The Architectural Design Review Committee (ADRC) held its regular monthly meeting on August 4, 2020 via Zoom at 8:30 a.m.

Attendees: Co-Chairs Jay Doherty and Elizabeth Durfee Hengen, Members Claude Gentilhomme,

Ron King, and Margaret Tomas.

Absent: Doug Shilo; Richard Woodfin Planning Board Chairman

Staff: Sam Durfee, Senior Planner

Lisa Fellows-Weaver, Administrative Specialist

Craig Walker, Code Administrator

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Co-Chair Hengen at 8:30 a.m.

Mr. Durfee read the following into the record:

Due to the COVID-19/Coronavirus crisis and in accordance with Governor Sununu's Emergency Order #12 pursuant to Executive Order 2020-04, this Board is authorized to meet electronically.

Please note that there is no physical location to observe and listen contemporaneously to the meeting, which was authorized pursuant to the Governor's Emergency Order. However, in accordance with the Emergency Order, this is to confirm that we are:

a) Providing public access to the meeting by telephone, with additional access possibilities by video or other electronic means;

We are utilizing the Zoom platform for this electronic meeting. All members of the Board have the ability to communicate contemporaneously during this meeting through the Zoom platform, and the public has access to contemporaneously listen and, if necessary, participate in this meeting through clicking on the following website address: https://zoom.us/j/754076629, or by dialing the following phone # 1-929-205-6099 and entering the password 754076629. For those calling in who want to provide public testimony, dial *9 to alert the host that you want to speak. The host will unmute you during the public hearing portion of the meeting.

b) Providing public notice of the necessary information for accessing the meeting;

We previously gave notice to the public of how to access the meeting using Zoom, and instructions are provided on the City of Concord's website at: http://concordnh.gov/273/Planning-Board

c) Providing a mechanism for the public to alert the public body during the meeting if there are problems with access;

If anybody has a problem, please call 603-225-8515 or email at: planning@concordnh.gov.

d) Adjourning the meeting if the public is unable to access the meeting.

In the event the public is unable to access the meeting; we will adjourn the meeting and have it rescheduled at that time.

Please note that all votes taken during this meeting shall be done by Roll Call vote.

Approval of Minutes

Ms. Tomas moved to approve the minutes of July 2, 2020, as written. Mr. Gentilhomme seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Sign Applications

1. <u>Landmark Sign</u>, on behalf of Genesis, requests ADR approval for the replacement of four monument signs at 227 Pleasant Street in the Institutional (IS) District.

Jason Moorehead from Landmark Design represented the application.

Mr. Moorehead stated that revisions were made to the signs based on the Committees recommendations from the July 7 meeting. Mr. Durfee noted that there are two separate lots. There are two separate signs on Pleasant Street as well as directional signs throughout the site.

Ms. Hengen commented that the revisions address the eligibility as well as provide clarification for directional vs location.

Mr. King made a motion, seconded by Mr. Doherty, to recommend approval of the proposed sign designs, as submitted.

Mr. Walker stated that the directional signs exceed the 4 sq. ft. requirement; they will need to be reduced or they need to obtain a variance. Mr. Durfee asked if the property could be classified as a campus as that may make a difference with the signage requirements. Mr. Walker replied he would look into this item further.

Mr. King amended the motion to include that the size of the directional signs conforms to the zoning requirements. Mr. Doherty seconded the amendment.

The motion passed with a roll call vote as follows:

Ms. Hengen – in favor

Mr. Doherty – in favor

Mr. King – in favor

Ms. Tomas – in favor

Mr. Gentilhomme – in favor

2. <u>Sanel Napa requests ADR approval for the installation of two new internally illuminated wall sign, a new non-illuminated monument sign, and the relocation of an existing non-illuminated monument sign at 102 Old Turnpike Road in the Industrial (IN) District.</u>

Max Tejada from the Sign Gallery represented the application.

Mr. Tejada reviewed the sign proposals explaining that the proposal is to replace one 13 foot side sign for the main entrance of the building and two monument signs, one for the employee entrance and the other noting the corporate office.

Mr. Doherty made a motion, seconded by Mr. King, to recommend approval of the proposed sign designs, as submitted.

