

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 2, 2024 Minutes

The Architectural Design Review Committee (ADRC) held its regular monthly meeting on April 2, 2024 in Council Chambers, at 37 Green St.

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

Absent: Co-Chair Elizabeth Durfee Hengen and Amanda Savage

Staff: Alec Bass, Senior Planner
Krista Tremblay, Administrative Specialist II
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 Mr. Proctor, seconded by Co-Chair Doherty, the committee voted to approve the minutes from the March 5, 2024 meeting. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

Sign Applications

3. Advantage Signs, on behalf of WB4, LLC, requests architectural design review approval for a new 39.75-square-foot internally illuminated pylon sign at 2 Home Ave located in the Opportunity Corridor Performance (OCP) District.

Josh Messinger represented the application.

Mr. Bass stated a lot of these signs received approval in the previous month and the applicant is returning only for approval of the pylon sign, which previously was more of a monument structure that was non-compliant. This proposal is now compliant with zoning.

Mr. Messinger stated they made a couple changes to the sign to meet the criteria with the ordinance.

Mr. King asked what is the “2” for?

Mr. Messinger stated it is a play on the address, 2 Home Ave and 2 Home Fitness.

Co-Chair Doherty stated it looks great and appreciates the night rendering, noting that graphically in the center of the “o” of “home” it should be black.

Mr. Messinger stated he thinks that will be black.

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

4. Jeff Burnham, on behalf of Capital City Billiards, requests architectural design review approval for an existing 60-square-foot internally illuminated wall sign at 219 Fisherville Rd located in the General Commercial (CG) District.

No one present to represent this application.

Co-Chair Doherty stated this is an existing business that has already installed the sign prior to obtaining the

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 2, 2024 Minutes

appropriate approvals. He stated a typical white background is interesting because of the capital and there is no clean hard line to create an opaque background.

Mr. Gentilhomme stated you would create a silhouette around it.

Mr. Tremblay noted there is also a fixture on the sign that is not working. It is an older fixture and replacement bulbs cannot be located. This sign was done by someone they knew and put it over the existing sign that was already there. Half of the fixture is lit and the other half is not lit.

Co-Chair Doherty stated he would not want to see them change to LED as it could be blinding, asking if this is okay if they do not change to a bright LED?

Mr. King asked how bright was the sign?

Mr. Proctor stated it is pretty representative of what they see on the application. The light in the gables lights up the area more than the sign's internal illumination.

Mr. King stated if they cannot get parts for this sign and when that last bulb no longer works the sign will be dead unless they put in new fixtures.

Mr. Bass suggested if the committee feels like the current lighting does not create the same adverse effect as the LED, then a condition could be made that if the lighting source ever were to be replaced the sign will then be required to have an opaque background.

Mr. Proctor suggested that or they have to come back to the ADR Committee.

Mr. Gentilhomme made a motion to approve as submitted with the condition that, prior to the change in lighting source within the sign box, the applicant must return for architectural design review approval for the new lighting source pertinent to its impact on the sign's appearance.

Mr. King stated there should be something added about why they are concerned with the sign's appearance in regards to a new lighting source.

Mr. Gentilhomme stated the concern is over the sign being too bright. Mr. Gentilhomme noted the applicant should strive to keep the new lighting at a low level.

Mr. Bass stated they did not reference opaque background. If they change the light source or add an opaque background would that satisfy the concern and not require the applicant's return for architectural design review approval prior to installation of a new lighting source?

Mr. Gentilhomme stated yes and that should be added to the motion.

Mr. King stated the motion should make it clear that they should have come for architectural design review approval and they went around that process. Mr. King noted that is why they are concerned about the sign.

Co-Chair Doherty stated he has the same concern as Mr. King. Co-Chair Doherty is concerned about other people just putting up signs and doing whatever they want.

Mr. King asked if they can put something in motion that this clearly goes against the architectural design review guidelines.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 2, 2024 Minutes

Mr. Gentilhomme rescinded his previous motion.

Mr. Gentilhomme made a motion to recommend approval as submitted with the condition that, due to the committee's concern that the applicant installed the sign prior to receiving architectural design review approval and concern of the brightness of the sign without an opaque background, that if the lighting source is changed within the sign box an opaque background shall be installed behind the white, or the applicant shall return for a new architectural design review approval.

Mr. King seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

5. Andrew Mailloux, on behalf of Szechuan Gardens, requests architectural design review approval for existing 18-square-foot and 24-square-foot internally illuminated building signs at 108 Fisherville Rd in the General Commercial (CG) District.

No one present to represent this application.

Mr. Bass stated that these signs were discovered by the Code Enforcement Officer as not have the required sign permit application for their installation.

Co-Chair Doherty stated it is interesting because they are probably not LED and back before architectural design review guidelines asked for opaque.

Mr. Bass stated the 1991 design review guidelines do reference opaque backgrounds for signs.

