

**City of Concord, New Hampshire**  
**Architectural Design Review Committee**  
**November 5, 2024 Minutes**

The Architectural Design Review Committee (ADRC) held its regular monthly meeting on November 5, 2024, in Council Chambers, at 37 Green Street, Concord.

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

Absent:

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

1. Call to Order

Co-Chair Hengen called the meeting to order at 8:31 a.m.

2. Minutes – Approve minutes from September 3, 2024

Mr. Gentilhomme moved, seconded by Mr. King, to approve the meeting minutes from October 1, 2024, as written. All in favor.

3. Staff Memorandum

**4. Sign Applications**

- 4.1 Green Bear Signs and Graphic, LLC, on behalf of Luma Massage, requests an architectural design review recommendation to reface an existing 22-square-foot internally illuminated pylon panel sign (SP-0369-2024) and for an existing non-permitted 26.6-square-foot non-illuminated building wall sign (SP-0393-2024) at 341 Loudon Road in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.

No one is present for this application.

Mr. Gentilhomme stated the sign on the building is bigger than the wall on which it is mounted. The sign is extending beyond the wall and feels there is no reason they needed to do that.

Mr. King stated it looks as though on the right side if you were to trim it will run across, including the top and bottom.

Ms. Skinner stated they may have to redo the sign.

Mr. Gentilhomme stated that is why he stated it needs to be trimmed down to fit within the allocated space.

Merle Thorpe arrived at 8:37 a.m.

Co-Chair Doherty asked to go to the pylon sign as it seems less designed and more like a temporary sign.

Mr. King feels the font for numbers is too thin and too small, which will make the numbers hard to read.

Mr. Gentilhomme made a motion to recommend that the Planning Board approve the applications as submitted with the condition that the existing building sign be reportioned to fit within the allocated space of the portico. Mr. King seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

- 4.2 NEOPCO Signs, on behalf of Bektash Temple A.A.O.N.M.S., requests an architectural design review

**City of Concord, New Hampshire**  
**Architectural Design Review Committee**  
**November 5, 2024 Minutes**

recommendation for a new 32-square-foot externally illuminated pylon sign (SP-0373-2024) to replace an existing pylon sign at 189 Pembroke Rd in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.

Glen Schadlick (5 Crosby St, Concord) is present to represent this application.

Mr. Schadlick stated this is an existing sign that is being replaced with a sign of the same square footage. The existing sign has lighting from below. The new sign will have lighting from above. This is a raised copied sign. All letters are raised chrome as well as the logo. The existing poles will be removed and replaced with granite. The location will be the same.

Mr. King asked about the lighting and where it will shine?

Mr. Schadlick stated they are LED block lights that will rotate and shine down on the face.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if they looked at adding the address on the pylon post facing the street?

Mr. Schadlick stated he generally agrees that it is good idea and often proposes it to his clients. However, this post is only 7 feet by 7 feet and it would be hard to install the street address. He is not aware of an ordinance which requires it, and is currently waiting to hear back from the State of New Hampshire Fire Marshall on the matter as well.

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.

- 4.3 Signarama of Concord, on behalf of Oakstream Properties and Keeler Family Realtors, requests an architectural design review recommendation for a new 7.83-square-foot externally illuminated pylon panel sign (SP-0374-2024) to replace an existing pylon tenant panel at 21 Green Street in the Civic Performance (CVP) District. (2024-075)

Kendra Price (249 Sheep Davis Rd, Concord) is present to represent this application. This is an existing tenant sign looking for a new sign.

Co-Chair Doherty stated the sign is very busy with a lot of graphics on the sign.

Ms. Savage noted it is redundant to have Keeler Family Real Estate and then the KFR next to the phone number. Ms. Savage suggested removing the KFR and centering the phone number.

Co-Chair Hengen stated the font of the phone number is nearly as big as the font identifying the business, and suggested shrinking the font of the phone number.

Mr. Gentilhomme suggested for the word “realtors” that is in gold that it needs to punch out on the sign to indicate the type of business. He noted that if the word had a taller font and in the color white it might stand out more than it does now.

Mr. Thorpe stated the sign would read better without the bottom white bar as there are too many lines of text and color.

Ms. Savage made a motion to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted with the following conditions to more closely conform with Section 5.4(B) of the Architectural Design Guidelines by providing a more simple and direct message: remove the KFR logo; remove the bottom

**City of Concord, New Hampshire**  
**Architectural Design Review Committee**  
**November 5, 2024 Minutes**

white bar; center the text of phone number or web address on the center white bar; and, shift the center white bar down to provide separation between the capitol logo and center white bar. Mr. King seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

- 4.4 Advantage Signs, on behalf of Sulloway & Hollis PLLC, requests an architectural design review recommendation for a new 2.52-square-foot non-illuminated building wall sign (SP-0376-2024) to replace an existing building wall sign at 19 Capitol Street in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District. (2024-071)

Josh Messinger (128 Hall St, Concord) is present to represent this application.

