City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
August 5, 2025 Minutes

The Architectural Design Review Committee (ADRC) held its regular monthly meeting on August 5, 2025, in Council Chambers, at 37 Green St, Concord, NH.

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

Absent: Member Ron King, 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 8:30 a.m.

2. Minutes – Approve minutes from July 1, 2025

Member Savage moved, seconded by Member Gentilhomme, to approve the meeting minutes from July 1, 2025, as written. All in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

3. Staff Memorandum

4. Sign Applications

4.1 Advantage Signs and Judy Hampe, request an additional architectural design review recommendation for an 11-square-foot externally illuminated freestanding sign panel (SP-0593-2025) and an 8-square-foot externally illuminated freestanding sign panel (SP-0595-2025), to replace two existing freestanding sign panels, at 35 Pleasant St in the Civic Performance (CVP) District. (2025-062/2025-063) (PL-ADR-2025-0099/0100)

Co-Chair Hengen stated this is a continuation of what was presented last month asking for clarity on the freestanding sign.

Josh Messinger (128 Hall St, Concord) is present to represent this application. Mr. Messinger stated it is a little redesigned from what the Committee previous saw because there is a new tenant. They need to make the Coldwell Banker sign smaller and the tenant, Outer Space Art Gallery, will be below that sign.

Member Thorpe arrived at 8:33 a.m.

Member Proctor asked if there are two separate panels between the posts.

Mr. Messinger answered exactly.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if the graphics have changed for Caldwell Banker and if the lighting is ground mounted.

Member Proctor noted at the last meeting they asked the applicant if they were going to retrofit the lighting and he thought they agreed.

Mr. Messinger does not know what the lighting plan is and will ask the applicant.

Member Savage asked about the replacement and repair of the rot and asked if they are replacing or repairing the wood posts.

Mr. Messinger thinks the posts are okay.

Member Thorpe stated half of the wood is removed at the base where it makes contact.

Member Savage stated the Committee can make a recommendation for the Planning Board.

Co-Chair Hengen stated they need to be repaired or replaced in kind.

Mr. Messinger stated the posts are sound.

Member Savage asked for the posts to be spruced up a little.

On a motion made by Member Savage, seconded by Member Gentilhomme, the Architectural Design Review Committee voted to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted with the condition that the existing freestanding sign posts be repaired, repainted, or replaced as needed. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

4.2 Signarama of Concord, on behalf of Nordic Notes & Notions, requests an architectural design review recommendation for a new 6.5-square-foot non-illuminated window graphic sign (SP-0603-2025) and a 1.25-square-foot non-illuminated door graphic sign (SP-0604-2025) at 3 N Main St in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

Kendra Price (249 Sheep Davis Rd, Concord) is present to represent this application. Ms. Price stated this is for a couple window decals and for the building. There is a new location. It is mostly window frontage.

Member Savage asked about the sign propped up in the window in the bottom left and if it will go away when the new decal is installed.

Ms. Price answered yes.

On a motion made by Member Savage, seconded by Member Proctor, the Architectural Design Review Committee voted to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

4.3 The Sign Gallery, on behalf of the New Hampshire Department of Education and the New Hampshire Department of Administrative Services, requests an architectural design review recommendation for a 54.58-square-foot externally illuminated building wall sign (SP-0496-2025), to replace an existing building wall sign, a 26.61-square-foot non-illuminated freestanding monument sign panel (SP-0502-2025) to replace an existing freestanding monument sign panel, and a 184-square-foot internally illuminated freestanding sign panel (SP-0503-2025) to replace existing sign panels at 25 Hall St in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District. (2025-073) (PL-ADR-2025-0108)

Max Tejada (266 Clay St, Manchester) is present to represent this application. Mr. Tejada stated there are three signs and two are existing. They are replacing internally illuminated channel letters and replacing with non-illuminated letters. The second existing is the monument sign that is not illuminated and just replacing the panels for the double-sided sign. The freestanding sign they are replacing with New Hampshire Department of Education. Mr. Tejada presented the night shot with the opaque background.

Co-Chair Hengen asked about the “live free and learn” is that part of the name.

Mr. Tejada stated that is part of the Department of Education’s slogan.

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

Discussion

Member Thorpe asked if the pylon sign is the only one that is illuminated.

Mr. Tejada answered correct.

Mr. Tremblay stated the pylon sign will go through Zoning Board of Adjustment because it requires a variance due to being too large for the square footage. It will be going to Zoning Board of Adjustment tomorrow night.

