

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

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

Attendees: Co-Chair Jay Doherty, Member Claude Gentilhomme, Co-Chair Elizabeth Durfee Hengen, Member Ron King, Member Douglas Proctor and Member Merle Thorpe

Absent: Alternate Member Amanda Savage

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 8:30 a.m.

2. Minutes – Approve minutes from November 4, 2025

Co-Chair Hengen moved, seconded by Member King, to approve the meeting minutes from November 4, 2025, as written. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Staff Memorandum

4. Sign Applications

- 4.1 Classic Signs Inc, LLC, on behalf of Hodges Development Corp. and Hodges Property Inc, requests an architectural design review recommendation to replace an existing free-standing sign panel with a new 84-square-foot externally illuminated free standing sign panel (SP-0660-2025) at 241 Loudon Road in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District. (PL-ADR-2025-0134) (2025-126)

Justin Parker (13 Columbia Dr, Amherst) is present to represent this application. They are changing the colors and design for Hodges Development.

Member King made a motion to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted. Co-Chair Hengen seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

- 4.2 Sousa Signs, LLC, on behalf of Ulta Beauty and Brixmore Capitol SC LLC, requests architectural design review recommendations for a new 133.4-square-foot internally illuminated building wall sign (SP-0665-2025), and a new 40-square-foot internally illuminated building wall sign (SP-0666-2025) at 80 Storrs Street in the Opportunity Corridor Performance (OCP) District. (PL-ADR-2025-0137) (2025-129)

Member Thorpe arrived at 8:33 a.m.

No one is present to represent this application

Mr. Bass stated this previously received approval which lapsed with the exception of the rear sign that did change a little bit.

Member King asked about the night rendering.

Co-Chair Doherty noted from his understanding of the application it is the letters are illuminated.

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

- 4.3 NEOPCO Signs, on behalf of Meridian Land Services, Inc and EWT 54, LLC, requests an architectural design review recommendation for a new 10.67-square-foot non-illuminated hanging building sign (SP-0670-2025) at 95 North State Street in the Civic Performance (CVP) District. (PL-ADR-2025-0138) (2025-130)

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

Glen Schadlick (5 Crosby St, Concord) is present to represent this application. This customer is moving into the leased space with an existing bracket on the building that has been used by other tenants. They are taking a branded trademark and putting it on a non-illuminated sign.

Member King made a motion to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted. Co-Chair Hengen seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

- 4.4 NEOPCO Signs, on behalf of After Thai Dessert House, Siam Orchid, and Twelve Dynasty Realty, LLC, requests an architectural design review recommendation for a new 14-square-foot internally illuminated building wall sign (SP-0673-2025) at 12 North Main Street in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District. (PL-ADR-2025-0139) (2025-131)

Glen Schadlick (5 Crosby St, Concord) is present to represent this application. This is the rear of Siam Orchid in the alley on the back. The owners have opened up a dessert restaurant that is in the back. These are individual letters and the only thing that lights up is the white area at the top, middle and bottom sections. They will remove the awning.

Member Gentilhomme arrived at 8:37 a.m.

The owners may paint or do some repair work on the brick above and that will have to go for the boards for that.

Co-Chair Doherty thinks the sign looks nice.

Mr. Schadlick stated the returns are dark green

Co-Chair Hengen stated it is an appropriate location for an illuminated sign.

Co-Chair Hengen made a motion to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted. Member King seconded. All in favor.

Discussion

Member Thorpe asked if the white illumination is something that they do not like for background context and the letters are the significant part but here they are reversing that and adding white letters with a dark silhouette.

Co-Chair Doherty stated typically illuminated letters are fine and it is the overall background if it is all white it is a lot of white. This seems appropriate.

Member Thorpe asked how much illumination will add up.

Mr. Schadlick asked how do you calculate lumens. Lumens are for non-shielded and this is a white shielded light and asked how to measure the lumen.

Member Thorpe asked what is the output of the lumen.

Mr. Schadlick stated they are LED.

Member Thorpe noted it is still rated.

Mr. Schadlick stated it is a lensed covered light and not a clear light. All calculations now are done with a clear lense for parking lot type lighting.

Member Thorpe asked if there is a Kelvin temperature on the lamp.

Mr. Schadlick stated they are 5000 kb's.

