to ensure that people know what the business is. Mr. Hortie responded that the Code Division told him that he had to remove the stick lettering originally on the red awning, which helped to describe what the store offers. Mr. Walker stated that they could add wording to the sign panel if they reduce the size of the word Aaron’s. Mr. Hortie stated that these are franchise signs which all need to confirm to corporate standards.

Mr. Doherty moved to recommend Architectural Design Review approval of the replacement panels in the existing freestanding and the affixed sign, as shown in the new graphics that were submitted today. Mr. King seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- **Application by B & B Associates Realty requesting Architectural Design Review approval of replacement panels in an existing freestanding sign located at 89 Storrs Street, within the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.**

Mr. Henninger explained that the application is for replacement panels in an existing freestanding sign.

Bob Dufour from B & B Associates Realty, and Glen Schadlick from NE-OP-CO Signs, were present. Mr. Schadlick stated that there are lamps inside the sign and the panels are translucent vinyl.

Mr. Walker explained that the sign is a pre-existing, non-conforming sign that has been grandfathered.

Mr. King suggested that the word “Realty” be moved further down, that the blue background for the word “Associates” surround the word only and not extend to the ends of the sign, and that the gray oval around the “B & B” be made bigger.

Mr. Doherty suggested that there is too much white background at the top and bottom of the sign panels and perhaps the words could be more balanced vertically.

Mr. Henninger said that the three disparate elements on the sign do not work well together.

Mr. Schadlick stated the company does not have a logo and that cost was a factor in the design.

The ADRC discussed various options and suggested that the gray oval be increased to include the word “Associates” removing the blue background, and the lettering for “B & B” and “Associates” have the same color and background. The lettering for “Realty” could be increased to reduce some of the white background. Mr. Schadlick stated that he would provide revised graphics based on the Committee’s suggestions by Thursday.

Mr. King moved to recommended Architectural Design Review approval of the sign as discussed subject to review of the revised graphics by Planning staff. Mr. Doherty seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- **Application by George Georgopolis / Veano’s Italian Kitchen requesting Architectural Design Review approval of replacement panels in an existing freestanding sign and an existing affixed sign located at 30 Manchester Street, within the Gateway Performance (GWP) District**

Mr. Henninger reported that the application is for replacement panels in an existing freestanding sign and an existing affixed sign.

George Georgopolis was present to respond to questions from the ADRC.

Mr. King asked how the sign for the affixed panel will fit in the panel, as the graphic shows only the sign for the freestanding sign and the graphics for the affixed panel sign would be altered. Mr. Georgopolis stated that he would provide a graphic showing the panel for the affixed sign by Thursday. It was agreed that the Planning Board would decide whether to approve the affixed sign panel based on the new graphic to be submitted and acceptable to the Planning staff.

Mr. King moved to recommend Architectural Design Review approval of the replacement panel for the freestanding sign as submitted. Mr. Doherty seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- **Application by Cheryl Brosnahan / Verizon Wireless requesting Architectural Design Review approval of a replacement panel in an existing building sign and a replacement panel in an existing freestanding sign located at 215 Fisherville Road, within the General Commercial (CG) District.**

Mr. Henninger reported that the applicant is proposing replacement panels in an existing building sign and an existing freestanding sign.

Lindsay Ruggles, from Verizon Wireless, was present to respond to questions from the Committee.

Mr. King suggested that the spacing between the first and second line of text, on the freestanding sign panel, be increased for easier reading. Mr. Gentilhomme explained that he prefers that both signs have the black backgrounds, as the white background isn't as sophisticated looking.

Ms. Ruggles stated that these are corporate signs and wasn't sure whether they could be changed, but she would talk with the applicant.

Mr. Gentilhomme moved to recommend Architectural Design Review approval of the replacement panels in the affixed building sign and the freestanding sign, and with the recommendation that panel in the freestanding sign match the panel in the affixed sign with the black background. The committee suggested that the applicant consider increased spacing between the first and second line of text to allow for easier reading. Mr. King seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- **Application by the New Hampshire Association of Realtors, for Architectural Design Review approval for the construction of a new three-story 23,832 square foot office building and related parking, access driveway, stormwater management, lighting, landscaping, and associated site improvements, located at 115A Airport Road, within the Institutional (IS) District. (2012-0049)**

Mr. Henninger reported that the application has been reviewed by the ADRC twice and that the applicant has submitted a revised design for consideration.

Mr. Scott Vlasak, architect with Bruce Ronayne Hamilton Architects, was present on behalf of the applicant. He stated that he has changed the materials and colors used, as the ADRC thought there was too much contrast with both the colors and the materials, and he provided samples of the masonry base, trim, and EIFS. Mr. Vlasak stated that the vertical piers are now masonry elements with three to four inch reveals. He explained that the landscaping plan incorporates both new and existing landscaping in order to give scale to the west elevation. Mr. Vlasak also reported that the windows on the west elevation are now grouped in sets of twos instead of sets of threes. He explained that neither the roof deck plans nor the mechanical equipment screening plans are completely finalized.

