

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

June 12, 2007

The Design Review Committee held its regular monthly meeting on Tuesday, June 12, 2007, in the Second Floor Conference Room in City Hall at 8:30 AM.

Present at the meeting were Duene Cowan, Jay Doherty, Claude Gentilhomme, Ron King, Fred Richard, and Hamilton Rice. Messrs. Woodward and Henninger, and Ms. Hebert and Ms. Osgood from the Planning Division were also present, as was Craig Walker from Code Administration.

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 June 20, 2007, 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:

- **3W design inc.** at 7 Henniker Street

There was no one present on behalf of the applicant.

Members of the Committee expressed some confusion regarding the particular design that was being requested. Plans submitted showed two different sign designs with different mounting plans.

The Design Review Committee recommended approval of either design but preferred the one shown on the drawing rather than the one shown in the modified photograph.

- **ONE.org** at 142 North Main Street

There was no one present on behalf of the applicant.

Members expressed concern about the background behind the proposed sign on the building.

The Design Review Committee recommended approval subject to the applicant addressing the multi-colored background on the building behind the sign.

Site and building plans related to an application by **Jensen's Residential Properties LLC** at **59 Manchester Street**.

(Mr. Cowan recused himself.)

Mr. Woodward explained this proposal to replace the existing office and community building with two residential units. He reported that the Committee had previously expressed concern about the landscaping being sparse in the front of the property. He presented a letter from the park resident closest to Manchester Street who indicated he like the view and the activity on Manchester Street.

There was a discussion about whether the landscaping buffer was for the benefit of the residents of the park or for the traveling public.

The Design Review Committee indicated that they considered the existing landscaping along Manchester Street acceptable in fulfillment of the requirements for a perimeter buffer for the mobile home park.

Site and building plans related to an application by **Centennial Senior Center on behalf of Concord Christian Academy at 37 Regional Drive.**

(Mr. Doherty recused himself.)

Mr. Henninger explained this proposal for a second phase to this project. They propose to place two modular classrooms on the site on a temporary basis while they propose and construct a major addition to the existing building in a later phase.

Chris Adams from Nobis Engineering was present to explain the timing of the anticipated construction on the site. He reported that after the construction of the major addition, the modular classrooms will be removed.

The Design Review Committee recommended approval as submitted.

Site and building plans related to an application by **George Geers Revocable Trust on behalf of Granite State Credit Union at 311 Sheep Davis Road.**

Mr. Henninger introduced this proposal to construct a new building for use as a banking facility. He reported this is a single-story structure with three drive-up lanes. The building will have yellow vinyl siding with white Aztec trim.

He reported that last month the Committee had questions about whether this is proposed to be a single story or a two-story building and the revised elevations clarify the design.

Mr. King had questions about traffic on Sheep Davis Road and whether the proposed entrance is in an appropriate location.

Christopher Nadeau, from Nobis Engineering, was present as were Doug Watts and Mark Sereda, from FCI Associates.

Mr. Nadeau responded that they have designed the site such that if the abutting parcel is developed, they will be able to move their access through that abutting property.

Mr. Henninger also presented a signage package for review which will include an affixed sign over the drive-up gable as well as an affixed sign over the main entrance along with a freestanding sign.

The Committee questioned the effectiveness of the sign over the drive-up window.

Mr. Gentilhomme suggested that they strengthen the columns at both the entrance and the drive-up as they are too thin. Mr. Sereda agreed and indicated it was his intention to make them larger.

The Design Review Committee recommended approval of the site and building plans subject to the addition of shade trees around the perimeter of the site as well as a base for the freestanding sign and further subject to a strengthening of the columns at both the entrance and the drive-up.

Site and building plans related to an application by **Granite State Management & Resources at 4 Barrell Court.**

There was no one present on behalf of the applicants.

Ms. Hebert introduced this proposal for a small addition and a revision to the parking lot. She reported they do not propose any new landscaping with the exception of replacing trees they are removing for the addition.

