

**City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
September 1, 2020 Minutes**

The Architectural Design Review Committee (ADRC) held its regular monthly meeting on September August 4, 2020 via Zoom at 8:30 a.m.

Attendees: Co-Chairs Jay Doherty and Elizabeth Durfee Hengen, Members Margaret Tomas, Claude Gentilhomme, Ron King, and Doug Shilo

Absent: Richard Woodfin Planning Board Chairman

Staff: Sam Durfee, Senior Planner
Lisa Fellows-Weaver, Administrative Specialist

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Co-Chair Doherty at 8:30 a.m.

Mr. Durfee read the following into the record:

Due to the COVID-19/Coronavirus crisis and in accordance with Governor Sununu's Emergency Order #12 pursuant to Executive Order 2020-04, this Board is authorized to meet electronically.

Please note that there is no physical location to observe and listen contemporaneously to the meeting, which was authorized pursuant to the Governor's Emergency Order. However, in accordance with the Emergency Order, this is to confirm that we are:

a) Providing public access to the meeting by telephone, with additional access possibilities by video or other electronic means;

We are utilizing the Zoom platform for this electronic meeting. All members of the Board have the ability to communicate contemporaneously during this meeting through the Zoom platform, and the public has access to contemporaneously listen and, if necessary, participate in this meeting through clicking on the following website address: <https://zoom.us/j/754076629>, or by dialing the following phone # 1-929-205-6099 and entering the password 754076629. For those calling in who want to provide public testimony, dial *9 to alert the host that you want to speak. The host will unmute you during the public hearing portion of the meeting.

b) Providing public notice of the necessary information for accessing the meeting;

We previously gave notice to the public of how to access the meeting using Zoom, and instructions are provided on the City of Concord's website at: <http://concordnh.gov/273/Planning-Board>

c) Providing a mechanism for the public to alert the public body during the meeting if there are problems with access;

If anybody has a problem, please call 603-225-8515 or email at: planning@concordnh.gov.

d) Adjourning the meeting if the public is unable to access the meeting.

In the event the public is unable to access the meeting; we will adjourn the meeting and have it rescheduled at that time.

Please note that all votes taken during this meeting shall be done by Roll Call vote.

Approval of Minutes

Ms. Tomas moved to approve the minutes of August 4, 2020, as written. Mr. Gentilhomme seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
September 1, 2020 Minutes

Sign Applications

1. Granite State Independent Living Foundation requests ADR approval for the installation of a new internally-illuminated freestanding sign at 21 Chenell Drive in the Office Park Performance (OFP) District.

Josh Messinger, of Advantage Signs, represented the application.

Mr. Messinger stated the proposed sign is a single sided, illuminated, aluminum sign. He noted that the white background will be opaque.

Ms. Tomas asked why the granite posts and sign are not the same size; the sign is higher than the posts. Mr. Messinger stated that the applicant wanted to have the sign sit higher making the sign more prominent than the posts.

Mr. Shilo asked how power is directed to the sign. Mr. Messinger explained that power is coming from a nearby lamppost and will be inside the granite post. A conduit will go through the sign. Mr. King asked about the size and color of the conduit. Mr. Messinger replied that the conduit is gray and will be ½ to ¾ inch.

A discussion was held regarding the sign being only one-sided. Mr. Messinger stated that this is a dead end street. The back of the sign is proposed to be a black cabinet.

Mr. King noted that there are two entrances to the property and he asked about the proposed sign location. Mr. Messinger explained that the proposed location is more in line with the building.

Ms. Hengen made a motion, seconded by Mr. Shilo, to recommend approval of the proposed sign design, as submitted, with the condition that the sign's white background be opaque.

The motion passed unanimously with a roll call vote as follows:

Ms. Hengen – in favor
Mr. Shilo – in favor
Mr. Doherty – in favor
Mr. King – in favor
Ms. Tomas – in favor
Mr. Gentilhomme – in favor

2. Caring Family Dentistry requests ADR approval for the replacement of an internally-illuminated monument sign at 327 Loudon Road in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.

Josh Messinger, of Advantage Signs, represented the application.

Mr. Messinger stated that the location is the former Ruby Tuesdays restaurant. The proposed sign is a Lexan faced pylon sign. He stated the sign will have an opaque background. He noted that two additional building signs will be proposed at a later date.

Ms. Tomas suggested that the Committee begin requesting that night vision designs be provided with the application packets.

Mr. Shilo made a motion, seconded by Ms. Hengen, to recommend approval of the proposed sign design, as submitted, with the condition that the signs white background be opaque.

