

**City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
October 9, 2012**

The Architectural Design Review Committee (ADRC) held its regular monthly meeting on Tuesday, October 9, 2012, in the Second Floor Conference Room in City Hall, at 8:30 a.m.

Present at the meeting were members James Doherty, Duene Cowan, and Frederick Richards. Gloria McPherson, Steve Henninger, Becky Hebert, and Donna Muir 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 October 17, 2012, and which are subject to the provisions of the City of Concord's Zoning Ordinance in respect to Architectural Design Review.

Agenda Items

- **Application by Tom Smith / Depot Antiques & Toys, for Architectural Design Review approval of a new affixed sign located at 30 North Main Street, and a replacement affixed sign and a replacement hanging sign located at 32 North Main Street, within the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.**

Mr. Henninger reported that this application was tabled at the August 15, 2012, Planning Board to allow further review and comment by the ADRC on the revised signage. He stated that the revised signage meets all Code regulations as presented.

Ms. McPherson stated that these are two separate businesses owned by the same owner and are located in two separate buildings connected by an interior door, but with only one exterior entrance.

Mr. Gregory Slossar, from Saymore Signs, was present on behalf of the applicant. He stated that the entrance to the businesses was chosen because of the lower ramp at one of the doors making it more accessible. He stated that the toys and trains sign is an existing internally illuminated light box sign. He stated that he has tried to mimic other signs in the area.

Mr. Doherty said that he likes the clarity of hanging sign and the larger sign, but the other sign feels different, perhaps because of the size of the sign and the greater number of words on this smaller sign.

Mr. Slossar stated that the owner is really committed to all the wording on the signs, and that the blue and orange colors of the hanging sign are the colors of the Lionel Train company logo.

Ms. Hebert suggested that the smaller affixed sign could be a square shape instead of rectangular, and located closer to or over the actual entrance.

Mr. Doherty moved to recommend Architectural Design Review approval for the hanging sign and the larger affixed sign as submitted and recommended Architectural Design Review approval for the smaller affixed sign with the request that the owner review the smaller rectangular affixed sign for possible reduction in text or adjustment of the proportions of the sign either vertically or horizontally for better readability. Mr. Cowan seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- **Application by Concord Christian Academy for Architectural Design Review Approval of revisions to an existing freestanding sign located at 37 Regional Drive, within the Office Park Performance (OFP) District.**

Mr. Henninger advised that the applicant is proposing to relocate an existing sign on Pembroke Road and attach it to the existing Regional Drive sign to form a v-shaped sign.

Mr. Dean Whiteway, headmaster of Concord Christian Academy, was present. He stated that the lettering on the current signs is difficult to read when driving by and when traffic is coming from the east, there is no sign visible.

Mr. Henninger reported that the new proposed panel is almost on the ground and will be blocked by the snow. Mr. Whiteway stated that they will be shoveling the front of the signs.

Mr. Cowan inquired whether the tracing around the top of the letters was part of the design of the sign and whether the shadowing which is shown on the graphic was intended. Mr. Whiteway said that there would not be any shadowing or tracing on the sign.

Ms. McPherson asked whether the white, yellow, and blue striping on the bottom portion of the sign would be painted across the entire sign. Mr. Whiteway responded that each clapboard would be painted individually in its own color creating a striped background for the lettering. He stated that the bottom two panels would be dark blue and the panel above the blue would be yellow. The rest of the panels making up the bottom portion of the sign would remain grey in color rather than partially white as shown. Mr. Whiteway advised that the "The Academy" lettering would be attached to the surface of the existing panels at the bottom of the sign. Mr. Whiteway advised the committee that the school's colors are blue and yellow.

Mr. Richards moved to recommend Architectural Design Review approval of the sign, as described by the applicant to the committee. Mr. Doherty seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- **Application by Michelle Lienhart / Just Be Boutique for Architectural Design Review Approval of a new affixed sign and a new panel in an existing freestanding sign located at 249 Sheep Davis Road, within the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.**

Mr. Henninger stated that the applicant is proposing a new affixed sign and a new panel in an existing freestanding sign. He explained that the affixed sign above the entrance of the boutique is consistent with other affixed signs in the strip center. Mr. Henninger noted that the temporary affixed sign is not as orange in color as shown on the sign application.

Ms. Michelle Lienhart, owner of the Just Be Boutique, was present. Ms. Lienhart advised the committee that the background color would more brown than the orange shown on the application drawings.

