

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

The Architectural Design Review Committee (ADRC) held its regular monthly meeting on July 6, 2021 in the 2nd floor conference room at 41 Green Street.

Attendees: Co-Chair Jay Doherty and Elizabeth Durfee Hengen, Members Ron King, Zarron Simonis

Absent: Claude Gentilhomme, Margaret Tomas, and Timothy 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 Hengen at 8:30 a.m.

### **Approval of Minutes**

Mr. Doherty moved to approve the minutes of June 1, 2021, as written. Mr. King seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

### ***Sign Applications***

1. Claudia Lambert requests ADR approval for the replacement of a non-illuminated freestanding sign and the installation of a non-illuminated wall sign at 4 Wall Street in the Civic Performance (CVP) District.

Ben Nardi represented the application.

Mr. Nardi gave an overview of the proposed signs; freestanding sign and wall sign. Both will not be illuminated.

A discussion was held regarding the amount of text in the signs as too much information reduces readability. Members suggested that the applicant determine which text is most important. Suggestions were to remove the web address and street address, and reduce the size of the phone number, which would then allow the business name to be increased.

Mr. Nadeau was asked if the applicant could add a "C" to the building and he replied yes.

Mr. Doherty made a motion, second by Mr. King, to recommend approval of the wall sign as submitted and recommend the blade sign be reduced to 3 lines of text.

The motion passed unanimously.

2. Shaw's requests ADR approval for the installation of a new internally-illuminated wall sign and multiple non-illuminated directional signs at 20 D'Amante Drive in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.
3. Shaw's requests ADR approval for the installation of a new internally-illuminated wall sign and multiple non-illuminated directional signs at 24 Fort Eddy Road in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.

The two Shaw's application were addressed together.

No one was present to represent the Shaw's applications.

Mr. Durfee explained that both of the applications are for signage relative to the drive-up and go areas. Signs include illuminated wall signs, parking signs, and directional signs used to identify the pick-up locations.

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

Mr. Doherty made a motion, second by Mr. King, to recommend approval of the signs for both locations, as submitted.

The motion passed unanimously.

4. Bridget Windsor requests ADR approval for the replacement of a non-illuminated wall sign and an internally-illuminated projecting sign at 32 N. Main Street in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

Bridget Windsor was present to represent the application.

Ms. Windsor stated that this is the former Metro PCS location.

Mr. Doherty noted that there are two different texts used, upper and lower case. Ms. Hengen noted that the logo is used with only one sign and could be misleading for two different businesses.

Ms. Windsor stated that she would change to the sign to lower case and have the logo be the only thing on the hanging sign and will center the logo. It was noted that the signs are not illuminated.

Mr. Doherty made a motion, second by Mr. King, to approve the signs with the recommendation that the logo be centered if the text is begin removed, and all text be consistent, either all upper case or all lower case on both signs, and the signs are non-illuminating.

The motion passed unanimously.

5. Harlan Hutchinson requests ADR approval for the replacement of an internally-illuminated wall sign and internally-illuminated freestanding panel sign at 89 Fort Eddy Road in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.

No one was present to represent the application.

Mr. Durfee stated that the proposal is for a wall sign and a freestanding sign panel sign. These signs have been installed. He added that the application will be pulled from the Planning Board consent agenda since they were installed without approvals.

Mr. Doherty stated that sign itself is fine; however, it could be more colorful.

Reference was made to other signs in the plaza and the signs background colors. It was recommended that the business reverse the building sign to use a black background and the pylon signs to remain as installed.

Mr. Doherty made a motion, second by Mr. King, to recommend approval of the signs, as submitted, with the recommendation that the white background have an opaque backer panel for both the pylon and wall sign. The motion passed unanimously.

6. Kelley Family Properties requests ADR approval for the replacement of a non-illuminated freestanding sign at 189 North Main Street in the Urban Commercial (CU) District.

No one was present to represent this application.

Mr. Durfee stated that the applicant is reconfiguring the apartments on the upper floors.

Mr. Nadeau stated that the applicant is applying for a blank panel as a master sign; there are no businesses in the building yet. The intent is to not need to return to the Committee if the master sign is approved. The master sign has been proposed with only four panels. Each sign will be installed blank and will end up having only two lines of text. The colors will remain as the grey tones shown.

