

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 6, 2021 Minutes

The Architectural Design Review Committee (ADRC) held its regular monthly meeting on April 6, 2021 via Zoom at 8:30 a.m.

Attendees: Co-Chair Jay Doherty, Members Claude Gentilhomme, Ron King, and Margaret Tomas
Absent: Elizabeth Durfee Hengen 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

Ms. Tomas moved to approve the minutes of March 2, 2021, as written. Mr. King seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with a roll call vote.

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

**City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 6, 2021 Minutes**

Mr. Gentilhomme – in favor

Sign Applications

1. Neopco Signs, on behalf of Remi Hinxhia, requests ADR approval for the replacement of a non-illuminated freestanding sign and the installation of a new externally-illuminated projecting sign at 60 Pleasant Street in the Civic Performance (CVP) District.

Glen Shadlick of Neopco Signs represented the application.

Mr. Shadlick explained the proposal is to replace the two existing faces of the 4x5 non-illuminated signs and reuse the changeable copy section. The existing fixtures will be reused. The logo is designed to look like a pizza pan. He noted that the projecting sign will be illuminated by exiting gooseneck lights on each side of the awning.

Mr. Doherty commented that the two bands of non-illuminated text seem fine as proposed. He added that the logo is attractive by itself. Mr. Gentilhomme added that the sign is very elegant. Ms. Tomas stated that the proposed signs are cleaner looking signs.

A discussion was held regarding two signs in a row at the entrance. Mr. Durfee stated that the freestanding is existing and is used for identification and showcasing specials; the projecting sign locates the doorway.

It was asked when the corrugated metal was to be added. Mr. Durfee explained that the metal was added a few months ago; however, there were complaints as the metal was blinding drivers. The owner would now like to carry over the siding from the neighboring condos to match.

Mr. Gentilhomme made a motion, seconded by Mr. King, to recommend approval for both signs, as submitted.

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

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

2. Wood & Wood Signs, on behalf of Bar Harbor Bank, requests ADR approval for the replacement of three non-illuminated wall signs at 90 North Main Street in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

Mr. Durfee stated that this application was continued from last month.

Sparky Potter represented the application.

Mr. Doherty noted that the Committee recommended the Bar Harbor text on the canopy sign be increased and be similar to what exists and be better incorporated within the canopy; and the plaque text and logos were to fit the proportion of the sign and the graphics.

Mr. Potter stated that the plaque signage is temporary. Mr. Durfee stated that there is no need to comment if the signs are temporary signs.

Ms. Tomas made a motion, seconded by Mr. King, to approve the awning sign as submitted, and to delete the applications for the wall signs as they are intended to be temporary signs.

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

Mr. Doherty – in favor

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 6, 2021 Minutes

Mr. King – in favor
Ms. Tomas – in favor
Mr. Gentilhomme – 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 that he has resubmitted a proof of the proposed sign based on the previous recommendations of the Committee. He explained that he has removed the sign over the window and is proposing to relocate it to the archway. This sign will now match the logo on the door. He is proposing to add three small recessed lights. The small window sign will be removed as well as the sign on the side of the building. He added that he does not have a sign on the pylon at the street. He will add a logo sign on to the door.

Mr. King suggested that the hanging archway sign be reinforced to prevent it from swinging. Mr. Smith agreed.

Mr. King made a motion, seconded by Ms. Tomas, to approve the sign as submitted, and recommended that the sign be reinforced so that it will not swing in the archway.

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

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

4. Hodges Development Corp., on behalf of From the Top Hair Salon requests ADR approval for an existing non-illuminated wall sign and an externally-illuminated freestanding sign at 211 Loudon Road in the General Commercial (CG) District.

Diane Benoit of Hodges Companies represented the application.

Ms. Benoit stated that this is an existing sign that has been installed for about 20 years. She received notification from the Code Department that the tenants at the courtyard square need to submit an application for the sign; this application is fixing prior issues with signs.

Mr. Doherty commented that he appreciated that the fonts and colors are the same as the pylon sign.