Co-Chair Doherty stated there are two signs. The first one that has the trees in front of it seems pretty straightforward. Co-Chair Doherty stated the second sign has typically more text than they like to see on a sign.

Mr. Tremblay stated the one covered by trees is facing Fisherville Rd and the other one is facing the parking lot.

Mr. Gentilhomme made a motion to recommend approval of the signs as submitted with the condition that if the signs or lighting source are replaced, the applicant must return for a new permit application and architectural design review approval prior to installation. Mr. King seconded.

Discussion

Co-Chair Doherty stated he is weary from what Mr. King stated before that the committee is setting a precedent that if they already have a sign installed and come for architectural design review approval after the fact, then they can put whatever they want on the sign. Co-Chair Doherty also noted he is worried about having a lot of text on the sign.

All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

6. Classic Signs, Inc, on behalf of Sullivan Tire, requests architectural design review approval for a new 55.15-square-foot internally illuminated building sign at 63 Hall St in the Opportunity Corridor Performance (OCP) District.

Justin Parker represented the application.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 2, 2024 Minutes

Mr. Bass stated this is back before the committee because the applicant had to change the dimensions of the sign, which required a new permit, and new architectural design review.

Mr. Parker added it may have come before the committee under a different company.

Mr. Bass provided a summary of the recent history at this location, stating Sullivan Tire requested design review approval for sign applications, and then returned for modifications to the exterior of the building and an awning. The awning required a re-sizing of this sign application before them now.

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

7. Daniel Weed, on behalf of Weed Family Automotive, requests architectural design review approval for two existing 24-square-foot non-illuminated building signs and one existing 47.5-square-foot externally illuminated building sign at 124 Storrs St in the Opportunity Corridor Performance (OCP) District.

Dan Weed represented the application.

Mr. Tremblay stated the signs are existing unpermitted signs.

Mr. Weed stated that all these signs are actually non-illuminated, though one says it had external illumination. There is a wall pack close to that sign, but it does not illuminate the sign; rather, it is there for the parking lot. Mr. Weed noted these signs were put up approximately 10 or 11 years ago. They were made by Advantage Signs and Mr. Weed expressed his surprise that the appropriate permits weren't received.

Co-Chair Doherty stated it seems pretty straight forward. There is the name of the business and a single line of text. It seems clean. They are not internally illuminated, and even if they were, with the dark background they would be fine.

Co-Chair Doherty made a motion to recommend approval as submitted. Mr. King seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

8. Jeremy Nadeau, on behalf of Nadeau Subs, requests architectural design review approval for an existing 9.2-square-foot internally illuminated pylon panel sign, an existing 10-square-foot internally illuminated window sign and a new 30.06-square-foot internally illuminated building sign at 89 Fort Eddy Rd in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.

No one present to represent this application.

Mr. Tremblay stated the tenant one panel on the north facing side is up so that is an existing unpermitted sign. The window box sign is also existing and unpermitted. The wall sign has not been installed.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if they are in conformance?

Mr. Tremblay stated they are non-conforming due to the lack of permitting. They do however meet the size guidelines.

Mr. Gentilhomme asked how long these have they been up?

Mr. Tremblay stated they have been up for about 4 ½ months. The pylon sign is partially covering up the

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 2, 2024 Minutes

Maddie's sign.

Mr. Bass stated the tenant is moving into this address.

Mr. King does not feel you can read the pylon sign with the small print.

Co-Chair Doherty stated the only thing that concerns him is the Pepsi logo because that is advertising for a brand and they typically do not allow branding of products. Co-Chair Doherty noted he is not sure where that falls in the guidelines.

Mr. Bass stated it is a brand logo which is common on signs, but it is not that business's brand logo.

Co-Chair Doherty stated it is a product being sold there and not part of the business itself.

Mr. King stated it is totally inappropriate and sets a bad precedent.

Mr. Gentilhomme does not recall seeing a sign with a product logo.

Co-Chair Doherty stated the Dick's sign had a Nike logo and a couple other products that they asked to remove, adding that was a long time ago.

Mr. Proctor asked if they brought these signs from another location?

Mr. Tremblay stated the window box is being reused.

Mr. King noted he does not feel the window box fits there.

Co-Chair Doherty stated there are three signs and suggested they start looking at each one, starting with the simpler pylon sign. It says the name of the business. Co-Chair Doherty is okay with the pylon sign. The next one is the window sign that is just sitting there and not mounted. Co-Chair Doherty asked for more definition on how that sign will be placed.

Mr. King stated they probably do not need it as it is just plopped in the window and it is a duplicate of what is overhead.

Mr. Gentilhomme does not feel they need it either because that is in the window and they want to put the big one above the door.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if all three signs with the two on the building will meet the square footage they are allowed?

Mr. Tremblay stated yes.

