

**City of Concord, New Hampshire**  
**Architectural Design Review Committee**

**May 11, 2004**

The Design Review Committee held its regular meeting on Tuesday, May 11, 2004, in the Second Floor Conference Room at City Hall at 8:30 AM.

Present at the meeting were Duene Cowan, Claude Gentilhomme, Elizabeth Hengen, and Hamilton Rice. Messrs. Henninger and Pollock, and Ms. Osgood from the Planning Division were also present.

The Design Review Committee met in order to review the proposed design of certain sites, buildings, building alterations and signs that are on the Planning Board's regular agenda for May 19, 2004, and which are subject to the provisions of the City of Concord's Zoning Ordinance in respect to Architectural Design Review. Comments on and criticisms of the items were made.

The following proposals were evaluated.

**Agenda Items**

Consideration of proposed placement and design of signs:

- **Blockbuster** at 50 Storrs Street (2 signs)

The Design Review Committee found the design and placement of the signs to be appropriate for the location and use, and recommended approval as submitted.

- **Capital Glass & Mirror Co.** at 62 Hall Street

Committee members noted that important information was missing from the submittal, including the proposed location of the sign, colors, details of materials and posts.

The Design Review Committee recommended tabling action until complete information is submitted for review.

- **Concord Farms** at 88 Pleasant Street

Committee members noted that important information was missing from the submittal, including the proposed location of the sign, details of materials, and whether this is a replacement or a new sign.

The Design Review Committee recommended tabling action until complete information is submitted for review.

- **Elizabeth's Kitchen** at 9 Pleasant Street (2 signs)

Committee members found the proposed hanging sign to be appropriate as submitted. However, the affixed sign was cluttered and contained too much information.

Members noted that each sign had a slightly different type face, with the type on the hanging sign reading a little crisper. Members suggested the applicant consider a uniform type face, preferably the one used on the hanging sign.

The Design Review Committee found the design and placement of the signs to be appropriate for the location and use, and recommended approval as submitted with the recommendation that the applicant simplify the design of the affixed sign by removing some of the wording and focus on the name and key message intended for the sign.

- **New Hampshire Preservation Alliance** at 87 North State Street

(Ms. Hengen recused herself from discussion of this application.)

The Design Review Committee found the design and placement of the sign to be appropriate for the location and use, and recommended approval as submitted.

- **Your Real Estate Company by Professionals LLC** at 163 Pembroke Road

Committee members felt there was too much detail on the sign. The applicant needed to simplify the design to improve the appearance and visibility of the message on the sign. Members felt there was a lot of redundant or obvious wording on this sign.

The Design Review Committee recommended approval with the recommendation that the applicant simplify the design of the affixed sign by removing some of the wording and focus on the name and key message intended for the sign.

Site and building plans related to revisions by **Riverbend Community Mental Health Inc.** at **40 Pleasant Street.**

Jay Bliss was present on behalf of the applicant and explained they wished to add a set of stairs on the north side of the building facing the former Concord Monitor building to replace the stairs removed as part of their last renovations. He explained these would be used for emergency exit only. He reported that the paneling, paint, and rail will all match the existing features. Nothing about the landscaping will lead people to believe this is a useable entrance.

Ms. Hengen suggested that if they remove the balusters and handrail they should be stored on site for use as repair parts or re-used. Mr. Bliss indicated that was their intention.

Members expressed concern about how much deterioration will occur to these stairs during winter months, given that the stairs would be located partially underneath the drip edge of the building.

The Design Review Committee recommended approval of the proposed stairs since they are appropriate aesthetically but found the functionality of the stairs questionable.

Site and building plans related to an application by **Two Loudon Developers LLC at Loudon & Old Loudon Road.**

Mr. Henninger reviewed the site plan for the benefit of Committee members and explained he was looking for feedback particularly relative to the landscape plan.

Members adamantly voiced their opinion that the applicant should not expect to put signs on the backs of the buildings, only a single freestanding sign at the development entrance with the shopping center name. There should be no individual tenant signs on the I-393 facades with the exception of identification signs on the back for service vehicles. The back of the buildings need to be as attractive as the fronts. With the exception of the rear of the largest building, all the facades will need to be treated as front facades. There should be no visible roof-top mechanical equipment.

Members would like to see the project as heavily planted as possible. They suggested that extensive vegetative screening be used to filter the buildings. They did not want to see lights from the interstate. Lighting on the backs of the buildings should be low with cutoffs.

Site and building plans related to an application by **Gloria A. Alosa Revocable Trust**, on behalf of **Richard Blanchette**, at **78 Fisherville Road.**

Mr. Pollock introduced this proposal for the construction of a new building for a martial arts studio with full basement for locker rooms. It will have a light gray vinyl siding.

Richard Blanchette was present as applicant to answer questions from the Committee.

Committee members noted that there were no side elevations and the trim color was unknown at this time. Mr. Blanchette advised that the side elevation would match and only a few high windows would be provided on the sides of the building.

Committee members expressed concern that there may be some code issues that have not yet been addressed in regard to egress and suggested Mr. Blanchette meet with the building inspector to determine what needed to be considered in the design.

The Committee was of the opinion that the elevations and landscape plans were attractive.

Members noted that the handicapped ramp location is not consistent as shown on the site plan and the elevations, and the 25 foot high light pole in the front parking lot might be out of scale with the building. Mr. Blanchette discussed this with the Committee and agreed to go with a lower 12 foot light pole.

