

**City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 30, 2024 Minutes – DRAFT**

The Architectural Design Review Committee (ADRC) held its regular monthly meeting on April 30, 2024, in Council Chambers, at 37 Green St.

Attendees: Co-Chair Jay Doherty, Claude Gentilhomme, Ron King, and Douglas Proctor

Absent: Co-Chair Elizabeth Durfee Hengen, Amanda Savage

Staff: Alec Bass, Senior Planner; AnneMarie Skinner, Acting City Planner; Brian Tremblay, Code Inspector; Krista Tremblay, Administrative Specialist II

Non-public Session (*held in the 2nd Floor Conference Room of City Hall at 41 Green St*)

1. Non-public session for consideration of legal advice provided by legal counsel, either in writing or orally, to one or more members of the public body, even where legal counsel is not present, in accordance with RSA 91-A:3 II(1).

Public Session

2. Call to Order
Co-Chair Doherty called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m.
3. Minutes – Approve April 2, 2024 meeting minutes
Mr. Gentilhomme moved, seconded by Mr. King, to approve the minutes from the April 2, 2024 meeting as written. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

Sign Applications

4. Sousa Signs, LLC, on behalf of Salon Centric, requests architectural design review for a new 36.2-square-foot internally illuminated building wall sign at 14 Loudon Rd in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.

The applicant, Jason Sousa, of Sousa Signs, LLC, stated that the project previously received architectural design review approval from the Planning Board for a pylon tenant panel and window door sign. Mr. Sousa noted that the new request is for architectural design review for the building wall sign, and that the proposed building wall sign will center the letters over the storefront, not over the door.

Claude Gentilhomme moved, seconded by Ron King, to recommend approval as submitted. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

5. Signarama Concord, on behalf of Revive Beauty, requests architectural design review for an existing non-permitted 16-square-foot non-illuminated building wall sign at 230 N Main St in the Urban Commercial (CU) District.

Brian Tremblay stated the sign shown in the window is the existing sign, and the sign above it is a new sign. The existing sign in the window will be removed.

Co-Chair Doherty stated the sign does not appear to fit in the space above the door, noting that he would be fine with the sign if it fits between the trim and the top of the door.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 30, 2024 Minutes – DRAFT

Claude Gentilhomme moved, seconded by Co-Chair Doherty, to recommend approval of the sign as submitted with the recommended condition of approval that the width of the sign be the same width as the window and door frame.

Discussion

Co-Chair Doherty stated he does not feel the sign fits vertically, and that it is not the right size for the location.

Claude Gentilhomme withdrew his motion.

Douglas Proctor moved, seconded by Claude Gentilhomme, to recommend approval as submitted with the recommended condition to reduce the height and width to fit within the clapboard area directly above the door front.

Discussion

Ron King commented that he felt the description on the permit should be changed.

All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

6. Signarama Concord, on behalf of Newbody Wellness, requests architectural design review for an existing non-permitted 13.5-square-foot non-illuminated building wall sign at 1 Merrimack St (Penacook) in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

Brian Tremblay explained that the sign is an existing sign, and it's compliant with the Zoning Ordinance.

Co-Chair Doherty noted this looks like a computer rendering and if they do approve this they need to clarify if it is within the window frame.

Ron King noted that the sign shown in the application is different in size, text, and color from what appears to be currently installed.

Claude Gentilhomme moved, seconded by Ron King, to recommend disapproval because the application materials are confusing, and the sign shown in the application is not reflective of the content or dimensions of the actual existing sign.

All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

7. NEOPCO Signs, on behalf of Blodgett Supply, requests architectural design review for a new 37.5-square-foot internally illuminated building wall sign at 254 Sheep Davis Rd in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.

Glen Schadlick, of NEOPCO Signs, explained that the proposed sign will be internally illuminated without a blackout panel behind the white, and it will provide the same output as a sign down the street that was approved for Budget Blinds. Mr. Schadlick reminded the group that he verbalized to the Committee about 6

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 30, 2024 Minutes – DRAFT

months ago that the LEDs he uses are less potent.

Alec Bass noted that architectural design review is required for this sign because the site is in a performance district. Mr. Bass read out loud Section 5.4(c) *Illumination* from the Architectural Design Guidelines, revised April 12, 1991: “Illumination of signs should be from an indirect light source to reduce glare and ensure attention is focused on the sign. The light should be contained within the sign frame and not spill over to other portions of building. Internally lit signs should provide an opaque background with translucent letters.”

