

**City of Concord, New Hampshire  
Architectural Design Review Committee  
March 12, 2013**

The Architectural Design Review Committee (ADRC) held its regular monthly meeting on Tuesday, March 12, 2013, in the Second Floor Conference Room in City Hall, at 8:30 a.m.

Present at the meeting were members Ron King, Frederick Richards, James Doherty and Duene Cowan. Becky Hebert and Steve Henninger of the City Planning Division were also present, as was Craig Walker, Zoning Administrator.

The ADRC 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 January 16, 2013, and which are subject to the provisions of the City of Concord's Zoning Ordinance in respect to Architectural Design Review.

**Agenda Items**

- a. Application by Natalia Strong/Soup Gallery, LLC, requesting Design Review Approval for a new hanging sign, located at 55 North Main Street, within the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.**

Mr. Henninger stated that the applicant was seeking approval for an affixed sign using an existing decorative bracket. Ms. Natalia Strong was present to respond to any questions from the committee. Don Reed, Design

Mr. King noted that the sign was attractive and made the motion to recommend Architectural Design Review approval of the sign as submitted. Mr. Richards seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

- b. Application by US Cellular requesting Design Review Approval for a replacement affixed sign and a replacement panel in an existing freestanding sign, located at 260 Loudon Road, within the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.**

Mr. Henninger presented the plans to the committee. No one was present to represent the committee.

The committee found the signs and awning as submitted to be acceptable. The committee did question the background for the affixed sign and agreed that it should match the white background of the existing sign panel on the front of the building. The committee discussed the mounting of the sign and after review of the details noted that the individual letters would be flush mounted on the wall.

Mr. King made the motion to recommend Architectural Design Review approval of the affixed sign, the new panels in the free-standing sign and the new awnings as submitted by the applicant with the recommendation that the background of the affixed sign remain white as shown on the plan dated 3/6/13. Mr. Richards seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

**c. Application by Michael Baron/Baron's Appliances requesting Design Review Approval for a new changeable copy sign over a portion of an existing time and temperature freestanding sign located at 350 Loudon Road, within the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.**

Tim Sullivan advised that the sign would create two lines of changeable copy with black backgrounds and translucent white letter. The existing LED lights would provide the illumination for the manual changeable letters at night but would not be directly visible. The applicant has requested to allow the colors to change from white, amber and red. Mr. Sullivan indicated that the colors would not sequence but may change when the manual message is modified.

Mr. Walker requested that this item be tabled to allow him to consult with the City Solicitor on this petition given the history of litigation in regard to electronic variable message signs. Mr. Sullivan did not object to the delay.

Mr. Doherty made the motion to table this application to allow the Zoning Administrator to consult with the City Solicitor about this application. Mr. Richards seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Henninger advised Mr. Sullivan that this application would be placed on the next month's agenda.

**d. Application by Carlson's MotorCorp requesting Design Review Approval for a replacement time and temperature sign and a replacement changeable copy sign both on an existing freestanding sign located at 13 Manchester Street, within the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.**

Mr. Walker requested that this item be tabled to allow him to consult with the City Solicitor on this application given the history of litigation in regard to electronic variable message signs. Mr. Sullivan did not object to the delay.

Mr. Doherty made the motion to table this application to allow the Zoning Administrator to consult with the City Solicitor about this application. Mr. Richards seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

**e. Application by Ninety Nine Restaurant requesting Design Review Approval for façade renovations, new awnings and light fixtures, located at 60-66 D'Amante Drive, within the Gateway Performance (GWP) District. (2013-12)**

Mr. Henninger introduced the application to the committee. Mr. Raymond Day from Allen & Burke Construction, LLC presented the building plans to the committee. Mr. Ray responded to questions on the lighting design, awnings, and material changes around the main entrance. Mr. Ray noted that the existing screening around the loading area and dumpster would be painted to match main body of the building.

