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

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

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

Absent: Co-Chair Elizabeth Durfee Hengen, Member Claude Gentilhomme, 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 8:30 a.m.

2. Minutes – Approve meeting minutes from February 3, 2026

Member Savage moved, seconded by Member Thorpe, to approve the meeting minutes from February 3, 2025, as written. All in favor. The motion passed.

3. Staff Memorandum

4. Sign Applications

4.1 Jake Duggan, on behalf of Yamas Greek Eatery and Laurie J Sanborn Revocable Trust, requests an architectural design review recommendation for a new 36-square-foot externally illuminated building wall sign (SP-0703-2026) to replace an existing awning sign at 25-27 South Main St in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District. (PL-ADR-2026-0159)

No one is present to represent this application.

Member Savage noted the sign is not as wide as the four over hanging illuminating lamps. Member Savage stated the other sign had two businesses and this one with the lights seems small.

Mr. Tremblay stated for square footage that is all they can get.

Member Savage stated there is no much they can do because it is not an awning it is a sign at its maximum square footage.

Member Thorpe asked if it would help to have more of a black outline to the white.

Member Savage asked if a suggestion to have the same color blue that the font is to have the trim or border to match.

Member Thorpe noted there is a taupe color around the letters and if the white where just taupe there would be some integration between the building, the window fenestration and the facade. Member Thorpe stated right now the white just pops.

Member Proctor suggested to make it a black background with white lettering.

Member Savage noted if you go down the street there is a blue sign with white lettering. Member Savage suggested to have a boarder that buffered the red brick to the white or taupe.

Member Thorpe suggested a blue border, taupe background and blue lettering.

Member Savage suggested a beige or a cream color.

Co-Chair Doherty liked the crisp, cleanness and modernist with no extra detail. Co-Chair Doherty noted the only part that bothers him is the gooseneck with some of the light will be on the sign and some on the brick.

Member Proctor noted there are goosenecks on the pilaster.

Member Thorpe stated if the white were toned down then it would not be so much of a contrast with the brick and it would integrate better.

Co-Chair Doherty noted whatever they do as a motion they would recommend as a suggestion because there are a lot of different ideas for the sign.

Member Savage asked if there is one thing that is agreed upon is the contrast with the bright white overlay the brick. Then they could say suggestions to either or meaning if they chose to put a blue border around it that buffers it or a different tone to not be so stark white to be cream, beige or taupe.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if they can do a band and an outline around.

Mr. Tremblay stated they need to stay within the square footage. This is a sign that is in Plymouth and Salem that are being used.

Member Thorpe stated this is in a historic district.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if a taupe or tan would tie better to the sign.

Member Savage would be ok with that.

Member Thorpe would recommend they consider a background color more in keeping with the mortar color so there is some integration between the brick and that and keep the sign the same portion and blue letters. Then to tone down the bright white to match the border color.

Co-Chair stated there is a motion and do we have a second.

Mr. Bass asked if someone seconded.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if there is a second.

Member Savage asked if the color is to be more matchy matchy to the border.

Mr. Bass called for a second on the motion.

Co-Chair Doherty seconded for the matter of discussion.

Discussion

Mr. Bass stated trying to consolidate the motion going forward they can consider recommend the Planning Board approve the application submitted with the following condition the white background does not blend with the building architectural features but to be toned down to match the mortar color and darker building features by making the white background more of a cream or taupe color in accordance with section 5.4A of the design review guidelines.

Member Savage asked if it should be a condition or a recommendation.

Mr. Bass stated everything they do is a recommendation to the Planning Board if it is approved with a condition it has to happen or they can recommend they approve it with a suggestion that is optional to the applicant.

Member Thorpe suggested to use whatever is more firm.

Member Savage stated that is a condition.

Mr. Bass suggested to revise the motion, there was no motion, to make it what they want.

