

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
July 5th, 2023 Minutes

The Architectural Design Review Committee (ADRC) held its regular monthly meeting on July 5th, 2023 in City Council Chambers, in the Municipal Complex, at 37 Green Street.

Attendees: *Co-Chair Jay Doherty, Co-Chair Elizabeth Durfee Hengen, Members Timothy Thompson, Margaret Tomas, and Zarron Simonis.*

Absent: Members Ron King and Claude Gentilhomme

Staff: Heather Shank, City Planner
Alec Bass, Senior Planner
Tracey Hutton, Zoning Administrator
Brian Tremblay – Code Inspector

Call to Order

1. Co-Chair Hengen called the meeting to order at 8:34 a.m.

Approval of Minutes

2. A motion was made by Co-Chair Doherty, seconded by Ms. Tomas, to approve the minutes from the June 6th, 2023 meeting. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

Sign Applications

3. Shannon Mounsey requests ADR approval for a new 6 sf non-illuminated sign at 5 Eagle Square located in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

Shannon Mounsey (Real 603) represented the application.

The sign will be suspended by a bracket off the corner of the building. Co-Chair Doherty asked how big the letters are. Ms. Mounsey responded by saying they are small, they know that, and it was how the logo was designed. Z. Simonis asked if it will just be this sign and nothing at the door as was there before. Ms. Mounsey stated they are not sure at this time if they will keep the existing clock sketch on the door. The previous tenant of the building was the architectural firm DC Designs which helped design the clock tower on Main Street. Eventually, they will probably add their logo to the door.

Mr. Thompson made a motion, seconded by Mr. Simonis, to recommend approval as submitted. All in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

4. Granite State Sign, requests ADR approval for replacement of existing signage with new 70.59 sf internally illuminated wall signs at 8 Loudon Road located in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.

Brian Betelho (Granite State Sign) represented the application.

This is a branding color change from yellow to white text with one additional sign (logo box) on the East façade. The North side of the building already has the logo box. The awnings shown in the renderings are to be reskinned. The LED lights on the North Façade currently go all around, they will now only make a “U” shape.

Co-Chair Doherty made a motion, seconded by Mr. Thompson, to recommend approval as submitted with the stipulation that the new sign on the east elevation be identified as new and not a reface. All in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
July 5th, 2023 Minutes

5. Burr Signs, on behalf of Jeff Maguire, requests ADR approval for a new 22 sf internally illuminated wall sign at 36 Fort Eddy Road located in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.

No one present to represent the application

Mr. Thompson made a motion, seconded by Mr. Simonis, to recommend approval as submitted. All in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

Building Permits in Performance Districts

6. Warren Street Architects, on behalf of Duprey Companies Capital Hotel Company, requests ADR approval for to renovate the façade at 70 Constitution Ave in the Opportunity Corridor Performance (OCP) District.

No one present to represent the application.

Mr. Bass gave a brief summary stating that in 2019 this site received Planning Board approval for a similar project. No construction occurred however, so their approval expired. At the June 6, 2023 ADR meeting the applicant attended and provided a submission before the committee where they voted to recommend approval. This item is on the agenda for this month due to the timing of when the applicant submitted their new application to go along with the June 6, 2023 submission.

With no one in attendance to represent the application. The Committee reviewed notes of the application

ADR recommends that the applicant consider an off white instead of the pure white as proposed.

Mr. Thompson made a motion, seconded by Co-Chair Doherty, to recommend approval as submitted with the stipulation that staff verify the proposal is consistent with what was presented to ADR last month. All in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

7. Garneau Electric LLC, on behalf of Aldi Store #90, requests ADR approval for construction of new roof mounted solar arrays at 289 Loudon Road in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District. (2023-116).

No one attended to represent the application.

Mr. Bass gave a brief summary of the project. The applicant had informed Mr. Bass that they had been working with City staff from Code and got the project to near completion before they were made aware of the requirement of the ADR application and Planning Board approval.

