

**City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
September 2, 2025 Minutes**

The Architectural Design Review Committee (ADRC) held its regular monthly meeting on September 2, 2025, in Council Chambers, at 37 Green St, Concord, NH.

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

Absent: Co-Chair Jay Doherty

Staff: AnneMarie Skinner, City Planner; Alec Bass, Assistant City Planner – Community Planning; Brian Tremblay, Planning and Zoning Inspector; and Krista Tremblay, Administrative Technician III

1. Call to Order

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

2. Minutes – Approve minutes from August 5, 2025

Member Savage moved, seconded by Member Thorpe, to approve the meeting minutes from August 5, 2025, as written. All in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

3. Staff Memorandum

4. Sign Applications

- 4.1 Advantage Signs, on behalf of Associated Enterprises Inc and Social Club Creamery, requests architectural design review recommendations for a new 11-square-foot non-illuminated vinyl window sign (SP-0617-2025) and an existing non-permitted 8-square-foot non-illuminated building wall sign (SP-0619-2025) at 138 North Main Street in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District. (2025-102) (PL-ADR-2025-0121)

Josh Messinger (128 Hall St, Concord) is present to represent this application. Mr. Messinger stated it is a pretty straight forward application. There is vinyl on the glass with logo.

Member King asked if everything meets code.

Mr. Messinger answered yes.

On a motion made by Member King, seconded by Member Gentilhomme, the Committee voted to recommend to the Planning Board to approve the application as submitted.

Discussion

Member Thorpe stated the visibility on the glass helps with the name as he is unsure if it is ice cream or a speak easy.

All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

- 4.2 Turn One Signs Graphics, on behalf of Brixmore Capitol SC LLC and Burlington, requests architectural design review recommendations for a 230-square-foot internally illuminated building wall sign (SP-0626-2025) to replace an existing building wall sign, a new 47-square-foot non-illuminated building wall sign (SP-0627-2025), a 60-square-foot internally illuminated building wall sign (SP-0628-2025) to replace an existing building wall sign, and a 33-square-foot internally illuminated building wall sign (SP-0629-2025) to replace an existing building wall sign, at 80 Storrs Street in the Opportunity Corridor Performance (OCP) District.

No one is present to represent this application.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if there are four signs.

**City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
September 2, 2025 Minutes**

Mr. Bass stated there are four signs. The large building wall sign is replacing an existing. There is a non-illuminated building wall sign underneath the awning walkway area.

Member Thorpe stated it seems like there were two different scripts.

Mr. Bass asked for the elevation Member Thorpe is referring to.

Member Thorpe stated the first elevation.

Member King stated they look the same to him; however, one has a red background so you see the white around it. Member King asked if all of this meets code.

Mr. Tremblay stated it does.

Member Gentilhomme has a question about the sign facing 93 and reading the text, it said the body is manufactured and installed internally illuminated face lit channel letters as shown. Member Gentilhomme noted the letters are black and they are channel letters that are face lit. Member Gentilhomme asked how does that work. Member Gentilhomme noted it is perforated so some light can come through.

Member Thorpe asked if there should be a distinction that the white should not be illuminated.

Member Gentilhomme asked what is the white or is that just the reflective unpainted surface.

Member Savage stated what they have indicated is just the face lit letters are the only thing to be illuminated and the white background is not illuminated. Member Savage made note, that should it show up, the white part is illuminated and would not meet the sign code.

Member Proctor takes the white part as a middle paneling.

Co-Chair Hengen stated it needs to be clarified in the motion that the background is not illuminated.

Member Savage made a motion to approve the sign application as submitted provided that the sign that faces the northeast elevation is not illuminating the white background.

Discussion

Mr. Bass noted they are channel letters and asked if the Committee is concerned that the applicant will illuminate the white background.

Member King stated they want to make sure they are not going to.

Co-Chair Hengen stated yes, they want it to not be illuminated.