Member Savage asked if they need to change the size and will need to come back.

Ms. Skinner stated there is no need to hold it up.

Co-Chair Hengen asked how much oversized it is.

Mr. Tremblay stated quite a bit.

Member Thorpe asked if it is within the Committee's purview to recommend downsizing of the sign and keep the post the way it is.

Ms. Skinner stated that if the Zoning Board of Adjustment find it meets all of the criteria they will approve the variance.

Co-Chair Hengen stated Architectural Design Review Committee in the past has made recommendations if it seems to be appropriate from a graphic prospective.

Mr. Bass stated the Architectural Design Guidelines provide the Committee means to review the application based on scale and proportion of the sign against the building and other architectural features. If that is not a concern then the Committee should not recommend a condition to change the sign just because it would otherwise require a variance.

Ms. Skinner stated they are only allowed 106 square feet.

Mr. Tejada asked if it is 106 or it is 150.

Mr. Tremblay stated 150 is the maximum allowed based on the zone, and the 106 is the frontage of the building.

Ms. Skinner stated they are allowed the lesser and the 106 is the lesser.

Member Gentilhomme asked if he should amend the motion to address the graphics.

Member Thorpe thinks when they have the opportunity to address the signs that are out of scale in the neighborhood they need to. It is clear the sign is sized to impact those driving by on the highway. Member Thorpe asked if that is the intent.

Member Gentilhomme responded he thinks it is.

Member Thorpe asked why does anyone driving on the highway need to know that is the Department of Education.

Member Gentilhomme noted if someone is next to the highway and they are advertising they will have a big sign.

Member Thorpe noted it impacts the approach on Manchester Street.

Member Gentilhomme stated it is not distracting.

Member Thorpe stated it impacts the overall impression of Concord when you are driving in.

Member Thorpe stated he is not questioning the graphics. Member Thorpe noted he is questioning the size of the sign.

Co-Chair Hengen noted Member Thorpe has raised an interesting point that will not be solved with this application. As the city updates the master plan and zoning that would be the time to have a discussion on dimensional requirements of signs near the highway and along Main Street.

Member Proctor stated the upper sign panel could be cut on half because it does not need to be that tall.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if they are asking for a variance for the overall height or size of the sign panel.

Mr. Tremblay stated it is for the size of the sign panel.

All in favor. 4 in favor (Proctor, Savage, Gentilhomme and Hengen) to 1 opposed (Thorpe). The motion passed.

4.4 Sousa Signs, LLC, on behalf of Daval Realty Associates LLC and Banks Chevrolet, requests an architectural design review recommendation for a 127-square-foot internally illuminated freestanding sign (SP-0608-2025), to reface an existing freestanding sign, at 137 Manchester St in the Highway Commercial (CH) District (2025-074) (PL-ADR-2025-0109)

No one is present to represent this application.

Member Savage stated it looks like they had a branding font change.

Co-Chair Hengen asked what is the allowed height.

Mr. Tremblay stated it is 20 feet.

Co-Chair Hengen noted the new font is hard to read.

Member Gentilhomme noted Chevrolet is hard to read, but imagines it is the branding.

On a motion made by Co-Chair Hengen, seconded by Member Gentilhomme, the Architectural Design Review Committee voted to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted.

Discussion

Member Thorpe stated in a year or two they will redo Manchester Street and take more pavement for a center turning lane. Member Thorpe noted this sign will be very prominent once that project is completed.

All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

4.5 Spectrum Signs & Graphics, on behalf of T&A Holdings LLC, and Cheers, requests an architectural design review recommendation for a 54-square-foot internally illuminated building wall sign (SP-0610-2025), to replace an existing building wall sign at 17 Depot St in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District. (2025-076) (PL-ADR-2025-0110)

Michael Gallagher (97 Eddy Rd) is present to represent this application. Mr. Gallagher stated they are proposing a nine foot by six foot internally illuminated sign. This is the only sign on the building and on the property. They are going with a five-inch-deep cabinet with push through letters and will be halo lit. It will be mounted to the wall with bolts.

Co-Chair Hengen asked the location.

Mr. Gallagher stated it will be on Storrs St.

Member Savage asked if the background is changing from a white to a black background.

Mr. Gallagher answered essentially, the existing now has vinyl applied.

