

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

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

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

Absent: Member Ron King

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 8:33 a.m.

**2. Minutes – Approve minutes from June 3, 2025**

Co-Chair Doherty moved, seconded by Member Savage, to approve the meeting minutes from June 3, 2025, as written. All in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

**3. Staff Memorandum**

**4. Sign Applications**

- 4.1 Massa Multimedia Architecture, on behalf of Wal-Mart Real Estate Business Trust, requests an architectural design review recommendation for a relocated 20-square-foot internally illuminated building wall sign (SP-0552-2025), a relocated 21-square-foot internally illuminated building sign, (SP-0553-2025), a new 10.26-square-foot non-illuminated building wall sign (SP-0554-2025), a new 23.35-square-foot non-illuminated building wall sign (SP-0555-2025), a new 34.84-square-foot non-illuminated building wall sign (SP-0556-2025), a new 27.49-square-foot non-illuminated building wall sign (SP-0557-2025), a new 47.11-square-foot non-illuminated building wall sign (SP-0558-2025), a new 32.86-square-foot internally illuminated building wall sign (SP-0559-2025), a new 88.94-square-foot internally illuminated building wall sign (SP-0560-2025), a 37.28-square-foot internally illuminated building wall sign (SP-0561-2025), to replace an existing building wall sign, an 88-square-foot internally illuminated freestanding sign panel (SP-0563-2025), to replace an existing freestanding sign panel, and a 72-square-foot internally illuminated freestanding sign panel (SP-0564-2025), to replace an existing freestanding sign panel, at 344 Loudon Rd in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District. (2025-049) (PL-ADR-2025-0089)

Member Thorpe and Member Gentilhomme arrived at 8:35 a.m.

Dylan Beato (24 Derringer Dr, city/state unknown) is present to represent this application. Mr. Beato stated the signs with the Wal-Mart branding will be four feet tall and the Wal-Mart spark will be six feet tall. The rest of the signs will be about two feet. Mr. Beato noted the two existing signs on the building as Subway and a credit union. They are looking to add an additional nine signs for outdoors and vestibules to allow for the customer to go to the part of the building they are looking to enter.

Co-Chair Hengen asked what is illuminated and what is not.

Mr. Beato stated out of all the signs there will be two that are lit, which will be the pick-up sign and the Wal-Mart with a spark.

Co-Chair Doherty asked why the Subway sign does not align with everything else on the building.

Mr. Beato stated that is an existing sign to remain. They cannot relocate it because there is an agreement between Wal-Mart and Subway.

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

Co-Chair Doherty asked if they are painting the building.

Mr. Beato answered yes, they are painting the building.

Co-Chair Doherty asked about below the pharmacy there are five stars and asked if that is a tenant sign.

Mr. Beato stated that is the credit union logo sign.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if that sign will be relocated.

Mr. Beato stated they will relocate that sign.

Co-Chair Hengen noted it would be clearer if the Subway was aligned with “groceries” to make it clearer that this is all one entrance.

Member Thorpe asked about the nighttime rendering.

Mr. Beato noted they do not know what the lumens are in the parking lot. They wanted to show the lumens for the Wal-Mart and pick-up sign.

On a motion made by Member Savage, seconded by Member Proctor, the Committee recommended that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

- 4.2 Brian Soulard and Dusk, LLC, on behalf of State Pleasant Street, LLC, request an architectural design review recommendation for a 16-square-foot internally illuminated projecting building sign panel (SP-0569-2025), to replace the panel of an existing internally illuminated projecting building sign at 26 Pleasant St in the Central Business Performance (CBP District. (2025-066) (PL-ADR-2025-0102)

Brian Soulard (26 Pleasant St Unit B, Concord) is present to represent this application. Mr. Soulard stated there is a sign that sticks out at 26 Pleasant Street and he will replace the sign. The sign will be solar powered with a light glow and go off and on when the sun comes up.

Member Savage asked if he is keeping the same encasement.

Mr. Soulard answered yes.

Member Proctor asked if the awning is a part of that.

Mr. Soulard answered no.