The Design Review Committee recommended approval subject to receipt of information relative to trim color, ramp location, side elevations, and the pole light reduced to 12 feet in front of the building, and reminded Mr. Blanchette that he will need to return for review of his proposed signage when the design has been determined.

Landscape plan related to an application for **Ed Reilly Subaru at 150 Manchester Street.**

Mr. Henninger explained that site and building plans for a 3,000 square foot addition to the existing automobile dealership were granted approval by the Planning Board subject to approval of the landscape plan by the Design Review Committee.

Paul Connolly, from CivilWorks, was present on behalf of the applicant and explained they would place deciduous trees along the frontage with evergreens mostly at the rear of the property.

The Design Review Committee found the landscape plan as revised to be appropriate for the location and use and approved it as submitted.

Site and landscape plans related to **Kimball Park.**

John Sullivan was present on behalf of Groundwork Concord and explained the process they had used for public input about prospective renovations to Kimball Park. He explained the public wanted more parking, better pedestrian access, better access to the Boys and Girls Club for vehicles, and better access to the pool for maintenance vehicles.

He explained they had tried to maximize parking and create a drop-off area for the Boys and Girls Club. They moved the basketball court into the center of the park to correct the impression that it belonged to the Boys and Girls Club. They propose to create a trail system for children to ride bikes and for the elderly to walk.

He reported they had just learned that funding has been approved to replace the playground equipment.

The Committee noted that parking should be adjusted and a feature added at the end of Bradley Street to create a visual focus and identity for visitors.

Mr. Henninger expressed concern about five parking spaces enabling vehicles to back out onto a busy area in back of the nearby retail uses.

Mr. Henninger reminded Mr. Sullivan that once the plan is complete and before construction, they will need to apply for site plan approval from the Planning Board.

Site and building plans related to an application by **Havenwood-Heritage Heights at 33 Christian Avenue.**

Mr. Pollock explained that this project was approved a number of years ago but approval expired and they now wish to reduce the scope of the project. At the time of the original approval a maintenance facility was also proposed. At this time they are looking for approval of the seven cottages only.

Theodore Kupper, engineer from Provan & Lorber, was present on behalf of the applicant and introduced Leslie Thomas, architect.

Ms. Thomas reminded the Committee that the last time they were before the Committee, one of the big issues expressed related to pedestrian access – walkways and front doors. She felt they had now addressed that concern. The big landscaping change was the connection of sidewalks along East Side Drive. In the earlier plans, the streetscape did not look residential so they added to the sidewalks and landscape package to make it appear more like the residential uses across East Side Drive. The porch element has been increased on the East Side Drive elevation.

Members recommended adding gates to the proposed fence to allow access to East Side Drive, the connection of the two proposed sidewalk loops between the buildings, and two (2) walkways linking the on-site walkway to the East Side Drive sidewalk.

No signage is proposed at this time.

The Design Review Committee recommended approval with the addition of gates in two locations along East Side Drive and the addition of connecting sidewalks along East Side Drive.

### **Concept Plan**

- Site and building plans related to a proposed **Taco Bell/Long John Silver's** at **321 Loudon Road**.

Mr. Henninger explained this site plan received conditional site plan approval under the old Zoning Ordinance. Architectural Design Review approval was not granted for the proposed building at that time. They are now presenting a concept plan for a Taco Bell and a Long John Silver's in a single building on the site. He explained that the original approval was for a fast food restaurant of 3600 square feet. This is two fast food restaurants in a single 3100 square foot building. He had available for comparison the approved architectural elevations for the existing Ruby Tuesday restaurant to the east and for the Smokey Bones restaurant under construction to the west of the site.

Mr. Cowan noted that the building was being proposed to be closer to Loudon Road than the previously approved restaurants on either side.

Frank Monteiro, engineer from MHF Design, explained that the building location had changed mostly because, while the site plan was approved under the old Zoning Ordinance, they were trying to comply with the current Zoning Ordinance. In order to satisfy the requirement for stacking for ten cars for the drive-up, it was necessary to move the building.

Members suggested moving the building back on the site by about ten feet and eliminate a portion of the pass-by lane at the rear of the building.

Jim Santos, project manager from Yum Brands, was present and reported that since they do not offer breakfast, they can have their dumpsters emptied during the morning hours so access to the dumpsters would not be a problem if they shortened the pass-by lane. Mr. Henninger pointed out that the dumpster could be reoriented to avoid using the by-pass lane.

Mr. Cowan expressed concern about the compatibility of the elevations with the abutting uses, a concern he reminded Committee members he had expressed at the time the site plan was reviewed.

Erin Woo, corporate architect for Yum Brands, Robert Haverty, property owner, and Attorney Raymond D'Amante were present to answer questions.

Ms. Woo explained that the intent was to make each of the towers a focus for its individual brand and then let the rest of the building be neutral.

Mr. Gentilhomme indicated he would like to see more cohesiveness within the whole development. The other two restaurant buildings have substance to them as do some of the other restaurants in the neighborhood.

Mr. Santos indicated there are some adjustments in colors and materials they can make to the design to tone down the appearance.

Members felt strongly that they needed to give some consistency and unity to the building and the building design needs to be compatible with abutting uses. The Committee expressed their opinion that simple changes to colors would not be sufficient to address their concerns.

There was no further business to come before the Committee and the meeting adjourned at 11:10 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen L. Henninger  
Assistant City Planner

o