

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
October 1, 2024 Minutes - DRAFT

The Architectural Design Review Committee (ADRC) held its regular monthly meeting on October 1, 2024, in Council Chambers, at 37 Green Street, Concord.

Attendees: Claude Gentilhomme, Co-Chair Jay Doherty, Co-Chair Elizabeth Durfee Hengen, Ron King, Douglas Proctor, and Merle Thorpe

Absent: Amanda Savage

Staff: Alec Bass, Assistant City Planner – Community Planning; Felicia French-Croll, Assistant City Planner – Zoning; AnneMarie Skinner, City Planner; Brian Tremblay, Code Inspector; and Krista Tremblay, Administrative Specialist II

1. Call to Order

Co-Chair Doherty called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m.

2. Minutes – Approve minutes from September 3, 2024

Co-Chair Hengen moved, seconded by Mr. King, to approve the meeting minutes from September 3, 2024, as written. All in favor. The motion passed. Co-Chair Jay Doherty abstained due to not being present at the September meeting.

3. Staff Memorandum

4. **Sign Applications**

- 4.1 Green Mountain Tableworx, on behalf of Remi's Block, LLC, requests an architectural design review recommendation for three existing non-permitted signs - a 0.5-square-foot non-illuminated door sign (SP-0338-2024), and two 2.25-square-foot non-illuminated window signs (SP-0339-2024 and SP-0340-2024), at 154 North Main Street in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

Mr. Tremblay stated the sign is an existing non-permitted sign.

Co-Chair Hengen made a motion to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted. Mr. King seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

- 4.2 SV Property II, LLC and Doug Lee request an architectural design review recommendation for six existing non-permitted signs – a 70-square-foot internally illuminated freestanding pylon sign (SP-0337-2024), a 35-square-foot internally illuminated freestanding pylon sign (SP-0342-2024), two 26.25-square-foot internally illuminated wall signs (SP-0343-2024 and SP-0344-2024), a 12-square-foot internally illuminated wall sign (SP-0345-2024), and a 12-square-foot internally illuminated freestanding pylon sign (SP-0346-2024) at 204 Fisherville Road in the General Commercial (CG) District. (2024-064)

Doug Lee (204 Fisherville Rd, Concord) presented the application. Mr. Lee stated they purchased the property in 2021 and have reduced the amount of signage on the property.

Mr. King asked if they are required to have the street number listed on the sign.

Mr. Tremblay said he believes it is a Fire Department requirement,

Co-Chair Hengen stated the street address numbers are helpful for drivers.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if the signs are proposed or existing.

**City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
October 1, 2024 Minutes - DRAFT**

Mr. Lee stated the signs are in place and existing.

Co-Chair Doherty stated the overall design and aesthetics are doing a good job of repeating the colors and diagram/symbols to provide direction. The colors are consistent to direct people to the property.

Co-Chair Hengen remarked that if the signs were not existing and were being presented to the ADRC as proposed signage, she would definitely have some suggestions, if not conditions. The two pylon signs say the same thing, and there are two different functions on the property. One of the pylons could focus on the car wash, with the other focusing on the storage unit. Co-Chair Hengen asked about separate entrances for the two businesses.

Mr. Lee stated there is one entrance for both businesses.

Co-Chair Hengen stated sign 4 and sign 6 are redundant. Co-Chair Hengen stated the idea is not to have more signage, but effective signage. Co-Chair Hengen stated she would have recommended the three building signs to be clearer.

Mr. Gentilhomme stated he would have had concerns about the opaque background.

Mr. Thorpe wondered if there is an issue with the street address numbers, and stated that each of the pylon signs have a tall brick base. Mr. Thorpe suggested attaching appropriately sized numbers on the brick to note the street address.

Co-Chair Hengen suggested white numbers for visibility.

