

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 1, 2025 Minutes

The Architectural Design Review Committee (ADRC) held its regular monthly meeting on April 1, 2025, in Council Chambers, at 37 Green St, Concord, NH.

Attendees: Co-Chair Jay Doherty, Member Claude Gentilhomme, Member Douglas Proctor, Member Merle Thorpe, and Alternate Member Amanda Savage

Absent: Co-Chair Elizabeth Durfee Hengen and Member Ron King

Staff: 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 Doherty called the meeting to order at 8:32 a.m.

2. Minutes – Approve minutes from March 4, 2025

Alternate Member Savage moved, seconded by Member Thorpe, to approve the meeting minutes from March 4, 2025, as written. All in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

3. Staff Memorandum

4. Sign Applications

- 4.1 Darcie Roy Sign Permits, on behalf of Samp 75 Realty LLC, and Verizon, requests an architectural design review recommendation for a 36-square-foot internally illuminated building wall sign (SP-0459-2025) to replace an existing building wall sign, a 35.34-square-foot internally illuminated tenant panel sign (SP-0461-2025) to replace an existing tenant panel, and a 15.27-square-foot sign (SP-0460-2025) to replace an existing tenant panel, at 75 Fort Eddy Rd in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District. (2025-019) (PL-ADR-2025-0068)

Mike Mastergeorge (4 Saddle Hill Rd, Amherst) is present to represent this application. Mr. Mastergeorge stated Verizon is updating their marketing material. There are copies of what the new sign will look like in the packet. They will change the logo. They are changing the illumination to go from white background LEDs to red LEDs. The signs are approximately the same size. It is a different color.

Co-Chair Doherty stated he appreciates the night rendering with the opaque background.

Mr. Thorpe asked if the level of lumens will be the same.

Mr. Mastergeorge stated it will be significantly lower. They are going from 127 lumen modules to 24 and total watts decrease from 220 to 158.

Member Gentilhomme moved to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted. Alternate Member Savage seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

- 4.2 Warrenstreet Architects, Inc., on behalf of Interchange Development, LLC, and Concord Hospital, requests an architectural design review recommendation for a new 81.9-square-foot internally illuminated building wall sign (SP-0469-2025) and a new 13.1-square-foot non-illuminated building wall sign (SP-0473-2025) at 1 Interchange Dr in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District. (2025-021) (PL-ADR-2025-0071)

Nicholas Jarvis (289 New Rd, Salisbury) and Troy Dryer (4 Crescent St Unit 2, Concord) are present to represent this application. Mr. Jarvis stated this is new construction with a front lit internally illuminated channel letter set. The face is illuminated with white LED inside. The face has impact acrylic that has a translucent vinyl. The backs are painted teal. Mr. Jarvis noted there is a consistent look around the entire lettering. Those are mounted to a slim raceway about three inches tall and will be secured to the top of

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 1, 2025 Minutes

the canopy. All of the wiring will be in the raceway and will have one electrical outlet. That is the only illuminated letter set on the building. On the right side there is a CH logo and it appears as a non-illuminated letter. The CH will be acrylic painted teal and will be mounted flush to the building fascia.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if the letters will be 18 inches high.

Mr. Jarvis confirmed the height of 18 inches.

Mr. Thorpe asked why the lettering is shifted to the left. Mr. Thorpe noted the letters span across two different types of back drop. Mr. Thorpe noted the window on the left and then a very large white expanse. Mr. Thorpe asked about centering it on a more uniform backdrop.

Mr. Jarvis stated they want to favor the letters closest to the entrance located on the left-hand side. Mr. Jarvis understands aesthetically centering on the available space by the above the windows and door, but the intent is to help guide people to the entrance which is on the left side of the building.

Member Gentilhomme stated he had a similar thought and noted based on the site plan the people will not be approaching the building head on.

Alternate Member Savage stated even if it was pushed a little bit to the center there will still be an overlap on the higher level above the canopy.

Member Thorpe stated yes, if they remain the same size.

Alternate Member Savage made a motion to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted. Member Gentilhomme seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

- 4.3 Sousa Signs, LLC, on behalf of Life Storage LP, and Extra Space Storage, requests an architectural design review recommendation for a 70.1-square-foot internally illuminated double sided pylon sign (SP-0480-2025) to replace an existing panel on an existing freestanding sign, and a 24-square-foot non-illuminated wall sign (SP-0481-2025) to replace an existing wall sign at 11 Integra Dr in the Industrial (IN) District. (2025-022) (PL-ADR-2025-0072)

No one is present for this application.

Co-Chair Doherty stated it seems pretty straightforward. They are announcing what they are and what they do.

Member Gentilhomme made a motion to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted. Alternate Member Savage seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

- 4.4 NEOPCO Signs, on behalf of PFP Associates LTD Partnership, and Lead Urgent Care Veterinary Services, requests an architectural design review recommendation for a 20-square-foot internally illuminated hanging wall sign panel (SP-0489-2025) to replace an existing panel on an existing bracket, and a 9-square-foot non-illuminated blade sign (SP-0490-2025) to replace an existing blade sign on an existing bracket at 22 Bridge St in the Opportunity Performance Corridor (OCP) District. (2025-024) (PL-ADR-2025-0073)

Glen Schadlick (5 Crosby St, Concord) is present to represent this application. Mr. Schadlick stated it is a simple panel change of the existing internally illuminated sign. There is an existing blade sign hanging from a bracket above the doorway that is being replaced. Mr. Schadlick stated the intent with the logo is they are trying to promote "LUVS" with the different colored acronym on the left side of the drawing.

Co-Chair Doherty stated visually it tells you exactly what this place is and it is slick. The white background because of the logo makes sense white.

Member Thorpe asked if the sculpture on the top is art or signage

Mr. Tremblay said it is considered art.