Mr. Richards made the motion to recommend Architectural Design Review approval of the revisions to the building facades, lighting and awnings as submitted by the applicant, with the recommendation that

the existing screening around the loading docks and dumpsters be painted to match the body of the building. Mr. Cowen seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

**f. Application by Picnic Point Holdings requesting Design Review Approval for façade renovations, located at 32 Commercial Street, within the Opportunity Corridor Performance (OCP) District. (2013-13)**

Mr. Cowen recused himself from the committee and presented the plans to the committee. The owner Dick Amarosa was present to answer any questions from the committee.

Mr. Cowen advised that the proposed granite gray hardipanel on two sides of the addition at the northwest corner of the building would extend over the existing concrete foundation to improve the insulation of the building. The last one foot of clearance from the ground would be covered with an EFIS substance also granite gray in color. The window frames would match the existing dark green used on the building.

Mr. King questioned the shape of the windows on the addition being renovated. Mr. Cowen replied that the addition had a different vernacular than the main portion of the building and trying to match it exactly would not be feasible. Mr. Cowen pointed out that the main 18<sup>th</sup> century portion of the building is only partially occupied and the owner intends at a later time to restore the grandeur of this building and convert it from its previous warehouse use to an office use.

Mr. King moved to recommend Architectural Design Review approval of the project as submitted by the applicant. Mr. Richards seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

**g. Application by AT&T Wireless Services, Inc./Centerline Communications, LLC, for property located at 19 Industrial Park Drive, requesting a Conditional Use Permit with Design Review Approval, pursuant to Article 28-5-23, Wireless Telecommunications Equipment, of the Concord Zoning Ordinance, for the installation of new and replacement equipment in an existing fully enclosed cell tower and new and replacement ground mounted equipment within the existing compound. (2013-01)**

Mr. Henninger introduced the application to the committee. Mr. John Lawrence, the applicant's agent, was present to answer any questions from the committee.

Mr. Cowen noted that there was no noticeable change in the exterior appearance of this facility.

Mr. King moved to recommend Architectural Design Review approval of the project as submitted by the applicant. Mr. Richards seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

**h. Application by Global Towers Partners/Centerline Communications, LLC, for property located at 2 Pillsbury Street, requesting Design Review Approval for the installation of new and replacement antennas and equipment on the rooftop and side of an existing building. (2013-0002)**

Mr. Henninger introduced the application to the committee. Mr. John Lawrence, the applicant's agent, was present to answer any questions from the committee.

Mr. Cowen noted that without the before and after graphics the proposed additional antenna and equipment would be difficult to identify the differences resulting from the new installation.

Mr. King moved to recommend Architectural Design Review approval of the project as submitted by the applicant. Mr. Richards seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

- i. Application by Crown Castle/Centerline Communications, LLC, for property located at 217 Fisherville Road, requesting Design Review Approval for the addition of new antennas, remote radio heads and surge arrestor on an existing monopole and new and replacement ground mounted equipment within the existing compound. (2013-0003)**

Mr. Henninger introduced the application to the committee. Mr. John Lawrence, the applicant's agent, was present to answer any questions from the committee.

Mr. Cowen noted that without the before and after graphics the proposed additional antenna and equipment would be difficult to identify the differences resulting from the new installation. Mr. Henninger noted that this monopole was one of the earliest installed in the community.

Mr. King moved to recommend Architectural Design Review approval of the project as submitted by the applicant. Mr. Richards seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

- j. Application by Crown Castle/Centerline Communications, LLC, for property located at 102 Little Pond Road, requesting Design Review Approval for the addition of new antennas, remote radio heads and surge arrestor on an existing lattice tower and new and replacement ground mounted equipment within the existing compound. (2013-0004)**

Mr. Henninger introduced the application to the committee. Mr. John Lawrence, the applicant's agent, was present to answer any questions from the committee.

Mr. Cowen noted that without the before and after graphics the proposed additional antenna and equipment would be difficult to identify the differences resulting from the new installation. Mr. Henninger noted that this tower was constructed many years ago for radio purposes and wireless telecommunication antenna had been added to this existing tower.