Member Savage stated unless it is too complicated and it says they approve the application as submitted and staff knows to check the work on the northeast elevation when it is installed.

Mr. Bass noted they can state "provided that only the channel letters are illuminated."

On a motion made by Member Savage, seconded by Member Gentilhomme, the Committee voted to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted with the understanding that on the east elevation, only the channel letters are to be illuminated and not the white background.

Discussion

Member Thorpe stated he likes what is happening with the east elevation with the letter floating over the wall and it is much more low key. Member Thorpe noted if it were bright signage it would distract from the views.

All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

- 4.3 New England Life Care, on behalf of TDL Investments LLC, requests architectural design review recommendations for a new 14.3-square-foot internally illuminated wall sign (SP-0630-2025) and a 21.25-square-foot replacement internally illuminated panel (SP-0631-2025) in an existing freestanding

**City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
September 2, 2025 Minutes**

sign at 374 Loudon Road in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District. (2025-098) (PL-ADR-2025-0117)

Joshua Watson (374 Loudon Rd, Concord) is present to represent this application. Mr. Watson stated this is for their ambulatory infusion suite. It is replacing existing signs that are both illuminated.

Member King commented on the square building sign that you cannot read the “collaborating to transform the patient care continuum” words.

Mr. Watson stated it is a good point and might remove that portion.

Member Savage noted on the street sign they do not have it.

Member King noted if they do remove those words, they can make the New England Life Care a little bigger.

Member Thorpe asked if the sign over the door is illuminated.

Member Gentilhomme stated the application states they both are illuminated.

Member King stated the white is an issue.

Member Savage asked Mr. Bass to explain why the white is an issue.

Mr. Bass stated 5.4(c) of the Architectural Design Guidelines states internally lit signs should provide an opaque background with translucent letters.

Co-Chair Hengen stated the purpose is so at night there is not a glaring white box and the wording stands out with a subdued background. Co-Chair Hengen stated it makes the sign more visible.

Member Savage stated they recommend that the white background be opaque and the only illumination is the lettering not the white.

Member Gentilhomme stated they can make a halo around the letters so the letters read.

Mr. Watson stated the white on the square building sign is a milky white and what they would suggest is the color scheme gets reversed.

Member Gentilhomme stated not necessarily. They would take the white background and on the inside, they would put an opaque material that blocks the light from transmitting through at night. It leaves a halo around the letters so they can read.

Mr. Watson stated that is helpful.

Co-Chair Hengen stated the graphic on the pylon sign is clean but it looks like two signs. It does not meld as a unit. Co-Chair Hengen suggested a black border around the entire rectangle to tie the pieces of the sign together.

Member Gentilhomme suggested taking the blue background and making a heavy border with it around the “NELC” area. Member Gentilhomme noted that will make it cohesive.

Co-Chair Hengen made a motion to approve the two signs with the following recommendations: that the wall sign have an opaque background in compliance with the section 5.4(c) of the design guidelines 5 and that the pylon sign also have an opaque background per the same section and that a blue border that matches the background of the infusion suite be placed along the top and the bottom parts of the left side of the sign to hold both parts of that sign together and integrate the design. Member King seconded.

Discussion

Member Savage suggested to remove under New England Life Care the small print “collaborating to transform the patient care continuum.”

Co-Chair Hengen answered yes.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
September 2, 2025 Minutes

On a motion made by Co-Chair Hengen, seconded by Member King, the Committee voted to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted with the following conditions: the amount of text on the building wall sign shall be reduced, so that all lettering can be read from the parking lot and roadway, for example the “Collaborating to transform the patient care continuum” script is too small and could be removed, allowing the rest of the sign font to be increased in accordance with Section 5.4(B) *Materials* of the Architectural Design Guidelines; the wall sign and pylon panel sign shall have an opaque background placed behind the white backgrounds per Section 5.4(C) *Illumination* of the Architectural Design Guidelines; and, on the tenant panel sign, a blue border, matching the blue behind “infusion suite” shall be placed on the top and bottom of the sign to tie the sign together per Section 5.4(D) *Coordination* of the Architectural Design Guidelines.