Brief discussion if the panels would be seen or provide glare from Loudon Road.

Mr. Thompson made a motion, seconded by Ms. Tomas, to recommend approval as submitted. All in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

Site Plan & Subdivision Applications

8. Northpoint Engineering, on behalf of ZV Investments, requests ADR review as a condition of Major Site Plan approval for construction to add six residential units to an existing 3-unit lot and expansion of parking areas at 5 Thomas Street located in the High Density Residential (RH) District (2023-103).

Aaron Thibeault (Northpoint) and Dan Martin (owner) represented the application.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
July 5th, 2023 Minutes

Mrs. Shank provided an update stating that the Planning Board has approved this project as submitted. The ADR approval had the condition that the applicant return to ADR to review colors, materials, window styles, and shutters.

Mr. Thibeault summarized the project status and the waivers obtained from the Planning Board, including not to construct the sidewalk and for driveway width in front of the garage doors. They still plan to provide a 5' concrete surface treatment in front of the garage doors to discourage parking.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if there was a question on the light pole. Mr. Thibeault replied that the lighting plan is still being developed in response to staff comments. The lighting will be pulled out of the city property and there won't be any light trespass.

Mr. Martin presented the architectural revisions made since the last time the project was before the committee.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if the chimney will be repointed. Mr. Martin said he was not sure, they will probably leave it, as it is not a functional chimney.

Ms. Tomas commented that the shutters in the presented elevations appear to be very narrow and should appear as though they can cover the windows. Mr. Martin said his intention is to have it appear correctly, a typical 32" window could have a 15" shutter.

Committee members were in support of the changes presented. No motion needed.

9. Keach Nordstrom, on behalf of James Palmisano, requests ADR approval as part of a Major Site Plan approval for construction of a new 144-unit age restricted residential development consisting of three new 3-story multifamily buildings, a clubhouse, and related site improvements and a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for disturbance of a wetland buffer at 33 Old Loudon Road in the Medium Density (RM) District. (2023-113).

Matt Peterson (KNA), Jason LaCombe (SMP Architecture) and Nick Palmisano (CPM Properties) represented the application.

Mr. Peterson provided the introduction to the project which included that the existing residential building had to come down as a safety standpoint. Each proposed unit comes with all the amenities so residents don't need to go to a different building to utilize the gym for example.

The applicant shared a video fly over rendering of the project. During the presentation Mr. Peterson identified features of the site. Mr. LaCombe mentioned that the drainage pond is intended to be a decorative feature of the area.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if they are 2 room units. Mr. LaCombe answered that they are primarily 2-bedroom units, but there are some 1 bedrooms in each building. All units will also have 1 Parking space located in the garage. The size of each unit varies, but each is in the 1,000 sf or more.

Mr. LaCombe said the sign at the entrance to site in the video is just a place holder. They understand they will be coming back for final sign design.

Ms. Hutton asked if the additional parking required for the club house has been added. Mr. Peterson said that they have added the parking, and have worked through about 80% of the other staff comments but do not plan on submitted revised plans until after the public hearing.

Ms. Tomas inquired about the sidewalks not being connected along the site. Mr. Peterson replied that they are revising the plans to provide sidewalk connectivity throughout the site.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
July 5th, 2023 Minutes

Co-Chair Doherty noted that it looks like railings are in place at the entrance and was curious if it was at all possible to adjust the grade to be able to remove the need. Mr. Peterson indicated it was something they looked at but were unable to do due to the grading required for the garages.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if the developer had any existing similar projects. Mr. Palmisano answered that Regency Village in Merrimack, Massachusetts is a good example. They have tried to implement comments they have received from tenants there into this project for Concord.

Co-Chair Hengen asked what the bump out was, and if it was the buildings stairs at the end of each building. Mr. LaCombe replied the fire stairs face the front of the building and hammerhead to provide corners and larger units inside. Every unit has an outside deck and that is what is seen at the end of the building.

