

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
March 3, 2020

The Architectural Design Review Committee (ADRC) held its regular monthly meeting on March 3, 2020 in the 2nd floor conference room at 41 Green Street.

Attendees: Co-Chairs Jay Doherty and Elizabeth Durfee Hengen, Members Doug Shilo, Claude Gentilhomme, and Margaret Tomas Richard Woodfin Planning Board Chairman

Absent: Member Ron King

Staff: Sam Durfee, Senior Planner
Lisa Fellows-Weaver, Administrative Specialist
Craig Walker, Zoning Administrator

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Hengen at 8:35 a.m.

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Gentilhomme moved to approve the minutes of February 4, 2020, as written. Mr. Shilo seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Major Site Plan Applications

1. CLOAS Realty Management, LLC, on behalf of Capital Regional Development Council, requests Major Site Plan approval to construct a new 15,300 sf structure and associated site improvements for the purpose of an environmental testing laboratory at 51 Antrim Avenue in the Industrial (IN) District.

Mr. Shilo and Mr. Doherty recused themselves for this discussion and left the table, which resulted in the lack of a quorum. Ms. Hengen apologized to the applicants and requested the applicant continue with a presentation and members provide non-binding comments. No formal motions were made.

Chris Drobat of Lavalley-Brensinger Architects represented the application along with Anne Ketterer also of Lavalley-Brensinger Architects.

Mr. Drobat explained the project. He stated that the site is currently undeveloped. The proposal is to construct a new 15,300 sf structure for an environmental testing laboratory facility. Samples of the exterior were provided; corrugated metal fiber cement. The rear of the building will be more industrialized and is proposed to be galvanized steel.

The parking area was explained to be along the front and side of the building. Deliveries will be made to the rear of the building and the driveway will be a continuous loop around the building. The building is proposed to be one-story, with a shingled, pitched roof. A garage is proposed at the rear of the building for deliveries, which are via courier services as well as by 18 wheelers.

Landscaping was discussed. Morgan, from Nobis Group, reviewed the proposed landscaping explaining that they are proposing to use native trees and shrubs throughout the site. She noted that there is landscaping existing at the street and property edge, which will also remain. Ms. Ketterer added that there is also landscaping proposed along the front of the street; however, the rear of the building will be designed for more utility use. The existing trees at the rear of the property will also remain. Mr. Walker noted that the property is along a bluff; it is sloped and wooded. He added that there are many easements for this property and is also within an aquifer protection district.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
March 3, 2020

Ms. Hengen asked about landscape bump-outs in the parking area. Ms. Ketterer stated that the parking proposal exceeds the zoning requirements and added that this layout is the most efficient for the project. Discussion ensued. It was suggested that additional landscaping be added to the front western area. Mr. Drobat stated that they would evaluate that further for and look for additional landscaping opportunities.

Ms. Ketterer noted that the signage package for the project will be forthcoming.

Mr. Gentilhomme stated that he liked the design proposed and felt that the choices presented were of a good palette.

There being no quorum present, no motion was made.

Mr. Shilo and Mr. Doherty returned to the Committee. The meeting reconvened.

Mr. Gentilhomme left at 8:51 a.m.

Sign Applications

1. John J. Pappas Revocable Trust, on behalf of CB Coldwell Banker | Lifestyles, requests ADR approval to replace a wall sign at 84 North Main Street in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

Scott Aubertin of First Sign represented the application.

Mr. Aubertin explained that the proposal is a rebranding for this location and everything will be replaced.

A lengthy discussion was held relative to the blue color of the sign. Mr. Aubertin stated that the existing sign was presented to the Committee two years ago and was approved with the blue color. This is not a proposal for a change in the color as this is the corporate color and is only a new design with a typeface change.

Alternatives were suggested such as adding a border, changing the background color, or switching the letters and background coloring.

Ms. Tomas stated that the blue is loud and it is a large amount of blue.

Ms. Hengen commented that the blue is a very bright and bold color. She added that the balance between this sign and the adjacent sign is disturbed due the intensity of the blue. She added that it is not unusual for corporations to modify colors in conjunction with design review.

Mr. Woodfin noted that these are the corporate colors. He added that the interior of the store is further defined with the corporate colors and there are screens displaying local real estate in the windows.

Mr. Doherty stated that he does not have any issues with the proposal. The blue background is bright; however, there are different colors throughout the area along the street.

Mr. Shilo stated that he does not have any issues with the proposal. He stated that the blue in the sign is fully saturated; however, it is no more saturated than the awning at the neighboring business, the flag hanging nearby, and the handicapped signs. Ms. Hengen replied that the flag and awning are different fabrics on different planes and their impacts are different from a sign on a building.

Mr. Doherty made a motion to recommend approval as submitted. Mr. Shilo seconded.

Ms. Hengen stated that the proposed sign is not in balance with other sign panels along the street. She explained that ideally a sign panel is visible; however, it should not fight with a building or an

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
March 3, 2020

adjacent sign. She added that the graphic is appealing but the blue color should be more grayed or mellowed. Mr. Aubertin stated that he can make that recommendation to corporate. He added that this shade of blue is carried throughout the building.

Mr. Shilo asked to confirm that the proposed blue is the same color of blue that is currently installed. If it is a different blue, he suggested using the blue as shown on the iPad or match what was presented within the sign application packet.

Mr. Shilo amended the motion to recommend approval as submitted, with the condition that color samples be provided to the Planning Board for final review, and reference the application printout for the color of the sign, which shows it to be a more muted blue rather than the existing sign. Mr. Doherty seconded the amendment. The amended motion passed unanimously.

2. Oakstream Properties, on behalf of Conservation Law Foundation, requests ADR approval to add a new projecting sign at 27 North Main Street in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

Notification was received that no one would be able to attend the meeting to represent this application.