All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

- 4.4 City of Concord requests architectural design review feedback in accordance with RSA 674:54 for a 206-square-foot internally illuminated freestanding sign at 19 Loudon Road in the Institutional (IS) District.

No one is present to represent this application.

Co-Chair Hengen stated this is feedback for a city sign.

Member Savage asked if they are following sign ordinance guidelines with a white opaque background.

Mr. Bass stated this application has gone through legal review and this application meets the criteria to fall under RSA 674:54. Mr. Bass noted RSA 674:54 is for governmental uses on governmental land, and they are required to have a public hearing and receive comments. However, they are not subject to our regulations.

Member Savage stated the tenants of the bottom part of the sign the 38 by 96 and 14 by 96 should adhere to the ordinance and the Architectural Design Guidelines and provide a white opaque background.

Member Gentilhomme noted when they do not have anything to put on the top they should put a blank black panel that blocks out the white.

Co-Chair Hengen wanted to go on record that it would behoove the city to follow its own sign ordinance.

The Architectural Design Review Committee reviewed the application and provided the following comments: the bottom two sign panels, the 38-foot by 96-foot and 14-foot by 96-foot tenant sign panels, shall have an opaque background placed behind the white backgrounds, consistent with the City’s own ordinance and Architectural Design Guidelines; and, for any of the 6 rows of text, if blank, shall have an opaque panel inserted, consistent with the City’s own ordinance and design review guidelines.

- 4.5 Jigme Ghising, Remi’s Block LLC, and New Everest Momo & Curry, request an architectural design review recommendation for a new 3.2-square foot non-illuminated projecting sign (SP-0632-2025) at 156 North Main Street in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District. (2025-101) (PL-ADR-2025-0120)

Jigme Ghising (156 N Main St, Concord) is present to represent this application. Mr. Ghising stated the sign will go on the corner of Loudon Road and North Main Street.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if that is so he can have visibility from all angles.

Mr. Ghising answered yes.

Member King noted you cannot read what is on the bottom below the mountains.

Co-Chair Hengen stated the Nepali and Indian cuisine is hard to read in the graphic.

Member King noted the sign is 24 inches and you will not be able to read that from any distance.

Member Thorpe asked if it would help to change the graphics of the font so it is similar to New Everest so that it is bolder.

**City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
September 2, 2025 Minutes**

Co-Chair Hengen asked if Member Thorpe is asking about the tag line.

Member Thorpe responded just for the tag line.

Member King stated the scale is so small.

Member Gentilhomme stated the main message you want people to see is this is the New Everest restaurant. If they know about the restaurant then they know what food they sell.

Member King suggested to reduce the size of the New Everest a little bit and make Momo and Curry bigger because it describes the food.

Member Savage suggests to remove underneath the mountain the small print so everything else can get bigger.

Co-Chair Hengen stated these are design suggestions.

Mr. Ghising understood.

On a motion made by Member Savage, seconded by Member King, the Committee voted to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted with the optional suggestion that the amount of text on the projecting sign is reduced, so that all other lettering can be made more readable. For example, the “Nepali and Indian Cuisine” script is too small and could be removed, allowing the mountain logo to be shifted down and the rest of the sign font to be increased.

Discussion

Member Thorpe asked about dropping the word cuisine to increase the Nepali and Indian.

Member Savage does not think so.

All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

5. Building Permit Applications

- 5.1 Dagle Electrical Construction Corp, Claire Wilkens, and Michael Cronin, on behalf of James on Depot LLC, request an architectural design review recommendation for an exterior building renovation, at 1-5 Depot Street, located in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District. (PL-ADR-2025-0116) (2025-097)

Michael Cronin (Wilmington, MA) and Claire Wilkens (8 Flintlock Circle, Gilford) are present to represent this application. Mr. Cronin stated they are going through some preliminary work right now. The goal is to take 5 Depot and fully redevelop it into 14 residential units for rent and two commercial units on the first floor.