Member Thorpe amended motion to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted with the condition that the white background shall be toned down to match the mortar color and darker building features by making the white background more of a cream or tope color to blend into the buildings architectural features in accordance with Section 5.4(A) of the Design Review Guidelines. Co-

Chair Doherty seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

4.2 NEOPCO Signs, on behalf of Prickly Porcupine, Capital Plaza Concord, LLC, and Foxfire Property Management Inc, requests an architectural design review recommendation for a new 4.5-square-foot non-illuminated projecting blade sign (SP-0704-2026) to be installed on an existing sign bracket at 57 N Main St in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District. (PL-ADR-2026-0153) (2026-004)

Glen Schadlick (5 Crosby St, Concord) is present to represent this application. Mr. Schadlick stated this is a new business going in the back of Capital Plaza. This is an existing bracket. This is the branding of their business on the sign and it is double sided.

Co-Chair Doherty stated the sign integrates with the curve in the bracket.

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.

4.3 Advantage Signs, on behalf of Nicholson Letourneau, PLLC, and 58 NSS Property, LLC, requests an architectural design review recommendation for a new 8.66-square-foot non-illuminated freestanding sign (SP-0706-2026) to replace an existing free-standing sign panel at 58 North State Street in the Civic Performance (CVP) District. (PL-ADR-2026-0156) (2026-008)

Amy Culherson (58 N State St, Concord) is present to represent this application.

Member Savage stated it is simple and clean.

Member Savage made a motion. Member Proctor seconded.

Discussion

Co-Chair Doherty stated that looks different than the rendering with height proportions.

Member Thorpe stated it looks like it is flat with the top of the granite in the picture and raised above in the photograph.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if this is in place or a rendering they are looking at.

Mr. Tremblay stated it is a rendering.

Ms. Culherson stated it is in place of the Nicholson sign to add the new attorney.

Mr. Bass noted one of the rendering the top of the sign is a top of the granite posts and there is another rendering that has the top of the sig flush with the granite posts.

Ms. Culherson stated it will replace the other sign using the same posts and it will be about two square feet larger than the other sign in same location.

Member Proctor does not have a problem with either.

Ms. Culherson stated it is going from 18.65 inches to 26 inches.

Member Thorpe does not mind the raising of the middle.

Member Savage suggested to use the same brackets and then they are equally distributing the height difference between the top and the bottom.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if the motion still stands.

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

4.4 Tyler Fish, on behalf of Concord Clothworks and Sheep Davis Flex, LLC, requests an architectural design review recommendation for a new 15-square-foot non-illuminated building wall sign (SP-0708-2026) at 248 Sheep Davis Rd Bldg 1 in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District. (PL-ADR-2026-0158)

(2026-010)

No one is present for this application.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if the sign proportions need to be like that because it feels like it is squishing on side and there is a lot of space on the top and bottom.

Member Savage asked if he would like two more inches on each side.

Co-Chair Doherty suggested to keep same over all area and adjust the proportions.

Member Thorpe stated it is tight on the ends on the side and too much space.

Member Proctor stated it might be an existing box.

Member Thorpe asked if it is an existing bracket.

Mr. Tremblay stated it is not an existing bracket.

Member Proctor made a suggestion to change to 68 by 30.

Co-Chair Doherty stated it is hard to see what it would be and suggested the white space around the logo be more proportional.

Member Thorpe suggested to have less on top and bottom.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if committee if they are all in agreement that the sign feels weird with too much white space on the top and bottom.

Member Thorpe stated it feels crushed and does not confirm with the portion of the glazing in the window.

Member Proctor asked how much area do they have.

Mr. Tremblay stated they are at their max and can change the font on the sign.

Mr. Bass suggested the make a recommendation the sign be elongated while maintain the same area and state the benefits.

Member Thorpe made a motion to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted with the condition that the sign shall be elongated to reduce the preponderance of white above and below the sign as presented while maintaining the same total area of the sign. The font may be adjusted larger as a result if they wish. Member Proctor seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

4.5 Roy McCandless, on behalf of McCandless Law Firm and Roy S McCandless ESQ, PLLC, requests architectural design review recommendations for a new 15-square-foot non-illuminated freestanding sign panel (SP-0722-2026) to replace an existing free standing sign panel, and a new 1.25-square-foot non-illuminated projecting hanging sign (SP-0723-2026) to replace an existing hanging sign at 8 Court Street in the Civic Performance (CVP) District. (PL-ADR-2026-0155) (2026-007)

Roy McCandless is present to represent this application. Mr. McCandless stated he just purchased the building and there are two signs. Mr. McCandless wants to replace the sign and there is a small sign on the porch.

