

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee

September 13, 2005

The Design Review Committee held a meeting on Tuesday, September 13, 2005, in the Second Floor Conference Room at City Hall at 8:30 AM.

Present at the meeting were Duene Cowan, 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 September 21, 2005, 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:

- **Baby Bungalow** at 54-56 North Main Street

Russ Aubertine from Advantage Signs was present on behalf of the applicant and explained that the affixed sign would be placed on a new granite band. It will be attached to the granite with a minimum number of holes. The hanging sign will be affixed to the brick column on the building.

Committee members found the white background to be stark and recommended that an off-white color be used for the background. Mr. Aubertine concurred.

The Design Review Committee found the design and placement of the proposed signage to be appropriate for the location, and recommended approval subject to the background of the sign being a cream color, and to the affixed sign being placed such that the oval is centered over the doors.

- **Citizens Bank** at 20 Fort Eddy Road

Carol Bugbee was present from Citizens Bank and explained that this was the result of a corporation-wide logo change.

Committee members expressed concern that the proposed affixed sign did not appear to be well placed within the signage panel. Ms. Bugbee reported the signs come in standardized sizes but there is one available that is about 10% smaller than the one proposed.

The Design Review Committee found the design and placement of the proposed signage to be appropriate for the location, and recommended approval subject to reduction in size in order to align the bottom of the sign to the bottom of the adjacent architectural detail and for the top of the sign to fit within the existing band on the canopy. Ms. Bugbee concurred with the recommendations.

- **Concord Collision Center** at 14 Hall Street

Glenn Schadlick from Ne-Op-Co Signs was present on behalf of the applicant and explained this sign will have gold raised letters on a black baked enamel aluminum panel and will not be illuminated.

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

- **Eastern Mountain Sports** at 68 Fort Eddy Road

Don Reed from Barlo Signs was present on behalf of the applicant and explained this is the result of the company making changes to the sign program and logo.

Mr. Rice expressed concern about whether the sign was oversized for the frontage of the store. There was some question as to how much of the building was actually being occupied by this use.

The Design Review Committee found the design and placement of the proposed signage to be appropriate for the location, and recommended approval as submitted, provided it complies with the Zoning Ordinance relative to size.

- **Fabulous Looks Boutique** at 86 North Main Street

Phil Spurr was present as applicant and explained they are moving a few doors down from their current location. He explained they will be using the same logo that they have had for many years and placing it on a black background with individual surface-mounted gold letters.

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

- **Fairfield Inn Marriott** at 4 Gulf Street (3 signs)

Jillian Nichols from Jutras Signs was present on behalf of the applicant and indicated that this is a modification to an existing affixed sign, as well as a new freestanding sign and a new affixed sign.

Mr. Henninger noted that the existing freestanding sign is 26 feet tall but, under the current Zoning Ordinance, when the sign is replaced it will be limited to twenty feet in height. The size of the sign panel itself is in compliance.

Ms. Nichols indicated they propose a new affixed sign above the second floor on the south-facing elevation.

Mr. Rice explained that they were allowed 200 square feet of total affixed signage. He believed the proposal complied with the Zoning Ordinance but it would need to be verified. However, they need a Conditional Use Permit from the Planning Board to place a sign over the second floor window.

Members expressed the opinion that the new affixed sign was too large for the gable where it was to be placed.

The Design Review Committee recommended approval of the freestanding sign as submitted, provided it is reduced in height to twenty feet to comply with the Zoning Ordinance. They also recommended approval of the proposed revisions to the existing affixed sign on the easterly elevation as submitted, and recommended approval of the graphics for the affixed sign in the gable on the southerly elevation provided it is reduced by about 10-15% and that the applicant apply for and receive a Conditional Use Permit for location above the second floor. Ms. Nichols concurred with the recommendations.

- **Genesis Health Care/Harris Hill Center** at 20 Maitland Street (2 signs)

Mr. Rice reported that the sign for 20 Maitland Street appeared to have no zoning vesting but the sign with the arrow has received a variance from the Zoning Board of Adjustment.

The Committee noted that these are panel changes.

The Design Review Committee recommended approval of the graphics for both signs but recognized that sign #1 showing 20 Maitland Street may not have legal status.

Mr. Rice indicated he would verify the status of the signage relative to zoning compliance before the Planning Board's meeting on September 21st.

- **GMAC Mortgage, Stewart Title, Atlantic Property Inspections** at 201 Loudon Road

The Committee noted that this was a replacement panel for a sign recently approved and constructed. New information on the sign was submitted at the end of the meeting.

The Design Review Committee found the design and placement of the proposed signage to be appropriate for the location, and recommended approval subject to a dark border around the panels and to caps on the posts as currently constructed, and further subject to the sign being set back five feet from the property line to comply with the Zoning Ordinance.

- **Gold's Gym** at 62 Hall Street
- **Gold's Gym** at 2 Home Avenue

Don Reed from Barlo Signs was present on behalf of the applicant and explained that this application package has turned into a request for approval of only two freestanding signs. The applicant is withdrawing the remaining applications for affixed signage for the time being.

