

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
February 3, 2026 Minutes

The Architectural Design Review Committee (ADRC) held its regular monthly meeting on February 3, 2026, in Council Chambers, at 37 Green St, Concord, NH.

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

Absent: None

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 Hengen called the meeting to order at 8:31 a.m.

2. Minutes – Approve meeting minutes from January 6, 2026

Co-Chair Doherty moved, seconded by Member King, to approve the meeting minutes from January 6, 2025, as written. All in favor. The motion passed.

3. Staff Memorandum

4. Sign Applications

- 4.1 Advantage Signs, on behalf of Wild Bloom Home and TwoKph LLC requests an architectural design review recommendation for a new 54-square-foot externally illuminated building wall sign (SP-0701-2026) to replace an existing building wall sign at 97 Storrs St in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District. (PL-ADR-2026-0152) (2026-003)

Josh Messinger (128 Hall St Ste C, Concord) is present to represent this application. Mr. Messinger stated it will be acrylic letters raised off a panel.

Member Gentilhomme arrived at 8:33 a.m.

Co-Chair Hengen asked about the external illumination if they are existing lights.

Mr. Messinger stated that is not something they are doing. The electrician will do it will be three goose necks shining down over the sign.

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

- 4.2 Advantage Signs and The Eleventh Letter Writing Gallery, on behalf of Associated Enterprises Inc, requests an architectural design review recommendation for a new 6.25-square-foot non-illuminated projecting building wall sign (SP-0702-2026) at 146 North Main St in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District. (PL-ADR-2026-0151) (2026-002)

Josh Messinger (128 Hall St Ste C, Concord) and Jocelyn Winn (146 N Main St, Concord) is present to represent this application. Mr. Messinger stated Mrs. Winn is the owner of the studio. They are doing a PVC sign with a graphic hanging off of a bracket.

Member King asked what is the writing gallery.

Ms. Winn stated it functions like an art gallery but the art has to have a writing component to it and she teaches writing courses. They host literary events.

Member Thorpe asked if there is a way it can be a little bigger.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
February 3, 2026 Minutes

Mr. Tremblay responded no, it is the maximum size.

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

5. Building Permit Applications

- 5.1 Alex Stoye, 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)

Mr. Bass stated the applicant has provided revised elevations.

Alex Stoye (56 Church St, Concord) is present to represent this application. Mr. Stoye stated they choose a standard aluminum store front door. They are replacing the existing door with a window. They decided to match the panel instead of doing a full window.

Member Proctor asked for the first-floor windows the upper transom and lower pane if they will thicken the bar in between them.

Mr. Stoye stated they are working on window design and the approval needed for today is for the door.

Mr. Bass stated the whole thing was continued at the last meeting because there was no door information. Mr. Bass noted Mr. Stoye would like to get a recommendation so on February 18th the Planning Board can approve this application.

Member Thorpe asked if the approval of the door.

Mr. Bass suggested to think about the whole thing and not a partial approval.

Member Savage noted they can make recommendations based on the rendering that go forward to Planning Board.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if this is replacement sash going in.

Mr. Stoye responded yes.

Co-Chair Hengen asked will it have an exterior mutton or is the mutton between the panes of glass.

Mr. Stoye stated the test windows they submitted is between the panes.

Member Gentilhomme noted they would want it on the outside.

Mr. Stoye stated that will be considered in the budgeting. Mr. Stoye stated their goal is to make the building look like as close as then can to the way it looked when it was built.

Co-Chair Hengen stated it is such a simply designed building. The window sash and pattern is a key design element. Co-Chair Hengen asked if they considered making the sash a deep green or maroon both which is historically significant.

Mr. Stoye stated they mocked it up in red, maroon, green and black. Mr. Stoye thought they all looked nice. The historic renderings of the building were tan for the color of the windows.

Co-Chair Hengen noted the darker colors would have been appropriate for the era.

Member Thorpe noted they might give it a pop for the new establishment.

Member Proctor stated he is fine with any of the colors.

Member Savage is happy with any of the colors.

Member Gentilhomme asked if the door will be all glass and the same color of the window.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
February 3, 2026 Minutes

Mr. Stoyle responded yes.

Member Thorpe stated the simplicity of the building with the demonstrated window patterning looks sharp.

Mr. Stoyle noted when you introduce a darker color there is a row of panels that stand out and with a tan color it matches the brick.

Member King agreed.

Member Gentilhomme made a motion to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted for the door relocation replacement and a strong suggestion that all new windows have exterior mutton pattern and that the horizontal divider between the first-floor windows and the horizontal divider between the large pane of glass and the transom lights be wide as shown on this rendering included with the revised application. Member Savage seconded.

Discussion

Member Thorpe asked if the door height is the minimum door height six eight.

