

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

The Architectural Design Review Committee (ADRC) held its regular monthly meeting on December 5, 2023 in Large Second Floor Conference Room, in City Hall, at 41 Green Street.

Attendees: Co-Chair Jay Doherty, Co-Chair Elizabeth Durfee Hengen, Members Douglas Proctor, Ron King, and Claude Gentilhomme.

Absent: Zarron Simonis, Alternate Member Amanda Savage

Staff: Alec Bass, Senior Planner
Krista Tremblay, Administrative Specialist
Brian Tremblay, Code Inspector

Call to Order

1. Co-Chair Doherty called the meeting to order at 8:32 a.m.

Approval of Minutes

2. On a motion made by Co-Chair Hengen, seconded by Member King, the committee voted to approve the minutes from the October 31, 2023 meeting. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

Sign Applications

3. Precision Sign Installation, Inc, on behalf of Panera Bread, requests ADR approval for a new 68 sf internally illuminated wall sign, a new 5.8 sf internally illuminated window sign and a new 20.6 sf internally illuminated pylon tenant panel at 75 Fort Eddy Road in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.

No one present for this application. Mr. Bass summarized the application.

Co-Chair Hengen made a motion to approve as submitted. Mr. King seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Signs East, LLC, on behalf of Donohue, Beasley & Ferber, requests ADR approval for a new 12 sf non-illuminated free-standing sign at 55 Hall Street in the Opportunity Corridor Performance (OCP) District.

Tor Larson (Donahue) presented the application. Mr. Larson explained they are replacing like kind just changing attorney names and colors.

Co-Chair Hengen felt the sign looked busy.

Mr. Gentilhomme made a motion to approve as submitted. Mr. Proctor seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

5. Little River Oriental Rugs, requests ADR approval for a new awning with 6.77 sf of non-illuminated signage at 10 North Main Street in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

Gerry Carrier presented application. Mr. Carrier stated this is a replacement of existing awning and installing new material. The existing name as shown on the existing awning will stay the same they are just replacing the awning material.

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

Co-Chair Hengen moved for approval as submitted. Mr. Gentilhomme seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

6. Advantage Signs, on behalf of Live Free Heating and Cooling, requests ADR approval for a new 62.48 sf externally illuminated free standing sign at 128 Airport Road in the Industrial (IN) District.

Josh Messinger (Advantage Signs) presented the application. Mr. Messinger explained this is a change in ownership of the building with a new tenant moving in to the property.

Co-Chair Hengen wanted to know why a phone number and website on the sign when most people that see the sign will be driving past the location.

Mr. Messinger explained this is how the brand is for the company he is representing.

Co-Chair Hengen suggested to change the blue band with the website/phone information, and replace with the street address.

The applicant will go back to his client with these suggestions.

Co-Chair Hengen moves to approval with the stipulation that the amount of words be substantially reduced with a focus identifying the name of the business and the street address. Mr. Gentilhomme seconded. Co-Chair Doherty wanted to make note that when the space for lease changes they will need to submit another application for approval. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

7. Signarama of Concord, on behalf of 45 Constitution, LLC, requests ADR approval for a new 5 sf non-illuminated monument sign panel and a new 24 sf non-illuminated wall sign at 45 Constitution Ave in the Opportunity Corridor Performance (OCP) District.

No one present for this application.

Co-Chair Doherty stated that the MLS is really hard to read on the white with the silver.

Mr. Gentilhomme made a motion to approve the application as submitted with the recommendation that the yellow used on both signs be detailed to improve readability by adding a more intense yellow or outline the yellow with black. Mr. King seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

8. Barlo Signs, on behalf of Sullivan Tire, requests ADR approval for a new 66 sf internally illuminated wall sign, a new 71 sf internally illuminated and 15 sf internally illuminated pylon panel signs at 63 Hall Street located in the Opportunity Corridor Performance (OCP) District.