Member Savage asked if using the existing posts.

Mr. McCandless responded exactly.

Member Thorpe asked if there will be a subtenant for the space below the line under scoring the name McCandless.

Mr. McCandless stated there might be as there are two rooms he could rent and would like to have that

option.

Member Thorpe asked if the McCandless law firm font size could be a little bit bigger. The line that separate the black surround that includes McCandless Law Firm it is lift so there is clearly another space.

Member Savage asked why increase the font size and would that take away real estate from second professional office name beneath that.

Member Thorpe stated there is extra left and right margin that would not restrict so the second name is a little less pinched.

Member Proctor stated he will have to come back if he changes it and suggested to leave it alone.

Co-Chair Doherty stated there are nice simple colors and there is a nice element that ties to the building.

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

4.6 Missy Vannest, on behalf of Magpie Collective and Harold E and Judith A Ekstrom, requests an architectural design review recommendation for a new 2-square-foot non-illuminated freestanding sign panel (SP-0726-2026) to be added to an existing freestanding sign at 15 Green St in the Civic Performance (CVP) District. (PL-ADR-2026-0160) (2026-012)

No one is present to represent this application.

Mr. Bass stated they are adding a tenant sign panel onto the sign.

Member Proctor 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 None

6. Site Plan Applications

6.1 TFMoran Inc, on behalf of 94 Manchester St, LLC, requests architectural design review recommendation as part of a major site plan application for a new 4-story, 14,768-square-foot footprint building and other site improvements at Tax Map 781Z Lots 12, 12-1, 12-2 and 12-3, addressed as 94-98 Manchester Street in the Highway Commercial (HC) and Office Park Performance (OCP) Districts. (2026-005) (PL-SPR-2026-0057)

Chris Rice (170 Commerce Way Suite 102, Portsmouth) and Jason Diorio (1359 Hooksett Rd, Hooksett) are present to represent this application.

Mr. Rice stated it is listed as a couple different tax map and lot numbers because the lot is a condominium right now and it will be dissolved as a part of this project. They are proposing a four-story hotel with 116 rooms. There are associated parking, site improvements, landscaping, drainage improvements and utilities.

Co-Chair Doherty asked about the site and the existing Key Collision sign where is that located and are they moving it.

Mr. Rice stated the hotel sites back beyond the setback line and they will have to take a look at it.

Mr. Bass stated staff did note that the free-standing sign was not on the site plan and is a comment that will be in the staff report.

Mr. Rice stated right now there are three condominium lots and that will all be merged into one lot.

Member Savage asked about moving the Key Collision sign to the other side of the driveway to be

discussed before a discussion with the Planning Board.

Co-Chair Doherty stated it appears to be a sign added on the other side of the entry.

Mr. Rice stated he thinks they proposed a sign on the other side of the entry. Mr. Rice stated they can always flip it to have Key Collision on the other side.

Member Thorpe stated it makes sense to put the sign related to the building the other way around and reverse them. Member Thorpe asked if there is on site surface water collection.

Mr. Rice stated everything is contained on site based on the soils and drainage analysis.

Co-Chair Doherty asked for the location of snow storage.

Mr. Rice stated it is at the edges of the pavement area.

Member Savage asked if this is meeting the city standards for trees and spacing.

Mr. Bass stated one of the waivers was to provide one planting for every 2000 square feet from what is required by code. The site plan requires one for every 1000. Mr. Bass stated one was revised to reduce the amount and the change never followed through. Mr. Bass they are requesting a waiver for the required amount of trees based on the zoning ordinance.

Member Thorpe asked if a shrub is equivalent to a tree.

Mr. Bass responded no.

Member Thorpe asked about lighting.

Mr. Rice showed the locations of the light poles and there are building mounted lights.

Member Thorpe asked if they are the fixtures shooting down.

Mr. Rice responded yes.

Co-Chair Doherty asked to look at the architecture.