Mr. King made a motion, seconded by Mr. Gentilhomme, to approve the sign as submitted.

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

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

5. Hodges Development Corp., on behalf of Splendore Chiropractic requests ADR approval for an existing non-illuminated wall sign and externally illuminated freestanding sign at 211 Loudon Road in the General Commercial (CG) District.

Dr. Donna Splendore of Splendore Chiropractic represented the application.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 6, 2021 Minutes

Dr. Splendore explained that this is a similar situation as the previous application. She stated that this is an existing sign and she received notification from the Code Department that the tenants need to apply for sign permits. She took this as an opportunity to update her sign.

Mr. Doherty asked if both signs match. Dr. Splendore replied no and stated that both signs have been existing for 23 years and have never matched. She prefers to not change the freestanding sign since it has been installed for so long. This application is to change the building sign.

Mr. Gentilhomme stated that it is better identity for both signs to match; however, if the signs have been there this way for 23 years he is okay that they are different. Mr. Doherty commented that he feels that the signs should match.

Mr. King made a motion, seconded by Mr. Gentilhomme, to approve the sign as submitted.

The motion passed with a roll call vote as follows:

Mr. Doherty – opposed

Mr. King – in favor

Ms. Tomas – in favor

Mr. Gentilhomme – in favor

6. Fast Signs, on behalf of John Constant, requests ADR approval for the installation of a new non-illuminated wall sign and a new non-illuminated freestanding sign at 35 South Main Street in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

Adam Gaudet of Birch Realty represented the application.

Mr. Gaudet explained that the proposal is for a new non-illuminated wall sign and a new free-standing sign. Both signs proposed are similar in size to the neighboring business and the prior tenant.

Mr. King expressed concern with the free-standing sign swinging in the wind and recommended that it be secured. Mr. Gaudet agreed and will address that with the installer. Ms. Tomas commented that this is a nice sign design.

Ms. Tomas made a motion, seconded by Mr. King, to approve both of the signs as submitted, with the strong recommendation that the free-standing sign be secured upon installation.

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

Mr. Doherty – in favor

Mr. King – in favor

Ms. Tomas – in favor

Mr. Gentilhomme – in favor

7. A & M Signs, on behalf of Rupert Dance, LLC, requests ADR approval for the relocation and replacement of an internally-illuminated freestanding sign at 105 Manchester Street in the Highway Commercial (CH) District.

No one was present to represent the application.

Mr. Durfee stated that the proposal is to replace the freestanding sign and to move up the reader sign. This will bring the sign in compliance.

Mr. King stated that there are several different sized signs in the freestanding sign along with different sizes and fonts. He stated that the signs are redundant and this is a poorly designed sign with no consistency. Ms. Tomas agreed and stated that consistency would help and ease the readability of sign.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 6, 2021 Minutes

Mr. Doherty asked about white backgrounds in the districts outside of downtown. Mr. Durfee replied that white is not prohibited in this district, but the Committee could recommend the background be changed from white to opaque. Mr. Nadeau stated that all three signs were illuminated. Mr. Durfee noted that one tenant has relocated.

Mr. Nadeau gave an overview of the sign history for this property. He stated that the sign was installed prior to the current zoning ordinance. The height is currently not compliant and the number of signs exceeds what is permitted. Companies have changed and the signs have also changed under the grandfathered use. With these signs, the sign height is grandfathered. The existing sign is not in compliance and the owner has relocated the sign rather than obtaining a variance. The lower signs cannot be calculated and the frontage to calculate the amount of area has not been obtained. The proposal is the compromise and solution.

Mr. King asked how the signs were installed. Mr. Nadeau replied that they were installed without permits or variances. The end product will be different and the assessed penalty will be for the existing sign.

Mr. Doherty asked about the sign company. Mr. Nadeau stated that the sign company is not familiar or is not willing to comply with City ordinances. He has been working to make the signs compliant for few months; it is a time-consuming process.

