

**City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
June 10, 2014**

The Architectural Design Review Committee (ADRC) held its regularly monthly meeting on Tuesday, June 10, 2014 in the Second Floor Conference Room in City Hall at 41 Green Street.

Present at the meeting were members Jay Doherty, Claude Gentilhomme, Fred Richards (arrived at 9:00am), Jennifer Czysz (left at 9:30am) and Ron King. Craig Walker, Zoning Administrator and Steve Henninger, Becky Hebert, Nancy Larson and Patricia Murray of the City Planning Division were also present.

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 June 18, 2014, and which are subject to the provisions of the City of Concord's Zoning Ordinance in respect to Architectural Design Review.

Agenda Items

1. Consideration of the following applications under the provisions of Section 28-9-4(f), Architectural Design Review, of the Zoning Ordinance.
 - a. **Application by ADN Realty Trust and ABS Realty Trust, on behalf of Fisherville Pharmacy, requesting Architectural Design Review Approval for a new 36 sq. ft. internally illuminated wall sign at 219 Fisherville Road, within the General Commercial (CG) District. (Continued from May 13, 2014)**

Cheryl Rogers, Fisherville Pharmacy, was present to speak to the application. She stated that the top sign in the dome window shown on the picture submitted with the application has been removed. The sign shown between the two columns is a temporary sign which will be replaced with the proposed sign. She submitted a picture of the current conditions showing no signs at the site. The Committee asked where the main entrance was and asked why the proposed sign was not located above the entrance. Ms. Rogers replied that the purpose of the placement was to indicate that the store is larger than just the section where the sign hangs. They will be occupying 3 units and do not want to limit the signage over just the end unit where the entrance is located. The Committee was of the opinion that the sign should be centered on the unit frontage below the gable where the original sign was located. The committee was unanimous in its opinion that the architectural design of the building dictates that a sign be placed at the gable on the north end of the building. . The committee found the design of the sign acceptable for the use and location proposed.

Mr. King recommended Design Review approval of a new 36 sq. ft. internally illuminated wall sign at 219 Fisherville Road as submitted with the recommendation that that the sign centered under the gable awning to with the option of adding lighting to further highlight the shop front. Mr. Gentilhomme seconded the recommendation. The recommendation passed unanimously.

- b. **Application by Wait Langdon, Trustee under The Will of Alice E. Ward, on behalf of Merrimack Center, requesting Architectural Design Review Approval for a replacement (sign re-face) 120 sq. ft. internally illuminated freestanding sign at 89 Fort Eddy Road, within the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.**

The Committee stated that they found the new sign face more attractive. There was no further discussion.

Mr. Gentilhomme recommended Design Review approval for a replacement (sign re-face) 120 sq. ft. internally illuminated freestanding sign at 89 Fort Eddy Road as submitted. Ms. Czynsz seconded the recommendation. This recommendation passed unanimously.

- c. Application by O ICE, LLC, on behalf of Friendly's Ice Cream LLC, requesting Architectural Design Review Approval for a replacement (sign re-face) 51.7 sq. ft. internally illuminated freestanding sign on an existing pylon and a replacement 8.4 sq. ft. non-illuminated wall sign at 147 Loudon Road, within the General Commercial (CG) District.**

Neeka Earle, The Sign Center, was present to discuss the application. She stated they are replacing the face in the pylon with the same "Friendly's" logo with the addition of "Est. 1935" and also adding lettering "'Creating Memories since 1935", which is part of Friendly's new logo, at the architectural eyebrow over the front entrance. She stated the reader board with changeable copy has already been removed from the site.

Mr. King recommended Design Review approval for a replacement (sign re-face) 51.7 sq. ft. internally illuminated freestanding sign on an existing pylon and a replacement 8.4 sq. ft. non-illuminated wall sign at 147 Loudon Road, as submitted. Mr. Doherty seconded the recommendation. The recommendation passed unanimously.

- d. Application by 154 Profile, LLC, on behalf of Capital City Tattoo and Supply, requesting Architectural Design Review Approval for a new 4sq. ft. non-illuminated hanging sign on an existing bracket at 8 North Main Street, within the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.**

Scott Flanders, Owner of Capital City Tattoo and Supply, was present to discuss the application. The Committee stated the sign was difficult to read and that the word "tattoo" was the only element to stand out. The Committee questioned the images included on the sign proposal. Mr. Flanders explained that they are images of tattoo machines and that he is licensed to sell such equipment to tattoo artists through TAT Soul.

Ms. Hebert suggested changing the design to a white back ground with black lettering which may enhance the background graphic. Mr. Gentilhomme suggested increasing the whole logo and reducing the reversed images.

