

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
August 1st, 2023 Minutes – DRAFT

The Architectural Design Review Committee (ADRC) held its regular monthly meeting on August 1st, 2023 in City Council Chambers, in the Municipal Complex, at 37 Green Street.

Attendees: Co-Chair Jay Doherty, Co-Chair Elizabeth Durfee Hengen, Members Claude Gentilhomme, Ron King, Timothy Thompson, and Zarron Simonis.

Absent:

Staff: Heather Shank, City Planner
Alec Bass, Senior Planner
Alicen Twardosky, Administrative Specialist II
Tracey Hutton, Zoning Administrator
Brian Tremblay, Code Inspector

Call to Order

1. Co-Chair Hengen called the meeting to order at 8:31 a.m.

Approval of Minutes

2. A motion was made by Mr. Thompson, seconded by Mr. Gentilhomme, to approve the minutes from the July 5th, 2023 meeting. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

Sign Applications

3. Classic Signs requests ADR approval for a new 36 sf internally illuminated wall sign at 8 Merchants Way in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District. This sign received a variance to allow 76 sf of building signage where 45 sf is allowed.

Ben Devall (Classic Signs) represented the application.

Mr. Devall stated that the frontage of this location faces Market Basket, therefore having little to no visibility to the main roadway. Except for slight scaling in size to accommodate the smaller façade, the sign is the same. The illumination is internal.

Co-Chair Doherty feels the canopy would balance the façade of the back side of the building. Mr. Devall felt there is lack of signage and way-finding on this side of the building.

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

4. SAR Concord, on behalf of Sugar River Bank, requests ADR approval for a new 1.625 sf non-illuminated sign at 150 North Main Street in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

Bill Lustig (Signarama) represented the application.

Mr. King voiced concerned of the precedent permitting this would set. Co-Chair Hengen concurs with his sentiments. Mr. Gentilhomme questions whether this can be called a sign. The Applicant is not trying to sell product with the display. The Applicant names examples of local businesses already doing this. Mr. King feels that the small logo on the graphic vinyl qualifies the banner as a sign.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
August 1st, 2023 Minutes – DRAFT

The Applicant is willing to remove the logo that represents signage in exchange for a vinyl band of graphics with a small logo that can be seen through the windows. The logo doesn't exceed the permitted sign square footage.

The Committee feels there may need to be a tweak in the ordinance language.

Co-Chair Doherty feels the logo and images are too crowded in one of the banners. One of the images appears unclear and blurry. Co-Chair Hengen questioned whether it is within the Committee's purview to comment on the images, if it is not a sign. Mr. Thompson states that a recommendation can be made, but not stipulations.

Co-Chair Doherty made a motion, seconded by Mr. Thompson, to recommend approval as submitted with the suggestion to increase the spacing between the logo and graphics on the right-hand side and make sure all the images, including the left side image of the people holding a key are in focus. All in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

5. Spectrum Signs, on behalf of Playabowls NH, requests ADR approval for a new 53.3 sf internally illuminated wall sign at 70 Storrs Street in the Opportunity Corridor Performance (OCP) District. (This sign received a variance to allow 69.8 sf where 21 sf is allowed).

The Applicant was not present.

Mr. Gentilhomme made a motion, seconded by Mr. Thompson, to recommend approval as submitted with the stipulation that this second sign facing the parking lot be subject to the same conditions imposed on the previously approved first sign facing Storrs Street. All in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

Site Plan & Subdivision Applications

6. Wilcox & Barton, Inc. on behalf of Havenwood Heritage Heights, requests ADR approval as part of a Major Site Plan approval for construction of three new residential buildings and related site improvements, along with a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for disturbance of a bluff buffer at 149 East Side Drive in the Medium Density (RM) District (2023-120).

Co-Chair Doherty recused himself.

Erin Lambert (Wilcox & Barton) and Courtney Carrier (Lavallee Brensinger Architects) represented the application.

Ms. Lambert did an overview of the project. They are suggesting opening up the campus. Phase Two will include demolition of existing buildings 4, 5, and 6 and a redesign to include a roadway down the middle to grant fewer dead ends. They are going to be rebuilding 1, 2, and 3-bedroom units, all having two parking spots, one being a garage. This plan will reduce the number of units. There are no 3-bedroom units in phase two. Mr. Thompson reminds the Committee that only one person needs to be 55+ to qualify as residents, therefore 3-bedroom will be advantageous.