Mr. Doherty stated that the sign proposed seems very out of character.

Mr. Walker spoke to the square footage requirements relative to signage for upper floor tenants and for common entrances. He stated that there is more than one tenant on the second floor. There could be an additional two square feet added for an additional tenant.

Members discussed an alternative placement for the sign to either be above the post rather than in the center of the arch. A question arose as to the thickness of the sign and how the sign is attached. It was also suggested to use something other than galvanized steel.

Ms. Tomas made a motion to table the application to the April 7, 2020, ADRC meeting. Mr. Shilo seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Capital Hotel Company VI, LLC, requests ADR approval to replace a freestanding sign and add a new wall sign at 406 South Main Street in the General Commercial (CG) District.

No one was present to represent this application.

Mr. Durfee stated that the sign package consists of two signs.

Mr. Doherty made a motion to recommend approval as submitted. Mr. Shilo seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

4. 107 Storrs Street, LLC, on behalf of Shaheen & Gordon, requests ADR approval to replace an internally illuminated monument sign, replace an existing awning, and add two internally illuminated wall signs at 107 Storrs Street in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

Brandon Currier represented this application.

Mr. Walker asked if there would be any historical restrictions to the existing sign painted on the exterior of the building. Ms. Hengen replied no.

The Committee agreed to address the applications separately.

Awning

Mr. Currier stated that the existing frame for the awning will be used they are only changing out the skin. A discussion was held regarding the actual color. Mr. Currier stated that the intent is to be consistent with the existing awning color and to match the awning and signage colors.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
March 3, 2020

Mr. Doherty made a motion to recommend approval for the replacement of the awning with the condition that the awning be the purple color of the background of the sign or the blue color of the ampersand in the sign. Mr. Shilo seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Freestanding Sign

Mr. Currier stated that the proposal is to replace the sign. No discussion was held.

Ms. Tomas made a motion to recommend approval as submitted. Mr. Doherty seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Wall Sign

The information for the wall sign was reviewed. Ms. Tomas suggested that the sign on Low Ave. be lowered a few inches for better visibility up the alleyway for pedestrians on Main Street. No additional discussion was held.

Mr. Doherty made a motion to recommend approval as submitted. Mr. Shilo seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

5. PFP Associates LTD Partnership, on behalf of Concord Medspa, requests ADR approval to replace two externally illuminated roof signs at 24 Bridge Street in the Opportunity Performance Corridor (OCP) District.

Emily Sullivan of Concord Medspa and Glenn Shadlick of NEOPCO Signs represented the application.

Mr. Shadlick provided printouts of the sign. He stated that Medspa is a new tenant and the proposal is just adding signage and logo to the building. The sign is a new panel.

Ms. Tomas asked if the font for the Medspa sign matches the existing sign. Mr. Shadlick replied no. Ms. Tomas suggested that the letters be spaced out more as it could make it easier to read. Mr. Shadlick replied that he does not believe that increasing the font size would make much of a difference.

Mr. Doherty stated that he feels that it is a nice contrast and added character to the sign.

Mr. Doherty made a motion to recommend approval as submitted. Mr. Shilo seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

6. Associated Enterprises Inc., on behalf of Erised Aesthetics, requests ADR approval to add a new externally illuminated projecting sign, and add vinyl graphics to the windows at 146 North Main Street in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

Glenn Shadlick of NEOPCO Signs represented the application.

Mr. Shadlick provided printouts of the sign.

Mr. Doherty stated that the sign design is very well laid out, simple, and easy to read. He appreciates the detail.

A discussion was held regarding the location of the sign. Mr. Shadlick explained that he must keep a 9 foot clearance otherwise the bracket would need to stick out over the arch and hit the existing jog. Mr. Shilo stated that it is clear that it is a flat surface and the location works.

Molding and trim will be added and will match the posts. Dark color granite is proposed. Lighting will be mounted onto the building to shine on the sign.

Ms. Tomas made a motion to recommend approvals as submitted. Mr. Doherty seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
March 3, 2020

Other Business

Concord Hotel, 11 South Main Street

Mr. Durfee stated that the break metal soffit that has been installed on the roof of the building is not functioning correctly and the bulbs are still showing. At this time, the lights have been turned off. Waivers will need to be requested to allow for the testing of the lights.

Mr. Durfee stated that an application was submitted for this month requesting multiple coloring schemes. The applicant has requested to continue the application while they work to ensure compliance with the original approval.

Ms. Hengen asked if the break metal is installed properly, will the intensity of the lights be muted. Mr. Durfee replied yes as it will be reflected light which should cut down on the intensity.

Ms. Tomas stated that it appears that there is an area in between the building and the break metal which is allowing light passage.

Mr. Shilo commented that these lights are for advertising. The lights call out to the traffic on the highway. There is no intimate pedestrian climate created with the lights. The lights do not do anything for safety on the streets. He added that the lighting is not dark sky compliant as lights are not supposed to be lighting the sky. He noted that there are also effects to the neighborhoods that can see the lights as well as to the wildlife and environment.

Committee Members

Mr. Doherty expressed urgency for the Committee to have a member with lighting experience. He explained that this is a priority as there is a real need for the City to have this knowledge available. He requested that staff help the Committee find a member with this skill set including asking the Planning Board for recommendation. He added that would like to see this position to be filled immediately.

Alternate PB member

Mr. Woodfin stated that at the next Planning Board meeting the Board will make a decision for a representative to be an alternate member on the Committee. Further discussion was held regarding the option to appoint numerous Planning Board members to allow them to alternate attendance.

Adjournment

Ms. Hengen made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Shilo seconded. The motion passed unanimously at 9:56 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Lisa Fellows-Weaver
Administrative Specialist