The motion passed with a roll call vote as follows:

Ms. Hengen – in favor

Mr. Doherty – in favor

Mr. King – in favor

Ms. Tomas – in favor

Mr. Gentilhomme – in favor

3. <u>Barlo Signs, on behalf of Shaheen & Gordon, requests ADR approval for the replacement of a non-illuminated wall sign at 107 Storrs Street in the Central Business Performance (CBP)</u>
District.

Brandon Currier represented this application.

Mr. Currier stated that the proposal is to replace the existing wall sign. The sign will be flat cut out acrylic letters painted white and flush mounted to the brick wall. The sign will not be illuminated.

A discussion was held about the proposed colors of the sign white and teal and the existing purple awning at the entrance. Mr. Currier stated that the existing monument sign has the white letters and a teal ampersand. Members commented that the white is overwhelming and stark. Additional discussion was held regarding the scale as proposed. Ms. Hengen stated that the sign appears to be over scaled and asked if the sign is facing Storrs Street. Mr. Currier replied yes and stated that they would like to keep the signage clean and match the existing colors. Ms. Hengen commented that the colors are not an issue; it is the excessive size as it appears to be rather high almost like a billboard. Mr. Walker stated that the letters are most likely superimposed onto a photograph; however, he agrees it is too large.

Mr. Walker asked if the Reprographics Printing business was still in operation at this location. If not, then the sign needs to be removed. Move to former tenant space discussion Brandon not exceed height of canopy of existing tenant sign canopy discussion is entrance Mr. Currier was not sure but would check into this issue. Ms. Hengen suggested that if the printing business no longer occupies space in the building, then the sign could be reduced and moved down to where the Reprographics sign is located.

Ms. Tomas suggested that the white of the sign be changed to match the white around the window sills of the building; it is subdued than what is shown.

Mr. Doherty asked if there was an alternative design that is stacked. Mr. Currier replied that he was not sure and would check to see if there is a stacked sign option. Mr. Doherty commented that he is okay with the proposal and added that other items may be more of a compromise than what they applicant may want to do. Mr. Gentilhomme stated that he supports the proposal with the name being all on one line; however, the letters could be smaller. Mr. Doherty stated that he is okay with the location and height as proposed. Mr. Gentilhomme and Ms. Tomas agreed.

Mr. Gentilhomme made a motion, seconded by Mr. Doherty, to recommend approval of the proposed sign designs, as submitted, with the following recommendations:

- 1. The sign letters be the same shade as the white of the existing window sills that are above the sign;
- 2. The sign be reduced by 25%;
- 3. The sign be centered in the elevation of the building; and
- 4. If the sign is relocated to the first floor, than the sign top align with the existing canopy that is located around the corner.

The motion passed with a roll call vote as follows:

Ms. Hengen – in favor

Mr. Doherty – in favor

Mr. King – in favor

Ms. Tomas – in favor

Mr. Gentilhomme – in favor

4. Neopco Signs, on behalf Penumbra, requests ADR approval for the installation of two new, nonilluminated wall signs at 10 N. State Street, in the Central Businesses Performance (CBP) District.

Glen Shadlick of Neopco Signs represented the application.

Mr. Shadlick explained that the proposed signs will be installed in the same location as the existing signs and they are the same square footage. Ms. Tomas asked if the color of the signs is intended to match the color of the building. Mr. Shadlick stated that the signs are within the same shade as the building.

Mr. King made a motion, seconded by Mr. Doherty, to recommend approval of the proposed sign designs, as submitted.

The motion passed with a roll call vote as follows:

Ms. Hengen – in favor

Mr. Doherty – in favor

Mr. King – in favor

Ms. Tomas – in favor

Mr. Gentilhomme – in favor

5. CVS Pharmacy requests ADR approval for the installation of two new internally illuminated wall signs, the replacement of two internally illuminated and one non-illuminated wall signs, and the replacement of an internally illuminated freestanding sign at 4 Hall Street in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.

Gary McCoy represented the application

Mr. McCoy explained the proposal is a rebranding of CVS stores to include a modification of the CVS logo and adding a heart to the emblem. In addition, the clinics, within the stores, are rebranding to a Health HUB. Two signs are proposed for each elevation. The signage is being reduced on each elevation and the components are being separated. All lettering will remain as internally illuminated channel letters.