Mr. Schadlick stated it is existing from the other veterinarian.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 1, 2025 Minutes

Member Proctor asked about illumination.

Mr. Schadlick stated the stick-out sign over the sidewalk is internally illuminated and the blade hanging sign is not illuminated.

Member Proctor asked for the dimensions of the sign.

Mr. Tremblay stated one is 36 by 36 and the other is 60 by 48.

Mr. Schadlick stated all were previously permitted.

Alternate Member Savage made a motion to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted. Member Gentilhomme seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

- 4.5 NEOPCO Signs, on behalf of Kenneth Blevens Sr, Kenneth Blevens Jr, and Cantara Concealment, requests an architectural design review recommendation for a new 12-square-foot non-illuminated building wall sign (SP-0491-2025) at 106 B South State St in the Urban Transitional (UT) District. (2025-025) (PL-ADR-2025-0074)

Glen Schadlick (5 Crosby St, Concord) and Aaron Cantara (106B South State St, Concord) are present to represent this application. Mr. Schadlick stated the sign on the left (the Loft) came before the Architectural Design Review Committee a while ago. The intent is to make the sign the same size so it will match the existing sign as far as depth and size. Mr. Schadlick stated when they submitted this 20 years ago, internally illuminated signs were allowed. Mr. Schadlick stated Code informed him that it is now in a zone that does not allow internally illuminated signs. They are making the size the same so it matches and asking for it to pass as a non-illuminated sign with the intent to apply for a variance in the future to match the other side. Mr. Schadlick stated as it is submitted it is a non-illuminated sign. They tried to keep the content simple.

Co-Chair Doherty stated the size and scale matches nicely with the neighboring sign.

Mr. Schadlick noted he tried to shift the sign over the entrance way. Mr. Schadlick noted if you look at the brick work on the right side it is 10 inches wider where it meets the edge of the building to the window. Mr. Schadlick stated on the other side it is less. Mr. Schadlick felt like putting it over the door to mark the entrance is key.

Co-Chair Doherty stated he is fine with it either way.

Member Thorpe asked about the zoning.

Mr. Bass stated the site is in the Urban Transitional (UT) District.

Member Thorpe asked if there is residential there as well.

Mr. Bass stated it is not a residential zone. It is a bridge between two different districts. Mr. Bass stated this application is for a non-illuminated sign. Mr. Bass noted it sounds like they may peruse internally illuminated. Mr. Bass noted that could trigger them coming back to Architectural Design Review Committee. Mr. Bass stated the Board could in their motion for an approval in the event if they were to receive the variance to not have them come back.

Alternate Member Savage noted if it is illuminated they would prefer it to be name of business rather than the white background.

Mr. Schadlick noted in a presentation coming up today on a different application there is a sample and he can show the brightness of the sign.

Alternate Member Savage noted if the illumination is just the letters and not the block, that they are trying not to illuminate the white background, and she is okay with that to be consistent as they have made that recommendation to other applicants in the past.

Mr. Schadlick stated when the Loft sign was approved it came before Architectural Design Review

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 1, 2025 Minutes

Committee with a white background.

Mr. Tremblay stated that sign was approved 20 years ago.

Mr. Schadlick asked for fairness and consistency.

Member Gentilhomme wondered how that got by the Architectural Design Review Committee.

Mr. Tremblay stated that sign was prior to the ordinance. Mr. Tremblay noted at the time it came to Architectural Design Review Committee the ordinance required it not to be illuminated but it was an existing permitted sign. At the time there were only changes made to the face of the sign. That is why it continued to be illuminated.

Alternate Member Savage stated recently the Architectural Design Review Committee dealt with CVS and Burger King on Loudon Rd. They held firm, using the same argument for consistency. When the Loft changes, the Architectural Design Review Committee will have them meet the sign regulations. Alternate Member Savage would like to do the same with the sign illumination, and is aware their argument is the one next door has that, but as they move forward make the change. Alternate Member Savage further noted that they have no idea when the Loft will change.

Mr. Bass stated one consideration could be that Planning Board approve the application as submitted with the condition that, if in the future the sign were to be internally illuminated that an opaque background shall be added behind a white background in accordance with Section 5.4(C) of the Architecture Design Guidelines.

Alternate Member Savage made a motion to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted with the condition that, if in the future the sign were to become internally illuminated, an opaque background shall be added behind the white background in accordance with Section 5.4(C) of the Architectural Design Review Guidelines. Member Gentilhomme seconded. 4 in favor (Doherty, Gentilhomme, Proctor, Savage) to 1 abstention (Thorpe).

- 4.6 Signarama Concord, on behalf of Hound LLC, and Sweet Dreamz, requests an architectural design review recommendation for a new 13.33-square-foot non-illuminated building wall sign (SP-0488-2025) at 325 Village St in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District. (2025-029) (PL-ADR-2025-0079)

Kendra Price (249 Sheep Davis Rd, Concord) is present to represent this application. There is a new ice cream shop in Penacook. They are looking to put up the new menu board. The new menu is non-illuminated.

Mr. Thorpe asked about lighting.

Co-Chair Doherty was not sure if the Architectural Design Review Committee has reviewed a full menu on the side of a building before.

Alternate Member Savage noted the sign does not identify the business.

Member Proctor asked if that is a service window under the sign.

Ms. Price answered yes.

Co-Chair Doherty asked when the prices change next year do they have to apply for a new sign. Co-Chair Doherty stated what the Architectural Design Review Committee is approving is on this sign.

Alternate Member Savage noted there is fixed pricing. Unless the suggestion or recommendation would be to remove all current pricing so that if the future price is higher or lower they can change whether up or down.