Mr. Gentilhomme asked what if they propose to take the one that is in the window and put that above the door, then take the one above the door in place of the one in the window.

Mr. Proctor stated he was thinking the same thing. However, he is not sure if it is smaller. The one in the window is a nicer sign.

Mr. King stated he likes that recommendation.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 2, 2024 Minutes

Co-Chair Doherty stated he likes it too.

Mr. Proctor asked if the sign is internally lit.

Mr. Tremblay stated the one in the window and the one over the door are internally lit.

Mr. Gentilhomme made a motion to recommend approval of the signs as submitted with the following requirements to take the window sign and place it above the entrance door and take the building sign and place it on a wall within the store due to the fact that it advertises a specific product. Mr. King seconded.

Discussion

Mr. Gentilhomme asked to have the motion read back.

Mr. Bass re-read the motion – approve as submitted with the following requirements to take the window sign and place it above the entrance door and take the building sign and place it on a wall within the store due to the fact that it advertises a specific product.

Mr. Bass expressed concern about the single product wording.

Mr. Gentilhomme stated he left that open because it is a standard they have been using.

Mr. Bass stated that could be challenged and suggested the committee consider language such as that the sign is not representing a simple message of the business or something more in line with Nadeau's.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if they only sell Pepsi or do they sell other drinks, chips, and products?

Mr. King stated the sign is supposed to advertise the business.

Mr. Gentilhomme stated let's add that to the motion at the end.

Mr. Bass recommended that the reasoning be changed as the sign isn't solely representing the business and might be more in line with the guidelines.

Mr. Gentilhomme made a motion to amend his previous motion to approve as submitted with the following requirements to take the window sign and place it above the entrance door and take the building sign and place it on a wall within the store due to the fact that the sign isn't solely representing the business. Mr. King seconded.

Discussion

Co-Chair Doherty stated that is a good point. The sign purpose is to locate the business and not the products they sell at the location.

Mr. Bass asked they amend the motion to say what they want it to say

Mr. King stated that the sign is to represent the business.

Mr. Bass stated they will want to amend the motion accordingly.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 2, 2024 Minutes

Mr. Gentilhomme made a motion to amend his previous motion to approve as submitted with the requirements that, due to the fact that signs intended to advertise businesses, and not specific product brands sold, that the window sign be relocated above the door and the proposed building sign be relocated on an internal wall within the store. Mr. King seconded.

Discussion

Co-Chair Doherty stated based on that recommendation the applicant will need to come back to the committee.

Mr. Tremblay stated the ones that are currently there are the window box and one part of the pylon, and that the proposed building sign is not currently installed.

Mr. Gentilhomme stated he does not think it matters if the window sign is mounted inside or outside. Mr. Gentilhomme stated the motion is okay the way it is written. With the new sign there will be some flexibility.

Co-Chair Doherty asked, since the proposed building sign is currently not installed, if they removed the product logos and installed a sign representing the business if that would be okay.

Mr. Bass suggested if the sign is re-designed he would ask them to come back for architectural design review approval. Mr. Bass noted they have not voted and he would recommend that they amend the motion based off their discussion.

Mr. Bass stated the only thing that is not clear to him is the recommendation. When he reads this recommendation the window sign cannot stay in the window and must go above the door.

Mr. King answered correct.

Co-Chair Doherty stated our goal is not have two signs sitting so close together. They need to pick one sign. If they pick the upper one it cannot have the Pepsi logo.

Co-Chair Doherty stated there is a motion made by Mr. Gentilhomme and seconded by Mr. King. Co-Chair Doherty asked if the motion is clear enough that it would allow the applicant to make the changes or would the applicant need to return to the committee?

Mr. Gentilhomme stated they have given them an avenue to proceed and if they do not like that avenue then they can come back to the committee.

All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

9. Signarama Concord, on behalf of Aerie Healthcare, requests architectural design review approval for a new 6.15-square-foot non-illuminated freestanding post sign at 33 Pleasant St in the Civic Performance (CVP) District.

Kendra Price (Signarama Concord) represented the application.

Mr. King asked if this is a black sign with white words or is it gray?

Ms. Price answered it is a really deep navy-blue sign with a black post.

**City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 2, 2024 Minutes**

Mr. King asked if the healthcare is in white?

Ms. Price answered it is in a lighter blue.

Mr. Proctor asked what is the sign in?

Ms. Price answered the brackets and the sign itself one.

Mr. Proctor asked about the post.

Ms. Price answered the post will be steel.

Mr. Proctor asked if it is in the ground?

Ms. Price answered yes, and in grass.

Co-Chair Doherty asked out of curiosity why is it not a perfect square?

Ms. Price responded it is what fit within the logo they have and thought that would look best.

Co-Chair Doherty made motion to recommend approval as submitted. Mr. Gentilhomme seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

10. Signarama Concord, on behalf of Sundial Solar, requests architectural design review approval for a new 8-square-foot externally illuminated hanging sign at 5 Pleasant St Extension in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

Kendra Price (Signarama Concord) represented the application.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if it is a hanging sign with no power to it?