On a motion made by Co-Chair Hengen, seconded by Member Savage, the Architectural Design Review Committee voted to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

4.6 Spectrum Signs & Graphics, on behalf of Capital Region Health Care Corporation, and Concord Hospital, requests an architectural design review recommendation for a 30-square-foot internally illuminated freestanding sign (SP-0611-2025) to replace an existing freestanding sign, and an 84-square-foot internally illuminated sign (SP-0612-2025) to replace an existing freestanding sign at 250 Pleasant St in the Institutional (IS) District. (2025-077) (PL-ADR-2025-0111) in conjunction with (PL-CUP-2025-0094

and Case 2025-075)

Nick Jarvis (289 New Rd, Salisbury) and Tim Paris (250 Pleasant St, Concord) are present to represent this application. Mr. Jarvis stated Concord Hospital has a wayfinding package to improve wayfinding services on campus. The signs are located on the main entrance. The signs are labeled 001 and 002 on the map that was supplied in the packet. Mr. Jarvis stated 001 is located at the intersection of Langley Parkway and Pleasant St. Mr. Jarvis noted these are both existing signs. It is a four-sided sign currently that is internally illuminated. The second sign 002 serves as the emergency entrance at the corner of Pleasant St and East Dr. It is an existing structure and they are internally illuminated cabinets. It is also externally illuminated as well. The proposed signage for 001 is an in-kind replacement and will use the existing poled will build structure that will go over the poles. The sign cabinets will have push through graphics with an opaque background. The Concord Hospital will be push through with vinyl applied on the face and the edges and face will illuminate and the background will not. The upper cabinet the emergency panel will fully illuminate as well as the white because they want to draw attention to the emergency services. All of the blue will not illuminate. The additional sign 002 is built in the same manner with push through graphics on the top and will be fully illuminated along with the Langley Parkway. All of the additional text will be opaque background with white letters illuminated. Mr. Jarvis stated they have a meeting tomorrow with the Zoning Board of Adjustment to review internal illumination that is not allowed in this district. They are also asking for additional square footage for signage. Mr. Jarvis stated this is an in-kind replacement of an existing sign and they are not asking for anything greater than what is existing. They are trying to streamline the wayfinding services to get people to the right location quickly and efficiently as possible.

Member Savage asked if the copy of "Langley Parkway" was going to be internally illuminated. In the past the Committee has asked if there is a white background that it be opaque.

Mr. Jarvis stated it is proposed to have an illuminated background and they want to distinctly identify the Langley Parkway as well as emergency services to help guide people. Mr. Jarvis noted this can be discussed with the owner representative.

Member Savage stated this zone does not allow illumination.

Member Thorpe asked if would help to put Langley Parkway on one entire line under Concord Hospital.

Mr. Jarvis stated his concern is changing the overall structure of the sign. The way it is built now there are two individual sign cabinets and the faces can be replaced. If they were to do a long panel on top it would change the build and adding time.

Mr. Paris stated for the white background he is okay with the opaque as long as the emergency bar is illuminated.

Member Gentilhomme stated they normally focus on the white background because it is attention getting.

Member Proctor noted because the red is illuminated that they could somehow tone down the white.

Mr. Paris stated part of this design package is a wayfinding program for Concord Hospital. There are two key decision points the intersection of Pleasant St and Langley Parkway or going up East Drive. In coordination with the sign package they are looking at interior wayfinding signage. They are trying to take the largest decision part first. In future they will be told what street to go to first.

Co-Chair Hengen noted on the sign to the right of emergency and the graphic at the top says emergency, emergency patient parking, and visitor entrance. Co-Chair Hengen asked is the visitor entrance for the main hospital or emergency.

Mr. Paris stated it is at the main entrance on East Drive.

Co-Chair Hengen noted they are pointing visitors in the same direction of the emergency.

Mr. Paris answered that is correct. Once they are on campus there will be specific signs to direct.

Mr. Jarvis stated 004, 005, and 006 will be clear to help direct people.

Member Gentilhomme noted in regards to the arrows they need to be decent in size to be able to read.

Mr. Jarvis thinks the opaque background will help.

On a motion made by Member Gentilhomme, seconded by Member Thorpe, the Architectural Design Review Committee voted to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted with the following conditions: that an opaque background be placed behind the "Langley Parkway" panel on SP-0612-2025 in accordance with Section 5.4(C) of the architectural design guidelines; a suggestion that the text "Langley Parkway" panel on SP-0612-2025 be replaced with "Main Entrance"; and, a suggestion that the wayfinding arrows be big enough to be recognizable.

Discussion

Member Gentilhomme asked the words Concord Hospital if they are illuminated.

Mr. Jarvis answered yes.

Mr. Bass added it has an opaque background.