Co-Chair Doherty expressed the need for consistent recommendations, noting that the Architectural Design Review Committee has been utilizing Section 5.4(c) for internally illuminated signs submitted with white backgrounds.

Co-Chair Doherty moved, seconded by Claude Gentilhomme, to recommend approval with the recommended condition that an opaque background be added behind the white background to allow the letters to glow for compliance with Section 5.4(c) of the Architectural Design Guidelines.

Discussion

Mr. Schadlick expressed that the Committee is putting a hardship on customers by requiring an opaque background, noting that the addition of an opaque background is another labor cost being passed to customers and it’s a component that can result in poor craftsmanship, like the shifted background behind the Uno’s sign.

All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Schadlick requested that the item be presented to the Planning Board as a public hearing, rather than a consent agenda item, on May 15, 2024.

8. Advantage Signs, on behalf of Concord Housing, requests architectural design review for a new 12-square-foot non-illuminated free-standing sign at 23 Green St in the Civic Performance (CVP) District.

Josh Messinger, of Advantage Signs, explained that the new sign will replace the existing sun due to fading from the sun. The request is a new face on both sides of the sign.

Claude Gentilhomme moved, seconded by Ron King, to recommend approval as submitted.

All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

9. Angel Galvan, on behalf of The Light Of The World Church, requests architectural design review for an existing non-permitted 12.8-square-foot non-illuminated building wall sign at 328 Village St in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

Claude Gentilhomme moved, seconded by Ron King, to recommend disapproval based on a lack of cohesion between the sign and the design of the building and arches.

**City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 30, 2024 Minutes – DRAFT**

Discussion

Mr. Gentilhomme noted that the sign was not installed in an appropriate manner, and it belongs above the brick of the arches and not in the arches.

All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

10. Carol Ellis, on behalf of Laborata Studios, requests architectural design review for two existing non-permitted non-illuminated window signs of 14 square feet and 13 square feet at 1 Merrimack St (Penacook) in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

Brian Tremblay explained that there are two existing signs in the same window, noting that there are white vinyl graphics placed directly on the window with a banner hanging behind the white vinyl graphics. Mr. Tremblay's understanding is that the white vinyl graphics were not visible from the street, so the darker banner sign was added.

Claude Gentilhomme expressed that, in his opinion, having "Laborata" in white vinyl on the window and in black on the banner sign makes it hard to read either.

Douglas Proctor suggested removal of the white vinyl graphics from the window.

Mr. Proctor moved, seconded by Mr. Gentilhomme, to recommend approval as submitted with the recommended condition that the white vinyl lettering of "Laborata" and "Studio" and the white vinyl insignia be removed from the glass surface. The words "jewelry" and "art classes" can remain, with the option to remove them from the glass surface and add them to the hanging sign.

Discussion

Mr. Gentilhomme noted what is confusing is the "Laborata Studio" in white on the glass, which makes it hard to read.

All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

11. Gerry Carrier, on behalf of Little River Oriental Rugs, requests architectural design review for four existing non-permitted non-illuminated window signs of 0.95 square feet, 0.67 square feet, 2.64 square feet, and 0.61 square feet at 10 North Main St in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

Co-Chair Doherty stated that he likes the strip of band text, but the center one is a little more than he would like to see in center text box. Co-Chair Doherty suggested simplifying the existing text by reducing to two lines of copy instead of the three that are there now.

Claude Gentilhomme would like to see the font size of "handmade rug" decreased, noting that the current size is still difficult to read from the street and too big from the sidewalk.

**City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 30, 2024 Minutes – DRAFT**

Ron King and Douglas Proctor noted there is additional and redundant information on the door, awning, and blade sign.

Mr. Gentilhomme moved, seconded by Mr. King, to recommend approval as submitted with the recommended condition of approval that the text on the middle window sign “Exceptionally Handmade Rugs” and “nhrugs.com” be removed and that “nhrugs.com” be added to the door sign.