Ms. Price replied there are some spotlights existing for external illumination.

Mr. King made a motion to recommend approval as submitted. Mr. Gentilhomme seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

11. Jonathan Huston, on behalf of Capital Vintage, requests architectural design review approval for a new 10.5-square-foot externally illuminated hanging sign at 19 Pleasant St in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

Jonathan Huston represented the application.

Mr. King asked what is Capital Vintage?

Mr. Huston replied it is curated vintage clothing as early as the 1900s. They give the clothes new life.

Co-Chair Doherty likes the play on the capital.

Mr. Huston responded that they have thought this through.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 2, 2024 Minutes

Mr. King stated the only thing is the stars are close to the letters and from a distance it might be confusing.

Mr. King made a motion to recommend approval as submitted. Co-Chair Doherty seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

12. Joel Harris, on behalf of Dos Amigos Burritos, requests architectural design review approval for four existing non-illuminated window signs at 26 N Main St in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

No one present to represent the application.

Co-Chair Doherty stated it is an interesting one as this is already up. Co-Chair Doherty noted he likes the way it reads as a band and has a nice tie to the inside of the building. They are not advertising specific products or branded products. Co-Chair Doherty wants to make sure they are not setting a precedent.

Mr. King asked if this exceeds the square footage?

Mr. Tremblay stated it fits within what is allowed for signage.

Mr. Proctor stated it is tough because it crosses from information to almost a graphic.

Mr. Gentilhomme made a motion to recommend approval as submitted. Mr. Proctor seconded.

Discussion

Co-Chair Doherty wanted to discuss this as they do not want to set a precedent or the blocking of views of interior spaces all along Main St.

Mr. Gentilhomme asked if they can put wording in the motion that then addresses the fact that it works with the whole façade of the building, and it has graphics appearance that is cohesive.

Mr. Proctor stated it could also be a horizontal band introduced into the window elevation.

Mr. King asked if they are concerned the bead store will list all their beads and other people will list all their things?

Mr. Gentilhomme stated yes, they are and if want to do that go to Dos Amigos to look and see how they incorporated all that information into the overall store front and it becomes part of the graphics.

Co-Chair Doherty stated the success of this one is the letters versus the transparency and the location with the seated bar adds privacy for legs below.

Mr. King stated he understands there is a counter inside. Perhaps it makes a difference to hide knees and feet. Maybe it works in this particular case. However, if it was a legal team and they list everything they possible have as a service in a band like this or other stores all along Main St.

Mr. Gentilhomme stated that is the point and why they want to put those conditions or reasons into the motion to establish that and if a legal firm wants to do the same thing. Then ADR will state reasons why if they want to incorporate into their storefront it must be done in a manner that it enhances the design of the whole storefront.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 2, 2024 Minutes

Mr. Bass stated he would recommend in the motion to keep it simple. Mr. Bass stated this discussion will be reflected in the minutes and will provide context if this ever comes up.

Co-Chair Doherty asked Mr. Gentilhomme if he wanted to withdraw the motion and asked Mr. Proctor if he will make the motion as was just stated?

Mr. Gentilhomme withdrew the motion on the table. Mr. King seconded.

Mr. Proctor made a motion that the signage is recommended for approval as submitted with the understanding that the graphic nature of the text enhances the architecture of the storefront. Co-Chair Doherty seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

Building Permits in Performance Districts

13. R. Fraser Company, on behalf of Concord Christian Academy, requests architectural design review approval as part of a building permit application for exterior alterations and a staircase to access second floor classrooms at 37 Regional Dr in the Office Park Performance (OFFP) District. (2024-013)

Nathan Carlile represented the application.

Co-Chair Doherty stated it seems to be pretty straight forward. It looks like a staircase addition off the back of the building. Co-Chair Doherty noted it seems to match the architecture with the same banding and the same materials?

Mr. Carlile answered correct.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if once you come down to the bottom of the stairs for an egress, do you need a pathway or walkway to get around?

Mr. Carlile stated the plan is to match the existing as there is another door that comes off the back auditorium. There is a 5x5 concrete pad there.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if there is a walkway to get to a public way?

Mr. Carlile stated there is no plan to do that at this point. This is required to serve as an additional egress.

Co-Chair Doherty stated Code might flag that, but it's beyond the regulations of architectural design review.

Mr. Gentilhomme made a motion to recommend approval as submitted. Mr. King seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

14. Charter Foods North, LLC, on behalf of Taco Bell, requests architectural design review approval as part of a building permit for exterior renovations and rebranding at 321 Loudon Rd in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District. (2024-012)

Donna Lakiu represented this application.