Mr. Gentilhomme made a motion to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application with the conditions that the white street address numbers be added on the posts of the pylon signs below the signage and that the white backgrounds of the pylon signs and 24-hour carwash wall signs have an opaque backing installed, per Section 5.4(c) *Signage* of the Architectural Design Guidelines. Mr. King seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

- 4.3 Signarama Concord, on behalf of Moon Babes, requests an architectural design review recommendation for three existing non-permitted signs - a 2.1-square-foot non-illuminated door sign (SP-0351-2024), a 2.1-square-foot non-illuminated window sign (SP-0352-2024), and a 1.35-square-foot non-illuminated window sign (SP-0367-2024) at 12 North State Street in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

Mr. Gentilhomme thinks the sign package is fine.

Mr. King made a motion to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted. Mr. Gentilhomme seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

- 4.4 Spectrum Signs, on behalf of B & L Transmission, LLC and AAMCO, requests an architectural design review recommendation for three new signs - two new 24-square-foot internally illuminated wall signs (SP-0358-2024 and SP-0359-2024), and one new 68.06-square-foot internally illuminated freestanding sign (SP-0360-2024) at 92 Manchester Street in the Highway Commercial (CH) District. (2024-065)

Jilian Arsenault (97 Eddy Rd, Manchester) presented the request, noting that they are taking existing signs from a previous location and retrofitting them for this location. They will no longer be formed faces.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
October 1, 2024 Minutes - DRAFT

They are removing fluorescent lights and using LED lights instead. The signs will be mounted on the brick wall. All existing Stratham Tire signage will be removed. The relocated sign will face the street. The other one will be side facing on the driveway that is shared with the collision center. The existing Stratham Tire pylon sign will change to AAMCO.

Mr. Thorpe asked about the signage on the tenant space and if it will be removed.

Ms. Arsenault stated yes, the Stratham Tire signs on the space they will rent in the future will be removed.

Co-Chair Doherty asked about the replacement panel and the thickness.

Ms. Arsenault stated the existing one is thicker because it is form faced. It will be replaced with a 316 Lexan.

Co-Chair Doherty asked about the thickness of the black frame.

Ms. Arsenault stated the black frame is staying as it is now.

Co-Chair Doherty noted they will ask for the street address numbers on the sign and the white to be opaque.

Ms. Arsenault stated the sign is on a pole and might be difficult to install. Ms. Arsenault noted she might put the address under the word's "total car care."

Co-Chair Hengen made a motion to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted with the condition that the street address numbers be added to the pylon sign post and the white backgrounds of the wall signs be opaque in accordance with Section 5.4(c) *Signage* of the Architectural Design Guidelines. Mr. King seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

- 4.5 Amber Monmaney requests an architectural design review recommendation for two existing non-permitted 9.4-square-foot non-illuminated window signs (SP-0357-2024 and SP-0361-2024) at 146 North Main Street in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District. (2024-066)

Amber Monmaney (146 N Main St, Concord) and Sabrina Krueyer (146 N Main St, Concord) presented the request, noting that they were unaware of the permitting requirement for window and door signage.

Co-Chair Doherty noted that the black letters are hard to read and suggested changing the letters to white instead of black, keeping the same size, to allow the name of the business to pop.

Ms. Monmaney agreed with Co-Chair Doherty.

Mr. Thorpe asked if there is a street address on the business façade.

Mr. Tremblay stated there is one on the glass door.

Mr. King made a motion to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted with the suggestion that the color of the small black lettering on the bottom of the signs be switched to white. Co-Chair Hengen seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

- 4.6 Signarama Concord, on behalf of Club Pilates, requests an architectural design review recommendation

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
October 1, 2024 Minutes - DRAFT

for a new 28.2-square-foot internally illuminated wall sign (SP-0353-2024) at 6 Merchants Way in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.

Co-Chair Hengen made a motion to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted. Mr. King seconded.

Discussion

Co-Chair Doherty asked for clarification on what was being approved and if is a wall sign or also the sign with the logon on the front door shown in the elevation materials.