All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

12. Shane Hustus, on behalf of Fox Hardware, requests architectural design review for an existing non-permitted 8.5-square-foot non-illuminated hanging blade sign at 325 Village St in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

Co-Chair Doherty stated the sign is not legible from what is shown in the application materials, that the application is not complete, and he does not feel they can make a recommendation on an incomplete application.

Co-Chair Doherty moved, seconded by Ron King, to recommend disapproval because of an incomplete application and inability to discern the sign from the materials included in the application.

All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

13. Michael Miller, on behalf of Center Point Church, requests architectural design review for an existing non-permitted 24-square-foot non-illuminated blade sign and two existing non-permitted non-illuminated window door signs of 3 square feet each at 20 North State St in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

Claude Gentilhomme moved, seconded by Ron King, to recommend approval as submitted.

All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

14. Poyant Signs, on behalf of Dunkin’, requests architectural design review for a new 17.16-square-foot internally illuminated building wall sign and a new 10.93-square-foot internally illuminated tenant pylon panel at 1 Whitney Rd in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.

Jennifer Robichaud, of Poyant Signs, explained that requested signs are part of a national Dunkin’ rebranding and updating of their signs. The existing fully internally illuminated building wall block sign will be removed. The white does not light, but is just the backer on the building sign. Also being replaced is the tenant pylon panel.

Members asked if there is an opaque background behind the tenant panel sign.

Ms. Robichaud stated the sign is not opaque, noting that none of the panels on that pylon sign are opaque. Ms. Robichaud noted that Dunkin’ does not want an opaque background or to change the sign’s background as this is their national look.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 30, 2024 Minutes – DRAFT

Co-Chair Doherty stated the Architectural Design Review Committee has been applying the architectural design guideline to have opaque backgrounds behind internally illuminated signs with white backgrounds in all recommendations.

Douglas Proctor explained they want just the letters to light up at night, not the whole background.

Claude Gentilhomme moved, seconded by Ron King, to recommend approval as submitted with the recommended condition that the tenant pylon panel have an opaque background to highlight and allow the letters of “Dunkin” to glow.

Discussion

Ms. Robichaud asked for clarification on the meaning of opaque. Does that mean that, when it’s dark outside and the sign is lit, the viewer will only see “Dunkin” in orange and “drive-thru” in white?

Co-Chair Doherty stated the pink part of the drive-thru can be shown.

Ms. Robichaud stated that the word “opaque” is not right and the language should recommend against white backgrounds. Ms. Robichaud noted that, within the sign industry, opaque means when that sign is lit you will see nothing but “Dunkin” and “drive thru” and everything else is black. The ADRC’s current application of the guideline is not what is meant by opaque.

All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Robichaud requested to have this agenda item removed from the consent agenda and instead have a public hearing before the Planning Board on May 15, 2024.

15. Kevin Rutter, on behalf of Smoking Turtle NH, requests architectural design review for an existing non-permitted 24-square-foot externally illuminated building wall sign at 9 Pleasant St Extension in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

Brian Tremblay stated the sign is made out of plexiglass, and it is externally illuminated.

Co-Chair Doherty stated there is a lot going on with this sign, making it hard to focus on what the sign really is about.

Claude Gentilhomme moved, seconded by Co-Chair Doherty, to recommend disapproval because the information on the sign is not presented graphically to clearly make readable, and the name of the store is not clearly stated.

All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

Site Plan and Subdivision Applications

16. Scott Donovan and Warrenstreet Architects, Inc., on behalf of Pleasant Street Residences, request an

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 30, 2024 Minutes – DRAFT

amendment to the major site plan and architectural design review approval for the conversion of an existing two-unit apartment building into a six-unit apartment building to not place window shutters on the exterior of the building. The site is addressed as 120 Pleasant St in the Institutional (IS) District.

Scott Donovan, of Warrenstreet Architects, Inc., and Karen Jantzen, of the Coalition to End Homelessness, presented. Mr. Donovan stated that a condition of approval for both 120 and 122 Pleasant St was to provide replacement shutters that matched the previous shutters. Now that construction is near completion and the almost-final version of the building is shown, they are requesting to not replace the shutters. Mr. Donovan and Ms. Jantzen feel that the aesthetics of the building and the way the building fits with the surrounding neighborhood will benefit from not replacing the plastic shutters.

Co-Chair Doherty agrees, noted that the shutters were too small and out of proportion with the building.