Mr. Bass stated there are no sign permits included in this review and the committee is to only look at building. The signs will come back at a later point with sign permits and additional information for a separate approval.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 2, 2024 Minutes

Mr. Gentilhomme stated he saw a Taco Bell with this façade and it is a nice clean look.

Ms. Lakiu is the District Manager for the Taco Bell. Ms. Lakiu stated they are only changing the color on the outside of the building due to the removal of Long John Silver. This will strictly be a Taco Bell.

Mr. Proctor asked if both halves are being painted?

Ms. Lakiu stated it will be painted to the Taco Bell colors and that is the only thing they are doing on the outside of the building. They will do a remodel on the inside.

Mr. Gentilhomme made a motion to recommend approval as submitted. Mr. King seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

Site Plan and Subdivision Applications

15. Timothy S. Blagden and the Friends of the Concord-Lake Sunapee Trail request architectural design review approval as part of a major site plan application for construction of a multi-use stone gravel trail generally located south of Bog Rd and east of the Carter Hill Rd/Broad Cove Dr intersection. (2024-007)

Timothy Blagden represented this application.

Mr. Bass stated there are no buildings proposed with this major site plan application, and the applicant is here as a requirement of the major site plan process and for architectural design review recommendation for the site plan.

Co-Chair Doherty thanked Mr. Blagden for attending the meeting as there are no buildings and not much for the committee to review.

Mr. Blagden stated it is a stone dust trail. This is an existing piece of it in Concord at Fisherville Rd and it would be a continuation of that.

Mr. Blagden stated the only thing that sticks above the ground on occasion may be seating benches on the side of the trail. They have gone to railroads and received wheel sets from them. Ladd Welding will put benches together as an homage to the railroad.

Mr. Gentilhomme wondered where the trail will start and end once completed?

Mr. Blagden stated their aspirational goal is to go from Horseshoe Pond in Concord to Newbury Harbor on Lake Sunapee. It will be 34 miles through 6 communities. If they get it done and you are riding a bike, there will be ice cream every 45 minutes.

Mr. King asked if this is an existing pathway?

Mr. Blagden stated this is an old railroad bed. The State of New Hampshire was not buying the corridors as the railroads abandoned them, and they are essentially now parcels. Their non-profit talks to owners and obtains easements from private citizens or license agreements from the city. When they get the pieces secured from two access points, they then launch it as a project. Trail maps are available on their website.

Mr. King asked if this is a primarily a bike trail?

Mr. Blagden stated walking, biking, and snow shoeing are all activities as quiet sports. They ask the land

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 2, 2024 Minutes

owners if they want to support snowmobiling. That is outside of the easements. If the land owner wants to support snowmobiling and they can get the machines on the property at one end and off at the other end. Mr. Blagden stated it is because the trail is stone dust that they say no to motorized dirt bikes and OHRVs.

Co-Chair Doherty stated it is a cool piece of history.

Mr. Gentilhomme stated it is a different type of experience. If you want to hike you do not want to do it here. If you want to take bike, it is different. You see different things along the way.

Mr. Blagden stated they have teamed with the Central New Hampshire Bike Coalition and other supporting organizations to donate bikes to the Concord School District and the Kearsarge School District. They are now starting to teach kindergarteners and first graders to ride bikes in physical education class. They think this is a strategy and hope those kids will now have a new capability. They hope the parents will look for a safe place to take the kids and find a bicycle. The Central New Hampshire Bike Coalition runs the bike swap at S&W Sports every May the weekend after Mother's Day. That is a good place to get a good bike cheap and the rail trail is a good place to practice.

Mr. Gentilhomme made a motion to recommend approval as submitted. Mr. King seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

16. Wilcox and Barton, Inc, on behalf of B&L Transmissions, LLC, requests architectural design review approval as part of a major site plan application for construction of a new automotive repair shop and related site improvements at 388 Loudon Rd in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District. (2023-143)

Erin Lambert, Matthew Barrett, and Jeremy Martinson represented this application.

Ms. Lambert provided a brief overview of the project. This is a former restaurant site located on the corner of Loudon Rd and Old Sheep Davis Rd. The building will be demolished as part of the project. There will be a new 7,900-square-foot AAMCO building. There is full access off of Old Sheep Davis Rd. The entrance into Loudon Rd is right-in/right-out only. There is a property to the north that has a right-of-way easement and the only access to the property is through this property. The back of the property is encumbered by wetlands. The project will preserve the wetlands. They are doing some minor grading. They did go to Conservation Commission and did receive their recommendation for approval. The landscaping complies with the city zoning requirement of one tree per 2,000 square feet of parking. There are planting beds along the frontage near the sidewalk. The project is extending the sidewalk along the frontage of the property as required by the ordinance. There is an accessible connection to the sidewalk which runs parallel to Loudon Rd and brings people down to the intersection with Old Sheep Davis Rd. All of the storm water for the most part is being infiltrated in underground infiltration galleries. There are some overhead light poles and site lighting that runs around the perimeter of the parking and in the back. It all complies with the ordinance, meets the height requirement, is downward facing, and provides the maximum ratio for lighting levels. The poles for security will have cameras on the poles. The Conservation Commission asked, as previously there was disturbance to the wetland buffer, to restore with native plantings and they have incorporated that into the landscape plan.