Mr. Diorio stated it is a duel brand hotel with 116 keys. They try to capture an extended stay and a short term stay under the same roof, using the same front desk, breakfast and same lounge area. They will have all the same amenities and tapping two markets. It is a new concept. They are at 58,610 square feet. There are some rooms on the first floor of the Manchester Street side. The elevators will be in the middle and the building is delineated on the left and right between extended stay and non. There will be signage and finish differences so you will know where to go. The outside of the building there is a main entrance in the middle will have a canopy. There is a New England feel with brick and then a mixture of fiber cement siding with bands breaking up the floors.

Member Thorpe asked if they are doing a full mansard.

Mr. Diorio stated there is no mansard just parapets that stick up a little beyond the structure of the roof. The darker color will be shake siding.

Co-Chair Doherty stated the guest rooms are closer to the street and that is the noisy side of the building and the lobby is on the quieter side of the building. Co-Chair Doherty asked if that is intentional.

Mr. Diorio stated they can look at that and he will review with ownership.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if the extended rooms are slightly bigger based on the window space.

Mr. Diorio stated that is correct, they are oversized windows to allow natural light in and they are operable to open a minimum of four inches per code.

Co-Chair Doherty noted it looks like the lobby the windows are a different pattern than the rest of the building.

Mr. Diorio responded correct.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if this has happened in other places with success.

Mr. Diorio responded yes, and they can also look at grouping some of the windows.

Member Thorpe asked if this is part of a prototype that is put everywhere.

Mr. Diorio stated the quest rooms are a prototype with custom finishes. If you go to another hotel of this brand it will be very different.

Co-Chair Doherty asked about the end of the hallway and if there are no windows.

Mr. Diorio stated there are no windows.

Member Thorpe stated there is an opportunity because it is an open corridor.

Mr. Diorio stated if the board was interested they can add them to the end of the corridor.

Member Thorpe asked about adding a large window to add natural light to a bleak hallway.

Mr. Rice Diorio stated there will be lights in the corridor.

Co-Chair Doherty asked the location of the mechanical equipment.

Mr. Diorio stated they sit over the corridor and there will be one on each side.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if there will be screening for the mechanical equipment.

Mr. Diorio stated if it is required absolutely.

Co-Chair Doherty asked how tall they will be.

Mr. Diorio stated six to seven feet.

Mr. Bass stated any roof mechanical equipment will be required to provide screening.

Member Thorpe asked the location of the meters and the utilities.

Mr. Rice stated the meter will be along the wall.

Member Savage noted the deliveries will be delivered in the back.

Mr. Diorio stated the deliveries will be made by small box trucks.

Co-Chair Doherty asked what the maximum height for the building.

Mr. Diorio responded 45 feet to roof structure.

Mr. Bass stated they are at the maximum height. Mr. Bass noted they measure to the supporting structure.

Mr. Diorio stated material will be brick.

Member Thorpe asked what is the mortar color.

Mr. Diorio responded it is a suede color. The windows and openings will be a standard black. There are two different color fiber cement and the darker is on the fourth floor and the light color will be on the lower floors.

Member Thorpe noted there are a lot of modular designs in Concord and they are all high contrast. It is not integrating with the civic structure of our city. They are powerful and contrary to the city urbanism. Member Thorpe suggested to reduce the contrast.

Member Savage agreed and stated she does not care for the contrast of the darker gray with the gray color and have it be more tonal.

Co-Chair Doherty stated the dark material is really too dark.

Member Thorpe asked if they would consider the brick columns that are dividing to have a slightly lower parapet to break up the façade.

Co-Chair Doherty noted the canopy over the entry looks as wide as they are changing clap board.

Member Thorpe asked if it will curve.

Mr. Diorio stated it is not curved.

Member Thorpe asked for a recap.

Mr. Bass grabbed a few points to highlight. Recommend the Planning Board grant architectural design review approval subject to the following conditions: the plan shall clearly show if the pre-existing free-standing sign to the west of the driveway, or if the freestanding sign will be relocated to the east of the driveway as shown on the site plan; landscaping shall be relocated to allow greater snow storage capacity in the back of the project area; windows shall be added to the end of the corridor in the stair areas to illuminate the corridors without having glare with a window being added directly at the end and will add windows to the northern and southern elevations; the darker siding shown on the rendering shall be lightened to more closely reflect the color of the material sample presented during the public hearing, which appears to be less contrasting than the rendering appears to show.