Mr. Cowan stated that the font used for the word boutique on the affixed sign was different than the font on the panel for the freestanding sign. Ms. Lienhart advised the committee this was for visibility reasons for motorists. He felt that at least the spacing between the words "Be" and "Boutique" should be increased. Ms. Lienhart concurred with this recommendation.

Mr. Cowan moved to recommend Architectural Design Review approval of the two signs as submitted, with the recommendation that the spacing between the words "Be: and "Boutique" is increased. Mr. Richards seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- **Application by Parker Education for Architectural Design Review Approval of a new freestanding sign located at 33 Pleasant Street, within the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.**

Mr. Henninger reported that the applicant has requested postponement of this application until the November Architectural Design Review meeting.

- **Application by Center Point Church for Architectural Design Review approval of a new freestanding sign and a new affixed sign located at 20 North State Street, within the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.**

Mr. Henninger reported that the applicant has requested postponement of this application until the November Architectural Design Review meeting.

- **Application by Carlson's Motor Sales for Architectural Design Review approval of a replacement panel in an existing freestanding sign, a replacement time and temperature sign, and a new changeable copy sign all on an existing freestanding sign located at 13 Manchester Street, within the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.**

Mr. Henninger reported that the applicant is proposing to modify their existing freestanding sign.

Mr. Walker explained that the proposal does not include the replacement panel for the name of the company as shown, as that panel has previously been approved and installed. He stated that the time and temperature sign is being reduced in size, and that the applicant is proposing a three-line mechanical changeable copy sign at the bottom portion of the sign.

Mr. Tim Sullivan, from Barlo Signs, was present on behalf of the applicant. He noted that the bottom portion of the existing electronic variable message sign would be covered by the mechanical changeable copy sign. The underlying electronic sign would be used to illuminate the new mechanical variable message sign on top. The overall size of the sign was not increasing.

Ms. Hebert asked whether the time and temperature portion of the sign would be smaller. Mr. Sullivan stated that it would be smaller.

Mr. Doherty asked whether the time and temperature would be red as shown on the image of the existing sign, or white as shown on the image of the proposed sign. Mr. Sullivan responded that the color of the time and temperature font allows for the applicant to change the color at will.

Mr. Richards moved to recommend Architectural Design Review approval for the replacement time and temperature sign and the new changeable copy sign as submitted, with the recommendation that the font for the time and temperature sign be either the color that has been submitted on the graphic (which is a yellowish white) or white. Mr. Doherty seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- **Application by iParty for Architectural Design Review approval for a new affixed sign located at 196 Loudon Road, within the General Commercial (CG) District.**

Mr. Henninger stated that the Zoning Administrator issued a sign permit based on last years' Planning Board approval. He added that the lighting for the sign causes a glare on Loudon road.

Ms. McPherson stated that this application should have come before the ADRC so that issues of lighting could have been addressed.

Mr. Walker reported that as per the permit issued, there should not be any sign illumination.

The ADRC discussed whether they should approve the sign as installed, without any graphics of the sign. The Committee decided to have the Zoning Administrator contact iParty to have the lighting removed.

- **Application by New Hampshire Distributors, Inc., for Architectural Design Review approval for the construction of a 35,735 square foot addition, a new one-way access driveway for trucks, and related paving, drainage, landscaping, and associated site improvements, located at 65 Regional Drive, within the Industrial (IN) District. (2012-0050)**

Mr. Doherty recused himself from the discussion and decision on this application, as his firm is involved with the project.

Ms. Hebert stated that the application is for a major site plan with a Conditional Use Permit for a 35,000 square foot addition.

Mr. Frank Lemay, from Milestone Engineering & Construction, was present on behalf of the applicant. He explained that because of an agreement with an abutter that fell through, the applicant would be relocating the driveway and reconfiguring the parking and the footprint of the building. He reported that the building is a chilled warehouse and therefore the exterior of the building would be a metal covered foam panel. Mr. Lemay stated that the front of the building would be screened by landscaping.

Ms. Hebert reported that the applicant would be adding trees along the frontage of the site and replacing some unhealthy trees in the parking lot. The scrub oaks will remain at the northwest corner of the site. Mr. Cowan stated that both the existing building and site have been well maintained by the applicant.

Ms. Hebert explained that the applicant is working with the abutters and the state, as there may be a need for mitigation due to the Karner Blue butterflies in the area.