All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

4.7 Mark Cusson and Turn One Graphics, on behalf DSM MB I LLC, Adam Seligman, and SD Cabinetry, request an architectural design review recommendation for a new 40-square-foot internally illuminated building wall sign (SP-0613-2025) at 100 Fort Eddy Road in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District. (2025-078) (PL-ADR-2025-0112)

Mark Cusson (15 Cross Rd, Hooksett), Adam Seligman (630 River Rd, Bow) and Brian Beach (630 River Rd, Bow) are present to represent this application. Mr. Cusson provided handouts to the Committee. Mr. Cusson stated the owners are opening a kitchen design store near market basket. Mr. Cusson stated code requires back lit halo lit letters. They want to stay with face lit letters for visibility. Mr. Cusson stated they are in a highly lit, busy parking lot surrounded by face lit signs. A halo lit sign creates visibility issues and a glow around the letters. Mr. Cusson stated it creates a traffic problem because the average time it takes to read a halo sign is four times longer than a face lit sign.

Member Savage stated she prefers version one over version two.

Member Gentilhomme noted they are not promoting halo lit signs. They are promoting opaque backgrounds on white. It can create a line around the letter to help to read. Member Gentilhomme stated version one is the best approach it is clean and straight forward.

Mr. Cusson stated they shrunk it down a little to fit the square footage. They are looking to create a fast and easy to read sign because of the intersection.

Member Proctor asked if this is in a cabinet.

Mr. Cusson stated they are individual channel letters and small bar with black vinyl letters.

Member Thorpe asked if the blue background on the logo allows light through it.

Mr. Cusson noted somewhat but blue is a dark color and would be more of a glow.

On a motion made by Co-Chair Hengen, seconded by Member Gentilhomme, the Architectural Design Review Committee voted to recommend that the Planning Board approve version one in the application as submitted. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

4.8 NEOPCO Signs, on behalf of PFP Associates LTD Partnership and the medical eye center, requests an architectural design review recommendation for two 36-square-foot externally illuminated building roof signs (SP-0614-2025 and SP-0615-2025), to replace two existing building roof sign panels, and an 11-square-foot non-illuminated building wall sign (SP-0616-2025), to replace an existing building wall sign

panel at 24 Bridge St in the Opportunity Corridor Performance (OCP) District. (2025-089) (PL-ADR-2025-0113)

No one is present to represent this application.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if this is a reface by the same business.

Mr. Tremblay stated it is a new business.

Mr. Bass stated it used to be Granite State Paint and Associates.

Co-Chair Hengen does not have any problems with it.

On a motion made by Member Savage, seconded by Member Gentilhomme, the Architectural Design Review Committee voted to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

5. Building Permit Applications

5.1 Wilcox & Barton, on behalf of WB4 LLC, requests an architectural design review recommendation to install solar panels on the south facing roof at 2 Home St in the Opportunity Corridor Performance (OCP) District. (2025-090) (PL-ADR-2025-0114)

Erin Lambert (2 Home Ave, Concord) and Ted Vanson (362 Etln Rd, Holderness) is present to represent this application. Ms. Lambert would like to have solar installed on the southern half of the roof. There are pictures on the packet to show the plan. The building uses a lot of energy.

Member Savage asked if that is a place holder that is relatively to scale to show where they will be located.

Ms. Lambert answered yes, the photo of what is there today and the photo with the red and green writing are the different components that will be mounted to support the solar panels.

Member Thorpe asked if they can tell where on the building the solar panels will be located.

Ms. Lambert answered on the south side.

Ms. Lambert stated the photos at the end of the application are not their building but it is an example of what the panels will look like on the building.

Member Savage asked about the tree line on the south side and if that is where it is going so not facing the street.

Ms. Lambert answered correct.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if the mechanicals will be screened.

Mr. Vanson stated they would be similar to a gray electrical box.

Ms. Lambert added that there is also HVAC wall units.

Member Savage asked if will be camouflaged by the existing gray exterior.

Ms. Lambert stated yes, except for one.

Co-Chair Hengen asked who will see the mechanicals.

Ms. Lambert stated the athletes that run around the building and anyone that parks on that side of the Comfort Inn parking lot.

Member Savage stated she is okay if it fades into the background of the existing building.

Member Thorpe asked if they can add evergreen screening.

Mr. Bass shared when looking at the City's GIS system, it doesn't appear as though the applicant has an opportunity plant an evergreen landscape screen.

Member Savage noted there is already mechanical equipment there.