Member King asked what is in there now.

Mr. Cronin stated right now it is currently under renovation and vacant. It was Castro's and a hobby shop.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if this is market rate housing.

Mr. Cronin responded yes.

Member Savage asked what is changing on the elevation to understand what is staying and going.

Ms. Wilkens stated the front elevation and the top right elevation will remain the same. They will replace the windows as they are with the wood fronts. The existing angle entrance will remain and they will install new wood door transoms. They will be adding access to the roof deck with a stairwell and elevator.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
September 2, 2025 Minutes

The front will be re-pointed and cleaned up. The two sides you cannot really see will be cleaned up. The back side they are proposing to take out the existing bulkhead area to access the basement. Where the door is in the center there is a bulkhead that goes above and below grade to the width of the windows. They would like to take that out and provide new access doors with stairs to access the basement. Where the two-side door currently there are double doors that they would like to remove and put in a single door with a transom. The stair and walkway that is currently there will be replaced. The granite steps on the other side will be updated and cleaned up.

Member Savage asked about the windows and if they are replacing matching the size.

Ms. Wilkens answered correct.

Member Savage asked for the back if all they are changing is from a bulkhead to a walk-in door.

Ms. Wilkens responded correct.

Member Savage asked about the roof line and them putting screening that was not there currently.

Ms. Wilkens stated there will be mechanicals on the roof, which they will be screening.

Member Thorpe asked if the roof deck penthouse is new.

Ms. Wilkens answered correct.

Member Savage asked if the fencing at the top roof deck meets code and is the right height.

Mr. Cronin stated the balusters need to be four inches by code and will be 42 inches high on that rail.

Co-Chair Hengen asked about the windows. If you go to the top floor of windows they look like they are a pair of two windows instead of a single opening window that is there right now.

Ms. Wilkens stated they are two narrow windows and they want to replace with one full window.

Co-Chair Hengen asked why because it does change the rhythm of the façade.

Ms. Wilkens stated right now there are two narrow windows and the space between them is about five inches.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if it would be a single sash instead of two narrow sashes.

Ms. Wilkens answered yes.

Member Thorpe asked if there will be air conditioning.

Mr. Cronin responded yes.

Co-Chair Hengen asked the applicant to discuss the new windows, the materials, and where they will sit.

Mr. Cronin stated they will build them with a finish trim that will go around.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if they are one over one.

**City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
September 2, 2025 Minutes**

Mr. Cronin stated he thought they were.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if they are doing two over two.

Mr. Cronin stated they are looking at two over two.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if there is a reason why they are not doing one over one the way they are there now.

Ms. Wilkens stated similar to the building on the back alley these windows would have a similar look.

Co-Chair Hengen stated the key is to make sure they are recessed to where they are right now.

Member Thorpe asked about the finish on these windows.

Mr. Cronin stated they will be black.

Co-Chair Hengen stated a black or a deep green would be historical.

Member Thorpe noted it would be better if the windows are one over one.

Member Savage asked if the Committee is asking to be one over one or are they okay with it being two over two.

Co-Chair Hengen stated it make sense to do one over one. It would be cheaper and bring more light in. Also, it will follow the historic design.

Ms. Wilkens stated if you walk down Main Street there are many different configurations of window types. There is not a precedent to maintain a certain amount of window. Ms. Wilkens noted the cost for one over one or two over two does not make much difference.

Member Proctor asked if they are rebuilding the store front that is there.

Ms. Wilkens stated it will be all new.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if the cast iron posts are still there and will stay.

Mr. Cronin stated they are there and will remain.

Member Thorpe asked if railing is set back.

Ms. Wilkens answered correct, it is set back seven feet from the front and the sides. If you were to look up it will not be on the façade of either edge.