The members stated this is a terrific sign.

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

- 4.5 Expose Signs & Graphics, on behalf of John Flatley Company, requests an architectural design review recommendation for a new 26.83-square-foot non-illuminated building wall sign (SP-0378-2024) at 32 South Main Street in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

Andrew Clark (32 South Main St, Concord) is present for this application.

Co-Chair Hengen stated it looks pretty straightforward.

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.

- 4.6 Spectrum Signs, on behalf of B & L Transmission LLC, requests an architectural design review recommendation for a new 25.67-square-foot non-illuminated window sign (SP-0379-2024) at 92 Manchester Street in the Highway Commercial (CH) District.

Jilian Arsenault (17 Eddy Rd, Manchester) is present to represent this application.

Ms. Arsenault stated this part of the building is an office and they wanted to create privacy from the public.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if they took into consideration to take white lines and wrap all around the panels?

Ms. Arsenault stated they had not, but did propose multiple options to the owner and this is the one they liked best.

Mr. Gentilhomme suggested to remove the two white stripes instead.

Co-Chair Doherty made a motion to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted with the condition that the white bars be removed and the graphics be extended up toward the AAMCO logo to more closely comply with Section 5.4(A) of the Architectural Design Guidelines that every sign should be an integral, subordinate element within the overall building and site design. Mr. Gentilhomme seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

- 4.7 Classic Signs Inc., LLC, on behalf of ROI Trust, requests an architectural design review recommendation

**City of Concord, New Hampshire**  
**Architectural Design Review Committee**  
**November 5, 2024 Minutes**

for a new 78.5-square-foot internally illuminated monument sign (SP-0380-2024) at 16 Manchester Street in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District. (2024-023)

Justin Parker (13 Columbia Dr, Amherst) is present to represent this application.

Co-Chair Doherty stated it is hard to go over the aesthetics because the tenants will need to come back to Architectural Design Review Committee.

Mr. King asked what Architectural Design Review Committee is approving.

Ms. Skinner stated the Architectural Design Review Committee is approving the size, materials, and colors of the frame.

Mr. King stated they are also approving for every tenant that comes in that the tenant panel background is dark blue with white letters.

Ms. Skinner stated the committee can do that.

Ms. Savage asked if it can list the name of the tenant and not the tenant's logo?

Ms. Skinner stated yes.

Co-Chair Doherty asked how large the letters are for the word Riverwalk?

Mr. Parker answered they are about eight inches.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if they are formed letters.

Mr. Parker stated it is a reverse bleed on vinyl.

Co-Chair Hengen pointed out it is a large sign, nine feet high and twelve feet wide.

Mr. Gentilhomme asked if this is a double-sided sign?

Mr. Parker believes so as there is two-way traffic.

Co-Chair Hengen does not have any problems with the design of the sign.

Co-Chair Doherty pointed out it would be better with raised letters, especially for the word Riverwalk.

Co-Chair Hengen made a motion to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted with the suggestion that the name of the property "Riverwalk at Concord" panel be enlarged to be more prominent than the tenant panels, and with the understanding that future tenant panel signs will have white lettering and deep blue background as shown and also will require architectural design review approval. Mr. King seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

- 4.8 Poyant Signs, on behalf of JS 155 Loudon Road LLC ET AL, requests an architectural design review recommendation for three new internally illuminated building wall signs of 72.87-square-feet (SP-0388-2024), 30.37-square-feet (SP-0390-2024), and 72.87-square-feet (SP-0389-2024), and two internally illuminated pylon panel signs of 35.51-square-feet (SP-0394-2024) and 49.51-square-feet (SP-0391-2024)

**City of Concord, New Hampshire  
Architectural Design Review Committee  
November 5, 2024 Minutes**

to replace existing signage at 155 Loudon Road in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.

Jenn Robichaud (125 Samuel Barnet Blvd New Bedford, MA) is present to represent this application. Ms. Robichaud noted the signs presented meet the ordinance and are an exact swap of what is there now.

Co-Chair Doherty made a motion to approve as submitted. Mr. Gentilhomme seconded.

Discussion

Mr. King noted his concern about the white background on the pylon sign and if it should be opaque?

Ms. Robichaud stated currently the sign is not opaque nor is the Burger King sign on the pylon that both tenants share. Ms. Robichaud pointed out if they follow what is asked the CVS will have an opaque background when the Burger King does not. Ms. Robichaud asked for them to allow the signs to exist quietly and allow to proceed as presented.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if on the CVS sign if they are removing and installing a new sign?

