

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

**May 9, 2006**

The Design Review Committee held its regular monthly meeting on Tuesday, May 9, 2006, in the Second Floor Conference Room in City Hall at 8:30 AM.

Present at the meeting were Duene Cowan, Claude Gentilhomme, Ron King, and Craig Walker. Messrs. Henninger and Pollock, and Ms. Seifried 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 17, 2006, 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:

- **Kaleidoscope** at 8 South Main Street

Karen McCormack and Michelle Carignan were present as applicants and presented for review and comment by the Committee a proposal for vinyl window signage in addition to the hanging sign that is the subject of the formal sign application.

Russ Aubertine from Advantage Signs was also present and presented a new idea for window signage that had just come up and had not been drawn yet. He described white cut-out lettering on the lower section of the windows with a transparent kaleidoscope design covering most of the window space in the doors.

The Design Review Committee found the design and placement of the hanging sign to be appropriate for the location and use and recommended approval as submitted. The Committee also found the window signage as described appropriate for the location and use and recommended approval as described provided a full application package with plans is submitted.

- **Capital Kitchen & Bath Inc.** at 58 Hall Street

Daniel Hughes was present as applicant to answer questions from the Committee.

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.

- **Comcast** at 54 Regional Street

Don Reed from Barlo Signs was present on behalf of the applicant to answer questions from the Committee.

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.

- **Contours Express** at 341 Loudon Road (2 signs)

David and Laura Renciarri were present as applicants to answer questions from the Committee.

Members suggested placing a contrasting border around the affixed sign to make it stand out against the light colored building. The applicants agreed.

The Design Review Committee found the design and placement of the replacement panel in the freestanding sign to be appropriate for the location and use and recommended approval as submitted and also recommended approval of the affixed sign as submitted but suggested that a border of a contrasting color should be added around the panel.

- **CMV Home Loans** at 87 South Main Street
- **Prudential Verani Realty** at 87 South Main Street (2 signs)

Richard Westergren from Poyant Signs was present on behalf of the applicants to answer questions from the Committee.

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

- **Dan's Floor Store** at 22 Pleasant Street (2 signs)

Rebecca Barden was present as applicant.

Members noted that the proposed main affixed sign appeared to be larger than allowed by the Zoning Ordinance. The Committee advised Ms. Barden that the sign should be no taller than the granite lintel above the storefront, both from a Zoning Ordinance perspective and to make the sign compatible and subservient to the historic building architecture.

The Design Review Committee recommended approval subject to the affixed sign being reduced proportionately to the width of the lintel and of a size to comply with the Zoning Ordinance. The Committee recommended approval of the smaller sign above the door as submitted.

Ms. Barden indicated she would provide revised plans by Tuesday for the Planning Board meeting on May 17<sup>th</sup>.

- **L. L. Bean Outlet** at 55 Fort Eddy Road (4 signs)

Don Reed from Barlo Signs was present on behalf of the applicant to answer questions from the Committee. He explained the Zoning Board of Adjustment had granted variances for these signs. He explained the change in design was a change in logo for the company.

Mr. Henninger explained this building was designed with features on the westerly elevation for four tenants but the applicant had taken the entire portion of the building intended for those tenants. He advised that the original four signs were approved by variance and the size of the lettering is not changing.

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

- **Lotions N Potions** at 25 North Main Street

Andrew Hatch was present as applicant as was Russ Aubertine from Advantage Signs.

There was a brief discussion relative to the bracket being proposed for this hanging sign. Mr. Aubertine agreed that they could consider adding a decorative feature to the bracket. The Committee noted that the hanging sign is being placed between the columns on both sides of the entrance. The Committee suggested that the applicant consider hanging the sign on the face of one of the columns.

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 with the recommendation that the brackets be painted to blend with the storefront behind the sign.

- **New Hampshire Hospital Association** at 125 Airport Road

Russ Aubertine from Advantage Signs was present on behalf of the applicant and explained, in answer to a question from the Committee, that there would be new granite posts to replace the existing wood posts.

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.

Mr. Henninger asked that they provide a sketch showing placement of the sign on the site and Mr. Aubertine agreed.

- **New Hampshire Retirement** at 52-56 Regional Drive (2 signs)

Ben Barr from Barlo Signs was present on behalf of the applicant and presented updated plans for the proposed signage showing a downsized affixed panel.

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.

- **Pleasant View Retirement** at 227 Pleasant Street (2 signs)

There was no one present on behalf of the applicant and no further response to last month's comments by the Committee.