Member Thorpe asked if they will be slightly blueish.

Co-Chair Doherty stated he thinks it is appropriate for this.

Mr. Schadlick stated even with the shielding there is no blue it will be a pure white.

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

Co-Chair Doherty asked if there are any more comments, with none asked for a vote.

All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

- 4.5 Signarama of Concord, on behalf of Optima Dermatology and Granite State Terrace, LLC, requests architectural design review approvals for a new 28.5-square-foot internally illuminated building wall sign (SP-0668-2025) and a new 10.85-square-foot externally illuminated tenant panel on a relocated freestanding pylon sign (SP-0669-2025) at 171 Pleasant St in the Institutional (IS) District. (PL-ADR-2025-0140) (2025-132)

Kendra Price (249 Sheep Davis Rd, Concord) is present to represent this application. This is a channel letter installation a new tenant panel and they want to move the pylon over ten feet.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if the pylon is ground illuminated.

Ms. Price responded correct.

Member Thorpe asked if the pylon sign has other tenants from the building.

Ms. Price responded correct.

Member Thorpe asked if there is a reason why the tenant did not put the sign on the pylon.

Co-Chair Doherty stated they are it is noted on sheet six and seems straight forward.

Co-Chair Hengen made a motion to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted. Member King seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

- 4.6 In accordance with Section 28-9-4(f)(8) *Request for Reconsideration* of the Zoning Ordinance New England Life Care, on behalf of TDL Investments LLC, requests reconsideration of the architectural design review decision made by the Planning Board at their September 17, 2025 meeting where the Board conditionally approved a new 14.3-square-foot internally illuminated wall sign (SP-0630-2025) and a 21.25-square-foot internally illuminated panel replacement (SP-0631-2025) in an existing freestanding sign at 374 Loudon Rd in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District. (2025-098) (PL-ADR-2025-0117).

Josh Watson (45 Center St Suite A, Scarborough, ME) is present to represent this application. They were required by the guidelines to have an opaque background and they are asking for reconsideration on. It looks dark when driving by at night. The owners would like the opaque background to be removed. Where the white is on the sign around the symbol and the letters there is an opaque background and it would otherwise be white like the Super Cut sign.

Member Proctor asked if that happens on the white with the letters as well.

Mr. Watson asked if it was allowed to dye cut around the letters so the illumination would show through. It is very hard to see at night.

Member Thorpe asked if Super Cuts is a white opaque background.

Mr. Bass has not had an opportunity to review any of the existing signs and when they received approvals.

Mr. Watson stated they are willing to do whatever as an alternative to make it look better. There is a frost colored tint that blocks 50% of illumination. Mr. Watson noted it would be a litter bit lower light but not have the black or gray background.

Co-Chair Doherty understands the smaller letters, New England Life Care, are hard to read and the rest looks nice.

Member Gentilhomme asked the color of the letters for New England Life Care.

Mr. Watson responded navy blue.

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

Member Proctor stated the white is overpowering. The light shining through is reducing how the camera is picking up on the letters.

Co-Chair Hengen noted even the NELC is hard to read.

Member Gentilhomme asked about creating a rectangle around NELC so the letters stand out on their own.

Member Thorpe noted letters will be washed out with the intensity of the white that surrounds it and would be counterproductive.

Mr. Watson noted it looks fine in the day and hard to read at night.

Co-Chair Doherty asked about the film that can cut 50% of the light.

Mr. Watson stated it is like a frost window tint. They would apply to the entire sign and knock down some of the illumination. They did discuss reversing the entire sign to have blue on the back and letters white.

Co-Chair Doherty stated cutting 50% of the light would stop the glowing and meet the intent of what they try to do to prevent the white.

Mr. Watson noted they would remove opaque and cover the entire sign with the frost film.

Member Gentilhomme stated that is not unreasonable.

Member Gentilhomme made a motion to recommend the Planning Board approve the application with the condition that the opaque background and be replaced with the frosted background over the whole area.

Co-Chair Doherty noted with the intent to cut the light by 50%.

Member Gentilhomme responded yes, that can be added to the motion.

Member King seconded.

Discussion

Member King asked if the applicant brought this to ADRC as a question and do ADRC want to be so assertive about what they want or is this an experiment.

Member Gentilhomme stated they need to give firm guidelines as to what to do.