Lauren Pasquarella (Barlo Signs) presented the application. The building is now Sullivan Tire and requesting to change out the sign on the front of the business and existing pylon sign.

Co-Chair Hengen made a motion to approve as submitted. Mr. King seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

9. Signarama of Concord, on behalf of Granite Edvance, requests ADR approval for a new 29 sf externally illuminated free standing sign at 3 Barrell Court in the Office Park Performance (OFP) District.

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

No one is present to represent the application.

Mr. Gentilhomme made a motion to approve as submitted. Mr. King seconded. Co-Chair Doherty questioned the space between the pieces of granite and it appears the sign is floating. Mr. Tremblay stated they extended the bracket. Mr. Gentilhomme pointed out there is no street address. Mr. Gentilhomme withdrew the motion. Mr. King seconded. The motion was withdrawn.

Mr. Gentilhomme made a motion to approve as submitted with the stipulation that the street addresses is added to the sign, possible at the top. Co-Chair Hengen Seconded. Discussion. Co-Chair Doherty suggested to add to the post. Mr. King was not sure how they would be able to add the street number. . King cannot see how the applicant is going to be able to add number(s) to sign to make readable. Mr. Gentilhomme withdrew the motion. Co-Chair Hengen seconded. The motion was withdrawn.

Mr. Gentilhomme made a motion to approve the sign as submitted with the stipulation that street address numbers be added to the sign, post or be visible on the building from the street. Co-Chair Hengen seconded. Discussion. Mr. King is not comfortable the applicant will be able to make the sign look good by adding the street numbers. Co-Chair Doherty asked for clarification from Mr. King on what he would like to see on the sign. Co-Chair Doherty asked Mr. King if he is looking for Architectural Design Review to give more direction or if the sign application needs to come back to Architectural Design Review. Mr. King said either one. The motion passed 4-1 in favor, Mr. King was opposed.

10. Barlo Signs, on behalf of Liberty, requests ADR approval for a new 24 sf internally illuminated wall sign and a new 0.27 sf non-illuminated pylon tenant panel at 254 Sheep Davis Road in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.

Lauren Pasquarella (Barlo Signs) is present to represent this application. Liberty Utilities has re-branded from Liberty Utilities to just Liberty. Just changing the face on existing wall sign and a tenant cabinet that is non-illuminated.

Mr. King made a motion to approve as submitted. Co-Chair Hengen seconded. Discussion. Co-Chair Doherty explained the pylon makes sense. However, the sign on the building questioned with the shape of the box they did not stack the logo on top of Liberty.

Ms. Pasquarella stated that was an option. However, the customer wanted the logo to the left as that is their logo lock up is at all of their locations.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if there is a blackout panel so the logo and name of company are illuminated.

Ms. Pasquarella is familiar with an opaque background so only the lettering will be illuminated.

Mr. King stated it looks crowded on the left and made recommendation to center.

Mr. King made a motion to withdraw the motion. Co-Chair Hengen seconded. The motion was withdrawn.

Co-Chair Hengen made a motion to approve with the stipulation that they have an opaque background on the building sign. Mr. King seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

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

11. Signarama of Concord, on behalf of Reflections Skin Suite, requests ADR approval for a new 2.53 non-illuminated wall sign at 109 North State Street in the Civic Performance (CVP) District.

No one present for this application.

Mr. Gentilhomme made a motion to approve sign as submitted with stipulation there be a black frame around the sign to make it distinctive. Mr. King seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

12. Advantage Signs, on behalf of The Loft Hair Studio, requests ADR approval for a new 12 sf internally illuminated wall sign, 2.62 sf non-illuminated window sign, and a 9.33 sf non-illuminated blade sign at 106 South State Street in the Urban Transitional (UT) District.

Josh Messinger (Advantage Signs) is present for this application. This is for an illuminated sign above the door and blade sign to left of the door and graphics on the door.

Co-Chair Doherty asked applicant how they could have the sign with an opaque background with the logo.

