

**City of Concord, New Hampshire  
Architectural Design Review Committee  
January 4, 2021 Minutes – DRAFT**

The Architectural Design Review Committee (ADRC) held its regular monthly meeting on January 4, 2021 in City Council Chambers, in the Municipal Complex, at 37 Green Street.

Attendees: Co-Chair Elizabeth Durfee Hengen and Co-Chair Jay Doherty, Members Ron King, Claude Gentilhomme, Zarron Simonis, and Timothy Thompson. Claude Gentilhomme arrived later in the meeting.

Absent: Margaret Tomas

Staff: Sam Durfee, Senior Planner  
Lisa Fellows-Weaver, Administrative Specialist  
Bob Nadeau, Code Inspector

### **Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order by Co-Chair Doherty at 8:30 a.m.

### **Approval of Minutes**

Mr. Thompson moved to approve the minutes of November 30, 2021, as submitted. Ms. Hengen seconded the motion. The motion passed; 5/1. Mr. Doherty abstained as he was not at the meeting.

### ***Sign Applications***

1. Barlo Signs, on behalf of Market Basket, requests ADR approval for the installation of one new internally-illuminated wall sign at 15 Merchants Way in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.

Brandon Currier of Barlo Sign represented the application.

Mr. Currier explained that the proposal is for a wall sign for Market Basket at Merchants Way. He explained that the sign is 482 .4 square feet. The ZBA granted a variance for the size of the sign at the December 1, 2021 meeting; 200 square feet is allowed. The reason for the larger sign is due to the deep setback on the property. The proposed size and colors are the standard branding for Market Basket. The sign will be channel letters.

Mr. Thompson made a motion, second by Mr. King, to recommend approval of the proposed sign, as submitted.

The motion passed unanimously.

2. Barlo Signs, on behalf of HomeGoods, requests ADR approval for the installation of one internally-illuminated wall sign at 17 Merchants Way in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.

Brandon Currier of Barlo Sign represented the application.

Mr. Currier explained that the proposal is for a wall sign for HomeGoods at Merchants Way. He explained that the sign is 238.15 square feet. The ZBA granted a variance for the size of the sign at the December 1, 2021 meeting; 120 square feet is allowed. The reason for the larger sign is due to the building being so far back on the property. The proposed size and colors are the standard branding for HomeGoods. The sign will be channel letters.

Ms. Hengen made a motion, second by Mr. Thompson, to recommend approval of the proposed sign, as submitted, noting that the scale is compatible with the scale of development and of the site lines.

The motion passed unanimously.

**City of Concord, New Hampshire  
Architectural Design Review Committee  
January 4, 2021 Minutes – DRAFT**

*Member Gentilhomme arrived.*

3. Advantage Signs, on behalf of Greenblott & O'Rourke PLLC, requests ADR approval for the installation of one new non-illuminated wall sign at 49 North Main Street in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

Josh Messinger of Advantage Signs represented the application.

Mr. Messinger explained that the business is located on the second floor and the applicant is looking for the signage to serve for road presence. The proposed sign is 4½ square feet and will mirror what is on the door.

Ms. Hengen asked if a projecting sign was considered. Mr. Messinger replied that a variance would be required for a projecting sign as that would be a second sign. Mr. Nadeau stated that yes, a variance would be required for a second sign, projecting or otherwise. He explained that since the business is located on the second floor there is no direct frontage; zoning allows for a four foot sign at an entrance, and does not provide for multiple signs.

Mr. Doherty asked about sign placement on either side of the door. Mr. Nadeau stated that could be allowed at either location, but not both. Mr. Messinger stated that the client preferred the wall sign proposal to show the location rather than seeking a variance.

Ms. Hengen stated that she feels a projecting sign would show the location and would be more visible. Another option was suggested that the sign be centered at the arch opening and be brought forward as it is not centered within the arch as proposed, and the proposed sign disturbs the architectural feature of the building.

Mr. Gentilhomme stated that a projecting sign is more for pedestrians not traffic.

Mr. Messinger stated that this was the client's proposal; however, he could go back to the client and suggest other options.

Ms. Hengen made a motion, second by Mr. King, to not recommend approval of the proposed sign design as a wall sign and the applicant should return to the Committee; however, the proposed design is adequate if proposed as a projecting sign, with the recommendation that the gray be darker for better visibility, in which case the applicant would not need to return to the Committee.

The motion passed unanimously.

4. Advantage Signs, on behalf of Holistic Family Health, requests ADR approval for the replacement of a non-illuminated monument sign at 102 Pleasant Street in the Institutional (IS) District.

Josh Messinger of Advantage Signs represented the application.