Member King asked what if it does not work.

Mr. Watson responded he will have to come back.

Mr. Bass stated if he gets approval to do that and they do it that is that. They will not have to come back.

Member Proctor stated this is a sign with a bunch of white signs and does not think it will hurt anything. It is an experiment for ADRC to know the possibilities in the future.

Member Gentilhomme stated ADRC is assuming it will work.

Mr. Watson responded us to and they just want to improve it.

Member Gentilhomme stated ADRC wants signs to be readable and give the proper message.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if there is any other discussion.

Mr. Bass stated the Committee is recommending Planning Board approve the revised application dated September 5, 2025 as submitted with the condition that the opaque background be removed and replaced with a frosted background applied to the entire free-standing sign panel to cut the light by 50%.

Co-Chair Doherty suggested they do not have to do the whole background and do where the blue switches.

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

Mr. Watson stated they will do a test run to see if it makes it remarkable different and if it does for consistency they will do the whole thing.

Member Proctor pointed out a gray bar on the side.

Co-Chair Doherty stated there is a motion and second, is there any more discussion, with none called for a vote.

All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

5. Building Permit Applications

- 5.1 Alex Stoyale, on behalf of Monitor Statesman, LLC, requests an architectural design review recommendation for exterior changes of a building at 10 Pleasant St Extension, in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District. (PL-ADR-2025-0133) (2025-121)

No one is present at this time in the meeting so this agenda item was moved to the end of the meeting.

Mr. Bass stated agenda items 5.1 and 5.2 both of these items 10 Pleasant St Extension and 75 Storrs St Architectural Design Review Committee had previously reviewed and recommended to the Planning Board to continue their application to return back to ADRC. Mr. Bass stated we have not received any new materials. It is essentially unchanged. They can provide the same exact comments. There has been no change with this application and the applicant is not present.

Co-Chair Doherty stated if there is no new information it is not worth their time.

Member Gentilhomme made a motion to recommend that the Planning Board continue the application to the date certain of the January 21, 2026 Planning Board meeting to allow the applicant to return to ADR to provide a more detailed and complete application, including how the relocated entrance will interact with the alleyway. Member Proctor seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

- 5.2 Alex Stoyale, on behalf of the City of Concord, requests an architectural design review recommendation for certain site and landscape improvements at 75 Storrs St, in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District (PL-ADR-2025-0132) (2025-119)

Member Gentilhomme made a motion to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted with the following conditions: the existing heritage sign shall be relocated along the Pleasant Street extension so that the reader is looking toward Storrs St when viewing; landscaping trees shall not be fruit or nut bearing; a detail of the fence shall be provided, including material; a license with the City of Concord shall be in place prior to final approval; and, additional spot grades shall be provided along the accessible route to show how the slope will interact and blend with the adjacent seating areas to assure safety and accessible compliance. Member Proctor seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

6. Site Plan Applications

- 6.1 Northpoint Engineering, LLC, on behalf of Ciborowski Associates, LLC, requests an architectural design review recommendation as part of a major site plan application, a conditional use permit to allow a portion of a proposed mixed-use building to be constructed to a maximum height of 89feet-6inches from area average grade, a conditional use permit application to allow the partial obstruction of views of the State House Dome, and certain waivers from the Site Plan Regulations for the construction of a new 8-story, mixed use building at Tax Map 6443Z Lot 27, addressed as 56 North Main Street in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District. (2025-123) (PL-SPR-2025-0049)

Mr. Bass noted agenda item 6.1 and agenda item 6.2 are two separate properties requiring two major site plan applications. The conditional use permit applications for the dome obstruction and height are associated with 56 N Main Street. The 2 Phenix Ave is separate however, a lot of the civil plans and

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

architectural plans are together. They can view them together, however, they will need to have two separate motions.

Jeff Lewis (119 Storrs St, Concord), Ari Pollack (214 N Main St, Concord) and Jason Lacombe (30 S Main St, Concord) are present to represent this application.

Mr. Lacombe presented to the Committee the submitted application materials noting the building will be eight floors with a basement to connect to both building, six Main Street retail store fronts, office space, meeting space, roof top restaurant with deck and 36 residential units.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if the central corridor is the primary access to residential apartment level.

Mr. Lacombe responded yes, in the elevator core there are four elevators. There are two that serve the function space, one that is a service elevator and one for residential to connect to the parking in the garage.