Mr. Walker noted that the image of the Capital dome is of the back side of the dome and asked if the applicant intended to image the front. The applicant indicated that the front of the dome would be the final image. A discussion about the final size of the sign ensued. Mr. Walker stated four square feet was allowed.

The committee then discussed with Mr. Flanders the option of removing the images of the tattoo equipment and expanding the dome and lettering to make the graphics more readable. Mr. Flanders found this described change to be an improvement and agreed to modify the sign accordingly.

Mr. King recommended Design Review approval for a new 4sq. ft. non-illuminated hanging sign on an existing bracket at 8 North Main Street, as submitted with the suggestion to delete the negative images of the tattoo equipment and stretch the logo vertically separating the text and expand "Capital City" out so it is more readable and create more white space between the words "Capital City" and "Tattoo". The revised plans are due to the Planning staff by Thursday, June 12. Mr. Richards seconded the recommendation. The recommendation passed unanimously.

- e. Application by Harold E. and Judith A. Ekstrom, on behalf of LARC (Legal Advice and Referral Center), requesting Architectural Design Review Approval for a new 12.8 sq. ft. replacement sign within an existing non-illuminated freestanding sign framework at 15 Green Street, within the Civic Performance (CVP) District.**

The Committee questioned if the sign would be black and white lettering. Mr. Henninger affirmed. Mr. King noted the outline of the State of NH was green. There was no further discussion.

Ms. Czysz recommended Design Review approval for a new 12.8 sq. ft. replacement sign within an existing non-illuminated freestanding sign framework at 15 Green Street, as submitted. Mr. King seconded the recommendation. The recommendation passed unanimously.

- 2. Application by W&E Realty, on behalf of Key Auto Group, requesting Major Site Plan and Design Review Approval, at 94 Manchester Street, to construct three (3) new buildings including a 19,909 square foot collision center, a 2,696 square foot used car sales building, and a 6,638 square foot oil/lube center with service bays. The project also includes parking, vehicle display areas, enclosed towing & vehicle storage for collision center, walkways, stormwater controls, underground utilities and landscaping. Also requested is a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) pursuant to Article 28-4-2 of the Zoning Ordinance, Buffer Requirements for Residential Districts and Article 28-4-2(L)(2) of the Zoning Ordinance, Conditional Use Permits Required for Certain Buffers, to allow for a shifting of change the required buffer. (2014-0019) (Continued from May 13, 2014)**

Ms. Hebert reported that the Architectural Design Review Committee (ADRC) reviewed and commented on this application on May 13, 2014. On May 2nd, the applicant submitted revised site plan drawings on June 3rd but revised architectural elevations have not yet been submitted in response to the ADRC and staff comments. Staff is in the process of reviewing the revised landscape plan and site plan drawings.

The ADRC made the following comments at its May 13, 2014 meeting:

- The entry to the site is not inviting and the ADRC recommended adding landscape islands along the main entrance drive.
- The ADRC was concerned about the lack of landscaping along the Manchester Street frontage and recommended adding more trees and a split rail fence to divide the landscape area from the vehicle display area.
- The ADRC suggested adding shade trees to both sides of the main entrance driveway.
- The ADRC asked for improvements to the façade of the collision center and the architect suggested introducing a brick base and contrasting panels along the front façade.
- The group also discussed moving the entrance to the quick lube building to the north side of the building, so the entrance would be more visible from Manchester Street.

Erin Lambert, Nobis Engineering, and John Tuttle, TW Design, and Atty. Steven Patterson, legal counsel for Key Auto, were present to discuss the application. Ms. Lambert presented the revised site plans noting the addition of two curved islands with trees within the striped parking lanes to the entry area. The landscaping has also been adjusted to provide more trees; a total of 159 new trees have been added to the site. She noted that the oil and lube center building was rotated as suggested by the Committee.

A discussion regarding the location of the showroom ensued. Mr. Gentilhomme expressed that the showroom should be more visible to customers. The Committee expressed that customers may not know where to go if the showroom is not located in a prominent area. Mr. Tuttle responded that typically people

drive to the vehicle that caught their eye in the lot and not necessarily the showroom building. They created a focal point on the building using glass and open parking spaces in front. He also stated they are open to suggestions from the Committee. Mr. Gentilhomme asked for a confirmation of the color of the metal panels. Mr. Tuttle stated the color is light grayish cream. He stated that it is the same color scheme used in the other Key Auto businesses. Ms. Larson brought up the request for a split single-rail fence near the entrance to contain the vehicles and plantings. Mr. Doherty expressed concerns for the architecture on the service end of the Collision building not matching the office end of the building. Concern was raised with the two white overhead doors facing Manchester Street which do not match any other door or window facing the street. Atty. Patterson responded that the Collision center building is the farthest back, is screened by the landscaping and is not designed to attract the general public. He further explained that this building is typically used by towing companies dropping off cars and people picking up cars after repair work. John Tuttle advised the committee that the "beige" top level of the collision building is in fact more of a grey color and directed the committee's attention to the reduced elevation which is more color correct and noted that the frames of the windows would be black not white. The committee found this explanation acceptable.

