

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
June 1, 2021 Minutes

The Architectural Design Review Committee (ADRC) held its regular monthly meeting on June 1, 2021 via Zoom at 8:30 a.m.

Attendees: Co-Chairs Jay Doherty and Elizabeth Durfee Hengen, Members Claude Gentilhomme, Margaret Tomas, Ron King, Zarron Simonis, and Tim Thompson.

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.

Ms. Hengen welcomed new member Tim Thompson to the Committee.

Approval of Minutes

Ms. Tomas moved to approve the minutes of May 4, 2021, as written. Mr. King seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with a roll call vote.

Mr. Doherty – in favor

Ms. Hengen – in favor

**City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
June 1, 2021 Minutes**

Ms. Tomas – in favor
Mr. King – in favor
Mr. Gentilhomme – in favor
Mr. Simonis – in favor
Mr. Thompson – abstained as he was not a member of the Committee at the May meeting.

Sign Applications

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

Rick Smith represented the application.

Mr. Smith returned to the Committee and presented two options for signage. One sign is proposed with a mandala to be installed by the entrance or without the mandala and the other request is for the sign between the windows with or without the mandala. Mr. Smith stated that the signs are to be placed in kind and nothing else changed. He stated that he preferred the signs without the mandala; however, would like to keep the mandala on the door.

Additional discussion was held about the wording on the larger sign. Mr. King stated that option ‘D’ includes wording and he feels that it is difficult to read.

Members felt option ‘B’ for the door sign was better and option ‘A’ for the sign between the windows; both options do not include the mandala.

Ms. Hengen made a motion, seconded by Mr. King, to recommend approval of option ‘B’ for the 2’x2’ square sign at the entrance, and option ‘A’ for the larger sign, as submitted.

Ms. Hengen amended the motion to include the lighting, as submitted, for three, recessed, eye ball lights. Mr. King seconded the amendment.

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

Mr. Doherty – in favor
Ms. Hengen – in favor
Ms. Tomas – in favor
Mr. King – in favor
Mr. Gentilhomme – in favor
Mr. Simonis – in favor
Mr. Thompson – in favor

2. Barlo Signs, on behalf of Northway Bank requests ADR approval for the installation of a new internally-illuminated monument sign at 190 North main Street in the Urban Commercial (CU) District.

Brandon Currier of Barlo Signs represented the application.

Mr. Currier stated that the application is for the monument sign. He stated that the business is open. The sign is not installed and has not been manufactured either. He stated currently there are two wooden poles, which will be removed and a new base will be poured with a single pole in the center with skirting. The sign will be fabricated with aluminum and will be painted.

A discussion was held regarding the base and sign not being proportional. Mr. King suggested to pull the base in to meet the bottom of the sign’s radius. Ms. Hengen suggested lowering the sign. Mr. King agreed. Ms. Tomas commented that the sign does not fit in well in this area. She suggested changing the material to granite which would match the stone under the porch. Mr.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
June 1, 2021 Minutes

Gentilhomme agreed that the sign could be lowered; he did not have any issue with the base and material as proposed.

Although not noted in the rendering, Mr. Currier added that the base will be covered by shrubbery.

Mr. Gentilhomme stated that the applicant has been very agreeable to try to meet what the Committee has recommended for all of the signs. He supported the design and suggested lowering the sign one foot to hide some of the base.

Mr. Gentilhomme made a motion, second by Mr. King, to recommend the sign be lowered six inches to one foot and bring the gray in two inches on either side to line with the radius.

Mr. Simonis asked what the IES maximum of illumines levels is for the sign; it should not exceed 40 candela per meter squared (NITS).

Mr. Gentilhomme amended the motion, second by Mr. King, to include the maximum of illumines levels for the sign will not exceed 40 candela per meter squared (NITS).

