

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
February 2, 2021 Minutes

The Architectural Design Review Committee (ADRC) held its regular monthly meeting on February 2, 2021 via Zoom at 8:30 a.m.

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

Absent: Member Claude Gentilhomme, and Planning Board Chairman Richard Woodfin

Staff: Sam Durfee, Senior Planner
Lisa Fellows-Weaver, Administrative Specialist
Bob Nadeau, Code Inspector

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

Mr. Doherty moved to approve the minutes of January 5, 2021, as written. Ms. Tomas seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
February 2, 2021 Minutes

Sign Applications

1. Geronimo Properties, on behalf of MVPT, requests ADR approval for the installation of two new externally-illuminated wall signs and a non-illuminated wall sign at 5 Clinton Street in the Neighborhood Commercial (CN) District.

Laura O’Kane represented the application.

Ms. O’Kane stated that the sign package is a change of tenancy to a physical therapy business at 88 South Street. The tenant wanted to add additional signage to the building.

A discussion was held regarding the types of lettering and lighting proposed as well as the placement of the main building sign with regards to the lighting. Mr. Nadeau confirmed that the lettering for the signs is proposed to be channel letters. Ms. O’Kane stated that there is existing gooseneck lighting and the lights will be angled towards the sign itself; no lighting will be attached to any of the signs.

Ms. Tomas noted that there is no street sign proposed. Ms. O’Kane concurred.

Mr. Doherty made a motion, seconded by Ms. Tomas, to recommend approval of the signs, as submitted, with the understanding that the lettering is all channel letters mounted on to the façade, all signs are non-illuminated and will be externally lit, and all locations are as depicted on the drawings provided.

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

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.

Glen Shadlick of Neopco Signs represented the application along with the owner, Elyssa Alfieri.

Mr. Shadlick stated that he reviewed the December meeting minutes and the Committee requested they consider alternative shapes that would be more complimentary to the logo. He explained that the proposal is to use the existing sign. The design is consistent with the neighboring business signs; however, they are proposing to do the opposite with the colors to differentiate the adjoining tenants. The size is under the square footage requirements.

Discussion ensued regarding alternative shapes and the height of the sign. Mr. Shadlick stated that the sign size is taller and is necessary in order to accommodate the width of the bottom line of text. Ms. Alfieri commented to the branding stating that the business is known more as LDR not Lilise Designer Resale. Mr. Doherty commented that it appears that the “L” and “E” are reaching the edges of the sign. Mr. Shadlick stated that the words could be adjusted in more.

Additional discussion was held regarding the blade sign. Mr. Shadlick commented that per the December meeting minutes, he understood that the Committee was in support of the blade sign, as submitted. Mr. Durfee concurred, stating the minutes showed that the Committee felt the blade sign was acceptable.

Ms. Hengen commented that the design perspective is ok and the owner is happy. Mr. Doherty agreed and added that the shape is not displeasing; however, he noted that the if the sign was flat

**City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
February 2, 2021 Minutes**

at the bottom it would be more pleasing. Ms. Tomas commented that she did like the shape being an oval.

Ms. Hengen made a motion, seconded by Ms. Tomas, to recommend approval of the sign design, 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

3. Hodges Development Corp., on behalf of Rick Smith, requests ADR approval for the installation of a new non-illuminated wall sign at 211 Loudon Road in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.

Rick Smith represented the application.

Mr. Smith stated he is requesting to place the Kirby sign over the front window as this is the most logical and appropriate area for the best visibility. He noted that there is another business that shares the front of this building with Kirby, Edward Jones and their sign is on the building. He stated that he would add some lighting over the sign; however, at this time, he was not sure what type of lighting would be used. He noted that there is no directory sign for the business.

Discussion ensued as to alternative locations for the sign. The wall within the porch area was suggested. Mr. Smith commented that he did not feel the sign within the porch area would be visually beneficial and there may be a lighting issue. Also suggested was to place the new sign where the existing sign is now, to the left of the windows, by cutting the proposed sign in half as most of the sign is redundant. Mr. Smith replied that he does not feel anything would be gained by eliminating the existing sign and replacing it with half of the proposed sign. Another option suggested was to hang the sign between the two columns in the porch. Access was discussed and how to avoid customers from walking under the sign. It was suggested that landscaping be added and the existing pavers be removed. Mr. Smith commented that this location is better than the back wall of the porch.