On a motion made by Member Gentilhomme, seconded by Co-Chair Doherty, the Committee recommended that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

- 4.3 Advantage Signs, on behalf of Eurofins and Concord Antrim Avenue Real Estate Inc, requests an architectural design review recommendation for a 35-square-foot internally illuminated freestanding sign panel (SP-0562-2025), to replace a panel on an existing freestanding sign cabinet, at 51 Antrim Ave in the Industrial (IN) District. (2025-068) (PL-ADR-2025-0105)

Josh Messinger (125 Hall St, Concord) is present to represent this application. Mr. Messinger stated it is a replacement of a face with digital print and internally illuminated.

Member Savage asked if the white background is opaque.

Mr. Messinger answered yes.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if it's the same structure and just the face being replaced.

Mr. Messinger answered yes.

Member Savage asked about when it is illuminated at night is it the whole sign or just the Eurofins.

Mr. Messinger stated it will be just the Eurofins and their logo.

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

Co-Chair Doherty asked how he can know it has an opaque background.

Mr. Messinger suggested specifically calling that out in their drawings.

On a motion made by Member Thorpe, seconded by Member Savage, the Committee recommended that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted with the condition that an opaque background be provided in accordance with Section 5.4(C) of the Architectural Design Guidelines and just the text and logo are lit. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

- 4.4 Advantage Signs, on behalf of Steve Duprey and Pierce Manse, requests an architectural design review recommendation for a new 90-square-foot sign non-illuminated freestanding sign (SP-0599-2025) at Tax Map Lot 583Z 8, an unaddressed N State St at the intersection of Horseshoe Pond Ln and North State St, in the Institutional (IS) District. (2025-067) (PL-ADR-2025-0104)

Josh Messinger (125 Hall St, Concord) is present to represent this application. Mr. Messinger stated this is for the Franklin Pierce Manse. Steve Duprey is sponsoring the project. This is a high-pressure laminate sign. Mr. Messinger noted it is similar to what you see at national parks. It will be one-half inch thick. Mr. Messinger stated this was approved previously, but the project was tabled by the client and the approval expired. Mr. Messinger noted they are here to get it approved again.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if this will be located near where you make the right turn to go down to the site.

Mr. Messinger answered yes.

Co-Chair Hengen asked why it is so high.

Mr. Messinger stated it is because of the sidewalk plow is what he was told. Mr. Messinger noted it would be his preference to be not so high.

Member Gentilhomme noted it is at the same the elevation as traffic signal.

Mr. Messinger is not sure if the drawing is to scale. Mr. Messinger noted it is nine feet from the bottom.

Co-Chair Hengen noted 180 inches to the top and worries about legibility with it being so high up.

Member Gentilhomme noted the main thing is they need to see the Pierce Manse.

Member Thorpe noted the “closed” panel looks like it needs to be removed.

Mr. Messinger stated they will need a step ladder to remove the “open” and “closed” panels. Mr. Messinger noted there has been some discussion of changing the hanging panels to a slider to slide when open and closed.

Member Gentilhomme asked if they have regular hours.

Mr. Messinger noted it is on the sign.

Member Gentilhomme noted if these are the colors they are using, people will not be able to read the sign. There is not enough contrast between the color of the type and the background.

Co-Chair Hengen stated it is hard to read.

Member Gentilhomme noted the signs below just show the hours instead of having an open sign and closed sign.

Member Thorpe commented that he finds the elaborate scroll distracting.

Mr. Tremblay stated this is a previously-approved sign from about a year ago. It was expired and that is why they cannot move forward with the project.

Co-Chair Hengen stated that does not mean they cannot offer new thoughts on the project.

Member Thorpe asked if any other member of the Committee is bothered by the elaborate scrolling.

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

Co-Chair Hengen noted if it was not there it would make everything else a little bit more visible and allow it to be lowered. Co-Chair Hengen stated that as low as the sign can go will make the sign more legible.

Member Thorpe noted it is at a critical crosswalk and a difficult location.

Member Savage noted there are two designs of iron work between page three and the one above it. The details are different.

Mr. Messinger noted one of the part numbers is outdated. The top page is the original one and some of those scrolls you cannot find any more. Mr. Messinger found a comparable one that the client likes.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if this is a single face.

Mr. Messinger stated it is double sided.

Co-Chair Doherty stated the height is a question with the “open” and “closed” hanging panels. Co-Chair Doherty suggested to get eliminating them.