Mr. Tremblay stated the Architectural Design Review Committee can approve the sign as submitted with the exception that if the prices change as long as it is in the same font as it appears now they do not have to come back to Architectural Design Review Committee as far as the price changes go.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 1, 2025 Minutes

Member Proctor asked if this will be laminated.

Ms. Price stated it is printed in vinyl and laminated to protect from UV.

Member Proctor asked if they serve from the window.

Ms. Price answered correct.

Member Gentilhomme asked if this is thrown into another category such as a menu sign because he does not see this as a sign.

Mr. Tremblay stated it falls into the guidelines of being a sign.

Co-Chair Doherty noted if you go to McDonald's there is a menu board.

Mr. Tremblay stated that is not a visible menu board. Mr. Tremblay noted this is visible from the street and it does state their name "Sweet Dreamz." They are advertising the business. Mr. Tremblay pointed out they do not have a lot of room for signage. This is a small portion of the building that is also occupied by a hardware store.

Co-Chair Doherty suggested if their name was on a smaller banner with the name of the business then the menu board could be something different.

Mr. Tremblay stated it would still fall under the guidelines under the definition of a sign.

Member Thorpe asked if it could be a permanent "Sweet Dreamz" element and then have a painted canvas banner that drops below.

Mr. Tremblay stated a painted banner is a sign and would have to be made of permanent materials.

Member Gentilhomme stated restaurants often post their menu in the window and asked if that is considered a sign.

Mr. Tremblay stated it depends on the size of the sign.

Member Thorpe stated this is not a drive-by situation. Patrons walk up and read the menu.

Mr. Tremblay stated it is definitely visible from the road.

Member Proctor stated it needs to be readable in case there is a line.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if this is the maximum amount they can have on a sign.

Ms. Price stated yes.

Co-Chair Doherty suggested having the name of the business much bigger in a panel at the top to emphasize this is a place to stop. Then have menu as a separate panel below. Co-Chair Doherty noted that would help to organize this and define where you are. Co-Chair Doherty pointed out there is too much going on with the sign.

Member Thorpe stated you cannot read the name of the store from this distance.

Ms. Price stated they will have an A-frame sign as well for advertising.

Member Thorpe asked if it hangs over the inset that is below the bay window.

Ms. Price said no.

Co-Chair Doherty stated the name is not prominent and cannot tell what the business is.

Member Thorpe noted it is almost the same size front as the self-serve flavors.

Member Proctor said you wanted to see the name on the cornice across the window.

Ms. Price stated she is not sure what she has for square footage.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 1, 2025 Minutes

Mr. Tremblay stated they are just under. They are allowed 15 square feet.

Member Proctor suggested to reduce the text a little.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if they separated Sweet Dreamz.

Member Gentilhomme stated above the window is a wide board and there is a panel above the door. To the right of the door there is a solid board that goes up. He suggested to separate the business name out of the panel and mount that above the window. Then put the menu below and centered.

Alternate Member Savage noted it sounds like they are suggesting two signs. One that would be Sweet Dreamz and other the menu. The title of business needs to be more visible.

Co-Chair Doherty agreed with what Alternate Member Savage is saying and the name of the business is not shown with the other things going on with the sign.

Alternate Member Savage asked if the applicant will be open to these suggestions.

Ms. Price thinks they will be okay. Ms. Price asked if they are referring to a panel of a certain size.

Member Gentilhomme stated it does not have to be that big but it needs to be centered in that area.

Mr. Proctor stated the sign with the name of the business needs to be comparable in size in reference to the rest of the other buildings.

Ms. Price asked if they do a second sign will they need a second permit.

Mr. Tremblay stated it will depend on the Architectural Design Review Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Bass stated the approval can cover it now. If they condition the approval accordingly, they would not need to come back for a separate approval.

Co-Chair Doherty noted there are so many things they want adjusted, he is not sure what it will look like in the end.

Member Proctor stated they can approve the sign as it is.

Co-Chair Doherty stated it is the whole composition and how it ties together.

Alternate Member Savage wondered about making a recommendation for them to make these changes and if there is for them to adjust their application and pull it from consent. Then bring the changes being suggested in front of the Planning Board on April 16, 2025, to help the process move along. She reminded the group that the Architectural Design Review Committee is a recommendation to the Planning Board and their recommendation is to make some changes. However, in between the Committee meeting and the Board meeting, the applicant can pull the item from the Planning Board consent agenda.

Mr. Bass stated they can pull from consent. If they can provide materials within a week it could be uploaded as part of the Planning Board agenda. Mr. Bass noted it is not uncommon for an applicant to revise a sign before the Planning Board meeting. Staff might not have time for a compliance review, but they can also request to continue.

Alternate Member Savage noted it sounds like there are two avenues. One is to continue with the temporary permitted sign and come back next month with a recommendation. Or they can do the other way and continue with the process, make changes, and they are at risk for staff not to be able to review and Planning Board may or may not want to continue or deny the application.

Ms. Price asked if she can get a sign today or tomorrow if she can make the April Planning Board meeting.

Mr. Bass stated it would definitely be able to get on the Planning Board agenda and most likely have staff able to review. Mr. Bass stated they can provide a recommendation based on this sign application and recommend conditions. Mr. Bass stated based on the conversation they may want to recommend the

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 1, 2025 Minutes

Planning Board approve the application as submitted with the following conditions: the company name Sweet Dreamz font size shall be increased to provide a more simple and direct message based on Section 5.4(b) of the Architecture Design Guidelines; the Sweet Dreamz business name shall be separated from the menu sign and relocated above the window and placed centered and the menu be placed centered below with the window and sign to provide a more integral subordinate element within the overall building design in accordance with Section 5.4(a) of the Architecture Design Guidelines and an understanding that any future changes to menu items or pricing shall not require subsequent Architectural Design Review Committee approval provided it matches existing graphics and font.

Member Thorpe also mentioned size.