Mr. Messinger suggested they could draw a box around the perimeter. The blade sign will not be illuminated.

Co-Chair Hengen stated this is over signed. However, understands they are filling existing sign boxes.

Co-Chair Hengen made a motion for approval on the three signs as submitted with the stipulation the building sign has an opaque background and with the recommendation that the building sign be removed. Mr. King seconded. Discussion. Co-Chair Doherty asked for clarification. Co-Chair Hengen stated the stipulation is for the opaque background on the building sign, and the recommendation is that the building sign not be installed at all (due to unnecessary excessive signage). Mr. Proctor asked where the address is located. Mr. Messinger explained the street address is located on the building already. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

13. Advantage Signs, on behalf of Table NH, requests ADR approval for a new 5 sf non-illuminated hanging sign at 57 North Main Street in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

Josh Messinger (Advantage Signs) presented the application for an existing sign for Table NH. It will be a non-illuminated hanging sign.

Co-Chair Doherty pointed out the proportions of the logo above Table would allow white space to be filled.

Mr. Messinger asked Co-Chair Doherty if is he asking about the white space and there being too much of it.

Co-Chair Doherty said if they moved the logo next to Table the sign could be bigger.

Mr. Messinger will bring back to the applicant with the recommendation.

Mr. Gentilhomme made a motion to approve the sign as submitted. Mr. King seconded. Discussion. Mr. Proctor stated the sign are nice. However, might not be able to see from across the street. Mr.

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

King suggested to bolden Table and off set it to make it a little thicker. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

Co-Chair Doherty explained we are going out of normal agenda order and going to agenda item number 16.

14. Barlo Signs, on behalf of Nucar, requests ADR approval for one (1) new 61.25 sf non-illuminated wall signs and one (1) new 28.11 sf internally illuminated pylon panel at 13 Manchester Street in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.

Lauren Pasquarella (Barlo Sign) presented the application.

Co-Chair Doherty asked applicant about the location of the sign on the building.

Ms. Pasquarella stated the sign is going in location where there is existing electrical for the sign.

Mr. King stated from a distance it looks like the car is off the sign and suggested to shrink it down a bit.

Ms. Pasquarella will make that recommendation.

Co-Chair Doherty questioned the height of the sign proposed on the building. Mr. Tremblay stated the sign cannot be above the second window sill for code compliance.

Mr. King made a motion to approve as submitted with the recommendation that on the wall sign there be more space between Nucar and the car logo and with the understanding that approval also only for the upper part of the pylon sign. Co-Chair Hengen seconded. Discussion. Co-Chair Doherty stated the Nucar should be centered as it would be visually pleasing. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

15. Yesco Sign and Lighting, on behalf of H & R Block, requests ADR approval for a new 30.72 sf internally illuminated wall sign at 240 Loudon Road in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.

No one is present for this application.

Mr. Bass stated that the sign is noted as externally illuminated on the application, however if you look at what was submitted it appears to be internally illuminated.

Mr. Tremblay noted that one of the windows is being removed for a door to be installed.

Mr. Gentilhomme made a motion to approve the sign as submitted with stipulations that the sign be in alignment with the adjacent sign for the smoothie shop and the sign be located such that the left edge of the green square be lined up with the left edge of the left window. Additionally, the raceway be painted the same color of the wall of which it is mounted. Mr. King seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

Co-Chair Doherty after agenda item number 13 went out of normal agenda order and skipped to agenda item 16.

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

16. Salon Lotus requests ADR approval for a new 4.86 sf non-illuminated hanging sign and a new 4 sf non-illuminated window sign at 57 North Main Street in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

No one is present for this application.

Mr. King stated the salon is really hard to read.

Co-Chair Doherty said there seems to be some space between their logo and salon. Suggested to enlarge logo and salon.

Co-Chair Hengen suggested to tighten the word salon and move up a little.