Mr. Messinger can make suggestions to the client. Mr. Messinger noted if the hours are stated people should know when it is open.

Co-Chair Doherty suggested for readability and balance to spread the hours across both signs.

Member Proctor noted it could say open with the days on one side and the hours on the other side.

Member Savage noted during winter it could be hard to use a step ladder to change the open and closed hanging panels

Member Gentilhomme stated he does agree with everything that has been said. Member Gentilhomme said the purpose of the sign it is to tell people that the Pierce Manse is in this direction.

Mr. Messinger agreed.

Member Gentilhomme stated he feels this is addressed to people going to the location or driving by.

Member Gentilhomme stated he does not think you need anything about hours. It should tell people to turn right and have a sign in front of the Pierce Manse to tell the people if it is open or closed. Member Gentilhomme noted that would be a nice clean presentation of this sign. Member Gentilhomme noted it is too busy with all of the information.

Mr. Messinger noted it will allow them to lower the sign.

Member Thorpe noted including the removal of the scrolls.

On a motion made by Member Gentilhomme, seconded by Member Thorpe, the Committee recommended that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted with the following conditions: that the sign not exceed the minimum requirements of MUTCD standards for height; that the “open/close” panel, hours of operation panel, and decorative metal below the larger sign be removed, allowing the sign to be lowered and to provide a more simple and clear message in accordance with Section 5.4(B) of the architectural design guidelines; and a suggestion that the hours of operation information be relocated to the site. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

- 4.5 NEOPCO, on behalf of Hoyle Tanner and Pleasant & Green, LLC, requests an architectural design review recommendation for a 12-square-foot non-illuminated freestanding sign (SP-0580-2025), to replace an existing freestanding sign and using the existing granite posts at 50 Pleasant St in the Civic Performance (CVP) District. (2025-057) (PL-ADR-2025-0097)

Glen Schadlick (5 Crosby St, Concord) is present to represent this application. Mr. Schadlick noted TF Bernier was acquired by Hoyle Tanner. Mr. Schadlick they are replacing a sign with existing posts using the same square footage and using the branding standards that Hoyle Tanner uses at their other five locations. Mr. Schadlick noted that the lettering and logo will be raised copy on an HDU background.

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

On a motion made by Member Savage, seconded by Member Gentilhomme, the Committee recommended that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

- 4.6 Signarama of Concord, on behalf of Home In Hand and Harold E & Judith A Ekstrom, requests an architectural design review recommendation for a 10-square-foot non-illuminated freestanding sign panel (SP-0577-2025), to replace an existing freestanding sign panel and using the existing posts, at 15 Green St in the Civic Performance (CVP) District. (2025-056) (PL-ADR-2025-0096)

Kendra Price (249 Sheep Davis Rd, Concord) is present to represent this application. Ms. Price noted it is a relatively small sign with new posts. Ms. Price stated it is about the same size. There are newer unpainted posts. There will be space for future tenants.

Member Gentilhomme asked if they are going to leave the new posts that way.

Ms. Price stated she believes so.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if that should be a part of the sign application.

Mr. Tremblay stated it came in late everything in the packet is all that was submitted.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if the posts are the same height.

Member Thorpe said they appear to be different heights at the top.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if they would be part of the sign application.

Mr. Tremblay answered yes.

Co-Chair Hengen noted they are looking at a revised application with the graphic as submitted with a different post configuration.

Member Savage asked about the height difference.

Member Proctor noted they are different heights because of the slope.

Member Thorpe asked if they can recommend they cut the extra post off at the top.

Ms. Price stated she is in touch with the construction company to fix the post.

Co-Chair Doherty noted the space between the sign and the posts and asked if it will have a tenant panel.

Ms. Price answered yes, there will be a future six-inch by 40-inch panel.

Co-Chair Doherty noted it might help to show a blank panel.

Member Proctor asked if the frame is being done by the building owner and the sign by tenant.

Ms. Price answered correct.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if this is a rendering or a banner inside.

Ms. Price said it is a banner on the inside.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if it is within it.

Ms. Price answered yes, if approved today it will be inset instead of screwed on to one side. It will be between the two posts.