Alternate Member Savage asked about needing a second application if they are asking for the more prominent Sweet Dreamz.

Mr. Tremblay stated it will require a second application.

Ms. Price asked about increasing the height of the proposed sign.

Mr. Tremblay stated the only problem is she will increase the square footage of this sign because it has Sweet Dreamz on it. Mr. Tremblay stated it may interfere with what they are allotted. Mr. Tremblay stated if they remove Sweet Dreamz from the menu board they will not need an additional sign permit for the menu board.

Member Gentilhomme asked for clarification.

Mr. Tremblay stated if they remove Sweet Dreamz he will not consider it a sign but just a menu board. Mr. Tremblay noted because Sweet Dreamz is there they are calling it a sign. Mr. Tremblay noted the ordinance will encompass the entire menu board as coming off the square footage for dimensions.

Member Gentilhomme stated that is the way to go because they can replace the menu board any time they want.

Ms. Price stated she will do that.

Alternate Member Savage stated if it becomes a menu board then they do not need a reference to pricing, font, and all the other stuff because that will not be a part of the sign application if it becomes a menu board. She further noted that the Architectural Design Review Committee would recommend under the conditions of removing the menu to then become a menu board with Sweet Dreamz as the sign application with the recommendation it become more prominent.

Mr. Bass noted the condition to increase the Sweet Dreamz font size and Sweet Dreamz business sign is to be separated from the menu sign and relocated above the window.

Member Thorpe suggested it would be nice to have them coordinated on the building centered over the window signage and menu board.

Alternate Member Savage noted if the applicant is taking this route the Architectural Design Review Committee does not make comments about the menu board. It is not a part of the application.

Co-Chair Doherty stated he agrees with Alternate Member Savage. However, the Architectural Design Review Committee does discuss centering over doors and windows.

Alternate Member Savage noted they could say any future menu board to be placed will be centered.

Mr. Bass clarified the location of the menu to be placed below the window and sign.

Member Proctor stated the menu panel should fill the masonry opening and the sign panel should be centered above the menu board of the same width.

Co-Chair Doherty noted if added.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 1, 2025 Minutes

Mr. Bass noted the menu panel shall fill the masonry opening.

Ms. Savage stated the one thing that is permanent is the sign of Sweet Dreamz and the one thing that is not permanent is the menu board. The menu board will be centered under the Sweet Dreamz sign within the width of the masonry opening.

Co-Chair Doherty stated for clarification that the sign is the name of the business and delete everything else.

Alternate Member Savage made a motion to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted with the following conditions: the company name "Sweet Dreamz" font size shall be increased to provide a more simple and direct message in accordance with Section 5.4(B) of the Architectural Design Review Guidelines; the "Sweet Dreamz" business name shall be separated from the menu and relocated above the window, and the menu panel shall fill the width of the masonry opening and be centered below the "Sweet Dreamz" sign and be centered to provide a more integral, subordinate element within the overall building design in accordance with Section 5.4(A) of the Architectural Design Review Guidelines; and, with the removal of the company name from the menu, the menu board no longer meets the definition of a sign. Member Proctor seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

- 4.7 NEOPCO Signs, on behalf of CCA North Corp, and Bank of New Hampshire Stage, requests an architectural design review recommendation for two 35-square-foot internally illuminated building wall signs (SP-0494-2025 and SP-0495-2025), to replace two existing building wall signs at 16 South Main St in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District. (2025-028)

Glen Schadlick (5 Crosby St, Concord) is present to represent this application. Mr. Schadlick provided the back story for the sign that is there now. Mr. Schadlick stated they received a variance for the sign that is there now with the intent that the internally illuminated sign portion would be changed out as needed if the bank was no longer a sponsor or the logo changed. Mr. Schadlick stated they were permitted for an internally illuminated sign when they received the variance. Bank of New Hampshire has changed their logo and they need to update that portion of the sign with the new logo. Their design team came up with this design. Originally, they wanted to have a gray background to mute it and now the new design has a white background. In trying to keep the way the variance was obtained they will mute the color or output of the light that comes from the sign. Mr. Schadlick showed the sample and stated this part of the sign is how it would look without any graphics or face plate. Mr. Schadlick pointed out the sample with the layer of translucent on the back of that to diffuse it and they will put a layer on the outside to diffuse it even more. The color presented is similar to what they see now with the gray background. They are trying to tone down more because of the white background. Mr. Schadlick pointed out the sign has so much lighting on it now this will be the dimmest portion of the sign.

Member Thorpe asked if the neon turns on it is a huge difference.

Co-Chair Doherty stated he appreciates the show and tell.

Alternate Member Savage stated they have more square footage to increase the sign itself inside the white and take up more real estate.

Mr. Schadlick stated he addressed that with marketing department at the bank. The way it is now there is also a lot of white space around it. Their intent is not to be the predominant name because they are just a sponsor. They want to have everything else be more predominant.

Member Proctor stated when he first saw it there is a lot of white and the rest of the building is dark. He suggested leaving the lettering the same size and increasing the frame dimension. Member Proctor noted they could use a fat blue border around it or a bigger black border around the whole thing. Then the lettering stays the same size.

Mr. Schadlick noted the frame that is showing is what is holding the face in there.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 1, 2025 Minutes

Alternate Member Savage stated she likes that idea, and noted she would like to reduce the white and increase the logo.

Member Gentilhomme suggested to put opaque backing on most and leave 2 to 3 inches for the logo itself so at night that would punch out.

Mr. Schadlick stated they have done that in the past and it becomes very blurry. There is sudden opaqueness with the white transition and the fuzziness of the translucent color.

Co-Chair Doherty stated what they are doing for night view is working. Co-Chair Doherty noted the day view is stark white and calling more attention.

Mr. Schadlick stated it's a great suggestion to increase the border and to decrease the white space.