Mr. Cronin stated it is purely use for the tenants.

Member Thorpe asked what is the material for the penthouse wood, brick and stucco.

Ms. Wilkens stated there is no stucco. It will be wood paneling like the front to match the paneling that is on the entrance not sure if will go brick on the elevator portion or wrap with wood paneling.

**City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
September 2, 2025 Minutes**

Co-Chair Hengen asked about the store front elevation and if that will have vertical wood.

Mr. Cronin stated they are trying to match some existing panels.

Co-Chair Hengen stated the roof top is whole different element and to keep more in a darker color or metal.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if the roof top is open to all of the residents.

Mr. Cronin stated only the residents not the public.

Member King stated in the summer it will be hot and asked if they will have umbrellas up there.

Mr. Cronin answered no, that is not the intention. It is an escape area and if it is too hot people will not go out there. They have created a community area within the building. This is more for relaxation.

Member Thorpe asked if they considered increasing the area of canopy to create a shaded area.

Mr. Cronin stated they have not thought about that at all.

Member King asked about the roof drains.

Mr. Cronin stated all interior roof drains tie in.

Member Gentilhomme noted the railing itself is shown with horizontal rails rather than vertical balusters.

Mr. Cronin answered correct.

Member Gentilhomme asked what is that made out of.

Mr. Cronin stated the would be a steel rail with a cap on it.

Member Gentilhomme is concerned with the horizontal ones because they climb up and if not strong enough they could get bent.

Mr. Cronin stated that is a good point and they will go vertical.

Co-Chair Hengen moved, seconded by Member Gentilhomme, that the Committee recommend that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted with the following conditions: that rooftop guardrail baluster slats shall be vertical and placed 4 inches on center to increase child safety; that any new construction on the rooftop shall be a dark colored, non-reflective finish and not constructed with wood materials; that windows shall be installed on the same plane as existing, leaving a return back to the building's elevation; that if any repointing of the brick is conducted, the original color and profile shall be matched; a suggestion that the existing sash configuration should be matched; and, an understanding that the original wood storefront is being matched, not necessarily with material, but in detail and proportion.

All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

- 5.2 ReVision Energy, on behalf of BCM Properties LLC, requests an architectural design review recommendation for installation of solar roof panels, at 3 Maple Street, located in the Civic Performance (CVP) District. (2025-100) (PL-ADR-2025-0118)

**City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
September 2, 2025 Minutes**

Greg Devoncourt (7 Commercial Drive, Brentwood) is present to represent this application. Mr. Devoncourt stated they have applied for a 12-panel solar array east facing and west facing grooves of the building. This is a small office building. It will be seven panels on the east roof and five panels on the west roof. Mr. Devoncourt noted there is not a huge amount of visibility from the building but you can see the east roof from the road below it. The west roof is not visible. Mr. Devoncourt stated the electrical comes in through the rear of the building. Mr. Devoncourt stated this will have a three-foot setback. These are all black panels. It is a 440-watt module.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if it is all parallel to the roof and flush.

Mr. Devoncourt answered yes.

On a motion made by Member King, seconded by Member Savage, the Committee voted to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted.

Discussion

Member Thorpe asked if that is an electrical mast head.

Mr. Devoncourt answer yes, this is the service coming in and then going down to the meter.

Co-Chair Hengen stated it is not a visible elevation.

Mr. Devoncourt stated this is not visible from any street. The conduit that will be running down will be smaller than the existing conduit.

All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

6. Site Plan Applications

- 6.1 Gallagher, Callahan & Gartell, PC and Cafua Realty Trust CXXXIX LLC request an architectural design review recommendation for a new 11,150-square-foot urgent care clinic, at Tax Map Lot 583Z 30, addressed as 161 North State Street, in the Urban Commercial (CU) District. (2025-095) (PL-SPR-2025-0046)

Ari Pollack (214 N Main St, Concord) and Andrew Masison (161 N State St, Concord) is present to represent this application. Mr. Pollack the project is located at 161 N State St at the corner of North State St and Penacook St. It is currently a host to a late 1960's building that has been used as an office and a bank. It is very close to the intersection and has been vacant for some time. the project is a tear down and redevelopment of the lot with a new medical facility with parking. There is an ATM for a bank that now runs a drive thru ATM that will be located in a vestibule in the parking lot.