Mr. Cowan moved to recommend Architectural Design Review approval for the design of the building and landscaping, with the recommendation that the Planning staff review and approve the proposed revisions to the landscaping plan. Mr. Richards seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

- **Application by the New Hampshire Association of Realtors, for Architectural Design Review approval for the construction of a new three-story 23,832 square foot office building and related parking, access driveway, stormwater management, lighting, landscaping, and associated site improvements, located at 115A Airport Road, within the Institutional (IS) District. (2012-0049)**

Ms. Hebert stated that the application is proposing to tear down the existing office building and build a new office building on the site and explained that the property was located in the Institutional District.

Mr. Brian Pratt, from CLD Consulting Engineers, Inc., and Mr. Scott Vlasak, from Bruce Ronayne Hamilton Architects, were present on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. Pratt explained that the new three-story building will be placed towards the front of the site, and due to FAA restrictions, the building will actually have a partial third story. He stated that the applicant originally asked for a waiver to reduce the amount of tree plantings on the site, however, the plan has been revised to include the required tree plantings in the parking lot. He reported that because of the FAA height restrictions, they will use shorter, ornamental trees, such as crabapples and dogwoods within the eastern portion of the site, adjacent to the airport. Mr. Pratt said that he would get revised plans to the Planning Division which would outline all the changes.

Ms. Hebert explained that the application was to be presented to the Planning Board for a determination of completeness on October 17th and the public hearing would be held on November 28th.

Mr. Pratt noted that at the request of staff, the applicant will attempt to preserve as many of the existing mature trees at the southwest corner of the site as possible.

Mr. Vlasak stated that the FAA height restrictions require the building to be stepped which affects the north and south elevations of the building, and that the applicant was looking to have an occupied roof deck, if possible. He explained that the main entrance would serve all the building tenants.

Mr. Vlasak said that the applicant would submit a sign plan once the tenants were chosen for the building.

Ms. Hebert said that the signs as shown on the building elevation do not comply with the City's zoning requirements because it isn't a single tenant building.

Mr. Vlasak stated that a rear exit on the east elevation was shown on the site plan, but not on the elevations, as they are waiting to see what the needs of the building tenants are.

Mr. Vlasak described the materials to be used on the building, including split-face red masonry with subtle accent bands at the base and between the first and second floor windows with tan EFIS on the upper stories. The main entrance would be aluminum metal panels and the white pilasters and horizontal banding shown on the graphics would be EFIS.

Mr. Doherty asked whether a loading dock was planned. Mr. Pratt stated that the zoning required only a loading space, which is what is proposed, rather than a dock.

The ADRC discussed the design of this proposed building in comparison to other building in the area, which appear to be more residential looking office buildings. Mr. Cowan was concerned with the numerous types and juxtapositions of materials being proposed. He suggested that there could be a better way to tie the two sides of the building together with the center tower. The ADRC discussed the use of split-faced brick rather than white EFIS on the pilasters and suggested illustrating the joints on the metal panels. The ADRC also discussed the west elevation and how it will be visible for a long distance, and suggestions were made to have it be more in line with the rest of the building.

Ms. Hebert reminded the architect that the railing needs to be considered an architectural feature even if the roof deck is not occupied and that roof top mechanical screening needs to be provided.

Mr. Henninger suggested that the employee entrance in the rear of the building have a canopy for practical purposes.

The ADRC stated that they would not be making any formal recommendation as the design is still evolving, but offered the following comments to the applicant:

- Address the concerns with the west elevation
 - Consider using split-faced block instead white EFIS for the pilasters
 - Where the corner EFIS goes all the way up the building, consider terminating the white after the first story or consider using split-faced block
 - Show the joints in the metal panels
 - Show all egress doors
 - Provide final color and materials for the building and windows
 - Ensure that the railing matches or complements the tower and the windows
 - Signage needs to be addressed in the design of the building.
-
- **Pre-application consultant for The Toy Shop on North State Street.**

Mr. Couture was present on behalf of The Toy Shop. He provided a black and white graphic of the sign and stated that the sign would be painted with a blue background with yellow letters to match the existing trim on the building.

Mr. Doherty noted that the arrangement of the chess pieces at the top of the actual sign as shown in the photo is more balanced than in the black and white graphic.

Mr. Cowan suggested the chess pieces be kept distinguished from the rest of the sign by using a different color, perhaps black and white.

Mr. Henninger explained to the applicant that The Toy Shop needs to apply for the sign through the Code Division, and that the application must include the size, colors and materials proposed. He stated that a graphic should be provided showing what the sign will look like painted. He stated that the due date for the sign application is October 30th.

There was no further business to come before the Committee, and the meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Gloria McPherson
City Planner

GM/djm