Member Gentilhomme asked about increasing the border by increasing a black vinyl around the panel.

Mr. Schadlick stated he was going to suggest the black. If they did a blue it would be too much blue. Mr. Schadlick stated the black would frame it better.

Member Thorpe asked if everyone would agree that instead of black framing it on all four sides to just have a black bar at the top and bottom.

Mr. Schadlick stated if you do it on the top and the bottom it will squashed as opposed to if it was equally brought in on all four sides.

Member Proctor stated the overall sign with the metal pulls everything together.

Member Thorpe stated that is what frames it as an entity and putting a black border all around it starts subdividing all the components.

Alternate Member Savage stated it identifies the location to someone who is not from Concord who comes to see a show and needs to have the delineation separate from the entertainment scheduled that night or that day.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if gray is option on the border.

Member Thorpe stated black will create contrast that it becomes an event in itself. Mr. Thorpe suggested a charcoal or a gray for the like the banding appearance.

Mr. Schadlick stated the only problem with the gray is the framing that is there now is a mill finish aluminum and it becomes oxidized with the changing colors. If you go with the gray or a green-gray there will be too much of a disparity. Mr. Schadlick would suggest to go with the blue or black.

Member Gentilhomme asked if they increased the border around the panel with black would they also put in a gray background.

Mr. Schadlick stated this is their new logo and they do not want gray. They want a white background.

Member Gentilhomme asked if they are saying to have a black border and the diffuser.

Mr. Schadlick answered yes, it will be toned down three times.

Alternate Member Savage suggested the border to be one of these three colors: blue, charcoal, or black.

Mr. Schadlick noted if they wanted to suggest the thickness of the border the one they see now in the frame is three inches. Mr. Schadlick suggested to do three or four inches more for the border.

Alternate Member Savage suggested within the range of three to four inches.

Member Proctor was thinking $2\frac{2}{3}$ to $3\frac{3}{4}$ of the height.

Co-Chair Doherty was thinking more substantial too.

Mr. Schadlick stated he thinks they will be okay with 8 inches or below. It will keep in line with the

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 1, 2025 Minutes

centering of the logo in the white area. If you go more than that it will decrease the sign itself and over take what they are trying to do.

Member Proctor suggested 60% of the white dimensional.

Mr. Schadlick stated that is almost a foot.

Member Gentilhomme asked what is the distance from the top of the logo to the black frame.

Mr. Schadlick stated it is about 16 to 18 inches.

Member Gentilhomme is thinking 5 to 6 inches.

Alternate Member Savage suggested to give a range to increase the black border between 5 to 8 inches.

Co-Chair Doherty noted to her point roughly 50%.

Member Gentilhomme made a motion to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted with the following conditions: a double translucent diffuser shall be provided behind the white background to provide a diffused background in accordance with Section 5.4(C) of the Architectural Design Review Guidelines; an additional dark blue, black, or charcoal vinyl border of 5 to 8 inches in width or up to 50% of the existing white space, be placed around the border to decrease the amount of white background so the sign is a more integral and subordinate element within the overall building design in accordance with Section 5.4(A) of the Architectural Design Review Guidelines; and, the sign shall have a satin finish as shown in the submitted application. Member Thorpe seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

5. Building Permit Applications

- 5.1 Warrenstreet Architects, Inc., on behalf of South State Street Residences, requests an architectural design review recommendation for exterior alterations to an existing building at 6 S State St, in the Civic Performance (CVP) District. (2025-018) (PL-ADR-2025-0070)

Cory Bouchard (4 Crescent St, Concord) is present to represent this application. The renovation is primarily interior. They proposed two small exterior changes to the outside of the building. The first one is a new entry door at an existing window opening for an ADA unit. The second entrance of the opening at an existing overhead garage door.

Member Thorpe asked for the occupancy of the building.

Mr. Bouchard stated it is currently mixed use with residential apartments and commercial office space.

Member Thorpe asked if the front gable facing street is the office.

Mr. Bouchard answered yes.

Member Thorpe asked if all other doors are residential.

Mr. Bouchard answered correct.

Member Thorpe asked what is the one that is in the garage infill.

Mr. Bouchard stated it is the laundry room.

Co-Chair Doherty asked about the elevation showing a six-panel door, noting that it also shows that for the existing door. When you look at the existing photos, the door is very different. Co-Chair Doherty

**City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 1, 2025 Minutes**

asked if he is changing all of the other doors to be panel doors.

Mr. Bouchard stated the existing doors in the model are shown plain and are inaccurate. They are matching the aesthetic of the existing doors on the building.

Co-Chair Doherty noted if you go to the rendering it shows the existing door as a six-panel door. The door that has the big light in it is showing as a six-panel door.

Member Proctor asked if they are matching the existing door or the door on the elevation.

Mr. Bouchard stated there are multiple existing doors. There is one that looks like a four panel. There is another door that matches, except the top two panels are glass. This one has a square glass insert. It is hard to match the style because there are several different styles there. Mr. Bouchard stated they were going to match the color. On the residential doors they will have a glass panels at the top and the laundry door will be half glass. There are two different door styles proposed.

Member Proctor stated it could be glass or a four-panel door as long as it matches the character of the building.

Co-Chair Doherty stated exactly, that is his point.

Mr. Bouchard noted the door styles that were selected are doors used on familiar projects and does not mean that is the right choice here.

Co-Chair Doherty noted if you look at the other door in the rendering you will notice the panels at the bottom are two horizontal panels. Co-chair Doherty suggested to pay attention to the character of the building.

Member Thorpe asked on the laundry door why have an infill that is both red and the siding color, rather than having a uniform color on the whole element. Member Thorpe also wondered if the garage doors will be painted.

Mr. Bouchard stated the garage doors are a tan color match siding of the building. Mr. Bouchard stated in making the siding tan it will match the other two doors on the left.