A discussion was held regarding the HUB on the brick. Mr. McCoy explained that this is a hierarchy of the placement of the signs. The HUB is furthest from the door. He mentioned that it may appropriate to move this portion of the sign to the right and relocate it to the manila band.

Mr. McCoy stated that the three signs on the canopy will all be replaced. The signage will also be reduced. He noted that the also plan to reface the existing pylon. The interchangeable letter sign will be omitted. There will be two permanent signs added and no additional changes or increase to the sizes.

Mr. Doherty referred to the freestanding sign and suggested the white panel be blacked out on to allow only the red to be seen at night. He added that overall he feels the proposals are an improvement. Other members agreed.

Mr. Doherty made a motion, seconded by Mr. King, to recommend approval of the proposed sign designs, as submitted, with the following recommendations:

- 1. The white panel of the free standing replacement sign to be opaque so the red letters are shown up at night; and
- 2. The Water Street signage, the Heath HUB be relocated to the manila panel between the two decorative elements and off of the brick.

The motion passed with a roll call vote as follows:

Ms. Hengen – in favor

Mr. Doherty – in favor

Mr. King - in favor

Ms. Tomas – in favor

Mr. Gentilhomme – in favor

6. Advantage Signs, on behalf of 58 NSS Property LLC, requests ADR approval for the replacement of a freestanding sign at 58 N. State Street in the Civic Performance (CVP) District.

Josh Messinger of Advantage Signs represented the application.

Mr. Messinger stated that the proposal is to replace a sign and add panels for future tenants. Granite posts will be added.

Mr. King made a motion, seconded by Mr. Doherty, to recommend approval of the proposed sign designs, as submitted.

Mr. Walker stated that the front posts will need to be moved back five feet from the property line. He added that he believes that there is adequate space to do this. Mr. Messinger will check out the site and move the feet if it can be accomplished.

Mr. King amended the motion, seconded by Mr. Doherty, to amend the motion to include that the sign location must conform to all zoning requirements.

The motion passed with a roll call vote as follows:

Ms. Hengen – in favor

Mr. Doherty – in favor

Mr. King – in favor

Ms. Tomas – in favor

Mr. Gentilhomme – in favor

7. Col's Kitchen requests ADR approval for the installation of a new externally illuminated projecting sign at 55 S. Main Street in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

No one was present for this application.

Mr. Durfee gave a brief overview explaining that a new business will be residing at this location and the proposed sign is being placed in the same location as the former business.

Mr. Doherty made a motion, seconded by Mr. King, to recommend approval of the proposed sign design, as submitted.

The motion passed with a roll call vote as follows:

Ms. Hengen – in favor

Mr. Doherty – in favor

Mr. King – in favor

Ms. Tomas – in favor

Mr. Gentilhomme – in favor

8. Granite State Credit Union requests ADR approval for the replacement of a non-illuminated wall sign and a non-illuminated freestanding sign at 311 Sheep Davis Road in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.

Jason Gagnon represented the application.

Mr. Gagnon stated that the proposal is to replace the existing wall sign above the entrance as well as the free standing.

A discussion was held relative to the text size on the wall sign. It was noted that the width of the wall sign could be increased to fill the entire space above the door. Mr. Gagnon stated that he believes that the sign will fill that space. He added that the letters are raised, acrylic letters and are mounted to the background. He stated that the wall sign in not illuminated. Ms. Hengen commented that the proposed sign is a much cleaner design.

Mr. Doherty asked if the pylon sign will be illuminated. Mr. Gagnon replied yes. Mr. Doherty suggested that the white panel of the free standing be opaque.

Mr. Gentilhomme made a motion, seconded by Mr. Doherty, to recommend approval of the proposed sign design, as submitted, with the recommendation that the white panel of the free standing sign be opaque; however, the white in the graphics may remain, as presented.

The motion passed with a roll call vote as follows:

Ms. Hengen – in favor

Mr. Doherty – in favor

Mr. King – in favor

Ms. Tomas – in favor

Mr. Gentilhomme – in favor

Building Permits in Performance Districts

- 1. Phenix Livery LLC, on behalf of Concord Craft, requests ADR approval for the construction of an outdoor patio at 117 Storrs Street in the Central Performance Business (CBD) District.
 - Mr. Durfee stated that the applicant requested to be continued to the September meeting.
- 2. Sheldon Pennoyer, on behalf of Remi Hinxhia, requests ADR approval for the construction of a rooftop terrace for outdoor dining at 60 Pleasant Street in the Civic Performance (CVP) District.