Mr. Gentilhomme asked if this is the applicant or sign company issue. Mr. Nadeau replied that the applicants hire the sign companies. He added that he is not sure who made the decisions. He added that there could be a lack of understanding as well as some confusion. The only path to compliance the Department has is through the applicant, not the sign company.

Mr. Gentilhomme made a motion, second by Mr. King, to table the application to next month and request revisions be submitted showing consistency in all design elements including text and fonts.

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

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

8. Sign-a-Rama, on behalf of TDL Investments, requests ADR approval for the replacement of an internally-illuminated wall sign and an internally-illuminated freestanding sign at 374 Loudon Road in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.

Shafike Gasana represented the application.

Mr. Doherty stated that the sign color is nice and noted that black text over green is hard to read. Mr. Nadeau stated that the sign over the door is a temporary sign. Mr. Gasana explained that the wording shown “Specializing in East African Food” will not be in the circle as shown in the rendering.

Ms. Tomas noted that the sign is nice; however, there is too much going on in the windows making it distracting. She suggested reducing the signage in the windows.

Mr. Gentilhomme made a motion, seconded by Mr. King, to approve the signs as submitted, with the understanding that there will be no text on the left side of the sign within the circle.

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

Mr. Doherty – in favor

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 6, 2021 Minutes

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

9. Sign-a-Rama, on behalf of Dan O'Brien Kia, requests ADR approval for the replacement of an internally-illuminated wall sign, the relocation of an internally-illuminated wall sign, and the replacement of a non-illuminated freestanding sign, at 158 Manchester Street in the Highway Commercial (CH) District.

No one was present to represent this application.

Mr. Nadeau explained that the oval sign has been installed and the applicant did pay the penalty in order to install the sign. The oval sign is the original sign that was on the face of this building prior to renovations.

Ms. Tomas asked if this is the same red as the proposed directional replacement sign as it appears to be different. Mr. Nadeau replied yes, it is the same red. He stated that a variance was obtained for the second sign. The applicant has modified the second sign. Mr. Doherty noted that there is a lot of white surrounding the Dan O'Brien and there is also a black outline. Mr. Gentilhomme stated that the white blurs the lettering.

Ms. Tomas made a motion, seconded by Mr. Gentilhomme, to approve the signs as submitted, with the recommendation that all reds match the existing Kia signage and the Dan O'Brien directional sign be simplified by using block lettering and removing the black outline.

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

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

10. Sign-a-Rama, on behalf of Modern Man Barbershop & Shave Parlor requests ADR approval for the replacement of two window signs and a freestanding sign at 253 South Main Street in the Urban Transitional (UT) District.

No one was present to represent this application.

Mr. King stated that the signs in the windows are hard to read and some letters are not showing up well. Mr. Doherty stated that the sign is an elegant design. He suggested that the text "barber shop" should be set out more.

Ms. Tomas asked about lighting for the free-standing sign. Mr. Durfee replied that there is no lighting proposed.

Mr. King made a motion, seconded by Ms. Tomas, to approve the signs as submitted, with a strong recommendation for some type of design element used to make the "e" and "r" more prominent and the ghost image behind the sign be removed.

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

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

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 6, 2021 Minutes

11. Barlo Signs, on behalf of Northway Bank requests ADR approval for the replacement of two externally-illuminated wall signs and the installation of a new non-illuminated wall sign at 190 North Main Street in the Urban Commercial (CU) District.

Brandon from Barlo Sign represented the application.

Brandon explained that there are two separate sign applications. One application is for a sign with aluminum channel letters and halo lettering. This will match the roof lines and shutters exiting on the building.

Mr. King commented that it appears that the fonts are different. The representative replied that all fonts are the same.

Mr. Gentilhomme stated that he would like the applicant to add signage to the property and leave the building alone. Mr. King agreed. Ms. Tomas stated that the signage does not fit with the character of the building and the proposed sign locations make it very crowded. It was suggested that the signs be moved to the left and scaled down.