Members noted that the large expanse of parking lot will not be shaded.

Members suggested that there be a more substantial landscape plan for the triangular area to the east of the entrance circle. Mr. King suggested that the southerly edge of the currently developed parcel should be fully landscaped along with the center part of the circle in front of the building.

The Design Review Committee recommended approval subject to the addition of landscaping along the entrance roundabout and along the southerly edge of the parking lot.

Site and building plans related to an application by **76 Old Turnpike Realty at 76 Old Turnpike Road.**

There was no one present on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. Woodward introduced this proposal for a new headquarters building for North Branch Builders. He reported they propose to construct a 2700 square foot addition to the existing building and a 2500 square foot storage building. They also propose a fenced-in area for their outdoor storage. There is a new parking and entry arrangement in the front. They propose to remove quite a few trees and only replace four. No signage package has been submitted at this time.

The Design Review Committee requested that the colors of the new addition be specified and color samples provided, and that photographs of the existing building be provided to better understand the colors and materials that already exist. The Committee further noted that the details of the roof overhang at the entry are not shown on the north and south elevations so that it is hard to visualize and understand exactly what it is, that the proposed affixed sign on the west elevation may be too large, and that there is a need for more site landscaping.

Site and building plans related to an application by **81 Hall Street LLC** at **81-91 Hall Street**.

(Mr. Doherty recused himself.)

Mr. Henninger explained this proposal for a new building and a partial redevelopment of a site on Hall Street. Currently there is a two-story office building, a house and a garage that has been used for automobile repair on the site. The house and garage will be demolished and modifications made to the existing office building, and a new 92-room hotel will be constructed. He reported that they have applied for a Conditional Use Permit for the height of the affixed sign.

The project architect reported that the design was based on Marriott standards which they have developed over the years.

Members noted that the southerly elevation seemed to be rather blank. They understood that it was necessitated by what takes place inside but suggested that louvers might be appropriate.

The architect reported that the building siding will be composite board with synthetic face brick for the lower level.

Members noted that the colored rendering and the colored site plan presented do not match.

The Design Review Committee recommended approval subject to the addition of louvers to the south-facing elevation.

Site and building plans related to an application by **Robert Aranosian** on **Sheep Davis Road**.

Mr. Henninger introduced this proposal to construct a 6650 square foot retail building on a vacant parcel. He reported that they proposed a lot of ornamental trees and not many shade trees. It would be more appropriate to reverse those numbers. No new vegetation is proposed along the property lines. He reported there will be three lights on poles in the front of the parking lot and wallpaks on the building at the rear. They will use a cut-off fixture for those lights.

Members suggested that they shift some of the trees proposed for the site frontage to the property lines. City staff has also suggested creating a small berm along the Sheep Davis Road frontage to screen the view of the undersides of vehicles parked against the edge.

Tim Golde, from Golde Planning and Design, and John Jordan, architect, were present on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. Cowan suggested carrying a little of the detail of the corner around the southwest corner of the building.

The Design Review Committee recommended approval.

Site and building plans related to an application by Capital Regional Development Council at 30 Henniker Street.

Ms. Hebert introduced this proposal to construct an 18,000 square foot industrial building split into 15 units. This will be a split face brick building and each unit will have a garage bay door in the rear and a more formal pedestrian entrance to the front. She reported that City staff has asked for more shade trees to be added to the site.

Mr. Henninger noted that most of the buildings nearby are earth-tone and he asked if members found that the proposed color might be a little bold for the neighborhood. Members felt that since this is an industrial park and not seen by a lot of people, earth tone colors were not necessary.

Members did feel that more attention should be paid to the building elevation on the street frontage. Mr. Cowan suggested that instead of individual awnings over each door, they should consider placing a larger awning over two doors.

Brian Pratt from True Engineering was present on behalf of the applicant and reported that the colors proposed at this time are light stone and desert beige for the architectural metal siding.