### Non-Agenda Sign Item

- **Gold's Gym** at 2 Home Avenue

Mr. Pollock explained that the applicants proposed a revised location for the freestanding sign previously approved for the easterly frontage. It was now proposed to be located at the opposite edge of the frontage in order to be better viewed from the Interstate. The sign is proposed to be placed parallel to I-93 instead of perpendicular as originally approved.

The Design Review Committee found the revised location of the freestanding sign previously approved for the I-93 frontage to be appropriate as presented.

Building plans related to an application by **Lawrence MacLean** at **3 North Spring Street**.

Mr. Henninger introduced this proposal for changes to the north elevation of an existing commercial building. He reported the changes included the addition of a porch and a handicapped ramp.

(Mr. Gentilhomme stepped down as Committee member and presented on behalf of the applicant.)

Todd Fahey was also present on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. Gentilhomme explained that the existing brick will remain and the clapboard on the front of the building will remain white. The clapboard on the side of the building will be painted a terra cotta color to blend with the brick. All trim will be white or off white. Granite lintels on the north and south sides of the existing structure will replace the existing brick lintels.

The Design Review Committee recommended approval of the modification to the elevations as well as the site plan to address the ramp.

Mr. Henninger asked that a revised site plan be submitted to show the parking area with the handicapped ramp properly depicted. Mr. Gentilhomme responded that would be done.

Site and building plans related to an application by **Bishop Brady High School at 25 Columbus Avenue.**

(Mr. Gentilhomme stepped down as Committee member.)

Mr. Gentilhomme and David Rienstra, architects from Team Design, were present on behalf of the applicants.

Mr. Rienstra explained this addition including a media center and library with a two-story classroom addition to the rear of the existing building. He explained they will be using the existing brick colors. There will be an ornamental iron gate under the proposed bridge between the two new additions to limit access to that courtyard area.

Mr. Pollock reported that no landscape plans had been submitted for review to date.

Mr. Gentilhomme explained the proposed landscaping includes a three-foot hedge to create a green spot in front of the existing building along with foundation plantings. They are adding about five trees in front of the new addition. There is an existing large maple in front of the proposed chapel area that they plan to keep.

The Committee expressed concern about the architecture being a little "jumpy" and the suggestion was made that the brick on the existing entrance be replaced with brick of the same color as the new additions. Members agreed that would be helpful.

Mr. King suggested there was a need for a transition space such as a foyer between the outdoors and the interior space. There was no space for a foyer but Mr. Rienstra suggested that the roof could be extended. Members agreed that would be helpful

Members asked for more detail relative to the iron gate to the courtyard.

Mr. Henninger suggested for presentation to the Planning Board that the brick hatching be removed from the colored plans in order to depict more accurate colors.

The Design Review Committee recommended approval subject to the brick on the existing entrance being replaced with the same brick as the new additions, the roof on the front entrance being extended two or three feet, more detail being provided relative to the proposed iron gate, and a landscape plan being provided. The Committee deferred recommendation on the landscape plan until a plan is submitted for review.

Site and building plans related to an application by **Capital Kitchen & Bath at 58 Hall Street.**

Ms. Seifried explained this proposal for the conversion of a residential building to a commercial use. She explained they propose no changes to the façade but will construct a handicapped ramp and provide landscaping to meet the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.

Daniel Hughes was present as applicant with a proposal for a handicapped ramp with a pressure treated joist system and white composite rails.

Members suggested using lattice under the ramp so that it does not conflict visually with the railings. Members advised the applicant as to how he could shorten the handicapped ramp.

Members were of the opinion that this was a nice building renovation.

The Design Review Committee recommended approval with shortening of the ramp and the use of lattice under the rails.

Mr. Henninger asked the applicant to provide revised plans for the Planning Board meeting on May 17<sup>th</sup>.

**Site and building plans related to an application by The University System of New Hampshire at 125 North State Street.**

Ms. Seifried introduced this proposal for modifications to the north elevation of the existing building. She explained the existing garage will be converted to office space in addition to the existing office space in the house.

Chris Adams was present from Nobis Engineering as was Roy McCandless, representative of the prospective purchaser of the property.

Mr. McCandless reported they had received approval from the Zoning Board of Adjustment to expand into the current garage space. He explained the first floor will have a very large conference room that will accommodate at least 18 people, along with a number of smaller conference rooms. The second and third floors and the basement will also be used for office space.

He explained the addition to the north of the building will not be seen from Franklin Street or North State Street. He explained they need good handicapped access for their clients and will demolish the existing handicapped ramp to construct an elevator.