Sheldon Pennoyer and Remi Hinxhia represented the application.

Mr. Pennoyer gave an overview of the proposal to add a roof top dining space to the existing restaurant for outdoor seating. He stated that the building façade is currently constructed of split face masonry block. Stair access is proposed from the current interior restaurant. The proposed stair doghouse was noted to be corrugated galvanized steel, which will fit in with the design of the existing structure. A guard rail was shown with vertical balusters. Umbrellas and trellises

were mentioned to allow for shading the serving areas and the customers at the tables. Planters were also proposed.

A discussion was held regarding the proposed color scheme. Mr. Gentilhomme suggested painting the existing white trim to match the color of the corrugated metal and suggested to replace the awnings. Further discussion ensued with regards to the exterior of the building and the doghouse. Mr. Pennoyer suggested tying the trellises into the top of the dog house and exceed over the roof as this may reduce some staining.

Mr. Hinxhia stated that he would not have a problem removing the awnings. He noted that the neighboring business would be also planning to do some sign renovations. Members suggested that Mr. Hinxhia work to unify the building facades and distinctions of the two businesses.

Mr. Gentilhomme made a motion, seconded by Mr. Doherty, to recommend approval of the proposed design, as submitted, with the following recommendations:

- 1. Extend the trellis over the doghouse to unify the two elements of buildings;
- 2. Reduce the number of windows in the east elevation and set them in a downward pattern so that they are not parallel to the stairs;
- 3. Paint all of the white on the building to match the galvanized metal siding and the railings; and,
- 4. The existing awnings be removed and maybe replaced with a more contemporary or more appropriate style.

The motion passed with a roll call vote as follows:

Ms. Hengen – in favor

Mr. Doherty – in favor

Mr. King – in favor

Ms. Tomas – in favor

Mr. Gentilhomme – in favor

Major Site Plan/Subdivision Applications

1. <u>Dan O'Brien Kia requests ADR approval for a façade renovation at 158 Manchester Street in the</u> Highway Commercial (CH) District.

Joe Gaukstern, of Northpoint Construction Management, represented the application.

Mr. Gaukstern stated that the proposal is to remove the existing storefront and roof of the showroom on the front of the building and reconstruct it in the exact same footprint, as prescribed by KIA Motors. This will be a new steel structure, storefront showroom and ACM panel facade. The existing service bays will be reworked with new overhead doors. The storefront will be white and gray with black awnings. New lettering will be red. There are no changes proposed to the signage, at this time.

Mr. King made a motion, seconded by Mr. Doherty, to recommend approval of the proposed design, as submitted.

The motion passed with a roll call vote as follows:

Ms. Hengen - in favor

Mr. Doherty – in favor

Mr. King – in favor

Ms. Tomas – in favor

Mr. Gentilhomme – in favor

2. TF Moran, on behalf of Interchange Development, requests ADR consideration for phase 1 of a multi-phase development at Whitey Road in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.

Representing this application was David & Laurie Rauseo, Jason Hill from TFMoran, and Eric Brown, architect from Prellwitz Chilinski Associates (PCA).

Ms. Tomas recused herself from this application.

Mr. Hill gave an overview of the site plan and the layout of the development for an 80,000 square foot supermarket, a retail space, and liquor store. Mr. Brown provided an overview of the proposed building designs, including building materials and color patterns.

The Committee provided non-binding comments on the proposed site layout and architectural elevations for the grocery store and liquor store. Members commented that the pedestrian connectivity and the circulation is an important element of the site design and therefore, should be worked out further. One recommendation was to make the landscaped endcap separating the grocery store parking lot and the industrial development into a landscaped pedestrian walkway. It was also questioned whether the brook should be considered in the design.

The Committee had no comments relative to the Market Basket building. Regarding the liquor store building, the Committee recommended that the materials be better integrated, and the heavy timber element be scaled down. They commented that since this is a brand new site, it is an opportunity to integrate more contemporary architecture.

Adjournment

Mr. King made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Gentilhomme seconded. The motion passed unanimously at 10:37 a.m.

Respectfully submitted, Lisa Fellows-Weaver Administrative Specialist