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

Mr. King made a motion, second by Mr. Simmonis, to recommend approval of the master sign, as submitted.

The motion passed unanimously.

7. Kelley Family Properties requests ADR approval for the replacement of a non-illuminated wall sign at 6 Loudon Road in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.

No one was present to represent this application.

Mr. Durfee stated that the proposal is to replace the existing wall sign. He stated that the sign is the same but the text color appears more silver than white.

Mr. King made a motion, second by Mr. Doherty, to recommend approval of the wall sign, as submitted.

The motion passed unanimously.

***Building Permit Applications in Performance Districts***

1. Bangor Savings Bank requests ADR approval for the replacement of an awning at 82 North Main Street in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

Kelly Stanford of Warrenstreet Architects represented the application.

Mr. King made a motion, second by Mr. Simmonis, to recommend approval of the awning, as submitted.

The motion passed unanimously.

2. Bohler, on behalf of Atlantic Broadband, requests ADR approval for the construction of a new 924 sf public utility building and associated site improvements at 264-268 Sheep Davis Road in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.

Gary Sadler represented Atlantic Broadband.

Color renderings were provided.

Mr. Sadler explained the proposal is for an 800 sq. ft. telecom utility building for the sole purpose to house communication equipment. The building will not be occupied equipment only. He reviewed the proposed materials. The building is 16 ft. high and will have a metal roof, a 20 ft buffer of evergreens and a 6 ft. high fence so it will likely not be seen from the road. There will be an occasional car on site for maintenance purposes. Standing seam awnings are used for protection from the elements. No signage is proposed.

Mr. Doherty asked about the choice of colors. Mr. Sadler replied that they are proposing barn like colors and textures; trying to keep it as neutral as possible. Mr. Doherty suggested changing the colors to make the building less visible. Ms. Hengen suggested using a darker color for the fence like black or darker greens. It was also suggested that darker earth tone be used for the building and roof such as a dark gray or green or black.

Mr. Simmonis asked about lighting. Mr. Sadler replied that there will be cameras and some lighting for security purposes only. They do not intent to have the lights on all the time. Lighting will be used in the parking area for safety and maintenance purposes.

Mr. King made a motion, second by Mr. Simmonis, to recommend approval of the utility building as submitted, with the recommendation for darker earth tones materials b used for the roof, building, canopies, and fence.

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

The motion passed unanimously.

***Major Site Plan Applications***

1. TF Moran, on behalf of KRJ Finance, LLC, request ADR approval for a nine-lot cluster subdivision at 462 Josiah Bartlett Road in the Medium Density Residential (RM) District. The applicant has requested to postpone the public hearing to the July 21st Planning Board meeting.

No one present to represent the application.

Mr. Durfee explained that this proposal is for a cluster subdivision of approximately 13 acres into a nine-unit condominium cluster development. An additional lot will be the remaining area required for open space. A Home Owners Association will be established and will maintain the ownership of the open space.

The landscaping plan was reviewed. Mr. Durfee stated that the site layout and building design need to be reviewed by the Committee.

A discussion was held regarding sidewalks. Mr. Durfee stated that there will be no sidewalks. The developer would prefer to not have any sidewalks. The sidewalks will also interfere with the drainage utilities underground. A waiver has been requested.

Ms. Hengen commented about the paneled column as it is an odd feature. She asked if it could be removed.

A discussion was held regarding the proposed colors and style of siding. Mr. Durfee explained that the developer has not yet determined these features yet. Mr. Doherty stated that he is okay with the overall concept. Mr. Doherty stated that the colors should vary and be based on the location and design of house.

Mr. King requested that there be attention given to the orientation of the houses throughout the development noting the proposed driveway locations and lot lines as well as the yard sizes. He suggested reconfiguring some to allow larger back yards than a front yard and reducing the length of the driveways will create a more neighborhood feel. He also noted that the locations of the utility boxes should be looked into.

Mr. Doherty made a motion, second by Mr. King, to recommend approval with the understanding that the architecture of the buildings and roadway is acceptable; however, the house layout, driveway locations, and utility box locations need to be reviewed and redesigned in order to create more of a neighborhood feel, which can be accomplished by relocating the houses and driveways as they relate to the extra parking spaces with the intent to not block green space; and samples of exact materials, color choices, and revised plans to be resubmitted to the Committee for final recommendation for approval.

The motion passed unanimously.