Co-Chair Hengen amended the original motion and recommended that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted, including architectural design review approval for a future sign permit for the door sign, provided that the future sign permit application matches what is shown on this submission. Mr. King seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

5. Building Permit Applications

None

6. Site Plan Applications

- 6.1 Dundee Investment Associates, LLC, requests an architectural design review recommendation for an amendment to a major site plan and a conditional use permit application for the construction of a 3,404-square-foot building, two side-by-side drive-thru lanes, and associated site improvements at 287 Loudon Rd in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District. (2024-069) **NOTE: Signage is not being reviewed as part of this request and will be reviewed with required sign permits prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy per Section 16.03(11) Signs of the Site Plan Regulations. Application materials at that time shall fully comply with Article 28-9-4(f)(3) Submittal Requirements and Article 28-6 Sign Regulations of the Zoning Ordinance.**

Mr. Bass stated that staff is recommending signage not be a part of this architectural design review approval and that signage be reviewed at the time of the sign permit applications to allow the applicant the time to prepare and submit a sign master plan for the entire site.

Ms. Skinner added that the site and landscaping plans were approved in 2018 as part of the Aldi store. Everything on the approved site plan is completed, with the exception of the building for the empty pad space.

Matthew Ashley (352 Turnpike Rd, Southboro, MA), Michelle Robinson (1123 S 51, Philadelphia, PA) and Dustin Johnston (17710 Detroit Ave, Lakewood, OH) presented the request.

Mr. Ashley stated the site was approved in 2018 and revised in 2021 for the retail plan. The site was permitted for a quick serve restaurant with a drive thru. They are adding an additional drive-thru. All utilities are existing. There is an existing pylon sign.

Mr. Johnston they are proposing a 3,400-square-foot quick serve restaurant. Raising Cane's is big on drive thru and mobile ordering. However, there is also a dining room. They have a 360-degree visibility from the roads. Mr. Johnston stated they are presenting one of their standard brand designs that meets the Concord guidelines. There are two styles of brick along with a composite paneling that breaks up each facade. They have the standard package of the signage. When there is a larger mass of brick area they like to use artwork to play off that material. Off the left of the front entry there is a painted mural with the City's name.

**City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
October 1, 2024 Minutes - DRAFT**

Co-Chair Doherty asked if they are looking at the dumpster enclosure as well.

Mr. Ashley stated there is one there currently built. However, they will be updating it.

Co-Chair Doherty asked about the shadow lines and if the façade is all flat.

Mr. Johnston stated most of the façade is flat and the one tower does pop out a little bit.

Co-Chair Doherty noted for future it would be helpful to have a three-dimensional rendering.

Co-Chair Hengen asked about the rear elevation in the wide section on the left and the function.

Mr. Johnston noted on the left it is a corral for storage for members to put temporary trash and storage of additional marketing material. There is a screen to keep pests out.

Co-Chair Hengen stated there are four different materials on the back elevation and noted the feel is industrial.

Mr. Johnston explained the aesthetics and that in 1994 the founder of Raising Cane's renovated an old warehouse. He used only materials that made sense. The founder used odds and ends furniture to set up the dining room. When he took down walls to expand he found old painted murals, so as they build new buildings they try to imitate the first Raising Cane's.

Mr. Thorpe asked if the elevation with the entrance canopy is the most prominent of the four elevations.

Mr. Johnston stated correct.

Mr. Gentilhomme suggested to placing artwork on the cooler of the rear elevation.

Co-Chair Doherty noted the murals seem to be advertising the business versus a traditional mural.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if all of the signage including murals and artwork will come in a separate application.

Mr. Johnston stated correct.

Mr. Tremblay stated the City of Concord does not allow for signs to be painted on buildings. Mr. Tremblay noted you can have murals, but with the word "Cane's" it would be considered a sign not a mural.

Mr. Johnston asked about the dog and the arrow that is at the drive-thru. Below the image of the dog is name of the dog Cain One. Mr. Johnston asked if that would be considered signage.

Mr. Tremblay stated yes and he would have to look further into it, but if it has "Cane" on it they would consider it advertising.