Member King has how many units per floor.

Mr. Lacombe stated there are nine units per floor.

Co-Chair Hengen asked full height of the connector piece.

Mr. Lacombe stated it is just below Phenix Hall cornice line.

Mr. Lacombe stated they broke the new building into four facades. There is Phenix Hall, lobby space, Phenix Block and the EMP rebuild. Mr. Lacombe presented the façade elevations submitted with the application materials to the Committee.

Member Thorpe asked about the material and if hiding mechanical screening.

Mr. Lacombe responded it is. The building will have a generator on the roof.

Member Thorpe asked about the materials.

Mr. Lacombe stated the entire building is brick masonry and a little wood grain fiber cement paneling. There are granite headers and accent pieces.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if using granite on the rebuild section.

Mr. Lacombe stated there is some stone they are looking at a different colored granite or sandstone on the EMP.

Co-Chair Hengen asked about the window openings if they will be recessed.

Mr. Lacombe they are recessed roughly eight inches. They kept it simple with double hung with an arched top single hung units and patio doors on the residential area.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if they will be coming back with lighting.

Mr. Bass stated if they get their architectural design approval then whatever they provide the Planning Board that is what is approved. If they change from that they would go through that as an amendment.

Co-Chair Doherty noted they do not have any materials in front of them today and if they approve this they are doing it with no materials.

Mr. Bass stated that is correct and you need to take that into consideration with the motion for the Planning Board. They are not obligated to come back unless there is a significant change.

Co-Chair Hengen asked at the top of the parapet there is a different lighting material.

Mr. Lacombe stated it is just a stone cap.

Co-Chair Hengen noted if they keep it all the same color your eye will not go to it.

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

Member Thorpe asked the top floor of the residential that is a different material and asked if it is black brick.

Mr. Lacombe stated it is slate roof.

Member Gentilhomme noted the rebuild on the left if you look at the perspective from the north the roof and drop the cornice down one story. That part of the building is drawing attention because it is essentially the tallest part of the addition. It is so tall and narrow the copper cornices that are crowning it and it bothers him that it is going up the whole height. Member Gentilhomme suggested to drop the copper cornice down and create a false cornice.

Co-Chair Doherty noted the mansard is good and like how treating them with the character of the fabric of a downtown where every building is a little different.

Member Gentilhomme noted one of the guidelines for use of materials downtown is substantial materials like stone or brick.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if the wood is below the glass connector.

Mr. Lacombe responded correct and it is set back roughly 25 feet from the face of Phenix Hall.

Co-Chair Hengen asked what other materials did they explore.

Mr. Lacombe stated painted panels to soften that space.

Co-Chair Hengen asked the material of the stacks of bay windows.

Mr. Lacombe stated that will likely be a panel or stucco material.

Member Thorpe asked if they considered sheet metal.

Mr. Lacombe stated originally, they were going to be copper.

Co-Chair Doherty asked about the glass piece that bumps out that does not span the whole way and there are two pieces that are flush with the neighboring buildings.

Mr. Lacombe responded correct and they are looking to do a copper screen that goes over the face of the glass so during the day it has an appearance of something solid but at night you would get a glow through.

Co-Chair Doherty suggested to have just the piece that sticks out to have the glow would be more powerful.

Co-Chair Hengen suggested a charcoal gray.

Co-Chair Doherty asked the Committee to recap a list of things from the discussion. Co-Chair Doherty suggested the EMP Hotel building the upper floor window pattern should be adjusted to diminish the scale of the building to tie in the fabric.

Member Proctor suggested to say window and masonry pattern.

Co-Chair Hengen suggested to say with the understanding that the windows are recessed and externally expressed muttons because there is nothing on the plans to show that.

Member Thorpe asked if there will be a change in the color of the windows from building to building.

Mr. Lacombe noted there will be a change for the facades.

Co-Chair Hengen noted another understanding about the trim detailing on the facades is granite or stone.

Co-Chair Doherty stated they have not discussed the two conditional use permits that are tied to this application. Co-Chair Doherty asked if there are any questions for the building.

Mr. Bass noted there was discussion on the windows on the Main Street side the stone material underneath the window is that a comment discussed.

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

Co-Chair Hengen stated the understanding that all of the trim details would be with the granite or stone.