Co-Chair Hengen noted the Committee can approve the sign and, in the motion, can address the replacement of the structure.

Member Savage asked if someone changes the frame of the sign is that a separate application.

Mr. Tremblay stated it is a part of the same application. Mr. Tremblay noted he drove by and saw the sign

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

and noted that no permit was issued. Mr. Tremblay had them get a temporary permit. Then he found out that there was also a change to the frame of the sign.

Member Savage asked when the temporary permit expires.

Mr. Tremblay stated it expires in 60 days.

Member Savage asked if there is time enough to ask them to come back with the proper encasement and sign.

Mr. Tremblay answered absolutely.

Member Savage is not happy with the encasement and does not feel comfortable approving the sign due to the lack of information in the application.

Member Gentilhomme noted they can approve the sign with a condition about the posts and structure.

Member Savage noted they will not see it and will not know what they are approving. This is to be all in one and not two separate applications.

Co-Chair Hengen noted they do have a banner up now.

Member Savage stated they have a temporary banner that will last for 60 days.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if the Committee has any comments on the sign itself.

Co-Chair Hengen stated she is hearing everyone is fine with the sign and not recommending approval of the structure holding the sign.

Ms. Price is coming back next month for the new posts and asked if the Committee has any suggestions for the new posts.

Member Savage noted to level out the top of post.

Member Thorpe suggested to level the top rail.

Member Savage noted it looks unfinished.

Co-Chair Doherty stated the cap feels unfinished.

Co-Chair Hengen noted it looks like a temporary sign.

On a motion made by Member Gentilhomme, seconded by Member Savage, the Committee recommended that the Planning Board deny the application as submitted, as changes to the post configuration which have occurred on site and as presented during the public hearing do not provide a uniform appearance and coordination within the site in accordance with Section 5.4(D) of the architectural design guidelines and with the following suggestions: that the applicant request to continue to August ADRC and Planning Board meetings, with a revised rendering depicting the proposed post and sign frame structure; and that the site address be included on said frame.

#### Discussion

Co-Chair Hengen noted the Committee does not need to stipulate the design of the structure. However, it should be finished and, if wood, be painted.

Member Savage stated if there is a natural look to it she is okay with it. It needs to be painted or stained to have a more finished look and to level the posts at the top.

Member Thorpe stated it is a block within the historic core of the city.

Co-Chair Doherty noted the previous sign did have the number 15, which is the address. The newer sign is a little different and it would be nice to keep that feature.

Member Savage stated she was going to bring that up because she did not see the number 15 was

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

identified on the new posts.

Member Gentilhomme made an amendment to the motion to recommend they add the street address number 15 be incorporated into the sign posts.

Co-Chair Doherty suggested that the post have a larger top to the structure.

All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

- 4.7 Signarama of Concord, on behalf of Aroi Thai Cuisine and Paisano's Realty LLC, requests an architectural design review recommendation for a new 7.83-square-foot non-illuminated building wall sign (SP-0596-2025) and a new 2.9-square-foot externally illuminated projecting sign (SP-0597-2025), mounted on an existing bracket, at 55 S Main St in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District. (2025-065) (PL-ADR-2025-0102)

Ms. Price is present to represent this application. Ms. Price noted there is an existing bracket within 10 feet above of the sidewalk ordinance. There is a smaller building sign.

Co-Chair Doherty noted it is straightforward and readable.

Co-Chair Hengen stated it is a clean and attractive sign.

On a motion made by Co-Chair Doherty, seconded by Member Savage, the Committee recommended that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

- 4.8 KC Signs, on behalf of American National Insurance and NH Farm Bureau Federation, requests an architectural design review recommendation for a 20-square-foot sign externally illuminated freestanding sign panel (SP-0583-2025), to replace an existing freestanding sign panel, and a 23-square-foot non-illuminated building wall sign (SP-0584-2025) to replace an existing building wall sign at 295 Sheep Davis Rd in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District.

No one is present for this application.

Member Savage stated it is straightforward.

Co-Chair Hengen noted it is cleaner than the previous one.

Member Thorpe noted if you look at the signage on the building that there is a white illuminated back drop.

Mr. Bass noted the application states it is non-illuminated.