Mr. Barrett stated it is a 16x132 wood frame building with a truss roof. The building will have colored vinyl siding and vinyl windows. The front elevation will be facing Loudon Rd. They added some aesthetic value by adding wainscot stone at the base and creating a more attractive entry with columns and exposed truss canopy.

Co-Chair Doherty asked about the third dimension when you start to put these pieces together. If you look

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 2, 2024 Minutes

at the box full of bays which are the long elevations, those wrap around to the back. There is the dark blue siding that wraps around the back. There is the strong base that wraps around to the back. Co-Chair Doherty stated those three elevations tie in together. Co-Chair Doherty questions the one in the front. If the dark blue on the side elevation wraps around and it looks the front elevation has a dark blue piece that pulls out and a light blue which is pushed back, which would be the same plane as the dark blue on the sides. Co-Chair Doherty asked if they are changing colors of materials at the corner?

Mr. Barrett stated yes.

Co-Chair Doherty stated that the base it looks like as you move the sides and there are some trees then the base ends.

Mr. Barrett noted the stone base ends and that would be finished concrete.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if there is a gap between the two where he sees the trees on the side?

Mr. Barrett stated that is correct, the first 20 feet of that building is two-story office space. When you get to the service bays, the concrete wall extends up high to prevent damage from equipment. If you look at the left side elevation on the right side the wood stud will go down to finish floor.

Co-Chair Doherty stated but then you have it as a base in the front. There are two bases with a gap with nothing.

Mr. Gentilhomme asked if the wainscoting should carry around the building?

Co-Chair Doherty stated visually he would think yes and also the materials should carry around. The second floor should be the dark blue.

Mr. Gentilhomme asked if they can make the wainscoting carry all around the building and raise the dark blue to be the same height all around the building?

Mr. Barrett asked on the gable ends?

Mr. Gentilhomme answered yes, and leave the pale blue in the gables? Mr. Gentilhomme stated the only other thing that he would suggest visually is to take the canopy over the entrance door and use the same slope as have on the building.

Mr. Proctor asked if the colors are AAMCO colors?

Mr. Barrett stated yes, very similar.

Mr. Proctor stated the only thing he saw was that the windows are not lining up from first to second floor.

Mr. Bass stated the signage will come at a later date and asked with the elevations he is not sure how a sign will be able to fit on the building sign.

Mr. Martinson stated they just discussed that topic. Mr. Martinson stated potentially AAMCO will say there needs to be a sign above the vestibule. Mr. Martinson will have to figure that out.

Mr. Gentilhomme stated something to consider is a pylon sign by the entrance.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 2, 2024 Minutes

Mr. Martinson stated that is what they want and do not want a billboard of AAMCO. Mr. Martinson stated he feels the aesthetics of the building complements the city and region. Mr. Martinson agrees with the blue as well.

Mr. Bass stated to the committee if they place a building sign on the front elevation that little mezzanine thing might be shrunk. Mr. Bass asked if, in the committee's opinion, if that is a minor change to the third-floor architecture item in the center to allow a building sign?

Co-Chair Doherty stated he thinks that will be fine and suggested they play with the canopy.

Mr. Proctor does not feel there needs to be an arch.

Mr. Gentilhomme made a motion to recommend approval of the application as submitted with the following recommendations: that the stone wainscoting be carried around the sides of the building and to abut the concrete on both sides and that the dark blue color be the full height to the top of the second floor and the gables remain light blue. Mr. King seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

17. Wilcox & Barton, Inc, on behalf of First Church Holdings, LLC, returns to present additional graphics and address review comments made by the Architectural Design Review Committee as a condition of architectural design review approval and as a requested amendment to reconfigure parking to the north and west as part major site plan approval at 177 N Main St in the Urban Commercial (UC) District. (2023-122)

Jon Chorlian represented this application.

Mr. Chorlian stated he was at the September 2023 Architectural Design Review Committee meeting and there were three items that needed improvement. The three items are the front doors and deck, the side door, and the five arched windows in the chapel section. The windows will be aluminum-powder coated to blend in with the brick and granite look. The entrances will be store front. They are going to overlay the existing stairs with a deck that will have a staircase on each side of the deck. The store front door openings are a 5\6th door and cannot do a double door. It ends up being a single door. They are proposing glass panels on the railings for the deck.

Mr. King asked at the top of stairs is the landing lower than the deck?

Mr. Chorlian stated no, the deck is at the elevation that you walk out of the building, so there is zero barrier.

