

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee

September 12, 2006

The Design Review Committee held its regular monthly meeting on Tuesday, September 12, 2006, in the Second Floor Conference Room in City Hall at 8:30 AM.

Present at the meeting were Duene Cowan, Jay Doherty, Claude Gentilhomme, Elizabeth Hengen, Frederick Richards, and C. Hamilton Rice. Messrs. Henninger and Woodward, 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 20, 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:

- **Country Estates at Juniper Fells** on Snow Pond Road

There was no one present on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. Henninger explained this is a freestanding sign at the entrance to the residential development.

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

- **Dunkin Donuts** at 196 North Main Street

There was no one present on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. Henninger explained this application for modification of an existing freestanding sign. He reported they propose to change the top panel in order for Dunkin Donuts to be added to the Cumberland Farms sign.

There was some confusion on the part of the Committee as to what they had actually applied for and Mr. Henninger explained that there was additional information submitted for this application without the appropriate application for an affixed sign that appeared to also be proposed. He felt it would be appropriate to comment on the affixed sign at this time in preparation for an application submittal.

Ms. Hengen felt the affixed sign should not be internally illuminated. Messrs. Gentilhomme and Richards were not concerned with an illuminated sign since it will be

set back a considerable distance from the street and the canopy will be in front of the building, blocking some of the view of the sign.

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

- **Elizabeth's Kitchen** at 26 Pleasant Street (2 signs)

There was no one present on behalf of the applicant.

The Committee noted that this is a replacement panel in an existing internally illuminated sign along with a hanging sign on an existing bracket.

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

- **Riverhill Condominiums** at 45 & 47 Bog Road

Mr. Henninger explained this is a freestanding sign for a 28-unit condominium development.

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

- **Tokyo Joe's** at 202 North State Street

Glenn Schadlick from Ne-Op-Co Signs was present for the applicant and explained that they are re-using existing panels from their previous location.

Mr. Rice noted that the City Council had adopted a revision to the Zoning Ordinance that does not allow changeable message signs under any circumstances. The proposed changeable message portion of this sign is no longer allowable under the current Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Schadlick explained that there are two signs proposed. One will face North State Street and one will face the existing parking lot. He reported this will be less signage than the Irving signage currently on the building.

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

Site and building plans related to an application by **John Grappone Leasing Inc.** at **4 & 8 Hall Street.**

Mr. Henninger presented this proposal to demolish an existing 22,000 square foot building and to construct a 12,900 square foot retail building with freestanding ATM building. He reported this was seen last month by the Committee and comments provided.

Attorney Raymond D'Amante was present on behalf of the applicant and introduced other team members present. Present were Kevin Patten, from BKA Architects, Larry

Haines from John Grappone Leasing, Inc., Debbie Constantin from CVS, Michael Kostiew from D'Amante Couser Steiner Pellerin PA, Erin Reardon from Nobis Engineering, Bryant Anderson from Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, and Richard Westergren from Poyant Signs.

Mr. D'Amante discussed the building orientation that was a concern expressed by the Committee last month. He explained the history of the access to the parcel. He reported that a Mapped Line of Future Street was recently terminated and an abutting City parcel was conveyed to both abutters. He explained that it was his understanding that the abutting property to the south will eventually be developed for retail use, so they designed their own building taking that future development into consideration. The orientation of this building places their front door facing two-thirds of the traffic using Hall and Water Streets, according to the Vanasse Hangen Brustlin traffic study. In terms of the Gateway and where the traveling public is coming from, the building will be oriented to that traffic. The traffic study also recommended splitting traffic between two entrances, which they have done. The new building will be part of the future of this neighborhood.

Erin Reardon explained they had looked at alternate layouts and the one proposed provided the best circulation for both vehicles and pedestrians. She reported they propose one-way circulation to accommodate the drive-through traffic.

Kevin Patten explained the Committee had expressed concern about the visibility of rooftop mechanicals. He explained that they now propose a two-tier elevation with more brick, they had eliminated arches and squared off most of the elements, and had added a band between the brick and dryvit to bring down the height and give it more interest and scale. The entry and orientation remains as originally proposed. There will be a brick wall on concrete brick for the compactor with one side having a chain link fence with matching red privacy slot. The majority of the mechanical equipment will be in the middle of the roof. He created a parapet line so the mechanical equipment will be screened from all four sides from any reasonable direction. There will be no loading dock.

Mr. Henninger asked about lighting on the exterior of the building and Mr. Patten responded that there will be a soffit line highlighting the yellow eaves, with downlighting with a shield to wash the wall of the building. There will be under canopy lighting for the entrance and the drive-through.

Mr. Henninger asked about signage and Mr. Patten responded that there will be eleven signs. Mr. Rice noted he would need to review the signage proposal for compliance with the Zoning Ordinance. They will be allowed three affixed signs. In answer to a question from Mr. Henninger regarding the freestanding sign, Mr. D'Amante explained they are considering placing it at the Hall Street entrance in order to encourage traffic to use that entrance.