Mr. Tremblay, City of Concord Code Inspector, stated the sign is preexisting. It was found to have no permit and it is already installed. Co-Chair Hengen asked what would happen if Architectural Design Review did not approve the sign. Mr. Tremblay stated they would have to change their sign. Co-Chair Hengen asked if they approved the sign with the recommendation and it goes to the Planning Board what happens. Mr. Tremblay stated the sign would stay.

Co-Chair Hengen made a motion to approve as submitted with the recommendation that the word salon be moved up and enlarged to improve readability and more space be introduced the word lotus and the bottom of the sign to improve graphic balance and readability. Mr. King seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

17. Green Bear Signs and Graphic, LLC, on behalf of Buba Kitchen, requests ADR approval for one (1) new 8 sf externally illuminated hanging blade sign and two (2) 7 sf non-illuminated window signs at 148 North Main Street in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

Co-Chair Hengen made a motion to approve as submitted. Mr. Gentilhomme seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

Conditional Use Permit Applications

18. Jason Gagnon, on behalf of Bank of New Hampshire, requests ADR approval as part of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for two non-illuminated signs above the first floor at 167 N. Main Street in the Civic Performance (CVP) District. (2023-141)

Jason Gagnon (Sousa Signs) and Tiffany Baert (Bank of New Hampshire) presented the application. Mr. Gagnon stated they are looking for approval for two non-illuminated wall signs which are located on the drive thru portion of the building. The two existing signs are PVC with vinyl. They are looking to change out the existing signs with the same material and different colors with vinyl. The hope is to keep the same height as it currently sits. If coming from the southbound on North Main Street there are multiple trees. The main entry and wall sign are free standing and you do not see until you get on top of the building. There is potential for people to drive right by the location. On the south side if going northbound there are a few trees which hinders the view.

Co-Chair Doherty stated the sign is a simple image which he is not sure if it tells him this is a bank. He likes the little logo.

Ms. Baert stated that is the logo part of the brand. The intent is for this to be recognizable.

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

Co-Chair Hengen feels this is elegant way to solve the visibility situation.

Mr. King likes the old sign that was square and fit in the chimney. He feels the symmetry odd. Mr. King stated he would like to see that on a box.

Co-Chair Doherty respectfully disagrees with Mr. King. He likes the angle.

Co-Chair Hengen loves the juxtaposition of the modern image that is floating on a very traditional classic building. She asked if the logo brand is important to have it facing in a specific direction.

Ms. Baert stated yes, it is important for the sign to be facing in a certain position.

Co-Chair Hengen made a motion to approve as submitted. Mr. Gentilhomme seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

Site Plan & Subdivision Applications

19. Altus Engineering, on behalf of Ryan Taber, requests ADR approval as part of a Major Subdivision approval for a 9-unit residential condominium development at 15 Hot Hole Pond Road in the Open Space Residential (RO) District. (2023-140)

Ryan Taber (Altus Engineering) presented the application.

Mr. Gentilhomme asked if this is condominium or separate properties? Mr. Taber stated it is a condominium development.

Co-Chair Doherty asked what part has in the project? Mr. Taber stated he is the developer.

Mr. Bass noted that these are not separate lots within the condominium. They are limited common areas.

Mr. Proctor asked if there are more than one unit in each building? Mr. Taber stated it is a single-family unit that is classified as a condominium.

Co-Chair Doherty pointed out on the site plan it appears to be pretty tight building areas compared to the building designs presented.

Co-Chair Doherty stated the driveway for unit five is shown on the plans as 24 feet wide with the driveway off the front of the house.

Mr. Taber explained for units one thru nine this is a layout area. The proposed plans are subject to change.

Co-Chair Doherty pointed out if the driveway is 24 feet that is half the size of the house. He stated he is not sure with the houses proposed how they will work with the driveway.

Mr. Taber stated the driveway might not be 24 feet. This is still in process of having an engineering review. This is not a finalized plan being represented today.

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

Mr. Proctor questioned what is being asked of the Architectural Design Review Committee today?