Claude Gentilhomme moved, seconded by Co-Chair Doherty, to recommend approval of the amendment request to not re-install shutters because the resulting building architecture would be diminished if plastic shutters like what were there previously were to be installed.

Discussion.

Ron King stated he walked the neighborhood, and the building is much cleaner without the shutters. Mr. King noted that several buildings in that area do not have shutters.

All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

17. Granite Engineering, LLC, and Brenton Cole, on behalf of Bradcore Holdings, LLC, request architectural design review as part of a major site plan application for an 8,250-square-foot building addition and accompanying circulation and parking improvements at 391 Loudon Rd in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District. (2024-018)

Brenton Cole, of Granite Engineering, John Wicker, Kurt Lauer, and Jeremiah Colbath presented the application.

Mr. Cole stated Chappell Tractor bought the property in 2017. They are looking to expand the building to allow 6 new service bays. The equipment they are selling or servicing is large new and used agricultural equipment. One of the new bays will be a washing bay that they do not have at this time. Along with the major expansion they will be redoing the parking lot. There is not much out there for new lighting or landscaping. The existing sign will remain.

Ron King asked about fencing.

Mr. Cole stated there is a split-rail fence along Loudon Rd, but not for screening of the storage areas. Mr. Cole noted there is good shielding with the existing vegetation.

Alec Bass stated the applicant received a variance from the requirement to screen outside storage areas.

**City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 30, 2024 Minutes – DRAFT**

Mr. King stated he is worried about heavy rain storms and the large amount of gravel area.

Mr. Wicker noted that most of the lot drains from north to south and there is nothing holding up runoff at this time.

Mr. Bass stated there are impacts to wetland buffers, and the applicant will have to go to Conservation Commission for a recommendation regarding the conditional use permit for disturbances to wetland buffers.

Co-Chair Doherty moved, seconded by Claude Gentilhomme, to recommend approval as submitted with the condition that additional landscaping trees and shrubs be added along the site's Loudon Rd frontage to enhance the property and a recommendation that the garage door openings be a darker color to tie in the architecture between the existing and proposed building.

All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

18. Wilcox & Barton, Inc., on behalf of B&L Transmissions, LLC, requests architectural design review as part of a major site plan application for construction of a new automotive repair shop and related site improvements at 388 Loudon Rd in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District. (2023-143)

Erin Lambert, of Wilcox & Barton, Inc., stated that the client decided the building was a little bigger than needed and reduced the size by removing two bays to make the building 16 feet shorter. The proposed building and site are essentially the same as what was presented to the group on April 2, 2024, only smaller. Ms. Lambert noted that the recommendations from the committee are incorporated into what is presented today.

Claude Gentilhomme moved, seconded by Ron King, to recommend approval as submitted.

All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

19. Wilcox & Barton, Inc., on behalf of First Church Holdings, LLC, returns as a courtesy to present further revised graphics for 177 N Main St. Note that Planning Board has given approval for architectural design review.

John Chorlian explained that, while the project received architectural design review approval from the Planning Board on April 17, 2024, he wanted to return to the committee to show the changes made based off of the committee's recommendations and answer any remaining questions.

Mr. Chorlian stated that colors for the window frames will be seawolf beige and sandstone. The new rendering more accurately matches the proposed height of deck at the front entrance.

Douglas Proctor noted the side deck by the sidewalk on Washington St appears to be very close to the sidewalk and road, and it sits high which could lead to awkward interactions between residents and vehicles waiting at the light.

No motion needed.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 30, 2024 Minutes – DRAFT

20. Wilcox & Barton, Inc, on behalf of Morrill Mill Pond, LLC, requests architectural design review as part of a major site plan amendment replacing the previously approved retail use with a second complementary restaurant to be generally located where the retail building was proposed with some modifications to the building footprint, parking, and stormwater management systems at 10 Whitney Rd in the Industrial (IN) District. (2022-54)

David Rauseo and Laurie Rauseo from Morrill Mill Pond, LLC, presented the application. Mr. Rauseo stated the change is from the previously approved 2,500-square-foot Walgreens to a smaller 2,325-square-foot Chipotle, with additional required parking on the west and south side of the building.

Mr. Rauseo stated they requested a monument sign at the far northern part of the property, noting that Chipotle and Starbucks will return for sign architectural design review in conjunction with sign permits and that signage is not part of this request.