On a motion made by Member Savage, seconded by Member Gentilhomme, the Committee recommended that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

- 4.9 Dhora Hinxhia, on behalf of Parlor Salon and Berat Holdings, LLC, requests an architectural design review recommendation for a 5.2-square-foot externally illuminated projecting building sign (SP-0588-2025), to relocate and replace the existing sign at 58 and 62 N Main St in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District. (2025-064) (PL-ADR-2025-0101)

Heather Dragon (62 N Main St, Concord) is present to represent this application.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if Ms. Dragon will be occupying two store fronts.

Ms. Dragon answered yes, she would like the sign over 58 as that will be the new entrance. Ms. Dragon noted there is a gooseneck light she would like to utilize.

Co-Chair Hengen stated it is pretty straightforward.

On a motion made by Co-Chair Doherty, seconded by Member Savage, the Committee recommended that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

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

- 4.10 Green Bear Signs, on behalf of The Soapery Off Main and Hades Property Holdings, LLC, requests an architectural design review recommendation for a 31-square-foot sign internally illuminated building wall sign panel (SP-0589-2025) to replace an existing building wall sign panel and a 20-square-foot sign projecting sign panel (SP-0590-2025), to replace an existing projecting sign panel, at 32 N Main St in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.

No one is present for this application.

Co-Chair Doherty noted it will be difficult to do an opaque panel behind the white of the sign.

Member Gentilhomme agreed and wanted to make sure “The Soapery Off Main” is highlighted at night and the rest is not.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if just “The Soapery Off Main” and not the lines below are illuminated.

Member Thorpe noted the words “The” and “Off Main” are black or charcoal and not easy to illuminate.

Co-Chair Hengen noted just the “Soapery” at night will do the trick.

Member Savage asked if just illuminating “The Soapery” the red font.

Co-Chair Doherty noted with just the white light around it.

Member Savage asked if the blade sign is illuminated.

Mr. Tremblay answered it is.

Co-Chair Doherty thinks the simplest thing since there is no applicant is to have just “The Soapery” light up at night.

Member Savage asked if that is to be a suggestion.

Co-Chair Doherty does not think it should be a suggestion.

Mr. Bass noted in the Central Business Performance District the sign needs to have light text on dark backgrounds or have an opaque background. For them to be to be compliant with zoning they need one of those two things to occur.

Member Savage asked if there is a reference in the Architectural Design Guidelines.

Mr. Bass answered yes, Section 5.4(C).

On a motion made by Member Savage, seconded by Co-Chair Doherty, the Committee recommended that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted with the condition that an opaque background be provided, on both signs, leaving just the red lettering text “Soapery” illuminated at night in accordance with Section 5.4(C) of the Design Guidelines and Section 28-6-9(e)(2) of the Zoning Ordinance. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

- 4.11 Bailey Signs, on behalf of Nothing Bundt Cakes and Carrier Place, LLC, requests an architectural design review recommendation for a 16.14-square-foot internally illuminated building wall sign (SP-0601-2025), to replace an existing building wall sign, at 273 Loudon Rd in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District. (2025-068) (PL-ADR\_2025-0106)

Cowles Self (9 Thomas Drive, Westbrook ME) is present to represent this application. Mr. Self noted it is a channel letter sign that is internally illuminated on a blue backer. The backer is intended to extend the white lettering against the light-colored background. It will be mounted on a raceway that is undersized.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if this is the corporate design.

Mr. Self answered yes.

Member Savage asked if the white lettering is opaque.

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

Mr. Self stated it is a translucent white and the white is a toned-down white. It is a non-glare illumination and meets local levels.

On a motion made by Co-Chair Doherty, seconded by Member Savage, the Committee recommended that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

- 4.12 Judy Hampe, requests an architectural design review recommendation for an existing non-permitted 2.72-square-foot non-illuminated projecting sign (SP-0591-2025), an existing non-permitted 2.25-square-foot non-illuminated projecting sign (SP-0592-2025), an 8-square-foot externally illuminated freestanding sign panel (SP-0593-2025) to replace an existing freestanding sign panel, and an 8-square-foot externally illuminated freestanding sign panel (SP-0595-2025), to replace an existing freestanding sign panel, at 35 Pleasant St in the Civic Performance (CVP) District. (2025-062/2025-063) (PL-ADR-2025-0099/0100)

Kenna Zucchini (35 Pleasant St, Concord) and Roger Buttles (35 Pleasant St, Concord) are present to represent this application. Mr. Buttles stated they have businesses in the building. Mr. Buttles submitted a sign application.