Mr. Cowan was concerned about the elevation for the northeast corner of the building because he felt it would be visible to traffic traveling south on South Main Street. He felt great progress had been made on the building but it looked like this elevation will be very prominent with a service door and a lot of brick as well as the compactor.

Ms. Reardon pointed out that there will be a well landscaped island buffering the northeast elevation.

Mr. Richards expressed strong concern about the approach from the north. He was concerned about the compactor on that elevation. Mr. Doherty also expressed concern. Mr. D'Amante responded that the landscape package buffering the compactor is extensive. Mr. Richards did not feel this building honored the function of the Gateway to the city. He did not feel the building had been customized to the site at all. Mr. D'Amante responded that they needed to consider pedestrian safety in their design for this site.

The Design Review Committee recommended approval of the site and building plans provided signage complies with the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance. There was a strong dissenting opinion from some Committee members relative to the compactor location.

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

Mr. Woodward introduced this proposal to construct a 5012 square foot addition to the existing office building, convert a portion of the existing building to office use, and expand the parking lot both on-site and off-site at 20 & 22 Franklin Street. He presented plans revised as a result of last month's comments by the Committee.

Ms. Hengen expressed concern about the height of the proposed link to the original building from the addition. She felt it should be lower and simpler and more scaled down. Mr. Woodward responded that it was his understanding that this was intended to be a space for the elevator.

Mr. Gentilhomme suggested that they lower the eaves for that portion of the building and remove the upper windows on either side of the connection. It would call less attention to that area.

The Design Review Committee recommended, if possible, that they lower the ridge for this addition, perhaps by lowering the eave on the stairwell/elevator addition on the north and east elevations. The Committee also recommended adding landscaping along the northwest corner of the parking lot.

Site and building plans related to an application by **NH Political Library at 14 Horseshoe Pond Lane.**

Mr. Woodward introduced this proposal and explained changes to the plan since the Committee previously commented. The most noticeable revision is the elimination of an external stairway previously proposed. He reported there will also now be brick paving for the access from the handicap parking space.

Christopher Carley, architect from CN Carley Associates, explained that since their last visit to the Committee, they had reconfigured the uses within the building and that had eliminated the need for the additional means of egress. They had also added shutters for the doors for the entryway.

The Design Review Committee recommended approval as revised with further consideration given to the guardrail, consistent with the requirement of the Heritage Commission, providing it meets building code requirements.

Site and building plans related to an application by **Ripley Street Management LLC at 1 Ripley Street.**

Mr. Woodward introduced this proposal for the re-use and expansion of an existing manufacturing building. He reported there will also be a new circulation system and parking area and a second level addition on the southerly side of the building.

Ken Jennison, owner, was present and explained that he proposes a metal roof and either painted or vertical metal siding on the building. Currently the building is yellow ceramic glass brick.

Regarding the freestanding sign, Mr. Henninger suggested raising the sign to allow for accumulation of snow. Mr. Cowan suggested creating a berm and then placing the sign on top of the berm.

The Design Review Committee recommended approval of the site plan and the design of the building addition and asked the applicant to submit details regarding building materials and colors and suggested providing photographs of the existing conditions.

Site and building plans related to **Bus Stop Shelters on North Main Street.**

Mr. Woodward explained this proposal for bus shelters in front of Eagle Square and in front of the State House Plaza. He explained that one suggested location for the Eagle Square shelters was between the two buttresses along the side of the southerly building, but CAT indicated that would not be an option because of visibility. The second option was a rather open structure in front of the furniture store, but staff had suggested that it be moved north away from that store front. He reported that the bus shelter at the State House Plaza were proposed to be in front of the existing monuments and staff had suggested moving the structure northerly to the corner of Park and North Main Streets.

Mr. Carley was present to discuss the proposals.

Mr. Gentilhomme liked the concept for the Eagle Square structure but did not like the bus stop at the State House Plaza. He preferred to see the design of the Eagle Square structure to be converted for use at this location as well. He also asked if the shelter could be designed to include the existing visitor kiosk.

(At 10:55 AM Mr. Gentilhomme left the meeting.)

Mr. Cowan felt CAT should be re-approached regarding locating between the buttresses in the opening to Eagle Square. It could be simpler and much less expensive. The Committee agreed

Regarding the State House Plaza, members did not think there was a good location or design that would be compatible with the Plaza. The Committee suggested moving the shelters north closer to Park Street and to try to combine the information kiosk into the design.

Members also expressed a concern about materials for the shelters and questioned whether this would encourage miscellaneous posters being pasted on the walls of the structures.

Site and building plans related to a proposal for the Executive/Legislative Parking Garage in the School Street/Green Street/Capitol Street area.

There was a brief discussion relative to the study contracted by the State for the Executive/Legislative Parking Garage. Members expressed concern about the mass of the buildings proposed, along with the lack of opportunity for green space since the buildings were being proposed for construction right at the sidewalk edge.

Staff was asked to confirm the date by which comments were due back to the State and bring this item back for further discussion next month.

There was no further business to come before the Committee and the meeting adjourned at 11:40 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen L. Henninger
Assistant City Planner

o