Mr. Bass explained they are being asked to review the site plan, any landscaping, pedestrian flow activity and any architectural design. The developer isn't planning to be the one to construct the houses so there are elements which will be subject to change. The curb cuts will remain the same and houses will need to be built in the proposed building areas, however driveway location off the street and size and layout of houses could all change within those parameters. ADR approval conditions by the Planning Board would need to be followed.

Co-Chair Doherty asked about the houses in the circle it is stated there is 50 feet minimum between the buildings how can they use the houses they showed with the site plan as they will not fit at the location.

Mr. Taber explained the driveway can flip flop. He stated the driveway might not be located in the exact location on the site plan due to it not working at the site. Each location will have a survey completed. These are proposed homes that will be up to the builder and homeowner as to the type of house is built that falls within the condominium regulations.

Mr. King asked about the contours of the property.

Mr. Taber stated they are two feet. The lot has a lot of steep grades.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if there the homes will have a walk-out basement.

Mr. Taber stated potentially.

Mr. Proctor asked if there is a design guideline for the houses people will have built?

Mr. Taber explained this is a private condominium development. The home owner will have some say. However, it will have to fall within the condominium guidelines. Which is single family units comprised of vinyl siding, hardy plank, asphalt or metal roofing and vinyl windows. The colors of the houses can be determined. This will be similar to the neighboring development across the street.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if there is opportunity for the homeowner to have a single-story house. Mr. Taber stated yes. However, it will cost the home owner more money due to constructional components.

Mr. King does not understand how ADR can approve a site plan that is not accurate. Mr. Bass stated they should make recommendations based off the site plan they have. Alterations do occur, and the Applicant wants as much flexibility as possible, however any changes at the time of building permit issuance will be checked against the approved plans. Changes cannot be significantly different from what was submitted on the site plans.

Mr. Gentilhomme noted the homeowner gets to choose the architecture design of house.

Mr. Taber stated the association is the one that will handle the property. Each building will have their own floor plans.

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

Mr. King asked about the septic system and the location. Mr. Bass stated each unit will have its own force line going into leech fields.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if the home owner can hire their own builder. Mr. Taber stated yes.

Co-Chair Hengen asked about the front entrance and if the front door or the garage doors are facing the street. The plans suggest that some of the houses have side entrances, in which case, the presentation to the street will be garage doors and not a front door.

Co-Chair Hengen wants to set basic premises. One being that the driveway is not full width the entire length. The curb cuts are reduced to a single lane and if needed to flare out when approaching the garage. Another that there always have the front door facing towards the street.

Mr. Taber stated both of those requests are acceptable.

Mr. King wanted to know if landscaping was to be discussed. Mr. Bass said yes, and stated that they are required to provide landscaping along the street.

Mr. Taber explained they will do a selective harvest and try not clear cut.

Co-Chair Hengen requested fully matured street trees planted at the needed intervals as already outline in the City of Concord regulations. Also, if the garage if facing the street that they be recessed from the primary plain of the house at least five feet.

Mr. Taber questioned comments made about a different development and five feet recessing might be an issue.

Co-Chair Doherty suggested to do three feet instead of five feet for recess on the garage.

Co-Chair Hengen suggested to go with at least four feet for the front plane of the garage is recessed.

Mr. Gentilhomme stated the most important item is that the home present the main entrance to the street. This way people know how to enter the building. He is suggesting a 12-foot curb cut for entrance to street.

Mr. Proctor asked for a document to be able to decide on how to proceed in reference to architecture.

Mr. Bass stated that the ADR approval will apply to everything in the application. It depends on if they want more information to be able to decide. If an ADR condition exists that the front doors need to face the street then that would be reviewed at the time of the building permit application.

Mr. Taber explained what he is looking for now is down the road. The new owner applies for a building permit. Based on this meeting and other documents there will be a set of plans for the building permit. They can look at the plans and see based the garage is recessed, the front door facing the street. Which will then be approved. However, if someone purchases lot two and they have the garage ten feet in front of the house. The plans for that house do not meet criteria as previously agreed.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if each house is being built they will come to ADR?