The motion passed with a roll call vote as follows:

Mr. Doherty – in favor
Ms. Hengen – in favor
Mr. King – in favor
Mr. Gentilhomme – in favor
Mr. Simonis – in favor
Mr. Thompson – in favor
Ms. Tomas – opposed

3. Signarama, on behalf of Eric Gill, requests ADR approval for the installation of three new non-illuminated wall signs, and the replacement of two internally-illuminated freestanding signs at 63 Hall Street in the Opportunity Corridor Performance (OCP) District.

Nichole Loati and Mark Reeves represented the application.

Ms. Loati explained that the proposal is for three non-illuminated signs for Gills Point S Tire & Auto Service. The Gills sign is fabricated stainless steel lettering that will be bolted to the building façade. The size is 72.75” x 19.2”. The PointS logo sign is a flat die-cut 3MM aluminum composite material sign that is fabricated in two pieces; there is a vertical seam. The proposed size is 158.5” x 49”. The sign will be bolted to the façade of the building. The face of the letters will be 1 ½” from the façade.

Mr. Doherty stated that the Gills and Concord signs appear to be different sizes making the signage unbalanced. Ms. Loati replied that this is the franchise guidelines with the Gills larger than the location. Mr. Gentilhomme commented that if the Concord sign were changed it would also throw the balance off so either way it would appear unbalanced. Ms. Tomas stated that the signage appears to be off-center on the building. Ms. Loati agreed and stated that it appears to be the rendering that is off-center. Ms. Hengen asked why Concord is there at all. Ms. Loati stated that the signage is within the allowance and each sign is a separate sign permit. Mr. Thompson suggested moving Concord or deleting it altogether which would then not span the length of the building. Ms. Loati stated that removing Concord may be amendable to the applicant and then the signage could be centered by shifting it to the right and the logo could also be increased. Ms. Hengen added that the “Tire & Auto Service” section could be increased. She noted that the signage is not illuminated.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
June 1, 2021 Minutes

Ms. Loati stated that freestanding sign is existing, currently with two signs. The proposal is to replace the face of the cabinet signs only. The signs are both internally lit.

Mr. Doherty referenced the white panel and stated that typically the Committee prefers that the white would be shielded or not glow. Ms. Loati replied that the background is a full white and will glow, but the design could be changed to incorporate an opaque backer panel so that the white of the sign will not glow at night.

Mr. Thompson made a motion, second by Ms. Hengen, to recommend approval of signs ‘A’ and ‘B’ as submitted, with the recommendation to realign the Gills sign to line up with the ‘point’ sign and to eliminate the Concord sign, and to reposition “pointS’ over the door.

Mr. Gentilhomme stated that having Concord balances the presentation. Mr. Doherty suggested that all signage be shifted so that it is balanced.

Mr. Thompson amended the motion to include that staff will review the revisions. Ms. Hengen seconded the amendment.

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

Mr. Doherty – in favor
Ms. Hengen – in favor
Ms. Tomas – in favor
Mr. King – in favor
Mr. Gentilhomme – in favor
Mr. Simonis – in favor
Mr. Thompson – in favor

Ms. Tomas made a motion, second by Mr. King, to recommend approval of the freestanding sign, as presented with the recommendation that an opaque backer panel be added to the white portion of the freestanding sign.

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

Mr. Doherty – in favor
Ms. Hengen – in favor
Ms. Tomas – in favor
Mr. King – in favor
Mr. Gentilhomme – in favor
Mr. Simonis – in favor
Mr. Thompson – in favor

4. Neopco Sign Co., on behalf of Avenues Recovery Center request ADR approval for the installation of a non-illuminated wall sign at 81 Hall Street in the Opportunity Corridor Performance (OCP) District.

Glenn Shadlick of Neopco Signs represented the application.

Mr. Shadlick explained that a variance has been obtained for the colors, location, and size of the sign. There is an existing sign on the building to the right of the proposed sign. The design will compliment that sign. The sign will not be illuminated and there is no external illumination proposed. Material proposed is an aluminum composite.

Mr. Gentilhomme asked if the sign faces I-93. Mr. Shadlick replied yes.