Mr. Simonis indicated he couldn't read the image but asked if it was a full cut off light. Mr. Peterson gave a review of the site lighting placement shown on the site plans. Indicating they are using more of a carriage style light, which will remain along the street as well. Mr. Simonis commented that there is no site lighting in the pickle ball and pool area. Mr. Peterson said the clubhouse will have same wall packs as the rest of the site and they will add carriage lantern lights behind the clubhouse to stay uniform with the rest of the site.

Mr. LaCombe went over the architectural materials shown on the elevations. All windows will be double hung with grills. All buildings and club house will be uniform in the coloring. The clubhouse will have direct access to the pickle ball courts. It will have changing rooms, a small office, restrooms and a maintenance service section. To hold the scale of the gable end down, he wrapped a pent roof around the club house. A privacy fence might be added around the pickle ball courts and the pool.

Mr. Simonis inquired about waste collection for the site. Mr. Peterson shared the 3 locations for each building shown on site. Mr. Simonis asked if lighting would be provided for those receptacles. Mr. Peterson responded that there are wall packs nearby, but they will make sure there is appropriate illumination and revise as necessary. Mr. LaCombe also pointed out the emergency generator nearby to power sprinkler pumps, basic lighting and utility. Mr. Simonis observed he did not see lighting wall packs by the entry stairs. Mr. Peterson thought they had some but would verify.

Mr. Simonis asked about utility transformers. Mr. Peterson said they show them on the site plans, but the utility company will determine final location.

Ms. Shank suggested adding some small post and rail fence, or strategically placed shrubs in the large green space in the middle to try to make it more of an outdoor space to attract use. Co-Chair Hengen suggested a small outside gathering area outside the pickle ball area as well.

Mr. Thompson made a motion, seconded by Mr. Simonis, to recommend ADR approval as submitted with the condition lighting be provided by the solid waste receptacles and the pickle ball court and pool area. All in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

10. TFMoran Inc, on behalf of Interchange Development, requests ADR approval as part of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) approval for construction of a new wireless telecommunications facility at 23 Interchange Drive in the Industrial (IN) District. (2023-105).

Laurie Rauseo (Interchange Development) and David Rauseo (Interchange Development) presented the application.

The proposed tower is a hot tip galvanized steel 185-foot tall structure with an additional 6-foot lightning rod on top with a privacy fence on the bottom. There is room for five carrier support structures, propane tanks and transformers. Being under 200 feet tall, lights are not required.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
July 5th, 2023 Minutes

The adjacent WIN Waste smoke stack tower 500 feet away is 235 feet tall.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if it could come in black. Mr. Rauseo stated the grey provides better blend with clouds and is a result of the process of manufacturing. Mr. Thompson shared from his experience and research that there are two ways to blend wireless communication towers. Either full camouflage and disguise as a tree, which he does not think works well, or you make it grey as presented which most studies support as the least visually intrusive.

Mr. Rauseo shared that placing on decommissioned smoke stacks at times are considered, but active smoke stacks provide too much challenges for maintenance of the equipment.

Mr. Simonis asked how this tower works with the proposed residential plan to the South of the proposed tower. Mr. Rauseo showed that the abutter to the south is a 40-acre industrial zoned before the residential area starts. Ms. Shank clarified that area could be still developed as residential, but she believes there would still be enough grade difference and buffer remaining to provide screening even if that zone was developed for residential use.

Mr. Simonis mentioned potential clearance issues with trees depending on orientation of the proposed transformer.

Mr. Thompson made a motion, seconded by Co-Chair Doherty, to recommend approval as submitted. All in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

11. TFMoran Inc, on behalf of Interchange Development, requests ADR approval as part of a Major Site Plan approval for construction of two new buildings, including a 4,940 sf urgent care facility, and an approximate 30,000 sf mixed use office/retail building, and a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for shared parking at 1, 5, 7 and 9 Interchange Drive in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District. (2023-105).

Jason Hill (TF Moran), Scott Vlasak (BRH Architects) and Kyle Wheeler (BRH Architects) represented the application.