Mr. Henninger also asked for the color of the garage doors to be noted on the plan for the next meeting and recommended that it should be a dark color. Also actual samples should be submitted of the materials proposed.

Site and building plans related to an application by Capital Regional Development Council, on behalf of FW Webb at 46 Henniker Street.

(Mr. Doherty recused himself.)

Ms. Hebert introduced this proposal to construct a 64,000 square foot warehouse distribution building. This building will be a red metal with split face gray concrete block and white trim.

Jim Spaulding, from the H. L. Turner Group, and Andrew Loverud from Design-Science, were present on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Loverud reported red is the corporate color.

Mr. Cowan suggested that the northeast corner treatment should wrap around the corner.

The Design Review Committee requested photographs of an existing building and storage area.

Site plans related to an application by Dartmouth Hitchcock Clinic at 253 Pleasant Street.

Ms. Hebert introduced this proposal for the revision to a parking lot resulting in the construction of Langley Parkway.

There was a lengthy discussion relative to drainage.

(Mr. King left at 10:45 AM.)

The Design Review Committee noted there was a need for more information in order to be able to understand what is being proposed. Members further noted that there should be landscaping between the parking lot and the Parkway.

Site and building plans related to an application by **NEWHAMCO** at **142 Loudon Road**.

Mr. Henninger introduced this proposal to construct an 11,000 square foot retail building on a lot that is mostly paved today. He reported they propose to demolish two existing buildings on the site.

Attorney Raymond D'Amante, Dean Holt from Mark Investments Inc., Jim Bernardino from Bohler engineering, and Karl McKinster from Jacob, Edwards & Kelsey were present on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. D'Amante indicated they are hoping to keep the one majestic tree on the site and may eliminate one parking space in order to accommodate that.

Mr. McKinster explained that there will be a manufactured limestone architectural detail around the affixed sign. The building will have brick siding with split face CMU block details. Lighting will consist of wallpaks on the back of the building and decorative lighting along the primary elevations. They propose to enclose the dumpsters with a cedar wood eight-foot fence.

Members suggested that the wallpaks be placed lower on the building than shown.

Mr. Gentilhomme asked about shielding of the rooftop units.

Mr. Cowan suggested putting a screen wall on the Loudon Road face of the front tote bin screening.

Mr. Gentilhomme suggested creating a path next to the proposed freestanding sign at the corner at Canterbury Road/Loudon Road since human nature is such that people will use that as the shortest route from the intersection to the store.

Mr. Cowan noted that the freestanding sign had a changeable message panel and asked if that was necessary. He was told that Walgreens feels that it is. Mr. Cowan felt it made the sign look cheap.

The Design Review Committee recommended approval of the site and building plans and commented that the design is clean and neat.

Revisions to previously approved building plans related to an application by **Mart Management** at **11 Borough Road**.

Mr. Woodward explained that The Village at Thirty Pines is the multi-family portion of the development that has come to be known as Sandwood Crossing and was included in a phased application of single family house lots and multi-family dwelling units that was first approved in 2001 under the prior Zoning Ordinance. The Village at Thirty Pines includes three multi-family buildings. On February 15, 2006, the Planning Board

approved a reduction of the multi-family development from 108 units to 90 units, together with modifications to the site plan to add carports and a community building, as well as modifications to the exterior elevations of all structures. On May 3, 2006, the Planning Board approved a subdivision application for conversion of these multi-family units to condominiums.

He reported that the applicant is now seeking to revise the exterior materials and colors, as well as to make changes to some of the design details for the multi-family units, the carports, and the community building.

Joel Silverwatch, architect, explained that the project was originally approved for a two-thirds brick façade for these building. They now propose to use cedar shake vinyl siding in a dark grey along the base level, a middle grey on the middle portion and then a lighter shade for the upper level. The portion of the building serving as the main entrance will also be the dark color. For the carport buildings they have changed the bay configuration with no change to the rear of the carport building. He reported the carports will be the darker grey with the medium grey and white trim. They will probably use a cementitious material on these buildings for its durability.