Mr. Doherty asked if the neighboring sign was the same size of the neighboring sign. Mr. Shadlick replied it is smaller and is centered within the sign band. Mr. Thompson suggested that

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
June 1, 2021 Minutes

the sign be raised to be at the same height as the neighboring sign. Ms. Hengen commented that typically a sign would be centered on the sign band; however, given that the sign is facing the highway perhaps it should be matched up at the top of the existing neighboring sign.

Mr. King stated that the font proposed is weak. Ms. Hengen noted that the additional verbiage at the bottom is not visible. Mr. Shadlick stated that they have utilized the total square footage allowed and no additional signage is allowed. Discussion ensued regarding the font size and lack of visibility and other options. Mr. Shadlick explained that he did suggest increasing the font size; however, that would then increase the size of the sign. He added that there really is no other place for a sign.

Ms. Tomas made a motion, second by Mr. Thompson, to approve the sign, as submitted, with the recommendation to remove the phone number and increase the text; should that not be feasible, then increase all the text to fill the sign fully.

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

Mr. Doherty – in favor
Ms. Hengen – in favor
Ms. Tomas – in favor
Mr. King – in favor
Mr. Gentilhomme – in favor
Mr. Simonis – in favor
Mr. Thompson – in favor

5. Advantage Signs, on behalf of Eastern Analytical requests ADR approval for the installation of a new internally-illuminated monument sign at 51 Antrim Ave in the Industrial (IN) District.

Josh Messenger of Advantage Signs represented the application.

Mr. Messenger explained that the sign proposed is for a new building. The sign will be internally illuminated. The materials proposed are an aluminum cabinet with Lexan faces. The post will be painted to match the cabinet.

Mr. Doherty asked if the white panel will be opaque. Mr. Messenger replied yes, the sign will have an opaque background. It was also asked if there will be any additional signage for the building. Mr. Messenger replied no and added that this is a dead-end road. Landscaping was mentioned. Mr. messenger replied that he was not sure about any plans for landscaping.

Mr. King made a motion, second by Mr. Simonis, to approve the sign, as submitted, with the recommendation for an opaque background.

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

Mr. Doherty – in favor
Ms. Hengen – in favor
Ms. Tomas – in favor
Mr. King – in favor
Mr. Gentilhomme – in favor
Mr. Simonis – in favor
Mr. Thompson – in favor

6. Advantage Signs, on behalf of Crisis Center of Central NH requests ADR approval for the replacement of an internally-illuminated freestanding sign panel and the replacement of an externally illuminated wall sign at 287 South Main Street in the Opportunity Corridor Performance (OCP) District.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
June 1, 2021 Minutes

Josh Messenger of Advantage Signs represented the application.

Mr. Messenger explained that the proposal is for directory updates for the pylon and building.

Ms. Tomas asked if the signs will be the same in both locations. Mr. Messenger replied yes. Ms. Tomas noted that the text on the pylon sign is very small. Mr. Messenger replied that the applicant is trying to keep the logo and sign consistent; however, he agreed especially with the stacked lines. Ms. Hengen stated that the pylon sign is very busy and fewer words on the signs is better and easier to read.

Ms. Hengen made a motion, second by Mr. Thompson, to recommend approval with the strong recommendation that the amount of wording on the pylon sign be reduced in order to render it more legible.

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

Mr. Doherty – in favor
Ms. Hengen – in favor
Ms. Tomas – in favor
Mr. King – in favor
Mr. Gentilhomme – in favor
Mr. Simonis – in favor
Mr. Thompson – in favor

7. Rowland Studio requests ADR approval for the replacement of an internally-illuminated freestanding sign panel, and two internally-illuminated wall signs at 89 Fort Eddy Road in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.

No one was present to represent this application.

Mr. Durfee explained that the proposal is for two building signs and a panel in an existing freestanding sign.

Mr. Simonis stated that building signs are different than the pylon. Mr. Nadeau responded explaining that the applicant will be filling the existing sign boxes. There is additional road frontage on the Fort Eddy Road side.

Mr. Thompson stated that white background with the black letters is not as aesthetically pleasing than the black sign with the white lettering. A discussion was held regarding having signs in different locations be consistent; it is a visual clue to have signs match.