Mr. Bass asked for all window treatments or these specifically.

Mr. Lacombe stated the bay windows would be some other material and that is why they were looking at a panel of stucco.

Member Thorpe noted with stucco you lose the detail of any sense of paneling.

Mr. Bass noted they talked about adding a sill band on the EMP building.

Member Proctor noted that was the window and masonry.

Mr. Bass noted there is concern about the lighting of the building.

Co-Chair Hengen stated also the color of the brick.

Mr. Bass noted if they received the ARDC approvals and there is a condition to come back and what is the action after that.

Mr. Pollack stated they are not sure about the lighting but for the brick to have the recommendation favorable to this rendering and to ask the applicant to return with physical samples prior to pulling the building permit so a conversation can occur. Mr. Pollack noted he does not think it is binding or will disrupt the approval.

Co-Chair Doherty noted they would be setting a precedent for other people.

Mr. Pollack does not have an issue with asking the applicant return for a non-binding conservation about the brick selection prior to pulling the building permit.

Co-Chair Hengen asked to add the selection of lighting.

Mr. Pollack asked if she was referring to fixtures.

Co-Chair Hengen stated fixtures and method of lighting for cornices or up lighting.

Mr. Pollack noted they can reference lighting consistent with the rendering presented and subject to a conversation prior to building permit. It would not set a precedent for treating lighting differently than any other type of review.

Co-Chair Hengen stated that will work.

Co-Chair Doherty stated lighting is important to them.

Member Gentilhomme asked if they can make a recommendation that they approve the architecture and not including material and colors.

Mr. Bass noted they will need architectural design review approval, conditional use permit approval and site plan approval they can be conditioned where you "shall" do this either before or after. The Planning Board will make the decision on the application.

Co-Chair Doherty made a motion to recommend the Planning Board approve the project with the following conditions the EMP Hotel building upper floor window and masonry pattern to be adjusted to diminish the scale of the building, the windows are all recessed on the exterior with expressed muttons, the trim details are granite or stone on the building, the mechanical unit screening over the link would not be translucent or glow or call attention in any way, the bay bump outs would not be efface or stucco but another material and a condition before construction the applicant return with physical sample of materials with color and pattern and a lighting plan design. Co-Chair Hengen seconded.

Discussion

Mr. Bass noted in the motion it stated prior to construction and would recommend prior to the issuance of the building permit.

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

Co-Chair Doherty stated he is ok with that suggestion.

Mr. Bass stated to return with physical samples, materials including colors and patterns for the bricks and asked if they wanted to be more specific with what they are looking for them to return.

Co-Chair Doherty noted just the materials.

Mr. Lacombe asked if they would be able to have the meeting at his office due to the volume of materials.

Co-Chair Doherty stated they definitely want to see everything.

Co-Chair Hengen stated if they do an off-site meeting it will have to be open to the public.

Mr. Bass stated the applicant will return with physical samples of the materials of the building including color pallets and a lighting plan with architectural design guidelines and Main Street design guidelines.

Co-Chair Doherty agrees and Co-Chair Hengen seconded.

All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

Co-Chair Doherty asked to discuss the conditional use permit for height and the shadows.

Mr. Pollack stated building or structures that exceed the height limit to move up from 80 feet to 90 feet shall be designed to minimize shadow impacts and impacts to solar access to public parks and open spaces on adjacent buildings and properties to the extent feasible to accomplish the development program as approved by the Planning Board. The idea is the architectural design review committee to see what they have prepared in terms of the distinction of an 80-foot building shadow and an 89-foot building shadow so that they might comment to the Planning Board about whether or not they think it is a reasonable impact considering the value of the program for the project and the community.

Mr. Lacombe presented slides for summer solstice and winter solstice with different times in a day.

Mr. Pollack noted the roof top is a partial floor and the roof top height shadow is their own roof.

Co-Chair Doherty stated he feels this is acceptable based on architecture of the building and what they have done.

Co-Chair Hengen also noted the benefits of the project to Main Street and the city overall.

Member Thorpe asked if there is a way to state this does not set a precedent for future development of Main Street.

Co-Chair Doherty thinks with the conditions they put at the end of that is what does it saying the importance of the setback and the study made this a different condition.

Mr. Pollack stated conditional use permits are discretionary in nature and the discretion lies with the Planning Board.