The motion passed unanimously with a roll call vote as follows:

Ms. Hengen – in favor
Mr. Shilo – in favor
Mr. Doherty – in favor

**City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
September 1, 2020 Minutes**

Mr. King – in favor
Ms. Tomas – in favor
Mr. Gentilhomme – in favor

3. The Smoothie Bus requests ADR approval for the replacement of a non-illuminated awning sign at 62 Pleasant Street in the Civic Performance (CVP) District.

Josh the business operator, represented the application.

The applicant stated that this is a new awning for the business.

A discussion was held regarding the fact that “Shoppe” is difficult to read on the awning. The applicant replied that the main focus of the awning is the Smoothie Bus and designed to be seen from the street; the Shoppe is designed so it would not be as prominent.

Ms. Hengen stated that the neighboring business has indicated that they are planning to replace their awnings as well. She is hopeful that the two businesses will be able to coordinate the graphics and colors of the awnings.

Mr. King made a motion, seconded by Ms. Tomas, to recommend approval of the proposed awning design, as submitted.

The motion passed unanimously with a roll call vote as follows:

Ms. Hengen – in favor
Mr. Shilo – in favor
Mr. Doherty – in favor
Mr. King – in favor
Ms. Tomas – in favor
Mr. Gentilhomme – in favor

4. 230 North Main Street, LLC requests ADR approval for the installation of two new non-illuminated wall signs at 230 North Main Street in the Urban Commercial (CU) District.

Timothy Barry of First Sign represented the application.

Mr. Barry explained that the sign package is for two separate sign panels for tenants. The signs will be placed at the end of the building and are for the purpose of traffic visibility on Main Street. In the future, the doors of the building will be lettered specifically for each tenant.

A discussion was held regarding the large round sign with the address. Mr. Durfee stated that the Committee does not typically see sign applications that do not provide graphics for the proposed signs. He stated that the Committee would be approving the location of the placement of the signs, not the actual advertised signs and that any sign panel would need to come before ADR.

Mr. Barry stated that the signs exceed the allowable footage. Mr. Durfee suggested that he check with Craig Walker as the approval for the signs may be premature as additional permits or approvals may be necessary.

Mr. Shilo made a motion, second by Mr. King, to recommend tabling the application for further review by staff.

The motion passed unanimously with a roll call vote as follows:

Ms. Hengen – in favor
Mr. Shilo – in favor
Mr. Doherty – in favor
Mr. King – in favor

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
September 1, 2020 Minutes

Ms. Tomas – in favor

Mr. Gentilhomme – in favor

Mr. Gentilhomme stated that he believes this building was just renovated and asked if the renovations would have needed to come before the Committee for review. Mr. Durfee replied that the Committee reviews buildings in performance districts; this building is in the Urban Commercial (CU) District.

Mr. Shilo added that if an applicant is looking for comments and/or suggestions relative to a location; it is encouraged to have them meet with the Committee to discuss prior to submission.

Building Permits in Performance Districts

1. Sheldon Pennoyer, on behalf of Chase Pennoyer and Kelly Buchanan, requests ADR approval for the addition of a dormer to a residential building at 31 Warren Street in the Civic Performance (CVP) District.

Sheldon Pennoyer represented the application along with Chase Pennoyer.

Chase Pennoyer gave an overview of the proposal. He explained that they are hoping to purchase the house and make some improvements to make it more livable. These modifications will include adding a dormer to allow a more functional bathroom, and kitchen windows. The materials used will match the façade of the existing building. They plan to remove most of the pavement from the existing parking area and replace it with grass, add a garden space and plant some trees.

Mr. Shilo asked about the change of use from office to single family residential. Mr. Pennoyer stated that the change of use is allowed. He explained that the history of the building was previously residential use; it was converted to the current use as office space by the existing tenant. Mr. Durfee added that residential use is a permitted use as it is listed as multi-use.

Mr. Shilo asked about parking and if it will be reviewed by staff. Mr. Durfee replied that this particular application does not trigger plan review so the Planning Division will not be reviewing the parking for this site. He stated that the proposal is decreasing the lot coverage. This would only require a building permit so there is no further review. He added that single family residential requires two spaces and two spaces are being provided.

Ms. Hengen added that this would be reducing a large amount of impervious surface down-town which is always nice. She asked if there was any plan to extend the rear roof slope. Mr. Pennoyer replied that they are not planning to extend it and will leave it as is. Ms. Hengen suggested that with the new window casements in the dormer, they consider enlarging the panes to the sash elsewhere. Mr. S. Pennoyer added that there is simulated glass and they will try to match the sizes; however, he is unsure of the vertical elements. Ms. Hengen suggested making the panes more vertical than horizontal. She noted that the bulkhead is the most elegant in the City and commented that this is a great project.