Mr. Thompson made a motion, second by Ms. Tomas, to recommend approval with the recommendation that all three signs be consistent with a substantially similar background and a dark background be used with white lettering; return to the Committee if the applicant wishes to use a white background.

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

Mr. Doherty – in favor
Ms. Hengen – in favor
Ms. Tomas – in favor
Mr. King – in favor
Mr. Gentilhomme – in favor
Mr. Simonis – in favor
Mr. Thompson – in favor

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
June 1, 2021 Minutes

Building Permit Applications in Performance Districts

1. The Turner Group, on behalf of NH Distributors requests ADR approval for the installation of a roof-mounted solar array at 1 Horseshoe Pond Lane in the Opportunity Corridor Performance (OCP) District.

Bill Hickey, of The Turner Group, represented the application.

Mr. Hickey explained that the proposal is to install a 376-panel solar array on the roof top of the northern half of the building. The southern end will not have any panels. The panels are installed on a frame that sits directly on the roof. Any visual impacts are minimal.

Mr. Durfee noted that the application is before the Committee due to the fact that the building is in a performance district.

Mr. Simonis mentioned glaring from the panels and noted that there may be some issues with the FAA because of the flight patterns from the airport.

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

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

Mr. Doherty – in favor
Ms. Hengen – in favor
Ms. Tomas – in favor
Mr. King – in favor
Mr. Gentilhomme – in favor
Mr. Simonis – in favor
Mr. Thompson – in favor

Major Site Plan Applications

1. Nobis Group on behalf of Dakota Partners and P&M Realty of Concord, LLC, requesting Major Site Plan approval for a mixed-use development consisting of six residential buildings (180 total units), and two commercial buildings, at Langdon Avenue in the Opportunity Corridor Performance District. The applicant is also requesting a Conditional Use Permit to allow for the construction of fewer parking spaces.

Mark Pilotte, of Dakota Partners, Ed Wojcik with Katie Van Hamel from Wojcik Architects, Chris Nadeau of Nobis Group, and Jonathan Halle of Warrenstreet Architects represented the application.

Mr. Pilotte stated that the proposal is for a 192-unit complex over a four phased project.

Mr. Nadeau stated that the project is on Langdon Avenue within the former South End railyard, adjacent to Concord Trailways bus terminal and Big Jim's. This will be a mixed-use design of 2 office buildings in the front of the property, one is a four-story and the other is a two-story. There will also be six residential buildings; all three-story buildings, two residential buildings will have 48 units, two buildings will have 36 units, and two will have 12 units. There will also be a club house at the far south end of the site.

Mr. Wojcik stated that the buildings will have two facades, a public street façade and a court yard façade. They have looked at various styles of buildings in this area and looked into the history of the site for inspiration. Historic pictures of the railyard were provided. Mr. Wojcik stated that they have tried to incorporate architectural elements similar to mills, including stair towers, different window patterns and roofing designs with pockets and brackets. The concepts for the three-story buildings include pitched roofs with tower elements for stair wells, and flat roof

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
June 1, 2021 Minutes

portions for the ERV units. Materials proposed include vinyl siding, a variety of board and batten for the upper portions, the lower areas would be clapboard style. Colors would vary for texture. The overall plan layout is a central corridor style with units on each side. Asphalt shingles will be used for the roof. Window treatments may be a black vinyl for a more contemporary feel. He explained that there is a jog in the buildings for division and roof planes. He noted that the courtyard façade of the buildings will have glass windows.

Mr. Doherty commented that he appreciates the historic review and presenting a modern look while using some of the interestingness of the area. He feels that the overall concept is successful.

Ms. Tomas asked if there are other renderings available for the other residential buildings on site since only 2 were shown in the presentation. Ms. Van Hamel provided an overview of the other buildings.

Mr. Doherty stated that the Committee typically requests information relative to proposed materials, colors, have samples provided, and provide explanations if all of the buildings will be different or the same. He requested this information for the next meeting.