Member Proctor noted darker siding not shingles.

Co-Chair Doherty asked what is the material.

Member Thorpe stated hardy siding.

Mr. Diorio stated it is fiber cement.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if it is clap board.

Mr. Diorio stated the lighter color is intended to be clap board and the darker color will be a shake shingle.

Member Savage noted to have the mechanical roof to have screening.

Mr. Bass stated roof top mechanical equipment shall be shown on the renderings.

Member Thorpe stated they talked about a tree on the north face of the stair hall windows.

Mr. Bass noted there was an ever green there.

Member Thorpe stated he is not sure if an ever green is the right choice and maybe a larger leaf tree on either end would help anchor it.

Co-Chair Doherty noted exterior lighting to pay attention to night view and ornamental lighting.

Member Proctor suggested to do siding instead of the shakes.

Member Savage made a motion to recommend the Planning Board grant Architectural Design Review Approval subject to the following conditions: the plan shall clearly show if the existing freestanding sign will remain to the west of the driveway, or if the freestanding sign will be relocated to the east of the driveway as shown on the site plan; landscaping shall be relocated to allow greater snow storage capacity in the back of the project area; windows shall be added to the end of the corridor in the stair areas to illuminate the corridors without having glare with a window being added directly at the end and will add windows to the northern and southern elevations; the darker siding shown on the rendering shall be lightened to more closely reflect the color of the material sample presented during the public hearing, which appears to be less contrasting than the rendering appears to show; rooftop mechanical equipment shall be shown on the elevations and the required screening added accordingly; the white spruce at the northern end of the building shall be replaced with a larger shade leaf tree and a shade leaf tree shall be added in the southern end of the building, closer to the building or the small landscape bumpout;

additional trees shall be added in the south western border of the property line and building to break up the large shrub line, provided they can maintain separation with the utilities; exterior lighting shall be added to the elevations and a night rendering shall be included; the darker shake material shall be changed to be a siding material so that it doesn't portray to be a false mansard roof; the non-public egress doors at the bottom of the stairs shall be blended with the brick, and not painted so as to stand out; no meters shall be added to the front of the building and shall remain in southern end of the building; and, a strong suggestion to revise the lobby window fenestration to better reflect the function of the space. Member Thorpe seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

6.2 The City of Concord requests a public hearing in accordance with RSA 675:54 for the construction of an approximate 20,400 square foot skate park and associated site improvements at Tax Map 64Z Lot 2, addressed as 19 Loudon Road in the Institutional (IS) District. (2026-018) (PL-SPR-2026-0058)

David Gill (14 Canterbury Rd, Concord) is present to discuss this application. Mr. Gill stated they are looking to renovate the current existing skate park moving from the rivers edge toward the corner. This is part of a larger master plan. Moving forward with the skate park portion because they have a grant and fundraising for the rest. It will be a multimillion-dollar improvement and focus is on the skate park. The existing is around 15,000 square feet and the new will be 20,400 square feet. They are proposing in a place of the old fire training grounds. There will be some drainage. Mr. Gill stated this will bring more activity to the park. Mr. Gill stated they did a traffic study. They have added trees on the back.

Member Savage asked if there will be a designated time the lights will be on or off.

Mr. Gill stated the park is open now seven a.m. to eleven p.m. and the existing skate park is not lit.

Member Thorpe asked if there is a public sidewalk for access.

Mr. Gill stated there is a sidewalk on both sides of Loudon Rd.

Member Savage asked about the trees.

Mr. Gill stated they are working on selection of trees and some will provide shade.

Co-Chair Doherty thanked Mr. Gill for his time.

Mr. Gill thanked everyone for their time on the committee and appreciated everything they do.

7. Other Business

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

7.2 Adjourn

Member Savage moved, seconded by Member Thorpe, to adjourn the meeting at 10:52 a.m. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Krista Tremblay

Krista Tremblay
Administrative Technician III