On a motion made by Member Savage, seconded by Member Proctor, the Architectural Design Review Committee voted to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

5.2 BigSky Solar, LLC, on behalf of Crisis Center of Central New Hampshire and FKA Merrimack County Task Force Against Domestic Violence, requests an architectural design review recommendation to install solar panels on the roof at 4 Blake Street in the Civic Performance (CVP) District. (2025-096) (PL-ADR-2025-0115)

No one is present for this application.

Co-Chair Hengen stated the panels do not bother her but where the utilities are located.

Member Savage asked if they can make a condition to match in color. Member Savage suggested to camouflage and suggest they paint a color to match the existing façade or exterior.

Member Thorpe noted the site layout doesn't appear to allow for visually screening.

Member Gentilhomme stated the only thing that comes to mind is that someone will create a box for the utilities and then paint to match the wall.

Member Thorpe stated they do need access to the panels.

Member Gentilhomme stated they normally have a little door or lattice hinged on a panel to allow for air flow.

Co-Chair Hengen added that in the future when they change the siding color it is easy to change that instead of the color of the utility box.

Member Proctor stated the diagram shows the main panel in the basement in the building. The other boxes are not that big. Member Proctor noted all of the inverters are under the panel.

Member Gentilhomme stated they are not looking at panels like on other application that has a huge installation.

Member Thorpe noted his issue is the conduits.

Member Proctor stated it looks like they are only running one conduit.

Member Gentilhomme noted it is possible they can run the conduit down next to the corner board.

Co-Chair Hengen stated their motions can be attentive to that and they can add a condition that they be subtle. Co-Chair Hengen recommended a condition such that any wall mounted conduits be tucked into the inner corner of the east elevation.

Member Savage stated since the applicant or installer is not present at today's meeting makes it difficult for the committee to make comments on design changes. There could be an alternative or they may say that is not the right spot. Member Savage suggested to say in the least conspicuous spot to leave some opportunity so they do not have to come back to ADRC.

Member Proctor stated the overhead line comes in and attaches above the window, across the facia, and down to the conduit to the meter. Member Proctor suggested they tell them to put the conduit next to the existing overhead.

On a motion made by Member Proctor, seconded by Member Savage, the Architectural Design Review Committee voted to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted with the condition that any mechanical components or conduit be placed in the least conspicuous location as

possible, such as: adjacent and parallel to the existing electrical conduit, around the change of elevation plane and out of view; adjacent and parallel to the porch vertical pilaster. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

6. Site Plan Applications

6.1 The City of Concord requests a public hearing in accordance with RSA 674:54 for a golf course parking lot and clubhouse, at Tax Map Lot 302Z 81, addressed as 1 Beaver Meadow St, in the Open Space Residential (RO) District. (2025-094) (PL-SPR-2025-0045) *RSA 675:54*

Member Proctor recused himself because he is the architect for this project.

Mr. Bass stated this application is coming through as an RSA 674:54, as this is a municipal property for municipal use. They need to go through the motions but they are not bound by any of the regulations and do not require approval by the Planning Board.

Eric Dinsmore (27 Locke Rd, Concord) and Bill Hickey (27 Locke Rd, Concord) are present to represent this application. Mr. Dinsmore showed the south elevation which will be the main entrance to the building.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if it will be all glazed.

Mr. Dinsmore answered yes. It will be an "L" shape store front entry. Mr. Dinsmore stated what is proposed for the exterior is a hardy panel system with PVC trim and a natural wood accent. Mr. Dinsmore noted two feet up will be a stone base. There are some accented roof pieces. The roofing will be standing seam metal roofing and asphalt.

Member Savage asked what is the purpose of the canopy roofing.

Mr. Dinsmore stated it is to add some depth to the wall and compliment the wall. They are in the process of finding a function to its form. It might be a shelter for mechanical equipment. Mr. Dinsmore noted where the patio will be located and the entrance to the function space. Mr. Dinsmore pointed out the existing building that will need to remain in operation and why the new building has its location. The pro shop will be located on the north side for visibility of the tenth hole.

The Architectural Design Review Committee reviewed the application and provided the following comments: add blind windows along the southern elevation; and, to intensify the landscape around all sides of the building, including patio areas, to add an outdoor sense for users and establish shade at outside eating areas.

7. Other Business

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

Adjournment

Member Gentilhomme moved, seconded by Member Thorpe, to adjourn the meeting at 10:20 a.m. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,
Krista Tremblay
Krista Tremblay
Administrative Technician III