Mr. Gentilhomme commented to the attention of detail shown and it is appreciated. He stated that there is a water feature nearby. He referenced the site plan and expressed concern with the four main apartment buildings and the proposed locations; they are regimental and all appear to be in a very tight pattern. He suggested an irregular layout from how they are sited and suggested they consider adjusting the angles of the buildings to incorporate the marsh in the design, rather than having them all in a row.

Mr. Nadeau replied that they originally provided something similar to his suggestion; however, the layout was done purposely with guidance from the City as the City staff requested a more urban street style.

Mark Pilotte further explained that there is a wetland on the southern part of the property, which requires a 75 ft buffer. He added that the rail line is on the east side. He further explained the parking requirements for the office building and for the apartments. This design supports what the City Planner requested. Mr. Wojcik added that the way the buildings are presented and the scale will be helped by the landscaping and lighting. The buildings are separate buildings and there will be view corridors. These are only three-story buildings and he feels that this is a good mix.

Mr. King referenced the west side of the site and asked if there will be any flexibility with the parking. He noted that this area would also be a good place to add a park or a green area surrounded by the parking, which may open the area up for a view corridor to the marsh. Mr. Pilotte replied that the area is very tight due to the drainage easement and detention basin.

Mr. Nadeau reviewed the pedestrian access and the internal sidewalks, which will connect to external sidewalks. He explained that they are also proposing a sidewalk up Langdon Ave to South Main Street with a cross walk.

A discussion was held relative to future development in this area and additional pedestrian connections. Mr. Nadeau explained that there are no future connections planned as this is private property. It was noted that there may be a long-term possibility of some type of a connection to the south end marsh and Terrill Park. Ms. Hengen commented that she hopes there will be an option for a foot path to utilize for the area. Mr. Pilotte replied that there is an area for a foot path as well as a piece of land off of South Main Street. Mr. King encouraged the walkway and view area. Additional discussion ensued relative to the detention pond area for a pathway. Mr. Pilotte

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
June 1, 2021 Minutes

stated that it may be possible to use this area; however, the final design of the detention basin would need to be reviewed.

Mr. Doherty asked about an internal green space. Mr. Nadeau replied that there is an urban feel with the street scape design in between the buildings. Mr. Pilotte added that they have made some changes to include a central play area, garden space with raised planters, a patio area, lighting accents, and added trees for buffers.

Mr. Doherty asked if the internal space could be developed differently to make it easier to walk through. Mr. Wojcik explained that they originally had a more traditional access; it has since been changed. The foot traffic will be light and there will be less chance of cut throughs.

Mr. Halle provided an overview of the landscaping and addressed the orientation of the residential buildings. He stated that the layout design was dictated by Planning Staff. The idea of an internal space was designed to be more park like with a smaller play area and not perceived as one big green space in the middle.

Mr. Halle presented a video showing the design of the office buildings. He explained that the building design does not address a particular end user and may be revised when a tenant is selected, it may also be combined into a single building. One building is 20,000 sf and the other is 40,000 sg ft. The buildings are brick with glass and an alucobond wrap. Discussion ensued relative to the materials.

Ms. Tomas commented that she feels the design and materials work well and this is a good fit into the area.

Mr. Doherty asked about the flat roof choice. Mr. Halle replied that both designs have moved forward very rapidly, and had not seen the residential building design when designing the commercial buildings. However, they looked at what was done on the North end of the corridor and designed this to be in line with the office vernacular in the City. He noted that all other buildings in the area have flat roofs.

Ms. Hengen stated that she likes the distinctions of the office and residential space. She suggested that if there are to be two buildings, provide a footpath between them that will lead back to the other site. She added that anything that can be done to encourage pedestrian traffic is in everyone's best interest. Mr. Halle replied that he believes that there is a four-foot fence and a gate planned along the back edge of the commercial buildings. Mr. Nadeau stated that due to the existing contamination, there is a higher threshold set for residential use by the State which requires a two-foot cap of clean soil in all areas that are landscaped. The 2-foot cap is not a requirement for the commercial area; therefore, they have to keep the residential area contained. Mr. Pilotte added that it is also cost driven as the fill material is very expensive. He added that a path could work and gate could be added. When the commercial project is completed they could cap the area and increase the amount of fill for the area. Mr. Halle stated that the plans show a chain-link fence; however, they are currently proposing an aluminum vertical rail fence, gates could be added. He noted that the residential area capped with 2 ft of fill will also change the grades.