Additional discussion was held regarding the entryway sign. Mr. Doherty suggested that the sign be placed inside the building. Brandon explained that this sign was built into the railing by the prior tenant. Members felt that the business's mission statement does not belong in this location.

Brandon referenced Item F, the ATM and Drive-up signs. He stated that these two signs will aid in visibility in the winter months. He noted Item G, the window vinyls, which are on one side of building and used for direction.

Mr. Durfee stated that the monument sign is not a part of this application. A variance will need to be obtained.

Mr. King stated that he feels that the signs are diminishing to the building and this many signs on one building are confusing.

Ms. Tomas made a motion, second by Mr. Doherty, to approve signs E-I; and not approve sign B as it does not fit in with the character of the building with regard to location and is not necessary with the monument sign.

Mr. Gentilhomme made a motion, second by Mr. Doherty, to amend the motion to recommend approving signs F-I; and to not approve signs B or E, and encourage the applicant to move forward with the monument sign.

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

Mr. Doherty – in favor

Mr. King – in favor

Ms. Tomas – in favor

Mr. Gentilhomme – in favor

12. WOW Fried Chicken & Subs requests ADR approval for the relocation of an existing internally-illuminated sign at 7 Depot Street in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

Maher Abbas represented this application.

Mr. Abbas stated that after 5 years, the business has relocated from 7 Depot Street to 5 Pleasant Street Ext. This is the same sign that was at the previous location.

Mr. King suggested painting the letters and the black bar behind the letters.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 6, 2021 Minutes

Mr. King made a motion, seconded by Ms. Tomas, to approve the sign as submitted, with a strong recommendation that the letters and black bar be repainted.

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

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

13. Spectrum Signs, on behalf of State Pleasant Street LLC requests ADR approval for the replacement of an internally illuminated projecting sign at 26 Pleasant Street in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

No one was present to represent the application.

Mr. Durfee stated that the sign will need to be redesigned due to the fact that white backgrounds for signs are not permitted in the CBP District.

Members felt that this sign was busy but delicate and suggested making the sign more prominent as the text appears to be lost.

Mr. Doherty made a motion, seconded by Mr. King, to approve the sign as submitted, with the condition that the sign be redesigned to remove the white background or add an opaque background so that the white is not illuminated in the evening and recommended that the font size for “gifts” be increased to be more legible or “gifts” be removed.

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

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

14. Advantage Signs, on behalf of Comprehensive Counseling Connections requests ADR approval for the installation on a new externally-illuminated freestanding sign at 187 North main Street in the Urban Transitional (UT) District.

Josh Messinger from Advantage Signs represented the application along with applicant Patti Bartlett from Comprehensive Counseling Connections.

Mr. Messinger stated that the sign needed to be redesigned due to the fact that it was over the square footage requirement. He stated that the sign is a digital print and will not be illuminated. Ms. Bartlett explained that the original sign was 15 sq. ft. and was from 1988.

Mr. Doherty stated that the sign is well done as far as the colors and he appreciates how prominent the numbers are. He expressed concern with the screen print as it appears flat with no 3-dimensional relief. Mr. Messinger stated that no other options were discussed. He explained that they are proposing to use ¾” material backed-up so there will be some dimension.

Mr. King noted that there is some crowding with the compass logo and the “g” in Counseling.

Mr. King made a motion, seconded by Ms. Tomas, to approve the sign as submitted, with understanding that the gray behind the lettering will be removed and with the recommendation that the compass logo be reduced in size to address the crowding of Counseling.

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

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 6, 2021 Minutes

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

15. Advantage Signs, on behalf of Wilcox & Barton, requests ADR approval for the replacement of an externally illuminated wall sign and a non-illuminated projecting sign at 10 Pleasant Street Extension in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

Josh Messinger from Advantage Signs represented the application along with Erin Lambert from Wilcox & Barton.

Mr. Messinger explained the proposal is for two signs, a blade sign facing Pleasant Street Ext. and a wall sign facing Storrs Street. The blade sign will not be illuminated and the wall sign will have external down lighting. The blade sign will have a custom bracket. The material is sign foam. The wall sign letters are raised on a sandblasted or depressed background. The sign is currently attached by an existing sign cabinet, which will be changed to angled brackets.