Mr. Messinger explained that the proposal is to replace the existing monument sign with a double sided monument sign with directory panels for tenants. He explained that the sign will sit on three posts with a 30 degree angle between either side of the sign to allow for better visibility.

Mr. Doherty asked if the panels are interchangeable. Mr. Messinger replied yes. Mr. Doherty noted that the font of one sign is cursive and is difficult to read. Mr. Gentilhomme suggested the lettering for the Heidi Placey sign be enlarged to make it more legible or the font be changed. Mr. Messinger commented that he would assume that the cursive font is a part of the logo.

**City of Concord, New Hampshire**  
**Architectural Design Review Committee**  
**January 4, 2021 Minutes – DRAFT**

Mr. Gentilhomme made a motion, second by Mr. Thompson, to recommend approval of the monument sign, with the recommendation that all panel boards be consistent with the same font; preferably not a cursive font to be more readable.

The motion passed unanimously.

5. Sign-A-Rama, on behalf of Charles Leonard Steel Services, requests ADR approval for the replacement of an externally illuminated freestanding sign at 183 Pembroke Road in the Office Park Performance (OFP) District.

No one was present to represent the application.

Members reviewed the proposed design and had no comments or concerns.

Ms. Hengen made a motion, second by Mr. Thompson, to recommend approval of the proposed sign, as submitted.

The motion passed unanimously.

6. National Sign, on behalf of Brothers Cortado, requests ADR approval for the installation of a new non-illuminated window sign and a new non-illuminated blade sign at 3-5 Bicentennial Square in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

No one was present to represent the application.

The Committee chose to address each sign proposal separately.

Members reviewed the proposed design for the window and had no comments or concerns.

Ms. Hengen made a motion, second by Mr. King, to recommend approval of the proposed sign for the window, as submitted.

The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Nadeau explained that the proposal is to resurface the existing blade sign.

Ms. Hengen commented that it appears that the size of the sign is disproportionate to the circle logo. Discussion ensued regarding the sizes of the sign and bracket, specifically noting that the sign dimensions are listed as 30" x 36", but the sign is drawn as a rectangle, not to scale with those measurements.

Mr. Thompson made a motion, second by Mr. Gentilhomme, to recommend approval of the proposed projecting sign, as submitted.

Ms. Hengen commented that the window sign is white letters on a black background and the projecting sign is opposite. She suggested that the projecting sign be a black background with white lettering and added that it would be more visible and relate better to the window sign.

Mr. Thompson amended the motion, second by Mr. Gentilhomme, to recommend approval of the proposed projecting sign, as submitted, with the recommendation that the colors in the sign be reversed and the logo in the sign be centered.

The motion passed unanimously.

7. NEOPCO Signs, on behalf of Casamigos, requests ADR approval for the installation of a new internally-illuminated wall sign at 94 Fort Eddy Road in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.

Glen Schadlick of NEOPCO Signs represented the application.

**City of Concord, New Hampshire  
Architectural Design Review Committee  
January 4, 2021 Minutes – DRAFT**

Mr. Schadlick stated that the sign is for a new business located at 94 Fort Eddy Road. The proposal will use the existing pill box, add new lettering; both the circle logo, pill box, and new channel letters will be internally illuminated. The proposed sign is the exact same square footage.

Mr. King made a motion, second by Mr. Thompson, to recommend approval of the proposed sign, as submitted.

The motion passed unanimously.

8. NEOPCO Signs, on behalf of Revelstoke Coffee, requests ADR approval for the installation of a new non-illuminated wall sign and a new externally-illuminated projecting sign at 100 North Main Street in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

Glen Schadlick of NEOPCO Signs represented the application along with owner Alex Stoye.

Mr. Schadlick explained that there are two sign proposals. The first sign is for raised black letters on the granite façade. The second sign is a circular, double sided projecting sign. He added that the height will meet all requirements. Coffee in the projecting sign will be illuminated. Mr. Stoye noted that power to the projecting sign will be via the granite. It will not be visible as the connection will be on the inside of the building.

Mr. Gentilhomme commented that this is a very classy design.

Mr. Nadeau stated that permits have not been submitted for the existing window signage. He added that only one window sign would be permitted and that a variance would be needed in order to permit the second window sign. Mr. Schadlick stated that since one set of window lettering is allowed, they would remove the second set of lettering and will submit a permit for only one.

Mr. Thompson made a motion, second by Mr. Gentilhomme, to recommend approval of the proposed signs, as submitted, noting that the sign package will comply with all City codes.

The motion passed unanimously.

9. Sousa Signs, on behalf of Irving Oil, requests ADR approval for the replacement of an internally-illuminated freestanding sign and a non-illuminated wall sign at 114 Fisherville Road in the General Commercial (CG) Zone.

No one was present to represent the application.