Mr. Richards recommended Design Review approval to construct to construct three (3) new buildings including a 19,909 square foot collision center, a 2,696 square foot used car sales building, and a 6,638 square foot oil/lube center with service bays and the installation of sign graphics on the buildings at 94 Manchester Street, as submitted with the recommendation that a split rail fence be installed at frontage, changing the Collision Center white overhead doors to gray-beige in color, and a suggestion to consider relocating the showroom to the west to make it more prominent. Mr. Gentilhomme seconded the recommendation. The recommendation passed unanimously.

3. Application by Abbott Farm, LLC, requesting a revision to the previously approved major site plan for "Abbott Village" to replace the tennis court (not constructed) with an in-ground swimming pool and bath house at 24 Callaway Drive, within the Neighborhood Residential (RN) District. (2010-0048).

Mr. Henninger gave an overview of the application. The application involves the revision to a multi-family condominium development originally approved in 2006. A tennis court was originally shown on the approved plans to be located immediately adjacent to the existing community building. The application involves the substitution for the tennis court with a pool and pool building. The footprint of the pool and pool building is smaller than the proposed approved tennis court. The pool will be an accessory recreational facility for use by the condominium residents.

Jason Garland, Abbott Farm, LLC, was present. He explained that tenant demand was more for a pool than a tennis court. The bath house will be of same materials as the Community Center. The bath house consists of two side by side bathrooms and an equipment room. Discussion ensued regarding the location of the bath house.

Mr. Doherty recommended Design Review approval to a revision to the previously approved major site plan for "Abbott Village" to replace the tennis court (not constructed) with an in-ground swimming pool and bath house at 24 Callaway Drive, as submitted with the recommendation that a pedestrian walkway be constructed between the two bathrooms to become the gateway for the outside space and interior pool space along with a gabled dormer with the doorways to the bathrooms opening out to the walkway, and the addition of frosted glass or tinted windows in each bathroom. Mr. Gentilhomme seconded the recommendation. Mr. King made a motion to amend the recommendation to add that the pass-through be located on the side facing the grass area and not on the parking lot side of the site. Mr. Doherty seconded the amendment. The recommendation and amendment passed unanimously.

- 4. Application by Liberty Utilities on behalf of Energy North Natural Gas, Inc., requesting Major Site Plan and Design Review Approval to permit construction of a 2-story 6,189 sq. ft. training facility at 10 Broken Bridge Road. Also requested is a Conditional Use Permit pursuant to Article 28-3-6(d)(4)(a)(2) of the Zoning Ordinance to allow greater than 2,500 sq. ft. of impervious surface, within the Industrial (IN) District and Aquifer Protection (AP) Overlay District. (2014-0028)**

Mr. Henninger stated that this is for Determination of Completeness for public hearing in July. The application involves the construction of a new two-story 6,981 square foot training facility on Broken Bridge Road. The building will contain two classrooms and equipment training areas. Exterior to the building is a fenced leak detection training area and a utility pole training area.

Matthew Routhier ASLA, from Northpoint Engineering, LLC, and John Duffy, Liberty Utilities were present. Mr. Routhier stated the facility would be for Liberty Utility employees' use. The maximum occupancy of the building is 34 including instructors. It is anticipated that only 15 or less students would be present at one time and only one training session would be conducted at a time. He also stated the exterior will be brown and gray in color. Mr. Duffy stated the doors will be yellow to match the company logo and also ties in to safety yellow.

Mr. Gentilhomme recommended Design Review approval for a Major Site Plan and Design Review Approval to permit construction of a 2-story 6,189 sq. ft. training facility at 10 Broken Bridge Road, as submitted subject to the approval of landscaping by staff, adding notations on the architectural elevations for the color scheme and the dimensions of signs. Mr. King seconded the recommendation. The recommendation passed unanimously.

- 5. Any other business which may legally come before the Committee.**

As there was no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting adjourned at 10:14 am.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen Henninger
Assistant City Planner