Ron King asked for the landscaping plan.

Alec Bass stated that, other than what is part of this amendment, this is a previously approved site plan.

Co-Chair Doherty moved, seconded by Claude Gentilhomme, to recommend approval as submitted.

All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

21. Jonathan Devine and TFMoran, Inc., on behalf of ROI Irrevocable Trust and Christine Windler, request architectural design review as part of a major site plan application for the construction of a new bank and associated site improvements. The site is addressed as 16-22 Manchester St (Tax Map 792Z 2) in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District. (2024-023)

Jonathan Devine, of TFMoran, Inc., and Kurt Lauer, the architect, presented revised materials as part of their testimony previously not available or reviewed by staff or the committee.

Mr Devine noted the site has two addresses on Manchester St and is the now-vacant site of two former houses that were demolished. A 3,700-square-foot bank is proposed with access from Manchester St and Black Hill Rd. The access from Manchester St will be a right-in only and the Black Hill Rd access will be a full-service driveway. Part of the proposal is an off-premise sign for the future compressive development plan.

Ron King questioned why there are no street trees proposed along Manchester St.

Mr. Devine stated the tenant wants to keep visibility to the face of the building, noting that there are no street tree requirements, only parking lot shade trees.

Claude Gentilhomme stated he would like to see street trees along Manchester St.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if they are protecting the columns from drivers?

**City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 30, 2024 Minutes – DRAFT**

Mr. Lauer stated they will have bollards by the ATM machine but not at the columns. Mr. Lauer added they are nine-foot lanes.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if the materials and colors are in the updated packet?

Mr. Lauer stated it is cement board trim and siding. The colors are arctic white and light mist, which are the corporate standard for St. Mary's Bank.

Mr. Devine stated they are showing the location of the pylon sign, that it's an off-premise sign, and signage is not part of this request.

Ms. Skinner clarified that part of the committee's charge is looking at the site plan, and the location of the sign is on the site plan.

Douglas Proctor stated the off-premise sign should be placed at the southwest corner.

Mr. Devine stated that, due to sight line and the existing Enterprise, placing the sign on the east would make it not visible for cars traveling east along Manchester St.

Claude Gentilhomme noted the off-premise sign should be in a better location.

Mr. Gentilhomme moved, seconded by Ron King, to recommend approval as submitted with the condition that street trees be planted along the site's Manchester St frontage in compliance with the Subdivision Regulations.

Discussion

Mr. Lauer asked Mr. Gentilhomme to give more information on where to place the trees.

Mr. Skinner stated the Subdivision Regulations provide for an average of one tree for every 30 feet of frontage.

Mr. Gentilhomme noted there needs to be a bigger discussion on the design and location of sign when or if it returns to the Architectural Design Review Committee.

Co-Chair Doherty stated he is concerned about the corners of the drive-thru columns, suggesting that bollards or metal trim be installed as column protection.

All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

22. Jonathan Devine and TFMoran, Inc., on behalf of ROI Irrevocable Trust and Christine Windler, request architectural design review as part of a major site plan application for the construction of a gas station, convenience store, car wash, and associated site improvements. The site comprises three tax lots addressed as 30 Manchester St (Tax Map 781Z 30), 32 Manchester St (Tax Map 781A 29), and 33-35 Black Hill Rd (Tax Map 81Z 32) in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District. (2024-024)

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 30, 2024 Minutes – DRAFT

Jonathan Devine, of TFMoran, Inc., and Alex Vailas with the ROI Trust presented the application. Mr. Devine stated this proposal is for an approximately 5,700-square-foot convenience store with a 2,500-square-foot single bay car wash, twelve fueling stations for gas and diesel, and electric charging stations with access on both Manchester St and Black Hill Rd.

Co-Chair Doherty stated they have never allowed LED changing text lighting for a sign with gas prices, that it has always been changeable text.

Mr. Bass asked if zoning has looked at this sign.

Mr. Devine stated zoning has not looked at this sign. Mr. Devine stated from his research the sign is conforming. Mr. Devine noted it is less than 150 feet on both sides. The overall height is within the regulation.

Ms. Skinner asked to clarify if the applicant is seeking approval of all components of the sign being shown, instead of applying for a sign permit application at a future date which will go through zoning review and then return for architectural design review and Planning Board approval?