Ms. Robichaud stated plastic out and plastic in.

Co-chair Hengen asked if that is considered a new sign.

Mr. Tremblay stated it is a reface of a pylon sign and considered a new sign.

Ms. Skinner noted the pylon is existing and is not being replaced, but the panel in the pylon is being replaced. Ms. Skinner noted the overall frame pylon is not new and existing. It is an alteration of an existing sign.

Co-Chair Doherty amended his motion to recommend approval of the building wall signs as submitted. Mr. Gentilhomme seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Gentilhomme respects what was said about the Burger King sign, which was completed many years ago. Stating the committee would prefer the white on pylon sign have opaque background, a guideline they have been using with the intention to cut down on the amount of brightness of signage.

Ms. Robichaud asked if anyone can speak to the current conditions of the sign's panels being problematic and too bright? Ms. Robichaud noted the Burger King sign would not change if CVS were to install an opaque background.

Co-Chair Hengen stated they would be moving in the right direction.

Ms. Robichaud stated she believes this may be a circumstance where the approval without an opaque background would be appropriate.

Mr. Gentilhomme made a motion to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application for the pylon panel sign as submitted with the condition that an opaque background be applied to the white background of the pylon panel signs to more closely conform to Section 5.4(C) of the Architectural Design Guidelines which states that internally lit signs should provide opaque backgrounds with translucent letters. Mr. King seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Robichaud requested to be removed from the consent agenda and have a public hearing at the next

**City of Concord, New Hampshire**  
**Architectural Design Review Committee**  
**November 5, 2024 Minutes**

Planning Board scheduled for November 20, 2024.

- 4.9 Signarama of Concord, on behalf of Who Doesn't Want That?, requests an architectural design review recommendation for five existing non-permitted signs, non-illuminated window or door signs of 1.4-square-feet (SP-0362-2024), 1.3-square-feet (SP-0363-2024), 1.1-square-feet (Sp-0364-2024), 1.0-square-feet (SP-0366-2024), and 1.66-square-feet (SP-0368-2024), at 34 Warren Street, Unit 1, located in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

Kendra Price (249 Sheep Davis Rd, Concord) is present to represent this application.

Ms. Price stated the applications are for the approval of existing vinyl signs on the bottom of the window and door.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if there are several entrances?

Ms. Price stated there is only one entrance.

Mr. Thorpe asked if the signs are all the same height and size, and on the same elevation?

Ms. Price stated yes, and while they were installed by others, she believes they were installed on the same elevation.

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

- 4.10 Signarama of Concord, on behalf of Cal's Cabinet Depot, requests an architectural design review recommendation for an existing non-permitted 24.94-square-foot non-illuminated building wall sign (SP-0375-2024) and an existing non-permitted 2.8-square-foot non-illuminated door sign (SP-0397-2024) at 254 Sheep Davis Road, Building 2, in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.

Kendra Price (249 Sheep Davis Rd, Concord) is present to represent this application.

Ms. Price corrected the agenda, stating that the building wall sign proposed and will be a new sign. There is a banner that has been acting as a building wall sign for a long time. They will be replacing that with a one-sheet metal PVC.

The committee stated there is too much information on the sign.

Ms. Savage suggested removing the words "kitchen & bath remodel, and quality & price" and to leave the text remaining on the bottom line to improve sending a concise message.

Co-Chair Doherty suggested changing the bottom banner to dark blue with white letters so it will pop.

Mr. Thorpe pointed out you cannot read the word Cals.

Ms. Savage made a motion to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application for the building wall sign with the following conditions to more closely conform with Section 5.4(B) of the Architectural Design Guidelines by providing a more simple and direct message: eliminate the second navy blue line; turn the light blue line into a navy blue with white lettering; shift the white band down to occupy the removed navy blue line so that the top navy blue band can increase in size and the word

**City of Concord, New Hampshire**  
**Architectural Design Review Committee**  
**November 5, 2024 Minutes**

“Cal’s” can be increased in size; and, remove the text in the upper left and upper right corners. Mr. Gentilhomme seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. King made a motion to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application for the door sign as submitted. Co-Chair Doherty seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

**5. Building Permit Applications**

**6. Site Plan Applications**

- 6.1 TFMoran, Inc., on behalf of Interchange Development, LLC, requests an architectural design review recommendation for a full-service restaurant with an outdoor seating area, an attached retail space, and associated site improvements at 10 Merchants Way in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District. (2024-047)

David Rauseo (152 Morrill Rd, Canterbury) and Jason Hill (48 Constitution Dr, Bedford) are present to represent this application.

Mr. Rauseo stated they are here to discuss 10 and 12 Merchants Way. There will be a full-service Italian restaurant with adjacent retail space. There is no back to the building as it will be visible from all directions. There will be seating area on west side of the building.

