

City of Concord, New Hampshire  
Architectural Design Review Committee  
August 8, 2017 Minutes

The Architectural Design Review Committee (ADRC) held its regular monthly meeting on August 8, 2017 in the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor conference room at 41 Green Street.

Present at the meeting were Co-Chair Elizabeth Durfee-Hengen and Jay Doherty; Members Margaret Tomas, and Claude Gentilhomme; Craig Walker of the Code Administration Division; Heather Shank of the City Planning Division; and Lisa Fellows-Weaver Administrative Specialist, were also present.

**Sign Applications:**

**1. Foxfire Property Management requesting ADR approval to install a new monument sign with tenant panels at 1 Granite Place in the Institutional (IS) District. *MBL: 583/Z64***

Mr. Messinger represented the application. He explained that the proposal is for a free-standing, directory sign on the property. A variance was obtained from the ZBA for having a second sign on the property, with the understanding that no additional signage will be added at the site. He noted that there has never been a sign at this location. He stated that the new sign will not compete with the existing sign because they are in different locations. The sign is not illuminated; all other requirements have been met.

A discussion was held regarding the size of the proposed sign posts and height of the sign. Members suggested the granite posts be increased in width from 8 inches to 10 inches to give more substance to the sign, and that the sign be lowered by 2 feet to make the sign appear more proportional. Mr. Messinger stated that the height was chosen for visibility by passing cars and also to allow clearance of the tenant panels when snow is piled up. He also noted that wider posts would increase the cost. Ms. Shank noted that lowering the height of the posts could offset the cost of using wider posts, and that there was plenty of room for snow to be stored elsewhere on the site. Ms. Hengen questioned whether the higher sign was more visible, and stated that the height was not in keeping with the residential character of the houses across the street. Members also felt that the proposed sign should more closely match the character of the existing sign, which was a substantial granite monument sign.

Motion: Ms. Tomas made a motion to approve the application subject to the condition that the sign be lowered by 2 feet and that 10-inch wide posts be used.

Second: Mr. Gentilhomme

Vote: 4-0 in favor, motion passed unanimously

**2. McCandless & Nicholson – Attorneys at Law, on behalf of 58 N.S.S. Property, LLC, requesting ADR approval to replace an existing freestanding sign on existing posts, and install a new wall sign at 58 N. State Street in the Civic Performance (CVP) District. *MBL: 46/2/8***

Jack Kelleher and Roy McCandless represented the application. Mr. Kelleher stated that the proposal is a request to replace the existing sign and posts and add a wall sign.

Motion: Ms. Hengen made a motion to approve the application as submitted.

City of Concord, New Hampshire  
Architectural Design Review Committee  
August 8, 2017 Minutes

Second: Mr. Gentilhomme

Vote: 4-0 in favor, motion passed unanimously

**3. Tarbell & Brodich, PA – Attorneys at Law, on behalf of Eaton Tarbell, Jr., Trustee of the Eaton W. Tarbell Jr. Revocable Trust of 2016, requesting ADR approval to replace an existing freestanding sign at 45 Centre Street in the Civic Performance (CVP) District. MBL: 44/1/13**

Frederick Moeckel represented the application. He stated that they are not proposing to relocate the sign due to the proximity to the sidewalk and tree. Mr. Walker stated that unless they are utilizing the existing post, the new posts would need to be relocated to comply with the 5-foot setback requirement. Mr. Moekel said his client would be fine keeping the existing post if they could keep it in that location. Members also stated their preference for wood versus vinyl posts. Mr. Doherty questioned whether the “www.” on the sign was needed, since this is implied today. He suggested removing it to make the business name easier to read. Mr. Moeckel stated that his client would be fine with that.

Motion: Mr. Gentilhomme made a motion to approve the application, subject to the condition that the “www.” text is removed, that the sign be installed on the existing post, and that should the post need to be replaced due to disrepair, the replacement post is also wood.

Second: Ms. Tomas

Vote: 4-0 in favor, motion passed unanimously

**4. Tarbell & Brodich, PA – Attorneys at Law, on behalf of Eaton Tarbell, Jr., Trustee of the Eaton W. Tarbell Jr. Revocable Trust of 2016, requesting ADR approval to replace an existing freestanding sign at 14 Centre Street in the Civic Performance (CVP) District. MBL: 46/1/5**

Frederick Moeckel represented the application. He explained that the existing post would be removed and new posts installed. He stated that the applicant would be fine with wood posts and with removing the same “www.” text. Discussion ensued regarding the brick planter and the location of the sign. Members suggested removing the brick planter.

Motion: Mr. Gentilhomme made a motion to approve the application subject to the condition that the “www.” text is removed, and that the proposed posts are wood. They also made the suggestion that the existing brick planter be removed.

Second: Ms. Hengen

Vote: 4-0 in favor, motion passed unanimously

City of Concord, New Hampshire  
Architectural Design Review Committee  
August 8, 2017 Minutes

**Building Permits in Performance Districts:**

**5. Concord Hospital requesting ADR approval for an amendment to a previously approved Major Site Plan for a façade renovation at 250 Pleasant Street in the Institutional (IS) District. *MBL:95/3/4***

Mr. Dougherty recused himself from this discussion as he works for the architecture firm representing the application.

Steve Davis was present on behalf of Concord Hospital. He stated that a duct is needed to service the emergency room, and this is the only place it can be located. He noted that it must extend vertically 10 feet past the roofline. He explained that the applicant is proposing a metal covering for the duct similar to the other metal panels on the building; however, he brought a second option with the duct exposed for comparison. He explained that they must remove masonry and use lightweight materials for the steel structure.

Members discussed the two options. Several members preferred the exposed duct option to add visual interest to the building. Mr. Walker pointed out that it would create areas for birds to nest, while Mr. Davis pointed out that it would be more of a challenge for maintenance purposes. Mr. Davis explained that while the exposed option is the least expensive, it is not the most practical, and not preferred by the applicant.

Motion: Mr. Gentilhomme made a motion to approve the application for the covered option as submitted.

Second: Ms. Tomas

Vote: 3-0 in favor, motion passed unanimously

**6. Any other business which may legally come before the Committee**

**Adjournment**

As there was no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting adjourned at 9:30 AM.

Respectfully submitted,  
Heather Shank, City Planner