Mr. Masison added that the elevation is facing North State St is a standard design. There are two canopies for ambulance and on back side emergency entry for all of the patients. They choose a combination of brick and efface for the elevation. It will be red brick similar to the fire station and municipal building across the street. They choose white and gray efface to complement the red brick. The window sizes were determined for proportion reasons. Taking some ties from the buildings across the street.

Member Thorpe asked if staff parking is in the lower right section of the plan.

Mr. Pollack stated they have not designated it. The idea is to make it as user friendly as possible.

Member King asked how they would enter.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
September 2, 2025 Minutes

Mr. Pollack stated you can enter in either driveway.

Member King stated he is trying to figure out the traffic flow on the right side.

Mr. Masison asked if referring to the entrance on North State Street.

Mr. Pollack stated they would pull into that driveway and circle to the parking area and would not use the ambulance vestibule.

Member Savage asked if the ambulance entrance is on the east side facing North State Street.

Mr. Pollack responded that is correct.

Member Savage asked if there will be wayfinding signs.

Mr. Pollack answered yes, they have not submitted sign applications, and will return for those approvals.

Member Thorpe noted doors that are not essential to the entrance would be more background if they were painted similar to the background of the surrounding surface rather than calling them out as entrances.

Mr. Masison stated those are standard doors they typically use and they can be painted.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if Member Thorpe is suggesting the ones that the public will never use could be red to match the brick or black.

Mr. Pollack stated there is no issue.

Co-Chair Hengen asked to move on to the landscaping.

Mr. Pollack noted you can see on the bottom of the plan there is what looks like a cut from the parking area to the property to the south. There is an odd shape to this lot. The lot does connect to Walker Street which is a residential street to the south. Mr. Pollack stated they are not connecting there and what see is plantings across that area similar to what is there today. Mr. Pollack stated they will landscape over that area and it will not be an access point for the property.

Co-Chair Hengen asked for highlights in the landscape plan they were trying to address.

Mr. Pollack stated they want to beef up area where there would potentially be a drive aisle. Then, they want to make some buffering for the folks that are to the rear.

Member Thorpe asked if there are any underground utilities that go in front of the building face that prohibit any tree location in the front of the building.

Mr. Pollack asked if discussing the Penacook Street frontage.

Member Thorpe answered yes.

Mr. Pollack does not know the answer to that. Mr. Pollack noted what they have shown for that area is lawn.

Member Thorpe asked if there is room to put more trees.

Mr. Pollack stated they can add more to make the Committee happy.

Co-Chair Hengen stated even if it was lower landscaping along there.

Mr. Pollack stated it is now grass proposed and they can add trees.

Member Thorpe stated something to vary the height.

Mr. Pollack responded sure.

Member King asked about snow removal if it is off-site.

Mr. Pollack responded correct.

**City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
September 2, 2025 Minutes**

Member Gentilhomme asked if there will be roof-top equipment.

Mr. Masison answered yes, and it will be screened.

Member Thorpe asked about the meter location.

Mr. Masison stated close to the generator enclosure.

On a motion made by Member Gentilhomme, seconded by Member King, the Committee voted to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted with the condition that additional landscape trees shall be placed along Penacook Street and the northeast corner of the site. A more prominent tree, such as a maple, is suggested for planting at the northeast corner of the site.

All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

- 6.2 Kasada LLC, NES Group, Service Credit Union, and Bohler Engineering MA, LLC, request an architectural design review recommendation for a new 2,466-square-foot credit union, at Tax Map Lot 611Z 38, addressed as 285 Loudon Road, in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District. (2025-099) (PL-SPM-2025-0025, PL-ADR-2025-0119)

Member King and Member Gentilhomme left the meeting at 10:09 a.m. A quorum is still maintained.