Mr. Hill stated this is part of phase 2c of the site plan portion of interior. This is an approved big box retail site to the south with a future parking lot. Phase 2 is all sharing a parking lot. The only change from what was looked at a couple years ago is they are reintroducing the shared parking arrangements. They are proposing a small strip of parking off the edge of the already approved lot and head in parking along the common driveway flowing east-west. There will be a fairly densely planted façade perimeter with shrubbery and street trees and open space at the intersection area of Interchange and Merchants Way. There will be a perennial garden with a stamped paver walkway.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if there is a transformer?

Mr. Rauseo stated there is a proposal to put a transformer at the existing junction box. However, they think they can run the primary a little farther south and put a transformer next to the dumpster enclosure.

Mr. King stated Merchants Way has a lot of traffic going in and out, which will be visible from the dining area, which would benefit if landscaping were added to break that up and add privacy to the diners.

Mr. Rauseo agreed it is a very busy intersection. Mr. Rauseo noted they could look to install low things so as to not obstruct line of sights. Added landscaping would need to demonstrate compliance with landscaping regulations and separation from potential underground utilities.

Mr. Thorpe stated they have put all the landscaping in the front of the building and not by where the people will be eating adjacent to the parking lot.

Mr. Rauseo stated this is what the client wanted. Mr. Rauseo pointed there is a planter with items growing out of the top by the outdoor seating area.

Mr. Gentilhomme suggested to plant trees in the outdoor eating area for people to eat under the trees.

Mr. King noted the planter box only appears to be two feet high.

**City of Concord, New Hampshire**  
**Architectural Design Review Committee**  
**November 5, 2024 Minutes**

Mr. Rauseo stated in the end they become taller than that to use as a buffer to the walkway adjacent to the parking spaces.

Mr. Thorpe asked if there is a way to increase the width of the planters to create ambiance for the diners?

Mr. Rauseo noted the planters are taller with the plantings. When you are sitting down you will see the planter box.

Ms. Savage suggested making the planters taller.

Mr. Gentilhomme stated when sitting down the planters should be 42 inches in height to create a screen with plantings above.

Co-Chair Hengen asked for building materials to be described.

Mr. Rauseo stated the darker columns at the entrances to retail and restaurant are face brick. The wood fill around the signage is wood looking nichiha siding. The wainscot is a faced stone. Above will be some EIFS and hardy plank clapboard look in the gray.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if the applicant brought samples and colors for the committee to review?

Mr. Rauseo answered no.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if the colors in the renderings will closely resemble the constructed materials?

Mr. Rauseo stated they are close.

Mr. King made a motion to recommend that the Planning Board grant architectural design review approval for the application as submitted with the following conditions to enhance the environment and serve as a functional part of the development improving conformance with Section 5.2 *Landscape and Site Treatment* of the Architectural Design Guidelines: the planters around the outside dining area shall be increased to a height of 42 inches excluding planting material, and made as wide as possible; and, landscaping along the northern part of the property shall be increased to provide screening from Merchants Way to enhance the dining experience. Mr. Gentilhomme seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

**7. Other Business**

**7.1 Review and approve 2025 meeting schedule**

The members left the January 2025 date and changed the October date to September 30, 2024.

**7.2 Co-Chair Hengen had a question about the Isabella Apartments at 32 South Main St, particularly the South State Street façade which is all the gas meters. She looked at the original plans received by the Architectural Design Review Committee and noted that they were there. However, she does not remember discussing it. Co-Chair Hengen asked if there is a provision for screening the gas meters?**

Ms. Skinner stated there is a requirement to screen roof top and ground mounted mechanical in the site plan regulations. However, meters on the outside of building is not considered ground mounted mechanical. That would be more like transformers.



**City of Concord, New Hampshire**  
**Architectural Design Review Committee**  
**November 5, 2024 Minutes**

Co-Chair Hengen stated there is traffic and pedestrian traffic that views that regularly and it instead looks as if it were the back of utilitarian side of a building.

Ms. Skinner noted the regulations probably need to be revised to consider such situations.

Mr. King asked if there is a way to contact them to make them aware of the comments and see if there is a way for them to address the lack of screening?

Ms. Skinner stated they can ask but cannot guarantee they will do the work.

- 7.3 Co-Chair Hengen asked for discussion from the October 16, 2024, joint work session with the Planning Board and an update on the conditional use permit.

Ms. Skinner stated it is going to Planning Board for public hearing November 20, 2024. The Planning Board asked for two options in relation to historic preservation for them to be able to make a decision.

**Adjournment**

Mr. King moved, seconded by Mr. Gentilhomme, to adjourn the meeting at approximately 10:35 a.m. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

*Krista Tremblay*

Krista Tremblay

Administrative Specialist II