Mr. King moved to recommend Architectural Design Review approval of the project as submitted by the applicant. Mr. Richards seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

- k. Application by Crown Castle/Centerline Communications, LLC, for property located at 58 Locke Road, requesting Design Review Approval for the addition of new antennas, remote radio heads and surge arrestor on an existing monopole and new and replacement ground mounted equipment within the existing compound. (2013-0005)**

Mr. Henninger introduced the application to the committee. Mr. John Lawrence, the applicant's agent, was present to answer any questions from the committee.

Mr. Cowen noted that without the before and after graphics the proposed additional antenna and equipment would be difficult to identify the differences resulting from the new installation. Mr. Henninger noted that this monopole was installed at the same time as the Fisherville Road tower.

Mr. King moved to recommend Architectural Design Review approval of the project as submitted by the applicant. Mr. Richards seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

- 1. Application by Havenwood-Heritage Heights, for property located at 149 East Side Drive, requesting Design Review Approval for the redevelopment of the north end of the property, including the demolition of 65 residential dwelling units, construction of 34 new residential dwelling units, construction of a new private road, driveways, sidewalks, stormwater management, lighting, landscaping, and related site improvements. (2013-0008)**

Richard Pizzi from Lavallee/Brensinger Architects presented the project to the committee. Erin Lambert from Nobis Engineering discussed the site and landscape plans. Richard Palmeri and Deborah Naylor represented the applicants.

Mr. Pizzi advised the committee that the units built in the 1980's as part of the first phase of the Heritage Heights complex were no longer marketable. 20 existing units are to be retained and updated and 34 new units are going to be built to replace the 61 units being demolished. The new units would either be single family detached units or duplex buildings. Ms. Lambert noted the overall layout was based on a central access way to improve way finding on campus, and with the units placed around cul-de-sacs. Mr. Pizzi noted that this layout was based on the most recent duplex project at the Havenwood complex off Ormond Street. The central cul-de-sac has become the focal point of this community and is very well received by the residents.

Mr. Pizzi presented the building elevations to the Committee. He commented that this project takes its inspiration from the Craftsman Style but with affordable modern materials and treatment. Mr. Richards commented on the vertical siding used in the gable ends and on the sides of the buildings and noted that this was not typical of the Craftsman Style. The committee asked the applicant to reconsider the horizontal vinyl siding and possible substitute horizontal clapboard or cedar shake style vinyl siding. Mr. Palmeri and Mr. Pizzi said that they would further evaluate the use of vertical vinyl siding.

Mr. Pizzi noted the existing units to be retained would be resurfaced to match the proposed units. He noted that several of the buildings had already been modified to be compatible with the architectural theme.

Ms. Hebert commented on the amount of pavement on site and the choice of centering the units around the cul-de-sacs. Mr. Palmeri explained that the layout was based on their experience with their clientele, that each unit would have front and rear pedestrian access. He noted that he presently maintain nearly eight miles of sidewalk on both campuses. The goal to provide walkability increases the amount of pavement. Ms. Lambert commented that they had revised the site plan to reduce the amount of pavement, increased the setbacks along East Side Drive and on the north side of the site, and revised the grading plan

so that they can preserve approximately half of the existing trees. She also noted that the cul-de-sacs will create very little traffic in front of the units as compared to the units in the existing phase.

Mr. Pizzi noted that space would be set aside on the site for common gardens. Ms. Lambert noted that this area and pedestrian features in the cul-de-sac islands need to be shown.

Mr. Pizzi noted that all the new units would have basements for storage and the clients would have the ability to make equity improvements in their rental units.

Mr. Richards excused himself at 10:15 AM due to another commitment but did comment that he found the overall site and building plan acceptable.

Mr. King moved to recommend Architectural Design Review Approval of the building and site layout as submitted by the applicant, with the suggestion that the applicant consider revising the vertical siding to a horizontal vinyl or cedar shake style siding on the units. Mr. Doherty seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- **Other Business**

No other business was discussed.

As there was no further business to come before the Committee, Mr. King made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Cowen seconded the motions. Motion passed unanimously and the meeting adjourned at 10:22 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen Henninger  
Assistant City Planner