2. Wilcox & Barton, on behalf Community Bridges, requests ADR approval for the expansion of a parking lot, improved pedestrian access, and the addition of two doorways in the rear of the building, at 162 Pembroke Road, in the Industrial (IN) District.

Erin Lambert of Wilcox & Barton represented the application.

Ms. Lambert gave an overview of the project explained that Community Bridges would like to renovate the existing building for more office space, expand the parking area and add sidewalks around the existing building. The construction will also bring the existing entrances into compliance with ADA requirements. 24 parking spaces are proposed to be added along with two doorways in the rear of the building. No changes will be made to the footprint. In addition, a

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

drainage mitigation system will be added. The outside architecture is not changing. They are adding windows and CMU that will match the existing building. The site currently has a heavy wooded boundary; however, they are adding trees to meet the necessary requirements. A sign application will be forth coming.

A brief discussion was held regarding the lighting. Ms. Lambert stated that there are new site line poles, which are noted on the photo metric plan. Mr. Simmonis noted that there may be some blockage due to existing trees. Ms. Lambert noted that there are wall mounted lights for the sidewalk; however, they are for emergency purposes only.

It was noted that the proposed flowering pear tree will need to be changed out.

Mr. Doherty made a motion, second by Mr. King, to recommend approval as submitted, with the recommendation that the lighting be plan be verified to make sure that there are not dark spot with the proposed lights, and the pear trees are replaced with another species.

The motion passed unanimously.

3. Dakota Partners, 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 returning at the request of the ADR Committee.

Mark Pilotte, of Dakota Partners, Ed Wojcik with Katie Van Hamel from Wojcik Architects, and Kelly Stanford of Warrenstreet Architects represented the application along with Peter Bloomfield of P&M Realty.

Mr. Durfee stated that the project was reviewed last month and the applicant is returning to the Committee to continue discussion. Samples were provided of the proposed materials for the multi-family residential buildings.

A discussion was held last month regarding connectivity from the residential area through the commercial buildings, this has been addressed. The connections through the two 12-unit residential buildings and the two office buildings has been opened up more and a path added; however, the fence will need to be in place until the commercial buildings are completed for environmental purposes. In addition, parallel parking has been added along the street to create more of a street frontage. The fence line west located of the residential buildings where ADR requested a connection to the conservation area has been moved back, which will allow more space and visual connection to green space.

Mr. Wojcik explained that they have reoriented the 12-unit residential buildings to provide a street entrance. Mr. King asked if the office buildings will be rented as office space given the economy and businesses moving away from office spaces. It was explained that the building will be marketed for offices and they are confident they will be rented.

Ms. Hengen stated that it appears the office buildings are now designed to have an entrance on the south elevations. She asked if the residents of the housing will utilize the parallel parking. Mr. Pilotte stated that the ratio for the parking on site is 1.5; traditionally it is a 1.2 to 1.5. They are comfortable with the proposed parking.

Ms. Van Hamel gave an overview of the renderings for the residential buildings and the courtyard. The finishes proposed are warmer tones, which will carry through and wrap around the building. She explained that they have reduced some of the details wrapping around the corners. Mr. Wojcik stated that they are trying to capture and incorporate historical architectural elements

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

of the property all while trying to be maintenance free and at an affordable cost. Mr. Pilotte added that there are 192 units proposed.

Ms. Shank asked if they would consider reconfigurations of the buildings to have ground floor entrances on the central green space. Mr. Pilotte explained they have concerns regarding security and want to limit the number of entranceways. He added that if the City required patios and individual entrances, he would not be able to pursue the project further. Mr. Wojcik added that there are now walking paths to connect the common space entrances to allow walking through the space from each of the buildings.

Landscaping plan was reviewed.

Mr. Pilotte explained that they redesigned the apartments to reduce the building sizes for cost purposes, which created an additional 20,000 sq. ft. of green space.

Ms. Hengen asked if there was any interaction of the residential and office space since they are so closely tied together. Mr. Wojcik replied that they cannot control the tenants of the office space.

Mr. Dougherty stated that he likes the mill look proposed and colors proposed for the residential buildings, but does not like the proposed design of the office buildings. Discussion ensued regarding the windows for the residential buildings. Due to costs, white windows and trusses are proposed; however, Mr. Wojcik added that they are keeping the black windows open as an option and looking will continue to look into other options, which may include making other changes to allow for the increased costs of the darker windows.