Discussion ensued relative to the proposed blade sign. Mr. Mr. Doherty commented that the blade sign is too big and could be designed to be more elegant. Ms. Tomas mentioned the precarious location of the sign and suggested a different bracket for visual weight. She also commented about the border on the sign and suggested it be changed as it also gives the sign a weight that should not be on this type of sign in this location. Mr. Messinger stated that the proposed blade sign is complying and added the logo was adjusted to fit within the allowable square footage. Mr. King agreed that the sign could be smaller and adjusted to the scale of building more and also agreed with changing out the bracket.

Mr. Doherty made a motion, seconded by Mr. King, to approve the wall sign as submitted; and to revise the blade sign, specifically for visual weight and size, as well as the bracket details, and to resubmit to the Committee.

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

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

Building Permit Applications in Performance Districts

1. Wilcox & Barton requests ADR approval for the renovation of the building at 10 Pleasant street in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

Erin Lambert of Wilcox & Barton represented the application.

Erin Lambert stated that she is returning to the Committee to address the inconsistencies of the windows and doors. She stated they are receiving guidance on washing the exterior of the building; it is not going to be a power wash.

A discussion was held regarding the proposed blade sign. Ms. Lambert stated that the blade sign is to note the entrance to the building. It will now be over the door with the brackets as opposed to wrapping around the corner of the building. Mr. Doherty asked why not keep it wrapped. Ms. Lambert replied that it was not desired by the Committee last month and the historical consultant suggested to keep the sign as close to the building for historical tax credit purposes.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 6, 2021 Minutes

Additional discussion was held regarding removing the door below the blade sign and making a window and why the window is different. Ms. Lambert explained that they are going to have the window look like the door and maintain the existing look. Ms. Tomas recommended a panel as it would be more visually appealing. Mr. Gentilhomme suggested adding frame work.

Mr. Doherty asked about lighting for the canopy. Ms. Lambert stated that she will check into the lighting. Additional discussion was held regarding the drainage from the canopy. Ms. Lambert stated that the canopy is at a slight pitch; however, there could be drain that will be connected into the roof and tie into the drainage.

Ms. Tomas made a motion, seconded by Mr. King, to approve the design as submitted, with the following recommendations:

- look at the canopy and blade sign and coordinate matching the two elements;
- consider lighting canopy;
- address drainage off of canopy; and,
- suggest making the door infill panel to not look like a doorway

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

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

2. The Fraternal Order of the Eagles #613, requests ADR approval for the installation of an awning at 36 South Main Street in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

Anna El-Amin represented the application.

Mr. Durfee explained that the proposal is to add a canopy over the existing deck. There is one window shown and that has been changed to a door.

Mr. Gentilhomme commented that the canopy would add to the character of building; however, the location and height need to be clarified.

Mr. King made a motion, seconded by Ms. Tomas, to continue the application and request the applicant provide a color photograph of the building with the canopy rendered on the building and a picture showing the side view in relation to the entrance.

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

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

Major Site Plan Applications

1. Wilcox and Barton, on behalf of 3G Eagle requests ADR approval for the expansion of a parking lot and loading area at 25 Henniker Street in the Industrial (IN) District.

Erin Lambert of Wilcox & Barton represented the application.

Erin Lambert explained the proposal is a Major Site Plan application for an expansion of the parking and loading area and the conversion of the east side of the building into three suites. They also plan to build five overhead doors. CUP's have been requested for 19 fewer parking spaces and for an increase to impervious surface in the aquifer protection district.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 6, 2021 Minutes

Discussion ensued regarding the removal of trees. Ms. Lambert stated that they have done an extensive review of the site relative to the trees and landscaping. She noted they do plan to replace some trees and explained that they are working on the landscaping and trying to keep the trees at the edge of the pavement and the retention pond.