Mr. Devine stated they are asking for review and approval of location of the sign, but size and materials review and approval will come at a later date as part of the sign permit application.

Claude Gentilhomme stated he disagrees with the sign location. The sign belongs at the entrance of the development.

Douglas Proctor stated the sign should be at the entrance to Black Hill Rd.

Mr. Vailas stated the sign needs to be as close to the lighted intersection as possible at Black Hill Rd. They want to encourage entering into the signalized intersection at Black Hill Rd. They had originally proposed it where the committee is suggesting. Mr. Vailas stated the trees will be cut down and you will be able to see the monument sign at the light.

Ms. Skinner stated that both City staff and the New Hampshire Department of Transportation want as much traffic as possible to go use the signalized intersection.

Co-Chair Doherty asked about the colors and elevations that will be sent to the Planning Board, and asked if they are provided prior to their review. Co-Chair Doherty asked if the red on the sign would be same that is the Common Man logo? Will the white trim and white around the window remain?

Mr. Vailas stated yes.

Co-Chair Doherty moved, seconded by Claude Gentilhomme, to recommend approval as submitted noting that the pylon sign for the overall project should be located at the entrance of the development if it cannot be located at the signalized intersection and with the understanding that the architecture of the building trim will be white, the colors and materials will be listed on all elevations, and the colors and materials will be listed on the car wash elevations similar in character to the main building.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 30, 2024 Minutes – DRAFT

Discussion

Co-Chair Doherty noted that there are no elevations, colors, materials, or information for the proposed gas canopy shown on the site plan.

Mr. Devine stated the gas partner will be the Irving canopy and will come in with the sign.

All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

23. NH Land Consultants and NH Sustainable Communities, LLC, on behalf of Thomas Cheney, request architectural design review as part of a major site plan application for an 83-unit condominium development. The site comprises 8.33 acres over four tax lots addressed as 169, 165, 159, and 153 Fisherville Rd in the General Commercial (CG) District. (2023-151)

Jeff Burd, of NH Land Consultants, shared that this project is for 83 condominiums. They are proposing 11 two-story buildings. Units will have three bedrooms, and a garage with patio in rear. There will be a clubhouse, pool, and pickleball park.

Ron King stated aesthetically, everything on site is proposed to be very straight and suggested to add a little curvature to make it more interesting. Specifically, to the external and internal sidewalk and walking areas to create a better experience and increase interest.

Co-Chair Doherty stated he does not like the garage door being so predominant, asking if there is a walkway to get to front door and what the colors of the building are?

Mr. Burd stated there is a combination walkway in front of the garage doors. The blue is wedgewood blue and it will pair with the gray. Then, there is desert tan that will pair with charcoal gray.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if it is a checker board?

Mr. Burd stated they are alternating by building. There will be a difference of colors between the front and back of the color, as well as the garages having a different façade and color.

Mr. King noted there are no shade trees on the plans.

Co-Chair Doherty moved, seconded by Claude Gentilhomme, to recommend approval as submitted with the conditions that the walkways and trails be provided with curvature, the addition of trees to the interior courtyard area community space, the walkways to the units be restudied to allow easier access for visitors, and that the front door be more prominent and the garage door be less prominent to promote community within the neighborhood.

Discussion

Mr. Burd does not feel the elevations properly depict how this looks. The covered porch does not show in the exterior renderings, so it feels like it is deeper than it is. Mr. Burd stated they have spent considerable time working on these plans to provide very desirable and successful floor plans within the units.

Co-Chair Doherty stated this committee is not telling them to redesign, but recommending to the Planning

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 30, 2024 Minutes – DRAFT

Board that they re-look at these and the Planning Board could tell them to redesign.

Ms. Skinner stated architectural design approval is required as part of the application. The first step is to come before the Architectural Design Review Committee. The Committee makes a recommendation to the Planning Board. The Planning Board takes this recommendation under advisement as part of the decision when approving, conditionally approving, or disapproving the architectural design review component of the major site plan application.

All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

Other Business

Adjournment

Co-Chair Doherty moved, seconded by Mr. King, to adjourn the meeting at 12:25 p.m. All in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Krista Tremblay

Krista Tremblay
Administrative Specialist II