Discussion continued regarding the connection between the residential and commercial. Mr. Pilotte mentioned that the fence is temporary and is due to the site's environmental issues. Ms. Stanford explained there is potential to internally connect the front and rear of the commercial buildings through the use of an entrance corridor, but they have not yet designed the floor plans pending tenant use.

Ms. Shank spoke to the commercial development of the site and staff's initial discussions with the developer focused on the importance of creating a cohesive design that ties the multiple uses together. This is not a residential district, the ordinance was changed to allow residential in this district, the primary purpose of the district was always to create high performing commercial development. She explained that parking for the commercial buildings should be in the rear, the uses should be able to be connected and a streetscape created using street trees, benches, etc. Discussion continued relative to the layout and the future development of the site. Mr. Pilotte stated that there are many constraints on the site; environmental issues of the site, floodplain areas; it has been difficult to address these items with the site constraints.

Ms. Hengen stated that housing makes sense. Mr. Pilotte stated that adding the office space creates synergy and opportunities for the area and for the residences in the area.

A discussion was held regarding balancing the height of the office buildings. Mr. Pilotte stated that the height is driven by parking. The original intent was to have two separate office buildings with separate parking, but all parking is now for both buildings. Ms. Hengen asked if it is their intent to improve the street scape and added that it may be an option to reduce the height of the taller building and increase the height of the smaller building to reduce the scale of the building along the streetscape, and make the rear elevation part of a vibrant street. Ms. Stanford spoke to the design intent of the buildings, and disagreed that the buildings were out of scale with the streetscape. The intent was to allow flexibility for future tenants.

Mr. Simmonis mentioned the lighting plan and asked if lights would be blocked by trees, and asked if the applicant would consider bollards. He recommended the applicant run the lighting

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

analysis with the trees. Mr. Pilotte replied that they are comfortable with the proposal; however, will look into the lighting of the site.

Ms. Hengen applauded the mixed-use approach for the development.

Mr. Doherty made a motion, second by Mr. King, to recommend approval for the layout and materials for the residential use, as submitted, with the suggestion to look into an additional entrance onto the courtyard space for each building, and to look at the lighting plan again.

The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Hengen made a motion, second by Mr. King, to recommend approval for the layout and architectural components for the commercial use, as submitted, with the following recommendations to be addressed prior to any building permits being issued:

- The applicant shall return to the Committee with a plan showing the exterior design once tenants are identified;
- A strong recommendation that to the southern façade be redesigned to add vibrancy to the streetscape and that it be acknowledged as the major entrance with the north entries that lead onto parking being diminished;
- Architecture, as it is further refined, should relate visually more to the elements of the residential buildings without losing the commercial aesthetic.

The motion passed unanimously.

4. Alex Vailas, LLC, on behalf of ROI Irrevocable Trust, requests Comprehensive Development Plan approval for a mixed residential and commercial development consisting of (5) new 5-story multifamily buildings, a gas station, car wash, sandwich shop, and convenience store in Phase 1; and an assisted living facility, (24) independent living townhomes, grocery store, commercial building, and drive through service in subsequent phases, in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.

Continued for further development of the plan.

5. Warrenstreet Architects, on behalf of Pitco Frialator, LLC, request preliminary design review for a new building on Integra Drive in the Industrial (IN) District.

Jennifer McCourt of McCourt Engineering represented the application along with Jonathan Smith from Warrenstreet Architects and Karl Searl of Pitco Frialator.

Mr. Smith provided an overview of the concept for a new 350,000 sq. ft. manufacturing building. The project will bring together 4 different buildings. 1/3 of the building will be for storage and 2/3 will be for manufacturing, office space, and a test kitchen

A discussion was held regarding the landscaping and the number of trees proposed. It was noted that 156 trees were proposed. If fewer trees are desired, Mr. Durfee stated that a variance would be required or a Conditional Use Permit.

Additional discussion was held regarding the proposed megawatts of solar panels that will be on the roof.

Overall, the Committee was supportive of the building design, but did express a desire to see more trees in the staff parking lot.

No vote was taken.

**Adjournment**

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

Mr. King made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Doherty seconded. The motion passed unanimously at 10:43 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Lisa Fellows-Weaver  
Administrative Specialist