Ms. Tomas made a motion, seconded by Mr. King, to approve as submitted, with the recommendation that the City continue to work with the applicant regarding the landscaping.

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

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

2. Nobis Group, on behalf of Brixmor Capitol, requests Major Site Plan approval for development of new restaurant, retail, and coffee shop uses with a drive-through facility at 80 Storrs Street in the Opportunity Corridor Performance (OCP) District.

Reuben Twersky and Frank Campione of Brixmor represented the application along with Chris Nadeau of Nobis Group.

Mr. Nadeau gave an overview of the proposal. He explained that the project on Storrs Street consists of a 6,100 sq. ft. restaurant (110 Grill), a 2,300 sq ft. coffee business with a drive-through, and a centered building for unknown future businesses. They are proposing to re-arrange the parking and intersection.

Mr. Twersky explained that the proposal is to create a pocket park in this area and to have a connection to Main Street.

Mr. Campione reviewed the aesthetics of the building and stated that they want to avoid two-dimensional architecture and would like to have walkability between buildings and access points. The style proposed is a contemporary design to look like three or four buildings that were developed over time by different developers yet the building is one continual façade. The street scape will consist of both in ground and raised planters, sidewalks, patios, bench areas, bicycle areas, resting areas, with access in between the buildings and into the existing plaza and intersection. Inground lighting and bollards are proposed. The buildings will be four-sided and have outdoor seating options.

Mr. King asked about the alleyway between the 110 Grill and the next building. Mr. Campione stated that this area is a service corridor and will be a screened wall with lighting. Mr. King commented that the buildings appear to be stark and the parking lot side could be dressed up more. Mr. Campione stated each operator will have a back of the house area for their building; restaurant uses require large kitchens. The entrance for the 110 Grill wraps two sides of the building – the front door is the left with the design of parking and landscaping done purposely due to glazing on the building. He added that the site is an active shopping center and he sees Storrs Street as the front side.

Mr. Durfee suggested 110 Grill swap the areas of their bathrooms and seating area in the southeast corner then add windows to the Storrs Street façade where there is currently wall. Mr. Campione thought this seemed like a feasible alternative that would be beneficial to the Storrs Street façade.

Mr. Gentilhomme agreed and suggested that the entire floor plan be flipped. He added that this would also allow the patio entrance to be on the street scape side. Mr. Campione noted that there

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 6, 2021 Minutes

may be an ADA accessibility issue. However, he commented that these are both viable options and he will discuss with the tenant.

Additional discussion was held regarding the downtown area. Mr. Doherty commented that the City continues to try to improve buildings and he referenced the CVS building. The building is one story and this proposal is for the same thing, one story buildings and large billboard-type signs. He added that it does meet the zoning but why do this style again; this is totally opposite of what was expected for this site.

Mr. Gentilhomme stated that there is nothing proposed in the renderings with relation to the character of Main Street. He commented that this layout and architecture are more reminiscent of Loudon Road. The architecture could be seen anywhere else in the country. He added that the pictures are detrimental and suggested to find better images to represent the businesses. He noted that the prior design indicated an impression of a two-story building. To tie in with Main Street, building materials of more substance should be used other than CMU and EIFS.

Mr. Doherty asked if there is a parapet. Mr. Campione stated that parapets are built around to hide roof top units and will give an illusion of a higher story building. The buildings are 22-23 feet high with peaks up to 26 ft. Mr. Doherty stated that there are buildings on Main Street that are two story and higher; screening the roofs is very important and the units will be more prominent than depicted. Mr. Campione replied that he will address this and provide updated renderings.

Mr. Doherty spoke to the drive-through and commented that a drive-through and walkability are completely at odds with each other. He asked if there was going to be a walk-up window. Mr. Campione replied that drive-throughs are everywhere now due to COVID-19. Many quick serve restaurants (QSR's) will not come unless there is a drive-through opportunity. Mr. Durfee stated that in documents included in an earlier submission, a walk-up window was referenced. He stated that it would be appropriate here but not something that is shown in these plans. Mr. Campione commented that it does make sense and added that this is something they could mention to the tenant and see if it could be considered.