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

Mr. Bass stated not unless that was a condition of ADR approval. However, a condition like that could be cumbersome for the development.

Co-Chair Doherty asked for a check list from the applicant.

Mr. Taber stated he will make a check list.

Mr. Gentilhomme asked how are ADR going to proceed?

Mr. King moved to table discussion until January 2nd meeting. Mr. Gentilhomme seconded.

Mr. Gentilhomme stated there have been clear stipulations as to what they want to see moving forward. The driveway needs to have a curb cut no more than twelve-feet. The plane of the front entrance be prominent. The front entrance needs to face the street.

Mr. Taber asked if there is a way to prevent delay.

Co-Chair Doherty asked for the list before the next month's meeting.

Mr. Gentilhomme pointed out the applicant is trying to move forward with moving earth. He feels they can approve the plan for the lots, location of building and requirements for setbacks and building code. Mr. Gentilhomme feels ADR can release the approval for the site.

Co-Chair Doherty disagrees. He feels there are too many questions.

Mr. Proctor point out there are no setbacks. Only building separation requirements.

Mr. Bass stated that the applicant cannot begin any site work until they received final approval. ADR approval is required as part of the final approval.

Co-Chair Hengen asked Mr. Bass what they need for ADR approval, or how to move forward.

Mr. Bass stated the ADR Committee could put forward an ADR recommendation with general parameters for the architecture and layout of the buildings and the site. If the committee is not comfortable with that, they could recommend against ADR approval at this time and ask the applicant to come back with more applicable houses to fit the lots.

Mr. Gentilhomme made a motion to approve as submitted with the condition that the applicant will come back and present the check list for the design of the individual homes that will be built at the site.

Mr. Bass stated that granting ADR approval with a condition that the applicant return is hard, and makes it difficult to provide anything beyond recommendations afterward. Mr. Bass stated it is cleaner if the ADR approval is not provided until the committee is satisfied.

Mr. Taber asked for ADR approval under the conditions provided by the committee.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if the applicant were to go to planning board if they would give conditional approval to finalize with ADR.

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

Mr. Bass stated he believes Planning Board has at times granted conditional approval for items other than ADR, however the Applicant had to return back to Planning Board for that ADR approval prior to final approval.

Co-Chair Hengen asked Co-Chair Doherty about his concern about setback for the potential houses on the lot being too big.

Co-Chair Doherty stated he feels this is going to be a very particular style house that will have to fit on the lot. He does not feel a colonial house, as presented, will fit on the proposed lot.

Mr. Proctor asked for a document with more information. At this time, he feels the only item can approve is the street scape.

Mr. Gentilhomme agrees with Co-Chair Doherty based on the lot and the design of the houses presented it is hard to see how it is going to work.

Mr. King agrees with Co-Chair Doherty to see a typical house drawn out on the lot to be able to decide.

Co-Chair Doherty is aware in the past this has moved forward to Planning Board with the recommendation of conditional approval and that the applicant needs to return to ADR to finalize pieces.

Mr. Bass explained the applicant will still go before the Planning Board on December 20 even if you are not recommending ADR approval at this time. The Planning Board could agree and not grant approval.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if Planning Board could over-ride ADR.

Mr. Bass stated yes.

Mr. King asked if the applicant could come to ADR with the lot layout, driveway and nothing else and that could be approved. Then he can come back with the house layout.

Mr. Bass stated that ADR approval is a single element, it cannot be split.

Mr. Gentilhomme is asking for the applicant to come back to get the ADR approval. He is asking for the applicant to come back and present the guidelines, colors and materials.

Co-Chair Doherty pointed out front door and garage needs to be included in the guidelines.

Co-Chair Doherty stated this application can move to Planning Board. However, the applicant needs to come back to ADR.