The Design Review Committee noted that the design of the signage had not changed since its recommendation for approval last month.

- **Granite Bay Connections** at 54 Old Suncook Road

The Design Review Committee noted that there was some question as to whether the proposed sign complied with the Zoning Ordinance. The Committee also had questions about the placement of the proposed freestanding sign.

The Design Review Committee found the graphics of the proposed freestanding sign to be appropriate and recommended approval provided the sign complies with the Zoning Ordinance.

- **The Yellow Submarine** at 192 North State Street

The Committee expressed concern that it appeared the sign was proposed to be placed in the sidewalk, and it appeared to be too large and too high.

The Design Review Committee recommended tabling action on this application until the missing information has been submitted and the sign is in compliance with the Zoning Ordinance.

Revisions to site plans related to an application by **River Hill Condominiums** at **45-47 Bog Road**.

Mr. Henninger explained that the Committee reviewed this proposal last month to construct a series of six-foot vinyl fences across the front of the property for privacy purposes, and recommended approval of a privacy fence with lattice at the top in either a desert sand or grey color. The Planning Board granted approval subject to the Design Review Committee's recommendations. However, the condominium association has found that the lattice-top fencing is cost prohibitive and is now before the Committee to consider alternatives.

Maggie Tatone was present on behalf of the condominium association board of directors and explained that she had learned that the fence is available in a grey color that would coordinate with the existing buildings but they had found the lattice at the top of the panels to be cost-prohibitive, especially since they had hoped to provide landscaping to soften the view of the fencing.

The Design Review Committee provided a revised recommendation for approval of a privacy fence without lattice in a light grey color and subject to staggered plantings where needed to soften the appearance of the fencing as viewed from Bog Road.

Site and building plans related to an application by Two Home Avenue LLC, Duprey Company, LLC, and PM Carter Properties LLC at 2 Home Avenue and 62 Hall Street.

Mr. Pollock introduced this proposal to change the use of an existing concrete building from an auto detailing service and other uses to a fitness center. He explained that they are also acquiring property across the street and will demolish the existing buildings on that lot to create a parking lot for use by patrons of the fitness center. He reported that revisions had been made to the plans as a result of comments made by the Committee last month. He reported that one of the garage buildings proposed to be demolished will remain on the Hall Street parcel. That building is cream color with vinyl siding and a shed roof. Mr. Henninger requested that the applicant submit photographs of the building and the applicant agreed to do so.

Joel Silverwatch, architect, explained they had made changes to the proposed canopy as a result of the discussion at last month's meeting.

The Design Review Committee recommended approval as revised provided that they submit documentation of the appearance of the building to remain on Hall Street and that they extend the canopy of the fitness center building to cover the columns, and that they add shade trees on the southerly property line on the parking lot parcel across Hall Street. The applicant concurred.

Site and building plans related to an application by the HT Properties Inc. at 232 & 234 Loudon Road.

Tom Ireland from Henley Enterprises and Henry Phillips from Eric Mitchell Associates, Inc. were present to answer questions relative to this application.

Mr. Henninger introduced this proposal to demolish 3240 square feet of retail space at 232 Loudon Road and to construct a 2432 square foot detached building for an automotive lubrication business and to expand the occupancy of the existing transmission repair business at 234 Loudon Road from 4000 square feet to 4560 square feet with the addition of two service bays.

Mr. Ireland explained they plan to remove the metal siding on the westerly side of the existing building and to replace it with brick so that the entire building will be brick. There is no mansard on the rear of the existing building. The new building will be brick to match the existing building. Plans for the renovation of the existing building were not yet available.

Committee members noted that, since the Branch Turnpike side of the building faces a residential area, the sign panel on that side of the building will need to be removed. The Committee recommended that they construct a shorter barrel in the sign band to comply with the Zoning Ordinance relative to signage and that they remove the band and signage from the Branch Turnpike side of the building. Mr. Ireland concurred.

1

Mr. Ireland indicated that coordinated drawings would be submitted before the Planning Board meeting on September 21, 2005.

In general, the Committee found the new building to be attractive.

Members felt the freestanding sign as shown looked top-heavy. They suggested it be a one-piece cabinet instead of two separate signs on a single pole. It should be made to appear to be one sign with two elements on a larger sign pole and the reader board should either be deleted from the sign or placed below the tenant panels in a secondary location.

A discussion ensued about how best to screen the dumpsters from view. It was agreed to extend the screen fence easterly along Branch Turnpike to ensure that they would not be seen from the abutting residential area, and that the cedar fence facing Loudon Road would be screened with evergreen shrubs and be stained a dark color similar to the proposed brick.

Non-Agenda Item

Mr. Henninger brought up the subject of the Dick's Sporting Goods building now nearing end of construction at 295 Loudon Road. He presented photographs of the graphics placed on the exterior walls of the building and asked for an interpretation as to whether these graphics should be considered signage.

Mr. Rice felt these graphics were not considered signs as defined in the City's Zoning Ordinance but he did feel that they were a significant architectural detail that should be presented to the Planning Board for review under Architectural Design Review.

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting adjourned at 10:40 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen L. Henninger
Assistant City Planner

o