Mr. Vlasak said that this is proposed to be a multi-tenant building, and once the space is leased, a sign application will be presented to the ADRC.

Mr. Henninger said that the landscape plans have been reviewed by City staff and a recommendation has been made to add two additional trees around the perimeter of the parking lot. He explained that the applicant has requested a waiver to install a larger number of ornamental trees in the back because of FAA height regulations.

Mr. Gentilhomme stated that it was awkward for him to see the project for the first time and that the building seems a little broken up to him. Mr. Doherty said that something about the design of the building still makes him feel uncomfortable, but perhaps it is just personal, as he cannot articulate any specifics.

Mr. Henninger said that it is a unique building in the industrial transition zone. Mr. Gentilhomme said that the building is fussier than it needs to be with so many materials.

Mr. Vlasak said that many changes were made to the materials and colors, but the owner likes the revisions, as it doesn't resemble a stacked three-story building.

Mr. Brian Pratt, from CLD Engineers, presented a revised landscape plan and explained the revisions to the Committee. He stated that he has worked with Ms. Hebert on the revisions.

Mr. Gentilhomme moved to recommend Architectural Design Review approval for the site plan, elevations, and landscaping plans as submitted. Mr. Doherty seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- **Application by D'Angelo / Papa Gino's, Inc., for Architectural Design Review approval of façade renovations, an expanded parking lot, and related driveway, access, landscaping, and site improvements, for property located at 87 South Main Street, within the Urban Commercial (CU) District. (2012-0055)**

Mr. Henninger reported that the application was for D'Angelo, which is moving from near the Dunkin Donuts on South Main Street to this building previously occupied by Penny Pitou Travel.

Chris Nadeau, from Nobis Engineering, and Brian Wilde and Michelle Inglese, from D'Angelos, were present on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. Nadeau stated that the front parking area will remain the same and parking in the rear of the building will be expanded. He stated that there will be a basement entrance for customers who park in the back of the building. He explained that the old vegetation would be cleared and the area replanted and new ornamental trees will be planted in the front. Mr. Nadeau reported that the dumpster in the back will be screened. Mr. Nadeau commented that Planning staff had requested additional landscaping along the back side of the parking lot between the lot and Storrs Street. He advised that the plans will be revised accordingly.

Ms. Inglese stated that the storefront windows have been adjusted to sit on the brick base, corner trim has been provided, and the brick base is proposed to continue around the south side of the building. She stated that the bay window on the north wall will remain, but will be tinted a dark color to obscure the restaurant equipment which will be placed behind it.

Mr. Doherty suggested that the brick be wrapped around both sides of the building in the same manner. The Committee discussed in detail with Mr. Wilde about where the brick base on the front of the building

should terminate. It was agreed to terminate the brick base on the front vestibule where it turns into the front wall and continue along the base of the north side of the vestibule to the corner of the building at the end of the patio. Mr. Wilde indicated that the plans would be revised accordingly.

Mr. Henninger thought that the rear customer entrance should have a canopy, providing a covered entrance for customers. Mr. Gentilhomme commented that the back entrance door should be stronger. He thinks it looks like an afterthought. He suggested making it a storefront door, which will let customers know that they can enter the restaurant. Mr. Gentilhomme also suggested that the lighting for the back entrance has to be stronger and directional signage added. The Committee concurred that any patrons parking in the rear lot should be directed to the back entrance rather than walking up and around to the front entrance

Mr. Nadeau presented the sign portion of the project, which includes two signs on the fringe of the canopy, a roof sign, and a freestanding sign. He stated that the roof sign is bracketed onto the roof, and the existing goose neck lamps will be reused.

Mr. Doherty moved to recommend Architectural Design Review approval on the signs as submitted. Mr. King seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Gentilhomme moved to recommend Architectural Design Review approval of the building elevations, with the recommendations that the brick base on the front of the building be adjusted as agreed upon, and further that the design of the rear entrance be enhanced to be more inviting and announcing that it is a main entrance, and that a canopy be provided at this entrance. Mr. Doherty seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously. The committee advised that this design does not have to return for further review unless staff was of the opinion that the changes were not in keeping with the Committee's intent.

Mr. Gentilhomme moved to recommend Architectural Design Review approval of the site plan with the changes to the site landscaping as recommended by staff. Mr. Doherty seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

There was no further business to come before the Committee, and the meeting adjourned at 10:34 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen Henninger
Assistant City Planner

SLH/djm