Member Thorpe asked why not have the laundry room entrance the same tan color.

Mr. Bouchard stated they can do that.

Alternate Member Savage stated she likes that idea too.

Member Proctor noted the panel infill can be panels instead of siding.

Member Thorpe asked if the panel infill can be set back like garage doors so it is not broad out to the face.

Mr. Bouchard stated it will be inset by a couple of inches.

Member Thorpe made a motion to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted with the following conditions: all new doors whether glazed or solid shall match the panel configuration and character of existing doors so that the exterior of the building utilizes materials appropriate for the character of the building in accordance with Section 5.3(E) Materials and Colors of the

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 1, 2025 Minutes

Architectural Design Review Guidelines; and the laundry room door color shall match the infill of the adjacent garage door, and the door and infill shall be in a similar plane as the original door, as far as the brick will allow, to maintain the character of the building in accordance with Section 5.3(E) Materials and Colors of the Architectural Design Review Guidelines. Member Proctor seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

6. Site Plan Applications

- 6.1 Northpoint Engineering, LLC, on behalf of Manchester Street Concord Auto, LLC and Manchester Street Concord Auto TIC, LLC, requests an architectural design review recommendation for the expansion of the automobile display area, at 150 Manchester St in the Highway Commercial (CH) District and Industrial (IN) District. (2025-006) (PL-SPR-2025-0039)

Mr. Bass stated there are no building features being done as a part of this major site plan. It is expanding the onsite display area for the vehicles and circulation.

Dennis Wilson (3 Bear Run Dr, Litchfield) and Aaron Thibeault (119 Storrs St, Concord) are present to represent this application. Mr. Thibeault stated this is an existing Capital City Subaru. It has a 30-foot access off of Manchester St. The current dealership will remain. There will be minimal changes. They are shifting the dumpster over. They will paint a couple of ADA spots to match the requirements. Mr. Thibeault stated 150 Manchester St was about 1 ½ acres. The lot was merged as a part of a larger merger expansion with back land on 10 Integra Drive. It became a three-acre parcel following a merger in 2022. The back portion of 11 Integra Drive is vacant and there is gravel and mixed vegetation. This existing building is 9,560 square feet and has 73 marked parking spaces. The use is motor vehicle sales. There is inventory display and storage surrounding the building. There is scattered peripheral scattered landscaping and not much internal landscaping. The proposal is to create inventory storage and additional parking. They will landscape the back portion of the lot.

Co-Chair Doherty asked about the use of the additional parking.

Mr. Wilson stated it will be used for new vehicle storage. All service cars will remain in the front of the building.

Mr. Thibeault stated the existing impervious lot coverage is 65,377 or approximately 40%. It was higher when the lot was much smaller. With the expansion of the Integra Drive parcel it will drop down to 40%. The proposed impervious area is 131,301 square feet, which is 78.9%. This parcel is a split zone. The rear part is industrial and the front is commercial highway. They received a variance to allow that use of motor vehicle sales and service use in the industrial district. The stormwater they are going to collect, detain, and release in the back portion. They are creating three stormwater management basins and one infiltration basin. Three are subsurface and the one you cannot see is on the surface. It acts as one hydraulic connection. Water goes in and infiltrates into the ground water. It is sized based on a potential expansion out front. Mr. Thibeault stated it is way oversized right now. There will be no runoff with the new impervious surface they are presenting.

Co-Chair Doherty stated it seems to be pretty straightforward. Co-Chair Doherty asked if they worked with the City on the landscaping.

Mr. Bass stated it will comply with Site Plan Regulations because it is part of a major site plan.

Mr. Thibeault stated they are not proposing to be below any of the landscaping standards.

Alternate Member Savage noted that trees proposed and wondered if there are an equal amount of shade trees.

Mr. Thibeault stated the trees are from the City's suggested list. The landscape islands are the required size.

Mr. Bass stated the Site Plan Regulations require the majority to be shade trees with a shade tree in every

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 1, 2025 Minutes

bump out or island within a parking lot. Only 25% of trees are allowed to be ornamental.

Mr. Thibeault noted there are a few maples and a couple of birches.

Mr. Bass stated it is in front of them because all major site plans require an Architectural Design Review Committee recommendation. Mr. Bass noted building features, landscaping, and pedestrian scape and feel are the components the Architectural Design Review Committee addresses using the Architectural Design Guidelines.

Member Thorpe noted there has been some attrition of trees in the front of the property and asked if they can augment some of the loss on the side of the property.

Mr. Wilson stated on the left side there are six to seven trees. On the other side there are three to four trees.

Mr. Thibeault stated the site plan approval is from 1993.

Ms. Savage stated they would like to see more landscaping up front.

Mr. Wilson stated they are strapped for space now. Mr. Wilson noted the plan is to move some of the inventory in the front to the proposed display area. Then, all the front will be landscaped.

Mr. Thibeault stated part of the project is to provide the City a right-of-way easement along the Manchester St frontage, so they will lose some frontage.

Mr. Bass stated CIP 36 is in the City budget for FY 2027 to start reconstruction of Manchester Street. It will be a three-lane road with sidewalks on both sides and utilities. Mr. Bass stated landscaping that frontage will have to be coordinated with the impacts of that project.

Member Thorpe asked how much berth are they left with between the new restriction line with the expansion of the road and sidewalk

Mr. Thibeault stated it will be around six feet.

Mr. Bass stated there are proposed underground utilities at the edge of the right-of-way line which may violate the ten-foot separation.

Alternate Member Savage it would be nice to have the frontage nicer.

Member Gentilhomme suggested grass.

Alternate Member Savage made a motion to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted. Member Gentilhomme seconded.

Discussion

Member Thorpe stated it will come before Architectural Design Review Committee again.