Additional discussion was held regarding the basement. Mr. C. Pennoyer stated that there is no set plans for the basement. He noted that in may become a rental unit or a workshop for himself in the future.

Mr. King made a motion, seconded by Ms. Tomas, to recommend approval, as submitted.

The motion passed unanimously with a roll call vote as follows:

Ms. Hengen – in favor

Mr. Shilo – in favor

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
September 1, 2020 Minutes

Mr. Doherty – in favor
Mr. King – in favor
Ms. Tomas – in favor
Mr. Gentilhomme – in favor

Mr. Durfee stated that this item will be a public hearing item on the Planning Board's September 16 meeting.

Major Site Plan/Subdivision Applications

1. Stantec, on behalf of the New Hampshire Air National Guard, requests ADR approval for a 14,700 sf addition and associated site improvements at 26 Regional Drive in the Industrial (IN) District.

Jeff Lipinski of Coover Clark represented the application.

Mr. Durfee stated that the NH Air National Guard is proposing a building addition. The property is owned by the City of Concord, and is leased by the Guard. Since it is City land all City regulations apply to the site, which is why the project is not applicable for RSA 674:54.

Mr. Lipinski provided an overview of the project stating that the new addition is being constructed to the existing Aviation Air Craft facility for the National Guard for storage and a maintenance area. The addition is for the readiness center of the aviation unit to allow access to aircraft that is being used and worked on. The project is federally funded and there are limited funds available. They are trying to minimize site disturbance. The sidewalks are being modified and they are adding an additional concrete paved area to the east side for vehicles and additional parking. A detention pond will be added as well off of the parking area. The materials will be the same as the existing building using the same style of bricks and windows. They will be extending the roof wall panels and wrapping the addition to the existing building. The elevations were reviewed.

A discussion was held regarding the drainage and the potential of icing along the sidewalk. Mr. Lipinski stated that there will not be any issues with icing with what is being proposed as not all of the drain spouts will be sloped to the ground. Drainage on the airfield side has been designed to go into an infiltration system. In addition, the sidewalks are flush with the grade. Mr. Gentilhomme stated that the graphic appears that any runoff will go across the sidewalk and cause icing during the winter months. He stated they could make the grade so any water will be carried away from the building. Mr. Doherty noted that there is a catch basin in the area.

Mr. Gentilhomme concern with the proposed design of the skylights and commented that they do not look good from the outside. He asked if there was any way to screen them and add clear story windows. Ms. Tomas added that the windows seem small and far apart. Mr. Gentilhomme stated that the windows could be constructed so they are straight across and all the way down. Others agreed. Ms. Tomas did note that perhaps the skylights would not be seen from the street view. Mr. Gentilhomme stated that it would have been helpful to see the design from the street level.

Mr. Shilo explained that the solar tubes could be made to be more interesting than a typical skylight and may not be accurately presented. He stated that there are many options available and they could be made to be a better feature as opposed to an eye sore. Mr. Lipinski stated that due to funding, they will have to accept other manufacturers. He noted that the size is approximately 15 feet and larger. Mr. King stated that he does not see a need to screen the skylights. Mr. Gentilhomme stated that at the present time the area is lined with trees and the only place you can see the addition is when you pull into the main entrance, therefore, the comment is not as critical an issue; however, with good architecture they may not need to be seen from the street.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
September 1, 2020 Minutes

Mr. Shilo asked about the façade, mixing brick and CMU materials and if there is a plan in place to accommodate cracking. Mr. Lipinski replied that the brick will be cementitious brick, not a clay brick and will match the existing brick. Mr. Shilo also asked about the flashing following the roof line as it can be problematic. Mr. Lipinski stated that they are soft cutting the step flashing and will then conceal it with a metal wall panel for a nice line that will then follow along the slope of the roof.

Mr. Shilo made a motion, seconded by Mr. King, to recommend approval, as submitted.

The motion passed unanimously with a roll call vote as follows:

Ms. Hengen – in favor
Mr. Shilo – in favor
Mr. Doherty – in favor
Mr. King – in favor
Ms. Tomas – in favor
Mr. Gentilhomme – in favor

Adjournment

Mr. King made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Hengen seconded. The motion passed unanimously at 9:42 AM.

Respectfully submitted,
Lisa Fellows-Weaver
Administrative Specialist