Mr. Cowan suggested constructing a gable on the rear of the carport building over the walk-through to break up the long roof line and to provide definition for the entry. Maurice Needham was present as applicant and agreed with the suggestion.

Mr. Henninger suggested that the walk-through should continue on the site plan.

The Design Review Committee recommended approval of the changes to the elevations for the residential buildings, carports, and the clubhouse building, subject to the provision of gables on the back side of the carport roofs above the walkthrough openings, to matching the column spacing on the rear elevations of the carports to that of the front elevations for three the largest carports in the center of the site, and to the use of a material more durable than EFIS for the base of the columns on the carports.

Site and building plans related to an application by **St. Paul's School** for faculty housing on **Dunbarton Road**.

Mr. Woodward introduced this proposal to construct an additional single family residence on Dunbarton Road pursuant to a previous conditional approval granted by the Board for construction of thirteen new dwelling units for faculty housing within the St. Paul's School campus. A condition of the original approval was that all units are subject to Architectural Design Review Committee approval. A single car garage is also proposed for the new residence as well as another single car garage for the adjacent residence that was previously constructed by approval of the Board.

Dennis Mires, architect, and Ted Kupper, from Provan & Lorber, were present on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. Kupper explained this matches the architecture of other houses at St. Paul's School.

Mr. Mires explained they propose a gambrel style house with white clapboard and trim with shingle roof and dark green shutters and doors the same as the rest of the property.

The Design Review Committee recommended approval of the design of the new single family residence and two single car garages together with the related site layouts as presented..

Non-Agenda Items

Site and building plans related to an application by **Louis and Anna Chan at 54 Airport Road.**

Ms. Hebert explained this proposal to construct a 1500 square foot office building and reported that the Planning Board had referred the revisions to the handicapped ramp back to the Design Review Committee. She explained the Committee had provided comments relative to building design and the applicant had revised the plans to remove the window from the second floor gable and replaced it with a louver. They have also now provided a canopy over the entrance.

She reported the Committee had also recommended changes to the handicapped ramp. She reported that the applicant's engineer has agreed to do it but would prefer not to because visitors getting out of their cars would be exiting onto a sloped surface.

It was agreed that the applicant could mark the parking space in question as not available for parking and replace that space elsewhere on the site if necessary.

Site and building plans related to an application by **The International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers at 48 Airport Road.**

Ms. Hebert introduce this proposal to construct an 8600 square foot addition to the rear of the existing building. She explained that this application had been submitted in time for a June consideration before the Planning Board but that the applicants had asked for postponement. However, they also wished to have reaction from the Design Review Committee in advance of the July meetings.

Pete Sawyer from SBM Associates was present on behalf of the applicants and explained that the new building will be a steel building with an EIFS system over split face block in earth-tone colors. The body will be a light beige color with trim in a darker brown. The dumpster will be fenced with a stockade fence. They will eventually paint the existing building to match the addition.

Mr. Henninger asked how they were screening the rooftop mechanical equipment and Mr. Sawyer responded that they are planning to keep the mechanical equipment inside with a condenser on the ground at the back of the building. Mr. Henninger noted the City's history regarding placement of condensers and the noise they generated. He suggested they look at their options to be certain they provide the least noise possible, given that they abut residential uses on three sides.

Mr. Sawyer indicated they will have vent stacks on the roof and may have an exhaust fan on the roof as well.

Mr. Sawyer explained that one proposed on-site sign will be a post-mounted sign in the landscaped area at the entrance to the new addition. It will be a 3'x18" panel placed about 12 feet high. Mr. Rice suggested that for visibility they should consider placing the sign at 8-10 feet high.

The Design Review Committee suggested repainting the existing building to match the new addition would be important.

Ms. Hebert noted that staff had asked the applicant to reconsider the site plan to eliminate the second access to the site and redesign the front parking lot. Mr. Sawyer reported they would like to retain the second access.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen L. Henninger
Assistant City Planner

o