Ms. Zucchini noted the existing sign that is owned by the engineers at the top of the stairwell.

Hengen asked if that is an example of what is there.

Ms. Zucchini answered yes.

Member Savage asked if this is one that did not have a permit.

Ms. Zucchini answered yes. Ms. Zucchini stated none of the signs are illuminated.

Member Thorpe asked where is the Outer Space sign.

Mr. Buttles will have his sign beneath Judy Hampe's sign for Coldwell Banker.

Member Savage asked if Coldwell Banker will stay and Outer Space will go where there is the J Kemp and Associates.

Mr. Buttles answered basically, and there is a new graphic for the Coldwell Banker sign.

Member Savage asked if the signs will be in the existing frame.

Mr. Buttles answered yes.

Member Thorpe asked if there is a proposal to stabilize the existing structure.

Mr. Buttles answered yes.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if someone can photo shop what they are thinking and present a rendering.

Member Savage noted what they are seeing is the existing sign. However, what they normally see is the existing sign and the new sign. Member Savage asked if that can be submitted and have staff review for the Planning Board meeting to show the visual of what the new sign will look like.

Member Gentilhomme noted there are four applications.

Co-Chair Hengen will go back to the others and stick with this now.

Member Gentilhomme asked for the dimensions of the signs and if they are the same width.

Mr. Buttles stated the Coldwell Banker and Outer Space sign will be same size. The whole sign will be 48 by 48 and each would be 24 by 48.

Co-Chair Doherty noted the Coldwell Banker sign has a white background and the text on Mr. Buttles' sign is very white. The existing sign looks like a cream and asked if it will get painted a cream or white.

Co-Chair Hengen stated she is sensing the application is not complete because of all of the questions. Co-Chair Hengen suggested the applicant come back with a photo shopped rendering and a clear articulation

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

on whether repainting the existing or replacing in kind or replacing completely.

Co-Chair Doherty noted the 35 is on there and there are scroll marks. Co-Chair Doherty asked if that is going to be painted white.

Mr. Buttles stated they will they will paint white and keep the 35 on it.

Co-Chair Doherty stated it would be helpful if they knew all of the pieces. Co-Chair Doherty asked about the black board and if it will be painted white.

Member Proctor asked about the lighting.

Mr. Buttles noted the one that is bent down is lighting up.

On a motion made by Co-Chair Hengen, seconded by Co-Chair Doherty, the Committee recommended that the Planning Board table the applications SP-0593-2025 (Coldwell Banker) and SP-0595-2025 (Outer Space Art Gallery) until the August meeting pending receipt of a clearer rendition of what that freestanding sign will look like with graphics photoshopped in and a better understanding on what is happening with the existing frame and background placard.

Discussion

Co-Chair Doherty noted they might want to talk about the posts if they will be replaced and reinforced.

All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

Co-Chair Hengen suggested to discuss the side street signs applications SP-0591-2025 and SP-0592-2025.

Member Thorpe asked if signs are there currently.

Ms. Zucchini answered yes and her sign is the Our Lighthouse Counseling (SP-0592-2025).

Member Savage noted it matches the door nicely.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if it is not illuminated.

Ms. Zucchini answered yes.

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

Co-Chair Hengen noted the other sign for CES (SP-0591-2025).

Co-Chair Doherty commented on the CES sign there is a website and phone number. However, there is no information to say what they do.

Member Savage noted it is an existing sign.

On a motion made by Member Savage, seconded by Member Gentilhomme, the Committee recommended that the Planning Board approve the application (SP-0591-2025) as submitted. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

**5. Building Permit Applications**

5.1 None

**6. Site Plan Applications**

6.1 None

**7. Other Business**

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

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

**Adjournment**

Member Gentilhomme moved, seconded by Co-Chair Hengen to adjourn the meeting at 9:52 a.m. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

*Krista Tremblay*

Krista Tremblay

Administrative Technician III