With regard to lighting of the sign within the columns, suggestions were offered and it was recommended that the applicant return to the Committee with a lighting proposal.

Mr. King made a motion, seconded by Ms. Tomas, to recommend approval of the sign design, with a new location recommended to be between the two columns and to mount the sign on the band as high as possible, and to return to the Committee with a lighting plan.

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

4. Hodges Development Corp., on behalf of True Confections, requests ADR approval for the replacement of a non-illuminated wall sign, the installation of a new non-illuminated wall sign, the replacement of an externally illuminated panel on a freestanding sign, and the installation of a new non-illuminated projecting sign at 211 Loudon Road in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
February 2, 2021 Minutes

Paul Foskitt of True Confections, represented the application.

Mr. Foskitt stated that based on comments from the Committee last month, he has resubmitted a sign application. He explained that last month the Committee approved the pylon sign and the ice cream cone hanging on the side of the pylon. He stated that he is trying to have all of the signage to match and will be replacing the pylon sign to match the signage on the building.

Mr. Foskitt stated that the Committee suggested enlarging the sign to the right of the entrance. He would prefer to leave this sign as is due to the fact that the sign is mounted and framed with the vinyl siding and any alterations would require replacing the siding. He stated that he will relocate the open flag either to the corner of the building or to the other column with the American flag. He suggested relocating the large sign on the porch to the front of the porch, which will improve visibility. There are two street lamps that illuminate the area at night and he does not feel there is a need for any additional lighting.

Discussion ensued regarding the placement and size of the sign and the pendulum light fixture in the porch area. Mr. Doherty suggested that the existing sign be changed so that all words are on one line and the sign be hung from the columns. Members agreed. Mr. Foskitt stated that he is not sure as to the materials and economics; however, would look into and if feasible would agree or revisit the matter.

Ms. Tomas made a motion, seconded by Mr. King, to recommend approval of the wall sign as submitted, with the recommendation to change the existing hanging sign to fit underneath the beam and span from column to column, two separate signs are feasible but must meet up with no gaps, all text should be in one line, the depth is reduced to allow more clearance, and to submit the design to staff for review.

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

Building Permit Applications in Performance Districts

1. New Hampshire Distributors Inc. requests ADR approval for the construction of a new 345 square foot entry vestibule on the east side of the building at 1 Horseshoe Pond Lane in the Opportunity Corridor Performance (OCP) District.

Chris Brown and Tom Painchaud from Milestone Engineering & Construction represented the application along with Bill Hickey of The H.L. Turner Group.

Mr. Hickey gave an overview of the proposal. He explained that the entrance is one exterior door shared by two tenants with access by an exterior wooden staircase and ramp. A new tenant desires a different egress. The proposal is to add a new 345 square foot vestibule facing Commercial Street. He explained that there is a gable style roof over the entrance; however, the entrance way is open to the elements. The vestibule will have two doors for each tenant to access their own space. There will be stairs and a wheelchair lift.

Mr. Hickey continued and described the exterior of the building is a painted, concrete masonry, block wall. There are two different brick facades on the north side because of two previous different projects; one is the original building, the other is an addition. He stated that they intend to match the brick from the north side of the building onto the proposed vestibule.

**City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
February 2, 2021 Minutes**

Mr. Hickey stated that the vestibule will have a low, slope roof, and an internal roof drain. A discussion was held regarding the condition of the sidewalk. Mr. Hickey stated that a new paved sidewalk leading to the new door will be added from the existing parking lot. Curbing was noted to be removed as well. Any disturbed area will be loamed and seeded once the construction is complete.

Mr. Doherty commented that it is nice to see that they will mimic other items along the building. Overall, members felt that this was a big improvement.

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

2. The Granite Group Inc. requests ADR approval for the construction of a new air lock entry to the north side of the building located at 6 Storrs Street in the Opportunity Corridor Performance (OCP) District.

Nicholas Colarusso of Cedar Mill Group represented the application.