Mr. Bass stated this is a major site plan application before Architectural Design Review Committee. If they ever propose any new improvements Architectural Design Review Committee might see them again but not necessarily.

Alternate Member Savage stated unless they make a façade change or sign change.

All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

- 6.2 Northpoint Engineering, LLC, on behalf of the City of Concord and Hampshire Aviation, LLC, requests an architectural design review recommendation for the construction of a new 11,550-square-foot aircraft hangar at 65 Airport Rd, Lease Area DZ-4, in the Industrial (IN) District and Open Space Residential (RO) District. (2025-014) (PL-SPR-2025-0040)

Ian McGregor (119 Storrs St, Concord) and Charlie Cummings (584 Currier Rd, Hopkinton) are present to represent this application. Mr. Cummings stated he and nine other pilots formed an LLC to build a pre-

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 1, 2025 Minutes

fab hangar. Mr. Cummings stated the hangar will be a classic and classy evergreen color and handed a sample to the Committee.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if the rendering is the color in the sample.

Mr. Cummings answered no, he was not able to get a picture of the exact color. It is the identical building with the five units.

Member Gentilhomme asked if there is a difference between this building and the one in the renderings.

Mr. Cummings stated the photo they have is not the correct color. The evergreen sample is the correct color.

Mr. McGregor stated they do not have a rendering of the proposed evergreen. They compiled as many buildings that represent what they are going to construct as possible. Mr. McGregor stated none of them matched the evergreen color that is being passed around right now. They are all constructed from the corrugated steel. They have a bifold hangar door.

Mr. Cummings stated that building is the exact cut and paste of the building that is across the taxi way.

Mr. McGregor stated this project is being proposed at the Concord Airport development leased site. They are working in close partnership with the City as well as New Hampshire Fish and Game because the airport has sensitive wildlife habitat with some endangered species. The parcel they are looking at developing is in the cleared area. There is a new United Therapeutics hangar under construction. What they are proposing is the 230 feet long by 50 feet wide hangar. It runs parallel to the taxi way. There will be five bifold hangar bays on either side of the structure. Planes will be facing away from the taxi way and have to taxi around the structure. The property will be accessed off Chenell Drive from the Nobis Engineering property. The existing leased property does not align with the existing gate in the fence. They are working with the City and State to move the lease line north, which is still located within the cleared area at the airport, so that the leased property and the existing gate within the property align. Mr. McGregor clarified it is not that the gate is not aligned but that the easement through the Nobis property does not align with the lease.

Member Thorpe asked if the gate remains and secure.

Mr. McGregor confirmed that is the case. Mr. McGregor stated the existing gate is located here where the easement runs through the abutting parcel. Mr. McGregor stated their proposal is to adjust the lease line to the north and have the gate remain. It would make the access for the property much easier. There are 10 parking spaces. Because of the size of the property as well as the aircraft that will use it there will be 90% impervious cover. There is stormwater on site that will be within the 100-year storm event. Not releasing any runoff, it will all be infiltrated below the impervious area. The other big condition that is being placed on the property is because of the sensitivity of the surrounding habitat. They are working with New Hampshire Fish and Game to ensure that signs will be placed around the perimeter of the property to show where the property bounds are and make sure no snow is pushed onto the conservation area, as well as no trespassing taking place in that area. They are asking for several waivers. Mr. McGregor stated the one that is most pertinent to this project is the requirement of color renderings. They do not have any of the three-dimensional graphic overlays of the proposed building. They are asking for a waiver for all landscape requirements. Mr. McGregor noted there are existing photos of the property. It is a lot like most rural airports being very flat and grassy. Mr. McGregor stated the existing United Therapeutics hangar is over 50 feet tall. The hangar they are proposing at the peak is just under 17 feet. The rear of the national guard building is a close green to the evergreen panel they are presenting today.

Co-Chair Doherty stated due to its location and neighboring buildings this is appropriate with building, style, and type. The color green will make it disappear with the trees around it. Co-Chair Doherty stated he understands why they are not doing trees because of how tight the site is and trying to conserve the conservation land.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 1, 2025 Minutes

Member Thorpe asked about wildlife.

Mr. McGregor stated the one that gets the most headlines is the karner blue butterfly. This is the only habitat in New Hampshire in which it is found. The host plant for the butterfly is the lupine. There is also a grasshopper, sparrow, and a northern black racer snake.

Co-Chair Doherty asked about the waiver request not to do a rendering.

Mr. Cummings stated this a cut and paste of an existing building.

Mr. McGregor stated for the airport property they have specific seeding specifications listed in the construction notes to comply with all department of environmental standards. Mr. McGregor stated he cannot tell them what is there now, but it would have to be approved by New Hampshire Fish and Game to be put back. There is a conservation seed mix for all the remaining grass areas.

Member Thorpe asked about lupine.

Mr. McGregor stated they would have to ask New Hampshire Fish and Game.

Alternate Member Savage made a motion to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted. Member Proctor seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

- 6.3 Nobis Group, on behalf of Child & Family Services Realty Corporation and NHSCOT, requests an architectural design review recommendation for conversion of the site to the NHSCOT headquarters, at Tax Map Lot 32Z 59, addressed as 210 Bog Rd, in the Open Space Residential (RO) District. (2025-015) (PL-SPR-2025-0041)

Morgan Dunson (18 Chenell Dr, Concord), Terri Wiltse (25 Triangle Park Dr, Concord) and Stuart Anderson (137 Main St, Woodstock) are present to represent this application. Dunson stated the site is located at 210 Bog Rd. It is currently developed as a summer camp. There is a main lodge on top of the hill. There are five cabins down in the center of the Bog Rd side. It is also connected at River Rd. The project is to renovate the existing lodge at the top of the hill internally to have NHSCOT headquarters where they have administrative staff work there and host events. These can be smaller classes weekly. They are proposing to have four to six larger events throughout the year. The main site improvements will be to improve the existing driveway, the loop around the circle will be paved with parking spaces, and eight ADA parking spaces. For larger events they are proposing two gravel parking lots on the lower side for 200 parking spaces. There is a grass open area for overflow event parking.

