

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

The Architectural Design Review Committee (ADRC) held its regular monthly meeting on December 1, 2020 via Zoom at 8:30 a.m.

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

Absent: Richard Woodfin Planning Board Chairman

Staff: Sam Durfee, Senior Planner
Lisa Fellows-Weaver, Administrative Specialist
Craig Walker, Zoning Administrator

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. Hengen moved to approve the minutes of November 3, 2020, as written. Ms. Tomas seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

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

Sign Applications

1. Sienna Investment on behalf of T-Mobil requests ADR approval for the installation of two new internally illuminated wall signs and the replacement of a panel on an internally freestanding sign at 273 Loudon Road in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.

Max Tejada of the Sign Gallery represented the application.

Mr. Tejada explained that the applicant is looking to install channel letters on a race way backerboard on the building and channel letters on the back of the building facing the side street. There is an awning proposed with no lettering. Two new faces are being added to the existing pylon sign.

A discussion was held regarding lining up the signs with neighboring tenants.

Mr. Gentilhomme made a motion, seconded by Mr. King, to recommend approval of the proposed signs, as submitted.

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

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

2. Lilise Designer Resale requests ADR approval for the installation of a non-illuminated wall sign and a new non-illuminated blade sign at 7 North Main Street in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

Josh Messinger of Advantage Signs represented the application.

Mr. Walker stated that the total square footage, as presented, is 20 sf. where a maximum of 16 sf. of signage is permitted. He suggested removing the oval around the sign.

Mr. Messinger stated that the proposed signs are aluminum panels with acrylic mounted letters. He stated that he would make the building sign smaller, could eliminate the rectangular border, however, would like to leave the oval as that is the owners design. He added that he thought with the border around the sign, it makes it easier to read.

Ms. Hengen suggested to reducing the rectangle on the building sign and asked if the applicant would consider reversing the white background and black lettering to be the same as the hanging sign. Mr. Messinger replied that a neighboring business has a similar color scheme. Ms. Hengen suggested that the Committee request an applicant to show neighboring signs. Mr. Walker stated that a work session could be scheduled to address the application and what the Committee would like to see.

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

Mr. Shilo stated that the window graphic is very appealing. Mr. Doherty agreed and asked if there were any discussions of using other shapes. Discussions continued regarding the proportions and alternative design options.

The motion and second were withdrawn.

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

Mr. Doherty made a motion, seconded by Mr. King, to recommend revising the signs and resubmit the application with a change in design that meets that required square footage and to look at alternative shapes that are more complimentary to the logo; and to send to Planning Staff for review prior to moving forward to the Planning Board meeting for public hearing.

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

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

3. Fred Potter on behalf of Legacy Wise requests ADR approval for the installation of a new externally illuminated monument sign at 135 North State Street in the Neighborhood Residential (RN) District.

Ms. Hengen recused herself from this application discussion.

Josh Messinger of Advantage Signs represented the application.

Mr. Walker noted that the hanging sign shown is deemed to be a location sign and is excluded from permits and is not a part of the application.

Mr. Messinger stated that the proposal is for a monument sign on the property to serve as a directory sign and building marker. They feel that the sign fits well within the aesthetics of the neighborhood. The directory sign materials will be aluminum framed with raised acrylic letters; granite posts will also be used.

As far as lighting, the lamp post has the option to be lit; however, neither sign will have lighting. Mr. Walker referenced the application for the tenant sign, which specified external illumination; if that is not the case then it should be removed from the permit. Mr. Messinger requested that the permit be changed then to state that the signs are non-illuminated.

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

Ms. Tomas stated that the font style chosen for the numbers is different in the two signs. Discussion ensued regarding suggestions of alternative fonts and the placement of the numbers. Additional discussion was held regarding removing the capitol from the monument sign. Members felt that it did not fit and the numbers were not as visible as should be. Mr. Messinger stated that he would bring the comments and suggestions back to the property owner.

The motion and second were withdrawn.

Mr. King made a motion, seconded by Ms. Tomas, to recommend the design be revised to remove the capitol building image; revise the numbers to match on both signs; and send to Planning Staff for review prior to moving forward to the Planning Board meeting for public hearing.

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

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

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

Mr. Shilo – in favor
Mr. Gentilhomme – in favor

4. LensCrafters requests ADR approval for the replacement of an internally illuminated panel on a freestanding sign at 240 Loudon Road in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.

Tracy Becker of Sign Pro represented the application.

Ms. Becker stated that this a replacement of the existing panel and will be internally illuminated.

Mr. King made a motion, seconded by Ms. Hengen, to recommend approval of the proposed signs, as submitted.

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

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

5. Crestwood requests ADR approval for the replacement of an externally illuminated freestanding sign at 14 Crestwood Drive in the High-Density Residential (RH) District.

No one was present to represent the application.

A discussion was held regarding the lighting. It was determined that the existing external lighting is being replaced with ground lighting. Mr. King stated that the posts are also being replaced.

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

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

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

Major Site Plan/Subdivision Applications

1. TF Moran, on behalf of Bradley Whitney, Jennifer Habel, & Interchange Development, requests ADR approval for a 3 phased development consisting of a grocery store, liquor store, medical offices, financial services, retail stores, restaurants, and industrial uses, for property off of Whitney Road in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.