Co-Chair Doherty inquired if the tenants for the buildings are known. Mr. Hill replied that as the application shows, Concord Hospital will be the Urgent Care center. He cannot disclose any retail tenants as he is not familiar with a specific tenant.

Mr. Hill indicated they are meeting, or exceeding all landscape requirements. Sidewalks associated with building facades and entry sequences to buildings will be concrete. Other site sidewalks connecting to parking facilities and lots will be paved bituminous asphalt. Also, the plan submitted does not show, but in a recent resubmission to the City they will be extending the Whitney Road sidewalk to the end of their property on the other side of Interchange Drive.

Mr. Simonis asked how the tenants would get to the two dumpsters to the south of the big box store. Ms. Rauseo clarified the two dumpsters are for the small retail tenants and the large retail tenant will be utilizing a compactor at the loading area. She also clarified the plans before ADR are the same plans which went before Planning Board. They have since started to address staff comments, which is why they are referencing additional landscaping and items not shown on this plan.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if this the applicant has now addressed landscaping comments. Ms. Shank responded that this was Ms. Fenstermacher's project and that she will follow up afterward. Co-Chair Hengen asked that maximize trees in the parking area. Mr. Hill said they will try, and without looking at the tabulations he believes they are meeting and exceeding the landscaping requirements.

Mr. Simonis asked if it was possible to bring both transformers to the same location. Mr. Hill said it would be difficult due to grading, utility conflicts, and cost issues discouraging that move.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
July 5th, 2023 Minutes

Mr. Vlasak presented the architectural elevations and introduced the urgent care by describing the Hospital's brick look. By the foundation would be a unit masonry. Signs are just for representation and will require separate permitting. The lighting is per the proposed site plan.

Co-Chair Doherty expressed concern that such a small building included lots of materials. Stating that the look doesn't quite resemble the Concord Hospital campus as it was presented and asked about the castle parapet piece occurring around the building. Mr. Vlasak responded that it is a free standing structure meant to resemble the look and feel of the Hospital campus. The brick piers come from what he believes is a look for the newer buildings from the main hospital campus. Mr. Vlasak mentioned the Hospital still might consider some exterior alterations and floor plans, and if they did it would come back to ADR.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if they had considered applying brick solely to the entry tower. Mr. Vlasak mentioned that was one concept, but he was not sure if that concept also removed brick from the other facades.

Co-Chair Doherty asked why two facades have tall towers poking above the roof line but not on the other facades. Mr. Vlasak explained they thought the other façades looked too busy since they were shorter in width.

Ms. Rauseo shared that a new architect has been hired by the Concord Hospital for this building with the intention to change the building. The intention is to keep the same building footprint. Ms. Shank said that would be a decision of the Planning Board if, and how they would grant ADR approval. In light of this information, the Committee decided they would stop commenting on the design of the urgent care building.

Mr. Vlasak went on to present the retail building, which is not intended to change. There are three tenants, the coloring represented may not be reflective of the final building but is shown to provide distinction in the renderings. They also step down the roof lines, as they expect the larger retail tenant will require higher ceilings.

Mr. Simonis asked how the compactor fits into the retail layout and if the stairs would be removed. Mr. Hill and Mr. Vlasak said that would have to be coordinated and resolved by moving one or the other.

Ms. Tomas asked for a walkthrough of materials. Mr. Vlasak explained the base of the building will be architectural concrete block, entrance will be an aluminum and glass door front, around the masonry will be a Cementous horizontal siding; the same is true for the piers. Up high, a panelized look like an EIFS material will be used. The two blue areas next to the large tenant center will be a canopy with a glazed, false glass underneath.

Co-Chair Hengen asked why hardy plank was introduced. Scott shared that Market Basket and Liquor Store both used this material in this development.

Co-Chair Doherty brought up that the big retail tenant has a big overhanging center with some depth. The other pieces don't feel like they belong and are very thin. Mr. Vlasak responded stating they might bring that back. Co-Chair Hengen suggested they keep it thin only at the transition between retail tenants.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if the bases will be changing between tenants. Mr. Vlasak answered that the base will change with each tenant with both material and color.