Mr. Durfee stated that the application is appearing before the Planning Board for a public hearing on April 21. Discussion ensued regarding the lack of connection to Main Street. Members commented that the proposal needs to be friendlier for the pedestrian. There is no brick or granite on the proposed buildings. Mr. King stated that a 110 Grill he visited had a great outdoor experience; he does not see the same type of experience reflected in this proposal.

A discussion was held about the retaining wall. Mr. Campione stated that the retaining wall is landscaped and is being used more as an eating area. Ms. Tomas stated that the Committee does not have a clear picture and not enough information; more details need to be provided. Mr. Gentilhomme agreed and commented that this is not the direction the City should be going in.

Mr. Gentilhomme stated that he does not support the drive-through at all; however, if there has to be one, it should be at the far end of the site by the parking lot. Mr. Durfee stated that the location and layout of the drive-through demonstrate best practices for drive-throughs; and that there is no chance for queuing out onto a public street due to the layout.

Mr. Doherty left at 11:15. Mr. Gentilhomme was appointed acting chair.

Mr. Gentilhomme stated that there needs to be a good discussion regarding the architecture of the building and more detail needs to be provided relative to the site, specifically the grading and landscaping.

Mr. King commented that the high blank facades feel like billboard advertising; it is more of a reflection to the shopping center than to Main Street. All members agreed. Mr. Gentilhomme

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 6, 2021 Minutes

stated that the Committee is not necessarily looking for traditional. He referenced a contemporary building recently reviewed across the street that did not have brick for the exterior; it had glass and was a clean design. Mr. Campione suggested warm wood tones on a metal product, longwood.

Mr. Gentilhomme stated that overall, the general concept of the layout is acceptable. The Committee needs detailed elevations with a clear sense of the grading, and material details for all proposed buildings.

The applicant suggested a design charrette with the ADR members to revise the architecture and improve aesthetics to better reflect the character of Main Street.

Ms. Shank stated that the applicants should look at the Master Plan for the area. She explained that the Plan envisions this site as an opportunity for a higher intensity development. New development should be a catalyst for this future development with streetscapes and urban density. The site is an important location to set a precedent for future development of the corridor. She stated that the Planning Board will most likely agree with the ADR with regard to building materials and aesthetics. She noted that a charrette would be a great idea. This current ADR meeting could be considered a feedback session. She encouraged the design team to continue. She added that the comments from ADR members were great and it seemed like they were having productive discussions with the applicant. She suggested that the applicant return to the next meeting after the charrette.

Mr. Gentilhomme stated that the Committee is on the same page as the City. The shopping center is not well liked and the architecture of the buildings in the area that the architect indicated they styled their proposal after are not valued.

Mr. Campione will talk with 110 Grill relative to a redesign of the interior.

Mr. Durfee will provide the applicants and members with the guidelines for Main Street development and Master Plans related to this area.

Mr. Gentilhomme made a motion, second by Ms. Tomas, to continue the project until next meeting with following comments:

Members agree that the general concept of the site plan is acceptable; however, the drive-through is not favored for the downtown Concord area. The applicant is encouraged to provide more site information especially in regards to grades, look at layout of the 110 Grill to provide more glazing on Storrs Street. In general, all architecture should be revised to develop designs that are more in keeping with the City's concept of the development of the corridor and the design guidelines of Main Street.

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

Mr. King – in favor

Ms. Tomas – in favor

Mr. Gentilhomme – in favor

Ms. Tomas asked about general design review for the City and where the line is stopped in terms of signage and plans. Mr. Durfee explained ADR reviews building permits in performance districts, all major site plan and subdivision applications and sign applications in mixed and commercial use districts.

Members requested documentation that shows the City's performance districts.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 6, 2021 Minutes

Adjournment

Mr. King made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Tomas seconded. The motion passed unanimously at 11:43 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Lisa Fellows-Weaver
Administrative Specialist