Mr. King asked if the landing they see here is level or flush with the deck?

Mr. Chorlian stated yes, the deck is at threshold height.

Mr. Gentilhomme asked if the existing landing is at the top of the floor elevation?

Mr. Chorlian stated the new landing and the entire deck.

Mr. Gentilhomme asked if were to go up the right set of stairs and turn left is there steps?

Mr. Chorlian stated you will go up those stairs and hit a 4x4 landing, then have one riser and then hit the deck. There is an ornamental fence with precast columns.

Mr. King asked if the colors they show is true to what will be there?

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 2, 2024 Minutes

Mr. Chorlian stated no, it is trying to show which are the spandrel panels. The arch panels will be powder-coated aluminum panels matching the frame color of the window. For the spandrel glass, they will pick a grayish hew. They are trying to follow the grayish granite color.

Mr. Gentilhomme stated it is advisable that they bring back the colors they are going to use.

Mr. Chorlian pointed out the glass panels and horizontal deck skirting. Mr. Chorlian stated the idea is material color and width. There will be no corner boards with a 45 at the corners. The color will be a grayish. The width wants to follow what the stair risers are doing. It wants to be 8-inch riser or half of that to line up on the stair noses.

Mr. Gentilhomme asked what is the material?

Mr. Chorlian stated it will be a trex or timber tech composite material.

Mr. King stated if that were one solid panel it would look bad. Mr. King noted the stair height is broken to 8 inches and is less bad. Mr. King asked if they went to half of the 8 inches if it would look even less bad?

Mr. Chorlian stated he agrees. Mr. Chorlian stated the risers are pre-existing 8-inch risers. Mr. Chorlian stated he does not think they want these things at the middle and follow the pattern along the stairs.

Mr. Gentilhomme stated he understands what Mr. Chorlian is saying. In the front and then end it is such a narrow piece they do not govern anything. Mr. Gentilhomme stated what he would like to see there is something that is representing something of the architecture of the original building. Mr. Gentilhomme noted this discussion also includes how are they going to construct that, what is the deck composition going to be and how are you going to deal with water inside of that space?

Mr. Chorlian stated stick-built deck that overlays and water will go through the deck and down the steps.

Mr. Gentilhomme asked if the deck is a porous surface and allow for moisture to come down naturally. Mr. Gentilhomme would like for him to investigate other material for the siding of the deck. He does not like seeing wood, which is a temporary material, on a massive stone or brick building.

Co-Chair Doherty likes the fact that it can be removed someday and there is nothing permanent. The stairs are below and in future you could remove this piece and stairs will still be there.

Mr. King stated the other concern is original doors and archways are fun. This blocks that if you were walking or driving. The whole façade is blocked by the stuck-up piece. Mr. King asked Mr. Chorlian if he could make the glass disappear?

Mr. Gentilhomme stated with glass it looks like a they are putting a frame around it.

Mr. Chorlian stated there is no frame.

Co-Chair Doherty stated he does not feel the glass fits with the character of the building.

Mr. Proctor asked about the fence that will be in front of this?

Mr. Chorlian stated it is a four-foot black powder coated aluminum fence punctuated with two-foot-wide columns with twenty-eight-inch square granite caps at the corners and gate entrances.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 2, 2024 Minutes

Mr. King pointed out glass is reflective and if go to last page on the left with the fencing above there is narrow and might pick up detail on the church.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if there will be a handrail.

Mr. Chorlian stated yes, there will be a handrail.

Mr. Proctor stated it is a very contemporary look.

Mr. Chorlian stated he likes the juxtaposition. He noted they are saving the building. Mr. Chorlian stated he feels they are entitled to a couple of things from a branding standpoint as it is a new chapter. It is not the same church. He would like it to be lower but have the deck accessible. The railing system he does not want to read residential. It is as small of a massing as possible.

Mr. Proctor suggested if he is concerned about massing to have a planter bed at the bottom to reduce the height of the box.

Mr. Chorlian stated a planter bed at the bottom to break up some of that is a great idea.

Co-Chair Doherty asked about the arches around the doors are they being altered?

Mr. Chorlian stated there are now the doors and then the whole assembly will come out.

Co-Chair Doherty asked about the arches above the door the gothic arches are they being demolished?

Mr. Chorlian stated this was the detail they saw last September.

Mr. King asked if they are not changing the arch?

Mr. Chorlian stated he is not changing the arches.

Mr. Gentilhomme stated the issue is Mr. Chorlian is using an old drawing from the past and it has those dashed arches.

Mr. Chorlian noted he is trying to show what was presented to the committee in September and this is what they said they would try to do better.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if there is no change to the brick and stone work just an infill panel to the door?

Mr. Chorlian stated exactly.

Mr. Proctor asked if that panel can be spandrel instead of aluminum to blend in with the door to read as one?

Mr. Chorlian stated he is not sure how much space there is and thinks the openings is the door and the panel sits against masonry.