Mr. Bass suggested to recommend to Planning Board to grant the conditional use permit approval as submitted.

Co-Chair Doherty noted it should say something about what they say in the study and setback of the building.

Co-Chair Hengen stated looking at letter “d” in the narrative and it talks about keeping the downtown district, positive contribution to architectural character. Those are things that do fall within the purview of architectural design review committee and should be expressed in the singular conditional use permit application that may now apply to future applications.

Co-Chair Hengen made a motion to recommend to the Planning Board to approve the conditional use permit with respect to the additional height with the rationale the design of the proposed development of the building was expressed in section “d” of the narrative with the downtown district and makes a positive

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

contribution to the architectural character of the city skyline and surrounding buildings. Additionally, the design of the redevelopment building makes it possible to repurpose the existing and adjacent Phenix Hall which would be renovated through a separate site plan filing. Co-Chair Doherty seconded the motion. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Pollack stated the conditional use permit considered by the Planning Board for impact on the dome view from interstate 93.

Mr. Lacombe presented views from interstate 93 at the speed limit.

Member Thorpe asked if the proposed views include the height of the architectural plans presented with the roof top restaurant and all of the parapets.

Mr. Pollack responded yes it does.

Co-Chair Hengen made a motion to recommend to the Planning Board to approve the conditional use permit application to allow partial obstruction of the state house dome as the overall redevelopment project is keeping with the downtown district and makes a positive contribution to the architectural character of the city skyline and surrounding buildings and in addition this particular redevelopment project makes it possible to repurpose the existing and adjacent Phenix Hall. Member Gentilhomme seconded the motion.

Discussion

Co-Chair Doherty stated he feels uneasy because that is not the exact building they are looking at and they do not have all of the information.

Member Thorpe noted it is tied to the height of what is proposed and they are going by the information they provided.

Member Proctor asked if the top floor is the restaurant.

Mr. Lacombe showed the location of the restaurant.

Member Gentilhomme stated this is written with the perspective of seeing the dome from the highway which is a little unreasonable because someone driving 60 to 70 miles per hour should drive down the road.

Co-Chair Doherty noted they are not writing the ordinance.

Member Gentilhomme asked when were the pictures taken.

Mr. Lacombe responded 2023.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if there is any further discussion and with none called for a vote.

With a vote of 5 in favor (Proctor, Gentilhomme, Thorpe, King and Hengen) and 1 opposed (Doherty) the motion passed.

- 6.2 Northpoint Engineering LLC, on behalf of Phenix Hall, LLC, requests an architectural design review recommendation as part of a major site plan application and certain waivers from the Site Plan Regulations for the construction of a 6-story addition and other site improvements at Tax Map 6443Z Lot 28, addressed as 2 Phenix Ave in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District. (2025-125) (PL-SPR-2025-0050)

Mr. Bass stated agenda item 6.2 is the same exact application less the two conditional use permit applications. Mr. Bass noted the committee can make the same recommendation as you made on the first application.

Co-Chair Hengen about the distinction other than the dome and the height are they looking at two different buildings.

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

Mr. Bass stated they are two separate properties and each need their own application.

Co-Chair Hengen stated all of the comments in the motion that was made in agenda item 6.1 would apply to agenda item 6.2.

Co-Chair Hengen made a motion to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted with the following conditions: the E&P Hotel building, the upper floor window and masonry pattern shall be adjusted to diminish the scale of the building; the windows are all recessed on the exterior and with expressed muntins; the trim details are to look red or stone on the building; the mechanical unit screen over the linking connector building shall not be translucent, glow, or call attention in any way; the bay bumpouts shall not be EIFS or stucko, but another material; and, prior to issuance of a building or construction, the applicant shall return to the Architectural Design Review Committee with physical samples of all materials for the buildings, including colors and patterns, and a lighting plan, which shall be in compliance with the Architectural Design Guidelines and Main Street Design Guide. Co-Chair Doherty seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

- 6.3 Nobis Group, on behalf of HP Hood, LLC, requests an architectural design review recommendation as part of a major site plan application for the construction of a new 4,800-square-foot wastewater pretreatment building, installation of multiple process tanks, and other associated site improvements at Tax Map 491Z, Lot 26, addressed as 330 North State Street in the Industrial (IN) District. (2025-137) (PL-SPR-2025-0054)