Mr. Anderson stated the existing building is approximately 12,000 square feet over two floors. The building because of the adjacent grade does allow for a full walk out on the east side. The only proposed changes on the exterior are to the rear elevation. Currently there is no internal staircase that connects the main level from the lower level. The proposed elevation on the rear there is no internal staircase that connects the main level from the lower level. They want to enclose an area on the rear elevation to allow for an internal stairwell and a limited use application elevator. This will allow users to go from one floor to the other without having to go outside. It is green clap siding with white trim and existing charcoal shingles. The proposed enclosure to the rear of the building would copy all of the existing materials. There are some modifications to the inside of the building but the main level stays as a large open space. There are other buildings on the property. However, they are not proposing any changes to those at this time.

Mr. Thorpe wondered about the number of employees.

Ms. Wiltse stated three full time and two part time.

Mr. Thorpe asked if the Highland Games will be at the site.

Ms. Wiltse stated no, the Highland Games would not fit here. They are looking at seasonal events like New Year's Day, spring, and Halloween.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 1, 2025 Minutes

Member Thorpe asked about largest number of visitors in vehicles and if all parking spaces would be filled.

Ms. Wiltse answered potentially.

Alternate Member Savage wanted to confirm that they were not touching the other cottages or buildings for now, but leaving as is.

Mr. Anderson answered yes. There needs to be further evaluations as some are in bad state of disrepair.

Alternate Member Savage asked when they are having a larger gathering would they be secured.

Mr. Anderson answered yes, there are some now that are boarded up with no access. They will be made safe.

Co-Chair Doherty asked to start with the building architecture it looks pretty straight forward and matching the window style in sizes. The shingles, siding, and trim are matching.

Mr. Anderson answered correct.

Member Gentilhomme made a motion to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted. Member Proctor seconded.

Discussion

Member Thorpe asked about lighting. They are showing some luminaires and wondered about the timing.

Ms. Wiltse stated they have had several conversations with the neighbors and they will not have it lit 24 hours per day, 7 days per week. Their intention is to light the parking lots for the larger events. For the lessons they do on a weekly basis, they will be parking closer to the top. There will be no need to have the parking lots lighted. Ms. Wiltse stated generally they leave the office leave about 5 p.m.

Member Thorpe stated he has walked this property for years. It is a large parcel. There is a lot of wildlife. Member Thorpe noted having light on all the time will be a dramatic change to the property.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if the landscaping has been reviewed with staff, noting there is a large gravel parking area and green spaces in between.

Ms. Dunson stated there are landscape islands with 5% interior landscaping for the two parking lots. They are proposing 28 trees. All the green areas that are disturbed will be loamed and seeded.

Member Thorpe asked about surface run off.

Ms. Dunson stated stormwater management is handled by infiltration basins. All existing gravel or proposed gravel driveway will flow into a swale, and then go into a sediment pond and be treated in a larger pond. They have submitted an AoT application.

All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

- 6.4 TFMoran, on behalf of West Street Keene, LLC, request an architectural design review recommendation for the addition of 1,867 square feet to the existing building at Tax Map Lot 46Z 63, addressed as 313 Loudon Rd, in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District. (2025-033) (PL-SPM-2025-0023)

Mr. Bass stated this is a minor site plan that does not require Architectural Design Review. However, because they are in a performance district their building permit is subject to Architectural Design Review.

Tony Nazsaka (124 Bedford Ct) is present to represent this application. They are proposing an 1,867-square-foot addition to 313 Loudon Rd, which is an existing Dollar Tree. It is a basic shell retail space. The developer builds and then advertises. They are adding to the frontage. They are set back from the existing building. There is a handful of ornamental trees being added. There are a few parking spots being added. There is no needed parking for adding the square footage. They are adding on and it will have its own identity. It has its own entry and space for a sign. There is no tenant. The material they are keeping

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
April 1, 2025 Minutes

the same stucco material to tie in with the existing building. The roof will be flat and be internally drained.

Co-Chair Doherty commented with all of the open spaces available on Loudon Rd and Fort Eddy Rd that we are building more spaces. Co-Chair Doherty asked about the sign size and if it is based on the frontage.

Mr. Tremblay stated signage is based on the building frontage and the pedestrian entrances. They can have roughly 34 linear square feet of signage.

Mr. Nazsaka asked if that is edge to edge of the letters.

Mr. Tremblay stated it all depends. If it was in a box it would be edge to edge.

Mr. Bass stated there is no script or signage proposed. They will have to apply for a sign permit. Mr. Bass noted because they are in a performance district the sign will be subject to Architectural Design Review approval.

Co-Chair Doherty noted the Dollar Tree sign in the proposal will not be that size.

Member Thorpe noted in site plan there is a wetland area shown to the left and wondered about runoff.

Mr. Nazsaka cannot speak to that.

Mr. Bass stated the minor site plan will go to Planning Board and be subject to Site Plan Regulations. Mr. Bass noted in approximately 2011 when this project first came through and entertained this addition which never was constructed. Everything was built out with this development anticipated.

Co-Chair Doherty stated he has no objections. It matches the style of the adjacent building and fits into the character of the area.

Alternate Member Savage made a motion to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted. Member Gentilhomme seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

7. Other Business

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

Adjournment

Co-Chair Doherty moved, seconded by Alternate Member Savage, to adjourn the meeting at 11:00 a.m. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Krista Tremblay

Krista Tremblay

Administrative Technician III