Ms. Lambert stated that each home has a patio with the possibility of being converted to a screen porch. Landscape is under design. They have added a step into each home, but all units are also ADA accessible. The rendering displays a future pavilion accessible by the walkway that runs around the campus. This required a Conditional Use Permit for disturbance to the bluff buffer. There will not be any tree clearing in this area but there will be along East Side Drive, and fencing added matching phase 1. The walkway behind building 45 and 46 will not be connected to East Side Drive. Mr. King asked if character curves would be considered in the walkway. The utility transfer room will be located in the corner that abuts Building 40 to back feed power there until it is rebuilt. It will be softened with landscaping and screening within the permissible allowances.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
August 1st, 2023 Minutes – DRAFT

Ms. Carrier stated that the goal is to keep the façade and design in line with the character of the Phase One. In Phase One there was duplex style housing. In Phase Two there will be more townhome style. The Developers tried keeping individual style of the units. They are all one-story units. The renderings show porches as an entry way. Each unit is separated by color. There are individual gables that outline the units. The buildings have a muted palette façade proposed at this time, but the color scheme has yet to be determined.

Mr. Simonis asked about the lighting. Ms. Lambert stated that the back path is not lit because of residents' bedrooms and to avoid bringing power along the bluff. The design of the street lights is LED and 14' tall at most. They will match the Phase One design. They are decorative.

Mr. Gentilhomme made a motion, seconded by Mr. Thompson, to recommend ADR approval as submitted with the recommendation that the client consider adjusting the sidewalk along East Side Drive to have some curvature to it. All in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

7. Nobis Group, on behalf of Dakota Partners, requests ADR approval as part of a Major Site Plan approval for construction of 3 new 3-story multifamily buildings totaling 98 units and related site improvements and a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for construction of fewer parking spaces than is required at 103 Old Loudon Road in the Medium Density (RM) District (2023-124).

Morgan Dunson (Nobis), Ed Wojcik (Ed Wojcik Architects), Mark Pilotte (Dakota Partners) represented the application.

The Applicant is seeking a Conditional Use Permit to reduce parking spots. Mr. Dunson reminded the Committee that there are existing structures that will remain intact. The Applicant may sell back this portion to the person who currently resides there. It is on the National Register of Historic Places. The Concord Coach Society once owned and occupied the premises.

This development abuts the proposed Casino project. There are wetlands that abut the property on other sides. Co-Chair Hengen asked whether or not the Applicants considered changing the design of the parking to be on the outside of the buildings. The Applicant assured the Committee that they configured it as carefully as they could with very limited space available. The Applicant also stated that the parking layout as presented provided views of the wooded buffer from the units.

Mr. Wojcik presented an image and color samples to the Committee that reflected the anticipated design and façade of the building. The darker, richer, bolder color scheme and design of the building is intended to blend with the background of trees. There will be board and batten siding along the bottom half and wood shingles representing the top half. Gables will add architectural appeal. The roof will be traditional shingle. They are planning on metal roofing for the entry way gables. The Committee appreciates the vinyl window design.

The blank portion of the siding houses an exhausted utility room. The Applicant intends to screen this. Co-Chair Hengen suggested the possibility of false (blind) windows instead.

Mr. Gentilhomme stated that the Committee will hold the designer to what the drawings depict in the building elevations, not the renderings which are missing some details. Mr. King would like to see the gable drawings in the physical renderings as well.

Mr. Simonis felt the lighting was appropriate. Ms. Dunson stated that snow storage will be in the center of the property. Mr. Thompson recommends they include the possibility of having snow removed off site as needed.

A future landscaped sign is proposed at the entrance driveway. The Applicant is aware that this requires a separate application approval.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
August 1st, 2023 Minutes – DRAFT

Mr. Gentilhomme made a motion, seconded by Mr. Thompson, to recommend ADR approval as submitted, not including the sign, with the recommendation that mechanical areas of the outside of the building include architectural details, such as false windows, based on the architectural structure drawings presented. All in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

Other Business

8. Update on Hotel Concord

Ms. Shank has reached out to this property owner and has not heard back. This is to review the lighting based off of a condition of approval previously received which has lapsed. She will reach out to him again. The Committee is asking the owner to reconsider the intensity of the lit rim of the building. The blue is too bright, and other colors not vibrant enough. Co-Chair Hengen suggested giving him a deadline to have this completed by. Mr. King wants this added to the agenda as ongoing issue.

9. Update on 120-122 Pleasant Street

Staff made a site visit since the last ADR meeting. Ms. Shank, during the site visit, learned of a small building addition proposed without notifying Staff, or identifying these changes in what was previously proposed. The Applicant told Ms. Shank that they will return to Planning Board with plenty of time to address Staff comments and show the revisions.

Code and the Building Inspector have also reached out to them. The Code Department is staying on top of this project knowing that the Applicants need to be back for approvals.

Staff will add this Applicant to the agenda as updates become known.

10. The Committee is currently two members short. Ms. Shank will reach out to Doug Proctor regarding his interest in serving.

Adjournment

Co-Chair Hengen made a motion, seconded by Mr. Thompson, to adjourn the meeting at 9:54 a.m. All in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,
Alicen Twardosky
Administrative Specialist II

The next meeting will be held on September 5th, 2023