Garrett Seibert (330 N State St, Concord), Robert Kawonczyk (330 N State St, Concord) and Dan Cowles (330 N State St, Concord) are present to represent this application. Mr. Seibert handed document to the Committee and it will be at the end of the minutes. Mr. Seibert stated they are trying to reduce the load on the existing city sewer infrastructure. They are proposing a pretreatment plant which will help. Mr. Seibert pointed out the existing Hood building and the location of the new building. They would tie utilities into the new pretreatment building. It will be a 4800 square foot building and will have some process tanks off to the side. They are proposing three parking spaces.

Member King asked the heavily hatched area is that a steep slope going down.

Mr. Seibert responded yes, that is a steep slope.

Member Thorpe asked if it is descending.

Mr. Seibert responded correct.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if they are leveling it out.

Mr. Seibert responded yes, they are level it out and the steep slope will drop off on the perimeter. Abutting the project are two state owned properties. They did not propose any landscaping.

Co-Chair Doherty noted civil wise the building seems to be far enough back. It will come down to materials and the building architecture.

Member Thorpe asked if there are wetlands where the building is located.

Mr. Seibert responded no, there is a low-lying area in there. They had the wetlands delineated and there are no wetlands back there.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if it is a metal clad building.

Mr. Seibert responded correct.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if they would consider a darker color.

Mr. Seibert stated that is an option and would defer to Hood.

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

Mr. Cowles stated they do not have any objection to a color preference. They picked white because of the building that is there is made up of different material and most of it is white.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if Co-Chair Hengen is suggesting a gray tone.

Co-Chair Hengen responded yes gray or charcoal gray.

Mr. Seibert read a statement from the architect. Mr. Seibert stated the pretreatment of the single-story slab on gray pre-engineered metal building footprint of 60 feet by 80 feet for a total of 4800 square feet. The roof is a white standing seam insulated metal panel with one on twelve monoscope from the front of the building to the rear with a 22-foot, 10.5 inch and 18-foot eave height respectively. The building primary structural frame consists of steel columns and clear span beams which span north and south. The exterior walls will consist of white preform insulated metal siding panels with an eight-foot-high CMU block wall interior. The building will have three exterior single-entry main doors that will be white insulated coil with motorized operator.

Co-Chair Doherty noted the building is simple and the key is to down play it. Co-Chair Doherty suggested using darker grays.

Co-Chair Hengen suggested the doors be a contrasting color with the wall siding.

Member King suggested the same with the roof.

Mr. Seibert asked about contrasting colors on the roof as well.

Co-Chair Hengen stated just dark.

Member Thorpe asked about storm drainage so it does not wash out.

Mr. Seibert stated they submitted a storm water design with the application.

Man blue

Member Gentilhomme made motion to recommend that the Planning Board grant architectural design review approval as submitted with the condition that the siding of the building, doors, and tanks be made of a darker color, such as grey. Member King seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

- 6.4 The City of Concord requests a public hearing in accordance with RSA 674:54 for the renovation and construction of an approximate 18,000-square-foot building addition and associated site improvements for a new police station at Tax Map 583Z Lot 10, addressed as 4 Bouton Street in the Institutional (IS) District. (2025-138) (PL-SPR-2025-0055)

Beth Fenstermacher (41 Green St, Concord) and Will Gatchell (33 Jewell Ct, Portsmouth) are present to represent this application.

Ms. Fenstermacher stated they came before the Committee in June with a pulmonary consultation and they have updates on the building. City Council approved the project last week. They are on track for December Planning Board and then going out to bid end of January or early February. Then start construction in the spring. There is still some materials selection they are working on.

Mr. Gatchell stated they needed to update the curtain wall. The building is mid-century modern. The four materials they are looking at is the curtain wall element, metal siding, granite tile and ashlar fieldstone. Mr. Gatchell provided different views of the building submitted with the application materials. There is parking for the public, staff and secured parking. There are three different types of fence for screening. The north will have a typical metal fence. There will be a secure non-scale fence. The back will have a screening fence for the residences. The intent is to allow openness and not segregate.

Member Thorpe asked if the fence is on the property line.

Ms. Fenstermacher responded yes, there are houses that are 60 feet away and they have met all of the abutters to get feedback on the buffer.