A discussion was held regarding the alignment of the commercial buildings; it was suggested that they be shifted closer to Langdon Ave to be in line with the EVO rock climbing gym building. Mr. Halle stated that the parking is proposed to be in the front of the building to be in context of the other buildings within the project. He added that this also goes back to the original discussions for the design to be that of a more urban feel. Mr. Nadeau explained that the four-way intersection to the west will be the main entry way into the site. Discussion ensued regarding flipping the plan so that the buildings front along Langdon Ave. and adding a tree line. However,

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
June 1, 2021 Minutes

Mr. Wojcik stated, the commercial traffic would then be entering into the residential development; this plan keeps the traffic to the north. Mr. Halle stated that he began the design with the buildings on Langdon Ave.; this is the direction that has been given to them by City staff.

Ms. Tomas referenced the landscape plan and noted the lack of evergreens on the site. Mr. Halle replied that there is a six-foot solid fence proposed for a visual aid and to help with sound. Ms. Tomas stated that there should be some evergreens added between the parking area and railroad. Mr. Pilotte agreed and added evergreens would also make the area denser and add foliage. He added that they will try to berm that area a few feet higher and place additional trees there to lessen the impact.

Ms. Fenstermacher commented to address the commercial building layout. She stated that the intent was the road between the commercial and residential building would be to create an urban street scape. She stated that the fence is a surprise and has not been previously discussed. She expressed concern with separation; the street will appear to be an alleyway and that is not the intent. The intent was that the street would be an urban corridor and have a connection between the residential section and the commercial section. She asked about the environmental issues that were noted to be driving the design.

Mr. Pilotte reiterated the need to protect the residents of the development regarding the soils. He added that the fence will be added for protection and is also a timing issue; it is not intended to be a permanent fence. He explained that once the commercial building is done all of the environmental issues will be addressed.

Ms. Hengen asked if there are any commercial businesses proposed that could be utilized by the residential tenants. Mr. Halle replied that is a viable option and can be a use supported. It was noted that these are two separate projects with two separate ownerships that will occur at two different times.

Ms. Tomas asked if the fence is removed, will there still be a brick wall appears that you would still need to walk around to access the commercial buildings. Mr. Thompson replied yes.

Mr. Pilotte stated that there is a very tight schedule. They plan to submit the funding application to the State in August and will need the site plan approved prior to that.

Mr. Pilotte stated that the feedback provided is appreciated. He understands the Committee likes the approach from the historical aspect and mimicking the past and bringing it forward to the future. He stated that their next step will be to provide samples of the materials and colors. He added that they will work on adding an open space from the east to the west with the detention basin and enhancing the area to allow the connection for the future for a path through the conservation land. They will also update the circulation path and provide an updated lighting plan with illuminated paths through the green space. They will also work on updating connection areas between the buildings.

Mr. Doherty requested they look at the folded plane and how that happens on the façade of the commercial buildings.

Ms. Tomas commented that the overall residential design is successful. She stated that it may be a bit stripy, especially if using all vinyl. Mr. Gentilhomme stated that at the pedestrian level they should be careful to make sure that they use a durable siding. Mr. Pilotte replied that because it is affordable housing the project is a challenge with what can be used to make the funding work out.

Mr. Doherty stated that he feels the Committee, overall, is in support of the project and it is proposed in a great area of the City that will become a gem in the future.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
June 1, 2021 Minutes

Mr. Thompson left the meeting.

1. 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 of Brixmor and Chris Nadeau of Nobis Group represented the application.

Mr. Twersky stated that they feel that they have met all of the Committee's comments. They are on a tight timeline and are hoping to get the Planning Board's approval at the next meeting.