Ms. Tomas asked if any lighting is being proposed. Mr. Hill responded that standard lighting and wall packs would be on building to match the style of campus but nothing extravagant. Co-Chair Doherty said this could be a good opportunity to do some nice decorative lighting. Not necessarily down lighting, but glow lighting could be considered.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
July 5th, 2023 Minutes

The committee discussed breaking the approval into three parts. Site plan, Urgent Care building and the Retail building.

Co-Chair Doherty made a motion, seconded by Mr. Thompson, to recommend ADR approval of the site plan provided it addresses staff comments. All in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Shank informed the committee, that she does not know how the Planning Board will vote or structure their ADR approval, but there is only a single ADR approval motion made by the Planning Board. If the ADR committee does not support ADR approval, they should consider not making a motion which recommends giving it.

Co-Chair Hengen stated that since the Urgent Care building will be a new design she believes that building needs to come back to ADR for approval.

Mr. Rauseo asked the committee to consider that the Urgent Care building will be relatively similar, adding comments provided by the Committee today. Co-Chair Hengen recalled that in the testimony provided earlier, a new architect with a new building was being considered.

Co-Chair Doherty made a motion, seconded by Mr. Thompson, to retract his previous motion. All in favor.

Mr. Thompson made a motion, seconded by Co-Chair Doherty, to recommend ADR approval for the site plan component with the stipulation that staff landscape comments are addressed; the retail building component be approved, with the stipulation that the cornices on the retail building return on the roof line to give depth for tenants two and three, and continue along the outer bays of the storefronts; and that the Urgent Care building be required to return to ADR prior to Planning Board approval. All in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

Other Business

12. Concord Coalition to End Homelessness exterior elevation changes on a residential structure at 120-122 Pleasant Street in the Institutional (IS) District. (2022-33) *need to consult with H. Shank if this should be brought up or not.

Ms. Shank presented an update on this application showing the elevations Mr. Halle presented to the Committee last month and Google street view photos. After the last meeting, Chris Makris, a resident, brought to staff attention that there are multiple elements of the existing building not included in those elevations. Planning Board wanted to send this application back to ADR, but the applicant contended that the project could lose financing, so the Planning Board went through the project and granted conditional approval based on its understanding of the images presented. The approval included a list of conditions that specific features be replaced. It also included a blanket condition that the carriage house and main house otherwise match what previously existed. Ms. Shank noted that staff may need some assistance clarifying what this entails. The Board also agreed, at the request of Mr. Halle, to allow a bump out feature on the front to be removed, though this was not noted in the motion.

Warren Street Architects has since provided revised elevations. Co-Chair Hengen was provided a letter by the resident Chris Makris in response to these revisions. She expressed that proportionally the items put back on the latest elevation do not resemble the existing.

Ms. Hutton said she would need to review the decisions to determine how Code would enforce.

Co-Chair Hengen sought consensus from the ADR committee that this project did not comply with the original presentation, and affirm that the architectural elements, particularly addressed in the letter by

**City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
July 5th, 2023 Minutes**

Chris Makris, be addressed by Code in conjunction with feedback from ADR, if needed, on what architectural features may be missing. There was no objection.

Item 4: Co-Chair Doherty brought up that the Committee wanted to clarify that the LED lighting on top of 8 Loudon Rd, Buffalo Wild Wings will not be moving, blinking, or otherwise significantly different. Ms. Shank will follow up with the applicant to determine if further action from ADR or permitting is required.

Mr. Thompson acknowledged that Ms. Tomas will be leaving the Committee. Members thanked her for her years of service on the Committee.

Adjournment

Co-Chair Doherty made a motion, seconded by Mr. Thompson, to adjourn the meeting at 10:59 a.m. All in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,
Alec Bass, Senior Planner

The next meeting will be held on August 1st, 2023