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

Member Proctor is concerned about the type b fence being up at the street. Member Proctor suggested to have a type a fence and put against the parking so there is room for landscaping.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if they do that for security reasons so no one can climb over the fence.

Ms. Fenstermacher responded correct.

Mr. Gatchell stated the parking need exceeds what they have now and were trying to keep existing vegetation.

Member King left the meeting at 11:26 a.m.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if the materials are different from what they saw the last time.

Mr. Gatchell responded correct, the biggest material difference is the masonry. They were talking about a brick composition and as they explored that the coloration of the bricks they had access to compared to the fieldstone it went from warm to black. They could not get the color composition to be compatible. They have arrived at a pallet of ground face CMU with half height and the intention is to allow that line to be a lot more horizontal. It will have a primary composition of a single base color the darker gray and then have a two percent intermingling of accent colors.

Co-Chair Doherty asked for a sample of the blue.

Mr. Gatchell provided the blue sample and stated it is an ACM panel that renders close to the spandrel of glass that is existing.

Co-Chair Doherty asked about the mechanical screen and what is the material.

Mr. Gatchell stated it is a corrugated metal panel that is similar to the penthouse.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if it is a lighter color.

Mr. Gatchell responded yes.

Member Proctor asked if the ACM panel is high gloss.

Mr. Gatchell stated the blue is not as glossy as the spandrel panel.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if the wall now will have more relief.

Mr. Gatchell responded yes, the windows will have a shadow line.

Co-Chair Doherty noted looking at the north and east and asked if the lower material changes at the corner.

Mr. Gatchell responded it does once you turn from the north corner it becomes the ACM panel to keep cost under control and to allow the envelope to be as simple as it could be.

Co-Chair Doherty asked how does the ACM react with the ground.

Mr. Gatchell stated right now the ACM is going to the ground he will make a note on that detail.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if they are making any changes to the existing front entrance.

Mr. Gatchell stated it is a replacement in kind. They are not touching the fieldstone and replacing all of the glazing in kind.

Member Proctor asked what is the entry wall now.

Mr. Gatchell stated this is a curtain wall. They have integrated site elements with cast benches and plaques.

Co-Chair Doherty asked what action needs to be taken today as this is a city project.

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

Mr. Bass stated this Committee as well as the Planning Board do not approve this project. However, you can provide comments. You could entertain a motion to provide certain comments or have no comments on the application.

Co-Chair Doherty has a concern with the north and east elevation and that is ACM all the way down to the ground.

Member Thorpe suggested to soften the security fencing along the egress and restricted parking area. Member Thorpe would like to see more use of evergreen and a mix would be realistic.

Mr. Gatchell did not include the planting plans.

Member Thorpe asked if there is a reason why there are no trees and islands inside the restrictive parking.

Mr. Gatchell stated how compact this entire area is with the garage bays so they can maneuver vehicles as needed.

Co-Chair Doherty made a motion to provide the following comments to the Planning Board: the MCM on the back of the building and the connection between the north and east elevation corner should be looked at and detailed a little more; the landscape and fencing in the area near the corner of the building and along Bouton Street should be looked at for visual appearance and so as to not take on a fortress appearance; the roof hatch and materials should be looked at, including if the guard is necessary; and, a mix of evergreen trees should be added to the landscaping. Co-Chair Hengen seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

7. Other Business

7.1 Approval of 2026 Meeting Schedule

Co-Chair Hengen made motion to approve the 2026 meeting schedule. Member Gentilhomme seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

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

7.3 Adjourn

Co-Chair Doherty moved, seconded by Co-Chair Hengen, to adjourn the meeting at 12:06 p.m. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Krista Tremblay

Krista Tremblay

Administrative Technician III

[illegible]

H.P. HOOD LLC.
CONCORD WASTEWATER PRETREATMENT PROJECT

**PRETREATMENT BUILDING
EXTERIOR PERSPECTIVE RENDERING**

CITY OF CONCORD MERRIMACK COUNTY, NEW HAMPSHIRE

B Barton & Loguidice
&L 443 Electronics Parkway
Liverpool, NY 13088

**REVIEW ONLY
NOT FOR
CONSTRUCTION**

Date
NOVEMBER 2025

AS SHOWN

Sheet Number

A200

Project Number

499.024.003