

**City of Concord, New Hampshire**  
**Architectural Design Review Committee**  
**December 11, 2018 Minutes**

The Architectural Design Review Committee (ADRC) held its regular monthly meeting on December 11, 2018 in the 2nd floor conference room at 41 Green Street.

Present at the meeting were Co-Chairs Jay Doherty and Elizabeth Durfee-Hengen, Members Ron King, Claude Gentilhomme, Doug Shilo, and Margaret Tomas. Craig Walker of the Code Department was present along with, Sam Durfee, and Lisa Fellows-Weaver of the City Planning Division.

**Sign Applications**

- 1. Paull Nails, on behalf of 31 South Main Acquisition, LLC, requests ADR approval to install a new wall sign at 31A. S. Main Street in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.**

The applicant had emailed indicating that he would not be in attendance.

Mr. Doherty stated that the proposed design was an improvement to prior designs. However, Ms. Hengen expressed concern with the stark white background and suggested a lighter background of tan, beige, or a light gray as it would blend better.

Mr. King made a motion to recommend approval of the design as submitted, with the suggested background revision to a slightly darker color, and revised plans to be submitted to the Planning Departments. Ms. Hengen seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

- 2. Strive Indoor Cycling - Pointe Barre Studio, on behalf of Plan B Properties, LLC, requests ADR approval to install a new projecting sign and a new window sign at 10 Hills Avenue in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.**

Owner Meagan Ferns and Glenn Shadlick of NEOPCO Signs represented the application.

Ms. Ferns explained that the facility is housing two separate businesses; an indoor cycling studio and a barre studio. Both businesses are noted on the sign. Mr. Shadlick stated that the bracket is matching an existing light fixture. The sign will not be lit. White vinyl graphic letters are being applied to the outside of the glass windows.

Mr. King made a motion to recommend approval of the design, as submitted. Mr. Doherty seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

- 3. Comfort Inn, on behalf of Duprey Company, LLC, requests ADR approval to replace a panel in an existing freestanding sign at 71 Hall Street in the Opportunity Corridor Performance (OCP) District.**

Craig Moore of Barlo Signs represented the application. He stated that the application is for the replacement of the box for the free standing sign on the highway. He stated that the pole is existing and is 29 feet high. There is no proposal to change the pole height or width of the sign. This sign change is a result of rebranding.

Mr. Walker explained that the ordinance allows the maximum height of a sign to be 20 feet. He stated that this sign is approved at 29 feet and there are no changes proposed for the height.

Ms. Tomas suggested that a new graphic be provided showing the sign at 20 feet. Ms. Hengen stated that she prefers a sign to be lower when it can be. Mr. King agreed. Discussion ensued regarding the visibility of the sign if it were lowered 9 feet specific to the existing vegetation along the highway and the traffic speed. Mr. Walker noted that there was an approval last month for a new sign on the side of the building.

Mr. Shilo noted that the cabinet appears to be offset. Mr. Moore stated that proposed sign will be off-set from center relative to the supporting pole and recognized this is different from what the sign construction plans show.

**City of Concord, New Hampshire  
Architectural Design Review Committee  
December 11, 2018 Minutes**

Ms. Hengen made a motion to recommend approval of the design as submitted with the understanding that the pole height exceeds the current zoning; however, it is a grandfather situation. Mr. Doherty seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

***Site Plan & Subdivision Applications***

Days Inn, on behalf of Capital Hotel Company VI, LLC, requests ADR review as part of a Major Site Plan application for the construction of a 4-story hotel, and related site improvements at 406 South Main Street in the General Commercial (GC) District.

The applicant was not present.

Mr. Durfee provided an overview of the application. He stated that this is a major site plan application for a hotel and was submitted with a concurrent minor subdivision of the property for a freestanding restaurant. The applicant has requested a waiver for the application to be addressed in one month, where it is usually done in two months. Mr. Durfee noted that the application does not show the layout of the restaurant for which plans have not yet been submitted, which is proposed to be at the northwest corridor of the lot, closer to the highway.

Members felt that the exterior materials should be metal panels as opposed to the Dryvit Systems proposed and there should be colored laminate paneling on the rear of the building, similar to the front facade. Ms. Hengen stated that the location and orientation of the wing sporting the “tru Hilton” logo presents a lost opportunity as it will not be easily seen by north-bound traffic on I-93.

Mr. Gentilhomme made a motion to recommend approval of the design as submitted, with the suggestion that if the building were mirrored east to west the wing detail would be more visible to the south-bound lanes of the highway and an additional wing could be added to the south west corner of the building, visible to the north-bound lanes; metal paneling be in the wing detail and the exterior materials of the building for additional visibility; and revised drawings be submitted to the planning department. Ms. Hengen seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

The landscaping plan was reviewed. Mr. Durfee stated that the plan is sparse and improvements will be necessary. Mr. King stated that there is no place noted for any landscaping on the west side of the development.

Mr. Gentilhomme made a motion to recommend approval of the landscaping plan showing necessary perimeter landscaping as required to meet zoning requirements. Seconded by Mr. King. The motion passed unanimously.

**Adjournment**

As there was no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting adjourned at 9:30 AM.