Co-Chair Hengen noted the Planning Board needs to be made aware of ADR's comments for this application.

Co-Chair Hengen made a motion to not recommend ADR approval at this time and the applicant return to ADR with more thought given to the following: front entrances for each house face toward the street, garage front walls are subservient to the primary façade of the house usually by a slight

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

recess, driveway curb cuts be reduced to a single lane and flare out when approaching the garage doors if necessary, architectural designs return to ensure designs proposed can be accommodated on the lots, a uniform setback provided for each house façade, and that there be mature trees along the street. Mr. Gentilhomme seconded.

Discussion.

Mr. Taber stated the street trees will be planted based on the requirements from the City of Concord. The uniformity around the road in the cul-de-sac asking about edge of street to front of house. He explained he will try to keep all setbacks uniform but due to grade changes it might be difficult to comply.

Mr. Proctor noted the applicant needs to come back with a checklist based on that comments above.

Mr. Taber asked if he can have one set of plans for the lot.

Co-Chair Hengen stated that is fine.

Co-Chair Doherty requested when he comes back with the plans that they will work for the lots as there are two different orientations.

Mr. King asked if there could be a change from what that they do not approve. They like the concept and asked if Co-Chair Hengen could change the wording on the motion.

Co-Chair Hengen stated they can say they endorse the overall project but they are not yet ready to grant approval.

Mr. Gentilhomme stated they endorse the project. However, they need more information to approve.

Mr. Bass stated one consideration could be the condominium declaration specific to the design of the houses be provided to ADR. He asked ADR Committee if there are any discussion to be had on the site plan presented.

Mr. King asked if there will be a sign at the front entrance to the property?

Mr. Taber stated yes. However, not at this time.

Mr. King noted there is no sign on the site plan.

Co-Chair Doherty stated the location of the sign needs to be identified in the site plan. He also wanted to know if each home owner is taking care of their trash or if there is trash removal.

Mr. Taber stated it will be built into the condominium association. They will have to sources a trash removal company.

Mr. King asked about lighting.

Mr. Taber stated there is no street lighting. He asked if a sign is required.

Co-Chair Hengen stated there is no sign required. However, if there was a sign ADR will review it.

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

Mr. Gentilhomme stated one of the things that makes a place feel quaint is having narrow street.

Mr. Taber explained he wanted to have a twenty-foot wide road with two-foot shoulder on each side. However, engineering came back with having a twenty-six-foot road. He feels the twenty-six-foot road is excessive.

Co-Chair Doherty stated they will not go against the engineering comments.

Co-Chair Doherty stated there is a motion on the table. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

Other Business

20. Concord Hotel Lighting

Mr. Bass has no update.

Co-Chair Hengen stated this has been discussed at the last several meetings. Co-Chair Hengen noted there are lighting guidelines included within the *Main Street Design Guide* (adopted 2018). She would like a resolution from the Architectural Design Review Committee that notes the following: (1) the Planning Board gave a temporary approval for the cornice lighting for the Hotel Concord; (2) the six-month trial period expired last February and the lights are still the same color and intensity; (3) the Hotel Concord needs to return next month to the ADR meeting on January 2, 2024 to discuss the lights, or the City will order them to turn them off until they do return to ADR. She further suggested that the City send the owners the page (13) from the guidelines about architectural lighting. The guidelines are pretty specific and helpful for approaching how to light a cornice: Architectural lighting is intended to illuminate architectural features. Architectural lighting should be static and not flash, blink or create moving patterns. Lighting should be coordinated with the other buildings, store fronts and the street. There was consensus among the ADR members that these steps be taken.

Mr. Gentilhomme and Co-Chair Doherty agree with Co-Chair Hengen.

Mr. Bass will follow up with code.

Adjournment

Mr. King made a motion, seconded by Member Mr. Gentilhomme, to adjourn the meeting at 10:48 a.m. All in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,
Krista Tremblay

The next meeting will be held on January 2, 2023