Mr. Gentilhomme asked if the existing doors are arched or if there is a panel above the existing doors.

Mr. Chorlian stated the doors are rectangular and there is a panel above the door.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 2, 2024 Minutes

Mr. Bass stated the committee is going to lose quorum in about 10 minutes and asked the Co-Chair Doherty if they want to finish this agenda item or move on? Mr. Chorlian is here today to address three items that were a condition of the Planning Board's architectural design review approval. Mr. Bass would recommend if they are satisfied with the changes the committee make a motion stating that the September architectural design review conditions have been satisfied.

Mr. Bass also added that here is an amendment to the site plan which is some minor modifications for parking and landscaping. If there is no issue with the site plan, the committee can recommend approval for the amended site plan and parking configuration. Those are the two items that need to be satisfied today.

Co-Chair Doherty stated he was not at the September meeting and cannot say if the items met the committee's recommendations. However, Co-Chair Doherty stated he does have several concerns about certain things and does not think they were addressed. If they were previously approved he does not want to mess with that and if they feel the items have been met, he would ask for a motion to accept.

Mr. Gentilhomme stated the question is it comes down to the details: railing, siding, and real colors. Mr. Gentilhomme asked if he is to come back to ADR?

Mr. Bass stated if ADR feels he has addressed the staircase entry, front entry, and the windows and the concerns are satisfied for the elements that needed improvement and if not satisfied the committee should indicate as such or put conditions on what needs to be addressed.

Mr. King stated he does not feel it is clear yet. Lowering the deck height will make a difference but he cannot see it. Mr. King stated he would really like to see that and also would like to see the width of those horizontals and the color. The glass railing has not been addressed.

Mr. King made motion to have the applicant come back to the committee.

Mr. Chorlian stated he needs to walk out of the April 17, 2024 Planning Board with a clean approval. Mr. Chorlian stated there are other sides to a project. Mr. Chorlian stated he will go to Planning Board and asked for an unconditional approval. Mr. Chorlian stated if they can agree on stuff he does not mind coming back to the committee. Mr. Chorlian stated the image will not look as tall as it does now.

Mr. Gentilhomme asked what Mr. Chorlian needs today.

Mr. Bass suggested to start with the site plan amendment. There are some minor landscaping and parking configurations. They could make a motion. Mr. Bass stated he came back to the committee for the front stair entry, the little staircase on side, and the windows.

Mr. Proctor stated the windows on the side have been satisfied because he is putting in spandrel. The front entry has been redesigned, but they need more detail.

Mr. Gentilhomme made a motion to recommend approval as submitted with the requirement that the applicant come back and present details, finishes, colors, and materials. Seconded by Mr. King.

Discussion

Mr. Gentilhomme clarified the applicant needs to come back with is the siding on the porches, the railing and colors.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 2, 2024 Minutes

Mr. Chorlian asked if they are no longer talking about any of the store front components?

Mr. Gentilhomme stated correct, on the store front he is saying colors. They are not stopping from building. They need to know the actual colors they are going to use.

Mr. Chorlian thought in September the store front was approved with a color selected.

Mr. Gentilhomme is asking the applicant to bring to the committee the color for the bases of the porches or any color going on the building.

Mr. Chorlian stated he felt that was already approved.

Mr. Proctor stated the Taco Bell that was earlier in today's meeting had a sample of the color on their drawings with the numbers and noted that this application first came before the committee in September 2023, and is now returning in April of 2024.

Mr. King seconded. 3-1 in favor. Co-Chair Doherty abstained.

18. Wilcox and Barton, Inc, on behalf of Fred and Mertie Potter, 125 NSS LLC, 20 Franklin St Concord LLC, and 10 Bradley Street LLC, requests architectural design review approval as part of a major site plan application to construct a 3,152-square-foot, 3-story office building addition at 125 N State St in the Neighborhood Residential (RN) District. (2024-15)

Erin Lambert represented this application.

Mr. Bass stated this was a previous conditionally-approved application that expired. There have been some minor site alterations. However, the architectural features of the building remain unchanged from the Planning Board's previous architectural design review approval.

Co-Chair Doherty stated from what they understand this is similar to what they had before.

Ms. Lambert stated their permit expired. There is nothing about the architecture or site plan around 125 N State St that has changed. The plans submitted were the ones that were approved through engineering and planning. The building elevations are reflected in the committee's recommendation as well as the Planning Board's site plan approval of June 2022. The site plan amendment that is going forward includes a lot line adjustment. The lot line adjustment is to add property to 125 N State St.

Co- Chair Doherty made a motion to recommend approval as submitted. Mr. King seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

Other Business

Adjournment

Mr. King made a motion, seconded by Mr. Gentilhomme, to adjourn the meeting at 10:45 a.m. All in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Krista Tremblay

Krista Tremblay

Administrative Specialist II