Mr. Gentilhomme asked about the letters "one love" and if they will be illuminated.

Mr. Johnston stated they are channel letters that are mounted on top of the steel structure for the canopy and they are internally illuminated.

Mr. Gentilhomme pointed out it is confusing to have Cane's and the "one love" as people may not be able to

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
October 1, 2024 Minutes - DRAFT

identify the business. Mr. Gentilhomme noted that the “one love” will be too prominent if illuminated.

Co-Chair Hengen suggested placing the “one love” inside while people are waiting in line. Co-Chair Hengen noted there is way too much signage on the building, but if they wanted to do artwork that would be a different story.

Mr. Johnston stated they do have an alternate version they use to replace the mural with the one heart which has more of their story. It is attached to the wall and sticks out a little bit. Mr. Johnston asked the ADRC if this would be more in line with what they would consider artwork for the building.

Mr. Johnston shared with the committee a handout (attached to the minutes as Exhibit A) showing the One Love Heart (XL) for consideration.

Co-Chair Hengen stated the artwork looks abstract and does not read as a sign.

Mr. King asked that they update what they will present to Planning Board to represent the changes to remove the Cane mural with the one love artwork.

Mr. Bass reminded the ADRC and the applicants that a code compliance review of signage for this proposal has not been conducted. Mr. Bass advised the applicants to prepare and submit a master signage plan for review. That will assist in determination of how much signage is permitted, and what is considered signage for the building.

Ms. Skinner asked for updated elevations removing the signage.

Ms. Robinson stated for the dog they can remove the words “Cane One” and asked the ADRC to include in the recommendation a recommendation of approval for the dog art work, noting that if “Cane One” is not considered signage to allow that instead.

Mr. Gentilhomme made a motion to recommend that the Planning Board grant architectural design review approval for the application as submitted with the following conditions:

- The approval does not include architectural design review approval for any signage, whether shown or not. Architectural design review approval of signage shall be considered at the time of sign permit application submissions and in conjunction with a prepared sign master plan.
- The One Love Heart (XL) artwork shared by the applicant during the October 1, 2024, Architectural Design Review meeting, and attached as Exhibit A to these minutes, shall be used in place of the proposed Cane’s sign on the front elevation.
- The dog artwork on the side elevation shall be approved as submitted, unless it is determined to be a sign, in which case approval will be for the same dog image but with removal of the words “Cane One.”
- Artwork shall be added to the back elevation.
- The approval does not include the “One Love” sign/art on the front elevation and will instead be included and considered as part of the master sign plan approval.
- The approval includes the flame depicted on the drive-thru elevation as submitted, but the words “Drive Thru” shall be removed.

Mr. King seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

7. Other Business

7.1 Review of Architectural Design Review process

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
October 1, 2024 Minutes - DRAFT

Ms. Skinner read Section 28-9-1(c)(4): “A Design Review Committee has been established by the Planning Board for the purpose of providing advice to the Board relative to conformance of development applications with compatibility standards of this ordinance and Architectural Design Guidelines as adopted by the Board as part of the Site Plan Review Regulations. The Design Review Committee is appointed by the Planning Board.” Ms. Skinner noted site plan regulations have been adopted by the Planning Board, and the architectural design guidelines were adopted by the Planning Board in 1991.

Per the zoning ordinance, items requiring architectural design review cannot go to the Planning Board without first having a recommendation from the ADRC, whether that be a recommendation for approval or denial. Ms. Skinner stated that, once an application is determined complete by the Planning Board, the Planning Board has 65 days to make approve, approve with conditions, or deny the application.

Co-Chair Hengen noted the 65 days would allow enough time to have an applicant go back to the ADRC.

Adjournment

Member King moved, seconded by Member Gentilhomme, to adjourn the meeting at approximately 11:04 a.m. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Krista Tremblay

Krista Tremblay

Administrative Specialist II

EXHIBIT A

CUTSHEET
One Love Heart (XL)