Mr. Stoyle stated that is a good question and it might be a little taller than that.

Member Thorpe asked if it could be reduced a little bit to put more transom definition between the transom and the door.

Mr. Stoyle stated he can look into that.

Member Thorpe noted by an inch or two.

Co-Chair Doherty noted one of the other things with the door if you look at the size of it with the brick running down both sides between the columns and the door. Co-Chair Doherty asked if that is really what they want.

Mr. Stoyle asked this little reveal.

Co-Chair Doherty responded yes.

Co-Chair Hengen noted the opening goes from plaster to plaster.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if that would be trim or will they extend the door to fill that opening.

Mr. Stoyle stated my guess is trim as part of the door frame.

Member Proctor stated they could put in an oversized door and that would be cleaner.

Co-Chair Doherty suggested to note when they are out there.

Mr. Bass wanted to make it clear that the strong recommendations are essentially suggestions to the applicant.

Member Gentilhomme stated yes, they are and knows the applicant is interested in their feedback.

Mr. Stoyle stated he appreciates that and wants the building to look like it did when it was built.

Co-Chair Hengen stated it is important for them to convey to the Planning Board what the optimal solution would be and it is not a condition.

Mr. Stoyle responded yes.

All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

6. Site Plan Applications

6.1 Wilcox & Barton, Inc, on behalf of Daval Realty Associates LLC, and Banks Chevrolet, requests

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
February 3, 2026 Minutes

architectural design review approval for a major site plan application for the construction of a parking lot and other site improvements at Tax Map 782Z Lot 8, addressed as 234 Airport Road in the Highway Commercial (CH), Single-Family Residential (RS), and Open Space Residential (RO) Districts. (2025-134) (PL-SPR-2025-0052)

Erin Lambert (2 Home Ave, Concord) is present to represent this application. Ms. Lambert noted there is no building. There is a new parking lot planned. It is an existing gravel parking lot. This property was owned by Sanel and then purchased by Banks. The drainage system has reached the end of its life. The benefit of this plan is that they are formalizing and will be putting curb along the road, sidewalk along the frontage of the project, formal curb cuts, striping parking and decreasing the impervious surface. There is a landscape plan and they are putting perimeter trees. This a commercial or non-residential zone that abuts a residential zone and they are required to do an enhanced buffer. The purpose of the buffer is to reduce headlights that pass on a residential property. They are going to the Zoning Board asking for a variance not to have to put that between the two because Banks would like to continue to allow users of the ball park to use the parking lot. The plans do show a fence because the berm does not work and planting are cost prohibited. If the variance is granted they will remove it. They are providing screening in one corner at the back of a residential property. It requires an AoT permit and they are working through now. All of the storm water will be infiltrated. Ms. Lambert stated this is for employee parking.

Member Proctor asked about the other two portions on the right.

Ms. Lambert stated this right now is parking for vehicles that are in service or getting ready to be sold. The rest is wooded.

Member Thorpe asked where is the storm water going.

Ms. Lambert responded in the ground. There are a couple of catch basins with underground infiltration.

Member Thorpe asked if it will be going into the city sewer.

Ms. Lambert responded no, it will go into the ground through an infiltration gallery. It is an underground series of chambers that will bring the water into the ground. Ms. Lambert noted this project will take a couple million gallons off the city's system.

Member Thorpe asked about the plantings going in the northeast corner.

Ms. Lambert stated they are using the option of a fence.

Member Thorpe asked if the circles they are looking at are trees.

Ms. Lambert stated correct.

Member Thorpe asked the species of the trees.

Ms. Lambert stated they are a mix of deciduous and evergreen.

Co-Chair Hengen noted on the plan it is noted they all deciduous.

Mr. Bass stated the regulations push for shade trees especially for parking lots to maximize shade in the summer.

Ms. Lambert stated this property is home to one of the pitch pine groves. In doing the parking lot they are taking down four trees that are qualified as pitch pine.

Member Savage noted the snow storage on the west side is it intended to be between the trees.

Ms. Lambert stated they will store on site or they will have to remove it.

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

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
February 3, 2026 Minutes

7. Other Business

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

Co-Chair Hengen noted full scale window replacement does not trigger design review and asked if that is worthy of taking another look at and is that in the site plan regulations.

Mr. Bass stated in the ordinance it has all of the thresholds on if it goes to Architectural Design Review or Planning Board.

Co-Chair Hengen suggested to have a parking lot of items that have been flagged when the ordinance is being revised.

7.2 Adjourn

Co-Chair Hengen moved, seconded by Member King, to adjourn the meeting at 9:22 a.m. All in favor.
The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Krista Tremblay

Krista Tremblay

Administrative Technician III