The elevator shaft will match the existing clapboard building.

Members were of the opinion that the approach to the addition is good.

Mr. McCandless expressed the desire to remove the existing wooden exterior stairway at the northeast corner of the building.

Members expressed concern with the easterly elevation of the elevator shaft and felt it should be sympathetic to the front elevation of the building. All of the detailing should be the same as the existing building.

The Design Review Committee recommended approval subject to the east façade of the elevator or stair tower mimicking the front windows of the east façade on North State Street elevation with windows, either open or shuttered, and appropriate details whether there is a stair tower attached or not.

Mr. McCandless explained that no landscaping was being proposed for the south elevation of the renovated garage as there is no opportunity to landscape that area because it is completely paved for parking.

Ms. Seifried asked for a colored elevation as well as full size drawings for the Planning Board meeting. Mr. McCandless agreed to provide the requested drawings.

**Site and building plans related to an application by Tiffany Properties LLC at 11 Integra Drive.**

Ms. Seifried introduced this proposal to construct three more storage buildings for self storage units and to expand the gravel area for outside storage. She explained the new buildings will look exactly like the existing units.

The Design Review Committee felt as much landscaping as possible should be added to screen this site, winter and summer, especially along the Integra Drive frontage and between the City's detention pond and the westernmost buildings.

**Site and building plans related to an application by John Dapergolas at 12 Integra Drive.**

Mr. Pollock introduced this proposal for a two-phase project that will include an addition to the existing building as the first phase and a new structure as a second phase.

The Design Review Committee felt they needed to provide as much screening as possible, perhaps using a combination of fencing and vegetation.

**Revised site and building plans related to an application by 2 Pillsbury Street LLC at 2 Pillsbury Street.**

Mr. Henninger introduced this proposal to replace all site lighting as well as modifications to the north elevation. He explained the loading dock area in the building is being converted to additional office space. Modifications are also proposed to the entrance canopy on the Pillsbury Street façade.

Steve Duprey was present as applicant with Jay Doherty, architect from The H. L. Turner Group. Mr. Duprey reported the canopy will be canvas in a green to match the windows and trim of the building.

Mr. Gentilhomme questioned the size of the posts in relation to the size of the awning and Mr. Duprey agreed to check with the awning company as to the appropriateness of the post size. It was agreed to surround the post with brick columns to match the existing brick of the building.

Members suggested using full-size windows at the easterly side of the former dock area. Mr. King suggested replacing the two end windows and making them full size windows. Mr. Duprey agreed.

In answer to a question by Mr. Henninger, Mr. Duprey explained that the light poles will be black.

Mr. Duprey mentioned the northeast corner penthouse is 12 feet high. He noted that NHPR is interested in placing two dishes on the roof in this area and he felt those dishes would be very visible from the south, north and east and would be about four feet above the penthouse structure. That will be the subject of a separate application.

The Design Review Committee recommended approval subject to replacing the two end windows on the first floor at the northeast corner of the building facing Allison Street and making them full size windows, and the enclosing of the columns for the proposed canopy in brick to match the building.

### **Non-Agenda Items**

Site and building plans relative to an application by **Krug Management** at 24 Hammond Street.

(Mr. Gentilhomme stepped down as Committee member and presented on behalf of the applicant.)

Ms. Seifried explained this proposal to remove the existing handicapped ramp that was placed improperly in the City's right-of-way. She reported they had received approval of the site plan from the Planning Board last month subject to submittal of a design for the replacement ramp for review and action.

Mr. Gentilhomme presented photographs of the existing conditions and a site plan showing a walkway instead of a ramp. Members suggested that the walkway be curved away from the building with plantings between the driveway and the pavement.

The Design Review Committee recommended approval as presented with additional landscaping along the side and a return of the gravel area at the front to lawn.

Mr. Gentilhomme indicated he would submit plans in time for Planning Board action on May 31<sup>st</sup>.

Site and building plans relative to an application by **Yves Tanguay** at 382 North State Street.

Mr. Henninger presented elevations that had been submitted to Code Administration in preparation for a building permit. He reported that nothing on the recently submitted plans is the same as those approved by the Planning Board.

Members felt a thorough review would be necessary since there were a substantial number of changes made to the elevations. The plans submitted were interesting but will require a lot of study.

The Design Review Committee felt the changes proposed were significant and recommended that the applicant resubmit for full review by the Committee and approval by the Planning Board.

There was no further business to come before the Design Review Committee and the meeting adjourned at 11:00 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen L. Henninger  
Assistant City Planner

o