Representing this application was David & Laurie Rauseo, Jason Hill from TFMoran, and Eric Brown, architect from Prellwitz Chilinski Associates (PCA).

Ms. Tomas recused herself from this application.

Mr. Hill stated that they are looking for the Committee to give an approval for the overall site plan and for Phase 1 which consists of the Market Basket and the NH Liquor and Wine Outlet site plan and elevations. Based on comments from the August meeting, changes have been made to the network connections for both the driveways and parking areas within the development as members had commented that pedestrian connectivity and circulation are important elements of

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

the site design. He explained the traffic patterns and truck routes. He also noted the focal points around the site, including an approximately 20 ft high berm to screen the Wheelabrator facility to the south. He added that within the second phase of the development there will be additional open space opportunities. They will return to the Committee as additional businesses are proposed for the development.

Mr. Brown stated that there are no changes to the Market Basket building since the last meeting. He highlighted changes to the liquor store noting that the roof dormers have been removed as solar panels are proposed. Pictures of building materials and color patterns were shown. A “drive-by” rendering was provided as members had previously requested the applicant provide this to show how the buildings will be seen from the highway and Route 4 in future submissions.

A discussion was held regarding the signage of the liquor store; the signage will be reviewed under a future submission. Mr. Brown stated that the design is typical of the State’s liquor stores. Mr. Doherty commented that the liquor store design is not quite fitting yet he understands that it is their prototype. Mr. Brown replied that the brand that has been successful; people know the brand and know the business. Discussion ensued relative to recognition that branding provides.

Additional discussion was held regarding the berm. Mr. Hill stated that the berm will be, at a maximum, 25 feet. He stated that it is the intent of the applicant to include the berm along the outside of the driveway; the height of the berm will not be affected. Ms. Fenstermacher stated that the berm is not shown on any of the plans submitted, and she is concerned how it impacts the grading and drainage shown on the plans to be approved. Laurie Rauseo explained the berm was already constructed in the summer, has been loamed and seeded with 20 large spruce trees on the top. She noted that the berm has reduced the sound. Members thought the berm was a good solution. Ms. Fenstermacher requested revised plans be submitted showing the location of the berm and how it impacts grading and drainage. She stated that the plans currently before the Committee for approval do not include the berm, and wanted to make sure they understood what was being approved.

Ms. Rauseo also spoke to the additional sidewalks that have been added throughout the development. Further discussion was held regarding the sidewalk network. Mr. Shilo commented on the sidewalks and how they line up with crosswalks differently at each driveway intersection. He stated that the sidewalks should go straight across to the crosswalks, unless there is a safety issue, to be consistent throughout the development and make the main pedestrian flow less circuitous. Mr. Hill replied that he will look into this further.

Ms. Rauseo noted that the telecommunication tower has been relocated to the industrial zone instead of behind the supermarket. The actual location is still being looked into but for now it is proposed to be on the west side.

Mr. Shilo made a motion, second by Ms. Hengen, to recommend approval as submitted with the suggestion to make the crosswalk condition more consistent along the main pedestrian flow paths and that all building signage will be reviewed by the Committee under separate package.

Mr. King asked how the berm review will be handled and whether a condition should be added if engineering design for the road required the berm to be changed. Mr. Shilo stated that if the berm construction needs to be changed then the applicant should return to the committee for additional comments.

Mr. Shilo amended the motion to include that for any adjustment required to the berm based on the road design or grading changes, the applicant would need to return to ADR for further review. Ms. Hengen seconded the amendment.

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

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

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

Ms. Tomas returned to the Committee as a voting member.

2. Brixmor requests ADR approval for the construction of two buildings, a drive-through facility, and associated landscaping and parking restriping at 80 Storrs Street in the Opportunity Performance (OCP) District.

Mr. Durfee stated that Brixmor has submitted a request to continue the application until next month.

Other Business

1. Discussion regarding proposed residential design standards - ConcordNEXT

Ms. Shank gave a presentation regarding residential design standards. Pictures of residential homes were shown using three proposals for design changes that included window glazing; the location of garages attached to homes and what districts this should be regulated in, and the location of front entrances/front entrance features.

One item discussed was if the design standards should be requirements or standards. One point raised was if the City would have the necessary enforcement if the standards become requirements. A comment made was that the standards could be basic with an intent to encourage good designs. However, it was noted that there could also be hardships with properties and topography as well.

Another item noted was safety with respect to main entrances to the house as main entrances need to be obvious from the street frontage. In addition, glazing and front doors require an action and could be much more restrictive with designing. An issue raised was if there could be any adjustment allowed and any flexibility.

With regard to the garages, there is possibilities without allowing a garage in the front.

Additional discussion was held requiring design review for residential as an alternative.

Two members were not in support of regulating residential features through the ordinance, though they were in favor of either requiring an architect's stamp for all residential construction, or requiring ADR review for all residential construction. Three members were in support of the standards to provide basic guidelines

Ms. Shank stated that members could email additional comments to her. She thanked the Board for their time and comments.

Adjournment

Mr. Doherty made a motion to adjourn. Mr. King seconded. The motion passed unanimously at 11:00 A.M.

Respectfully submitted,
Lisa Fellows-Weaver
Administrative Specialist