Tom Chiudino (905 S Main St, Mansfield MA), Robbie Catura and Nathan Henry (New Boston, NH) are present to represent this application. Mr. Chiudino stated this is near Aldi and Raising Caine's. This is the third final unoccupied previously approved parcel.

Co-Chair Hengen stated it is a pretty straightforward design and asked to call out on the architectural plan.

Mr. Chiudino noted this will be a full-service branch. The exterior is based of stone with several accents at the entrance and the end of the structure. Rising above the stone is a fiber cement vertical siding that is a bark color. Above that is a band of white efface with the blue trim at the top. The main roof height is about 17.5 feet and then there are three sections that step up. The highest one will be at the entrance at the 20-foot limit. The windows are aluminum clear anodized store front and there is a clear anodized awning that is the entrance and sun shade at the end. The mechanicals are on the northeast side and they are screened with fence. The facility has two lanes of drive-up which are both ATMs. The parking spaces in the back would be employee. They average four employees during the day and could have as many as six. It is a simple structure.

Member Thorpe asked if it is possible to use more trees along the peninsula of the ground cover.

Mr. Chiudino stated the parking was already there. Mr. Chiudino pointed out the parking that was added. Three are new trees on the north side property line. Mr. Chiudino is not sure they if can add trees with the other existing stores.

Member Savage would like to see an additional tree to the north of the property and the one at the entrance.

Member Thorpe noted the non-essential emergency or employee exit that is silhouetted in white and suggested not to do a white door and make it more background like the graphite gray siding to make disappear.

Mr. Chiudino stated they would have that painted to blend with the siding.

Member Thorpe asked about the perimeter lighting and the wall mounted fixtures.

Mr. Chiudino stated they have two sets of decorative sconces that are on by the entrance and there are wall pacts which are more for the parking area.

Member Thorpe asked about the parking area itself and is there light for that.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
September 2, 2025 Minutes

Mr. Chiudino showed the lighting plan.

Mr. Chiudino there is one at the entrance, two along the back and another one.

Co-Chair Hengen noted they have requested to increase the number of trees in northeast corner of the lot and the service doors are a dark color.

On a motion made by Co-Chair Hengen, seconded by Member Savage, the Committee voted to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted with the following conditions: increase the number of trees to be planted on the lot as much as possible, specifically, at least two additional shade tree shall be provided in the seeded lawn strip along the northern side of the site while still abiding by the required 10-foot separation from underground utilities; and, any service doors, not used for public access, shall be painted a dark color to complement the adjacent siding.

Discussion

Member Thorpe asked if roof-top equipment was discussed.

Mr. Chiudino stated there is not any it is a PRF system and the one unit is inside the enclosure.

Member Thorpe asked if meters are related to that.

Mr. Chiudino stated the electrical meter is on the back top left corner and that is the only meter.

Member Thorpe asked if the power is underground.

Mr. Chiudino answered that is correct.

All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

7. Other Business

7.1 Any other business which may legally come before the Committee.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if there is update on the gooseneck vents on the Stickney Ave project.

Ms. Skinner stated they will be painted black.

7.2 Adjournment

Member Savage moved, seconded by Co-Chair Hengen, to adjourn the meeting at 10:38 a.m. All in favor.
The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Krista Tremblay

Krista Tremblay

Administrative Technician III

Claire Wilkens
Architect, PLLC
8 Flintlock Circle
Gilmanton NH 03237
603.630.6095
1cmw@gmx.us

DEPOT STREET
APTS & RETAIL
1-5 Depot Street
Concord, NH

PROGRESS PRINT
DATE: 28 AUGUST, 2025

COPYRIGHT
DATE: 28 AUGUST, 2025
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"
PROJECT NUMBER: 2025