Members reviewed the proposal and had no comments or concerns.

Mr. Thompson made a motion, second by Mr. Gentilhomme, to recommend approval of the proposed signs, as submitted.

The motion passed unanimously.

10. Sousa Signs, on behalf of Irving Oil, requests ADR approval for the replacement of an internally-illuminated freestanding sign and two internally-illuminated wall signs at 190 Pleasant Street in the Neighborhood Commercial (CN) District.

No one was present to represent the application.

Ms. Hengen stated that the wall sign is very large within the gable. Mr. Nadeau replied that the applicant has frontage on two streets, which is why they are able to have multiple signs. He stated that all requirements have been met and noted that there are no changes proposed to the canopy at this time.

**City of Concord, New Hampshire  
Architectural Design Review Committee  
January 4, 2021 Minutes – DRAFT**

Mr. Thompson made a motion, second by Mr. Gentilhomme, to recommend approval of the proposed signs, as submitted.

The motion passed unanimously.

11. Sousa Signs, on behalf of Irving Oil, requests ADR approval for the replacement of a non-illuminated wall sign at 231 Loudon Road in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.

No one was present to represent the application.

Mr. Thompson stated that it appears that the applicant is rebranding the entire building from white to orange.

Mr. Durfee noted that the property is within the Gateway Performance District and an application for façade changes should have been submitted but was not.

Mr. Thompson made a motion, second by Mr. King, to recommend approval of the proposed signs, as submitted, and for the applicant to submit the appropriate application for all façade changes.

The motion passed unanimously.

***Building Permits in Performance Districts***

1. Thorne's of Concord requests ADR approval for the replacement of an awning at 140 North main Street in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

No one was present to represent the application.

Mr. Durfee stated that the applicant is requesting to replace the existing awning. He stated that there is no application for a sign. Mr. Nadeau stated that the applicant is hoping the Committee with approve the sign as well as he is working with the applicant to get a sign permit in for the lettering on the awning.

A discussion was held regarding the proposed size and color scheme of the awning. The awning is proposed to be 18 feet wide and will come out 4 feet. Members felt the coloring was subtle. Mr. Gentilhomme commented that the awning does not cover the brick totally and he appreciates the separation between the neighboring business awning.

Ms. Hengen noted the staggering of heights of the neighboring awnings. Mr. Thompson stated that the buildings are at different heights.

The general consensus of the Committee was that the concept is fine; however, more clarification is needed.

Mr. Gentilhomme made a motion, second by Mr. King, to not recommend approval and for the applicant to revise and resubmit a clearer rendering of the awning, provide color samples of the text as well as awning materials.

The motion passed; 5/1. Mr. Thompson was opposed.

2. Cowan & Goudreau Architects, on behalf of Technical Education Concepts, requests ADR approval for the renovation of the southern façade of a building inclusive of a canopy roof addition and new ramp at 32 Commercial Street in the Opportunity Performance District.

Gary Goudreau of Cowan & Goudreau Architects represented the application along with Richard and Janice Amarosa.

**City of Concord, New Hampshire  
Architectural Design Review Committee  
January 4, 2021 Minutes – DRAFT**

Mr. Goudreau gave an overview of the proposal. He explained that the existing building, Technology Education Concepts, Inc. is an industrial, one-story, brick building with some wood cladding. Public access is on the south side of the building, which is the area proposed for renovations. The building is T-111, translucent glazing panels, with some brick masonry. The south side of the building contains a paved parking lot and is also used by delivery vehicles. There are three overhead doors on this side also used for deliveries.

Mr. Goudreau continued and explained that the owner is proposing to remove the T-111 and replace it with MCM and a combination of metal and translucent siding, which will allow for more light. The existing doorways have ramps taking you from the elevation of the loading dock to the parking lot. They will replace the existing stairways with poured in place concrete, along with an added concrete ramp with painted metal railings. A new canopy roof extension is proposed to protect both the stairs and ramp from inclement weather. They would prefer to not use moveable windows due to security. The colors of the siding are proposed to be gray/silver in a horizontal pattern.

Ms. Hengen stated that this is the Page Belting building and is a historical building. She stated that she appreciated the applicant noting the sensitivity of the building. Mr. Amarosa explained that the use of the building will not be changing. Ms. Hengen asked what the colors would be for the overhead doors. Mr. Goudreau replied that most of the trim is a forest green now. Ms. Hengen encouraged the continued use of the green.

Ms. Hengen made a motion, second by Mr. Thompson, to recommend approval of the proposed signs, as submitted.

The motion passed unanimously.

**Adjournment**

Mr. Thompson made a motion to adjourn. Mr. King seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,  
Lisa Fellows-Weaver  
Administrative Specialist