Mr. Nadeau presented the landscaping plan and explained that shade trees have been added along Storrs Street, the main entrance driveway, and the south side of the drive through. The parking area against the plaza has been eliminated due to fire concerns. The drive through has been changed to have two order stations with two separate lines coming in and will merge at the pick-up lane.

Ms. Tomas asked about changes made to the main entrance area with the crosswalk and pull off/drop off area; it is very busy. As far as the entrance area, they have eliminated the drop off area and it is now only a delivery area. There is still an outdoor gathering spot at the 110 Grill with additional landscaping added. Mr. Nadeau added that they rotated the bike rack and the seating wall is now two feet higher than the lower table areas.

A discussion was held regarding the drop off area. Mr. Durfee explained that the area would not be allowed to be used for pick-up/drop-off of customers to avoid conflicts with the drop off area and due to the location of the entry of the crosswalk. He added that any deliveries could be done during off peak hours.

Mr. Twersky reviewed the changes made to the elevations. He stated there are no changes proposed to the 110 Grill from the last meeting. There are no major changes made to the coffee shop other than the change noted to the pick-up window. He stated that with regard to the middle building's changes, all wood materials have been eliminated to the north elevation and brick is proposed with granite tile, which will be added on the columns and popup. The other changes made were to the South elevation. Two options were proposed; one with only brick and the other with wood on the top portion

110 Grill

Mr. Twersky stated that the design proposal has not changed; this is the best effort from the tenant and this layout is the design typically used by the tenant. He feels that the design is a take it or leave it at this point.

Mr. Gentilhomme stated that there are several other locations where the tenant has changed the building's appearance and modified the materials, either slightly or in a major way to accommodate the local context; however, they did make the changes. He expressed frustration with the fact that 110 Grill is not willing to be a partner of the community and are not willing to work with the City to fit in better. He stated that one thing that could be done is rather than using CMU is to use brick. Mr. Gentilhomme stated that there are two specific locations that have incorporated other materials. They need to tie their architecture to fit into the area.

Ms. Tomas stated that she has mentioned the other locations and changes and agreed with Mr. Gentilhomme. She added that she does not support this design in this location. Mr. Twersky stated that the point of objection with the ADRC has been the location of the front door and he does not recall this being an issue. Ms. Tomas replied that he has not been listening if he has not heard it.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
June 1, 2021 Minutes

Ms. Hengen stated that the change to brick from wood clapboard the middle building is successful. She added that the street is a major artery of the City, a pedestrian walkway and connects to Main Street. She stated that the vision is to have a street scape that functions as a secondary Main Street. The other two tenants have been willing to work with the City and design the buildings to fit in and 110 Grill has not.

Mr. Doherty stated that the Committee is not happy that the tenant has not changed the exterior.

Coffee Shop

Mr. Doherty mentioned that the entry is on the right side of the building and it was suggested to shift the logo to the right. Mr. Twersky replied that they will be returning with a sign package.

Mr. Gentilhomme stated that the siding was changed to an architectural panel siding, which is an improvement.

Center Tenant Building

Ms. Hengen stated that option A where the siding is all brick, is a better option, as noted in the south elevation; wood does not belong in downtown. She stated that the commercial architecture along Main Street would be a better prototype for this project versus wood framed houses. He stated that he could check back with the architect to see if there is something else they could add; however, adding brick to the front elevation is very heavy. They have added glazing to lighten it up some. Depending on the use and ceiling heights, he suggested adding spandrel glass. Members agreed with the option of spandrel glass.

Mr. Gentilhomme stated that the spandrel glass gives the sense of having two stories. Ms. Tomas added that there is already glass, granite tile, and brick. She suggested that they limit it to these three materials. All members concurred.

Mr. Doherty again reiterated that he feels that this is a missed opportunity to have multi-story buildings in this part of the City. He stated that the applicant is given it some height with materials used to give the illusion that there are two stories; however, it is a miss for this site. Mr. Twersky replied that he has heard the comments. He stated that he is aware that there is a vision and a 2020 Master Plan. The conservation would be different City is looking for eminent domain with different incentives and wants to knock down the center and redo the area, but they are still dealing with an existing shopping center.