ROOF PLAN

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

A1.05


FOR REVIEW AND
COORDINATION ONLY
2025-08-25

GENERAL NOTES:


- A. OPENINGS SHOWN ARE REQUIRED TO THE MINIMUM 1/2"
- B. THE BUILDING IS NOT SQUARE. DIMENSIONS ARE GIVEN FROM GRID LINE 1/A
- C. THICK 5'-4/2" BETWEEN AT DOORS WHERE DIMENSION IS NOT SHOWN
- D. STAIRS FROM TROOP 17" MINIMUM, MAXIMUM 7'-4/2"
- E. FINISH FLOORING IS NOTED AND IS REQUIRED BY CODE
- F. THE FLOOR FINISH WALL AT ALL STAIRS, CORNERS, CORRIDORS AND ENTRANCES MUST
- G. FINISHES IS SHOWN FOR CORNER, FINISH, FINISHES, FINISHES

KEY NOTES:

- 1. EXTERIOR WALL WITH WINDOW, ALLOW 5'-0" FOR TYPICAL
- 2. EXTERIOR WALL BETWEEN WINDOWS
- 3. WINDOW, WINDOW, WINDOW
- 4. EXTERIOR CLOSET POLE AND SHELF
- 5. EXTERIOR WALL FINISHES, 1/2"
- 6. FINISHES - FINISHES, 1/2"
- 7. FINISHES WITH CORNER SIZE AND CORNER WITH CORNER
- 8. FINISHES WITH CORNER SIZE AND CORNER WITH CORNER
- 9. FINISHES WITH CORNER SIZE AND CORNER WITH CORNER
- 10. FINISHES WITH CORNER SIZE AND CORNER WITH CORNER
- 11. FINISHES WITH CORNER SIZE AND CORNER WITH CORNER
- 12. FINISHES WITH CORNER SIZE AND CORNER WITH CORNER
- 13. FINISHES WITH CORNER SIZE AND CORNER WITH CORNER
- 14. FINISHES WITH CORNER SIZE AND CORNER WITH CORNER
- 15. FINISHES WITH CORNER SIZE AND CORNER WITH CORNER
- 16. FINISHES WITH CORNER SIZE AND CORNER WITH CORNER
- 17. FINISHES WITH CORNER SIZE AND CORNER WITH CORNER
- 18. FINISHES WITH CORNER SIZE AND CORNER WITH CORNER
- 19. FINISHES WITH CORNER SIZE AND CORNER WITH CORNER
- 20. FINISHES WITH CORNER SIZE AND CORNER WITH CORNER
- 21. FINISHES WITH CORNER SIZE AND CORNER WITH CORNER
- 22. FINISHES WITH CORNER SIZE AND CORNER WITH CORNER
- 23. FINISHES WITH CORNER SIZE AND CORNER WITH CORNER
- 24. FINISHES WITH CORNER SIZE AND CORNER WITH CORNER
- 25. FINISHES WITH CORNER SIZE AND CORNER WITH CORNER
- 26. FINISHES WITH CORNER SIZE AND CORNER WITH CORNER
- 27. FINISHES WITH CORNER SIZE AND CORNER WITH CORNER
- 28. FINISHES WITH CORNER SIZE AND CORNER WITH CORNER
- 29. FINISHES WITH CORNER SIZE AND CORNER WITH CORNER
- 30. FINISHES WITH CORNER SIZE AND CORNER WITH CORNER



① Elevation Front - SD
3/16" = 1'-0"



④ Elevation Rear - SD
3/16" = 1'-0"



② Elevation Left - SD
3/16" = 1'-0"



③ Elevation Right - SD
3/16" = 1'-0"

SERVICE
CREDIT UNION
★★★★★

Elevations
SCU - CONCORD, NH
285 LOUDON RD CONCORD, NH

NESGroup
Architects



Floor Plan

SCU - CONCORD, NH

286 LOUDON RD CONCORD, NH