Mr. Colarusso explained that the proposal is a Phase 2 of the building. He stated that there is a need to create a buffer and they would also like to dress-up the exterior. They are proposing a new airlock concept for an entrance, enclosed, with proper footings. This will be a permanent part of the structure and will match the existing elevations and pitch.

Ms. Tomas commented that the proposed curved roof of the entrance does not match with the building façade and sign. Mr. Doherty commented that he liked the curved roof as it offsets the entrance and he appreciated the simple detail.

A brief discussion was held relative to the sign. Mr. King stated that the sign appears to be crowded. It was noted that the sign was intended to match and the size proposed is 60 x 24.

Mr. King made a motion, seconded by Ms. Hengen, to recommend approval for the canopy, as submitted; the sign will be submitted separately due to the fact it appears to be crowded and does not fit the design of the space.

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

Major Site Plan Applications

1. CP Concord, LLC, requests Major Site Plan approval for the construction of a new restaurant and drive-through facility with associated site improvements at 310 Loudon Road in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.

Matt Robillard and Robert Grimaldi represented the application.

Mr. Robillard gave an overview of the site and the development to include a 2,200 square foot restaurant with drive thru. He stated that this is an existing grass pad. He reviewed the traffic

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
February 2, 2021 Minutes

pattern, loading areas, dumpster location and parking area. He stated that there will be continuity of the sidewalks with the existing building, Harbor Freight.

Mr. Grimaldi provided an overview of the elevations noting the proposed materials, which include wainscoting, brick accents, standard gray EIFS, and fencing. Decorative shutters and goose neck lighting are also proposed.

The landscaping plan was reviewed.

Ms. Hengen asked if the proposal was a corporate design. Mr. Grimaldi replied yes; it is a national branded cooperate design.

Canopies were described to be slimline canopies with a flat base. Lighting on the canopy will range from one to three LED lights.

A discussion was held regarding the fence. Mr. Grimaldi explained that the fence will be a hand thru powder coated aluminum rail. Ms. Tomas suggested that the base of the building be changed from EIFS to another more durable material. Mr. Grimaldi replied that they are in the process of developing something else and could provide a color match to the Committee soon.

A discussion was held regard the existing trees. Mr. Robillard explained that there are some trees that will need to be removed and they propose to replace them with larger trees and screening. He noted that 14 shrubs are also being added to the site.

Ms. Tomas made a motion, seconded by Ms. Hengen, to recommend approval of the site plan, as submitted, with the condition that sample materials be provided, either virtual or physical, before final approval of the site plan and design occurs and that the base be changed from a gray EIFS to a brick or another more durable material.

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

2. Keach Nordstrom Associates, on behalf of Martin & Mary Jane Coronis, requests Major Site Plan approval for the addition of a 5th apartment unit in the existing building at 266 N. State Street in the Urban Transition (UT) District.

Matt Peterson, of Keach-Nordstrom, represented the application.

Mr. Peterson explained the proposal is a conversion to add an additional dwelling unit. He provided an overview of the property noting a 19% slope in the back. There will be a new water service and they will address sewer issues accordingly. Some of the pavement in the rear of the building will be removed to allow for eight parking spaces in the rear of the property. With regard to drainage, they are proposing an infiltration basin. Two trees will need to be removed; however, he believes that there will be space to replace trees in the rear of the property. Landscaping will be added to the front of the property as well.

Mr. Peterson stated that the applicant is redoing the interior and a portion of the exterior due to a fire. Windows were replaced last spring. Shutters and siding will be replaced, in kind, in areas necessary from fire damage. He will provide pictures of the windows.

Mr. Peterson stated that if there was a need for one of the units to be ADA compliant, the applicant would return to the ADR.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
February 2, 2021 Minutes

Ms. Hengen made a motion, seconded by Mr. King, to recommend approval of the site plan, as submitted, with the understanding that if trees are removed then the trees will be replaced with new trees, any building alterations match pre-fire materials, and overall form and massing and proportions are not being altered.

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

Other Business

Mr. King mentioned the shrubs at the Quick Mart are dead and need to be replaced. Ms. Tomas stated that the buffer along the rear of the Aldi's property has also died. Mr. Durfee stated that he will check into these two items.

Adjournment

Mr. King made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Hengen seconded. The motion passed unanimously at 10:30 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Lisa Fellows-Weaver
Administrative Specialist