110 Grill

Mr. Twersky asked for clarification of what materials the Committee is looking for, for the 110 Grill. Ms. Tomas replied that the building should fit in with the context of the City and not look like every other 110 Grill. There is not one specific material or style; it has no context as proposed. She added that the design of the other buildings has been done well and fits in with the City. The 110 Grill needs to do the same.

Ms. Hengen suggested specifically to introduce materials such as brick and granite. Ms. Tomas added that it is not just materials; it is the shape of the building as well. Mr. Gentilhomme noted the angled roof, which he does not feel is the best design. Ms. Hengen referenced another location that was inside a wood framed building so the business is able to conform to the context.

Mr. Twersky requested the images referenced to be sent to him

Mr. Gentilhomme made a motion, second by Mr. King, to recommend approval of the submissions with the following comments:

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
June 1, 2021 Minutes

- Asking the applicant to reconsider the architecture of the 110 Grill building, specifically to consider the materials and the form/shape to be more in conformance of the materials found in downtown Concord Main Street; and
- With the middle building, the Committee would prefer option A for the south elevation; the west elevation the Committee prefers a solid spandrel light above the heavy horizontal line that goes over the fold of the west façade (in the middle of the building); and
- The south building, (anticipated to be a drive-up coffee shop) on the east elevation, the sign should be moved to the north side of the façade.

Ms. Hengen stated that she is uncomfortable with the motion and would prefer to approve the designs of the middle and south building with the caveats noted and not approve the north building.

The motion and second were withdrawn.

Mr. Gentilhomme made a motion, second by Mr. King, to not approve the architecture and finishes of the 110 Grill because the form and finishes are not compatible with that which is seen in downtown Concord Main Street.

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

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

Mr. Gentilhomme made a motion, second by Mr. King, to recommend approval of the architectural designs of the middle and south buildings, with the following requirements:

- The Committee recommends option A for the south elevation with spandrel light, in full height, be used on the middle of the west elevation above the horizontal dark band; and
- The sign be moved towards the north corner of the building on the east elevation of the south building to better delineate that the entrance is down the alleyway.

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

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

Ms. Tomas made a motion, second by Mr. King, to recommend approval of the site, as submitted, with the concern of the loading and unloading drop off area will be a potential issue with confusion of a drop off area.

Mr. Doherty commented that this drive through is still not something that should be going on in the downtown area. Mr. Gentilhomme agreed and added that he also understands the concerns with a truck loading and unloading area, he would prefer to leave up to the City's Engineering Department. Mr. Durfee suggested moving the crosswalk. Ms. Hengen agreed with moving the crosswalk. Mr. Doherty commented that there is still a lot of activity going on in this area. Ms. Tomas stated that there is a traffic light and will not be looking at pedestrians; it is a very busy

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
June 1, 2021 Minutes

driveway for a crosswalk and cars pulling out at the same time. Discussion ensued. Trees were also mentioned and plantings, both needing to be added to the site.

The motion and second were withdrawn.

Ms. Tomas made a motion, second by Mr. Doherty, to recommend approval of the site plan with the following items:

- The Committee has a concern with the loading and unloading zone and requested that the City's Engineering Department look into this area; and
- The Committee has a concern with the location of the crosswalk and requested that the City's Engineering Department look into this item; and
- The Committee has a concern that downtown is not the right location for a drive thru and would prefer to not see a drive thru restaurant in downtown; and
- The Committee would prefer to see multi-story buildings in this location; and
- Drive through and one-story buildings are inconsistent with the Master Plan; and
- The Committee recommends planting schemes with trees and garden boxes, similar to Main Street would be an alternative to full street trees.

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

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

Adjournment

Ms. Tomas made a motion to adjourn. Mr. King seconded. The motion passed unanimously at 11:47 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Lisa Fellows-Weaver
Administrative Specialist