City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
May 5, 2026 Minutes

The Architectural Design Review Committee (ADRC) held its regular monthly meeting on May 5, 2026, in Council Chambers, at 37 Green St, Concord, NH.

Attendees: Co-Chair Elizabeth Durfee Hengen, Member Claude Gentilhomme, Member Douglas Proctor, Member Ron King,

Absent: Co-Chair Jay Doherty, Alternate Member Amanda Savage and Member Merle Thorpe

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 8:32 a.m.

2. Minutes – Approve meeting minutes from March 31, 2026

Member Gentilhomme moved, seconded by Member Proctor, to approve the meeting minutes from March 31, 2026, as written. All in favor. The motion passed.

3. Staff Memorandum

4. Sign Applications

4.1 Advantage Signs, on behalf of New Hampshire Retirement System, requests an architectural design review recommendation for a new 37.2-square-foot internally illuminated building wall sign (SP-0746-2026) at 80 Commercial St in the Opportunity Corridor Performance (OCP) District. (2026-030) (PL-ADR-2026-0171). (2026-031) (PL-CUP-2026-0109)

Josh Messinger (128 Hall St, Concord) is present to represent this application. Mr. Messinger stated there is a set of channel letters that will go on the side of the building.

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

4.2 Wall Street Dental Group, PLLC, on behalf of 16 Wall St LLC, and Wall Street Dental Group, requests an architectural design review recommendation for a new 8.81-square-foot externally illuminated freestanding sign (SP-0755-2026) to replace an existing freestanding sign, at 16 Wall Street in the Civic Performance (CVP) District. (2026-032) (PL-ADR-2026-0172)

Denise Wilkinson (16 Wall St, Concord) is present to represent this application. They are replacing the existing sign with a new sign. It will be same footprint. The lighting that exists on the side of the building will remain.

Member King asked if street number is big enough for the fire department.

Mr. Tremblay responded yes.

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

4.3 Green Bear Signs and Graphic, LLC, on behalf of Flomac Limited Partnership, and Back Nine, requests an architectural design review recommendation for a new 35-square-foot internally illuminated building wall sign (SP-0759-2026) at 8 Loudon Rd in the Gateway Performance

(GWP) District. (2026-036) (PL-ADR-2026-0174)

No one is present to represent this application.

Member King asked what is back be nine.

Mr. Tremblay responded it is a golf simulator company.

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

4.4 Merrimack County Savings Bank/NH Mutual Bancorp, on behalf of Capitol Street Associates and Ransmeier & Spellman, and NH Trust, requests architectural design review approvals for two new non-illuminated building walls signs of 18.5-square-feet (SP-0760-2026) and 23.75-square-feet (SP-0761-2026), to replace two existing building wall signs at 1 Capitol St in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District. (2026-037) (PL-ADR-2026-0175)

Co-Chair Hengen recused due to being part owner of the building. Co-Chair Hengen noted this means there is not a quorum for this application.

Mr. Bass stated they can hear the item and the committee will not make a recommendation on the application.

Alison Whynot (24 NH Rte 25, Meredith) is present to represent this application. Ms. Whynot stated they have updated their logo and they are looking to change the sign in the same location on the front and the side of the building. It will be the same size with an updated logo.

Member King asked if the number 97 is not a part of that.

Ms. Whynot responded correct.

Mr. Bass suggested to not have discussion on the item when there is not a quorum.

No recommendation due to lack of quorum. Will have a public hearing at the May 20, 2026 Planning Board.

Co-Chair Hengen returned to the room.

4.5 Spectrum Signs and Graphics, on behalf of B & L Transmissions, LLC, and 603 Bar-B-Q, requests an architectural design review recommendation for a new 42-square-foot internally illuminated free standing sign panel (SP-0762-2026), to replace an existing freestanding sign panel, at 388 Loudon Rd in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District. (2026-039) (PL-ADR-2026-0177)

Michael Gallagher (97 Eddy Rd #4, Manchester) is present to represent this application. They are looking to reface an existing pylon sign on the corner with the two faces of the sign.

Co-Chair Hengen stated the application has an image that has hours indicated until sold out.

Mr. Gallagher stated that was a temporary sign.

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

Discussion

Co-Chair Hengen stated it is far higher and hard to read as it is close to 18 feet high.

Member King asked what does it mean smoke free or die.

Mr. Gallagher stated it is a play on words. They use large smokers for the meat and with live free or die he wanted to combine that to give the feel of Texas BBQ to a New Hampshire BBQ.

Member King asked if it is plain wood around the outside.

Mr. Gallagher stated it is a printed texture and using a retainer for the panel sign. That is a direct printed wooden texture.

Member King asked if it will fade.

Mr. Gallagher responded no, they use UV ink.

All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

4.6 Classic Signs Inc. LLC, on behalf of GMX-RP-SCU-Concord LLC, Dundee Investments LLC, and Service Credit Union requests architectural design review recommendations for two new 33.28-square-foot internally illuminated building wall signs (SP-0751-2026 and SP-0752-2026) and a new 30.5-square-foot internally illuminated freestanding sign panel (SP-0753-2026) to be placed on an existing freestanding sign, at 285 Loudon Rd in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District. (2026-043) (PL-ADR-2026-0178)

Justin Parker (13 Columbia Dr, Amherst) is present to represent this application. Mr. Parker stated it is two sets of halos lit channel letters that are the same size and same design.

Member King asked if there are shadows behind the Service Credit Union.

Mr. Parker responded yes, the face is opaque and the back will be clear.

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

5. Building Permit Applications

5.1 Wilson & Wilson Architects, on behalf of Spring Corner Condominium, and Nonna's Place, LLC, requests an architectural review recommendation for a 650-square-foot façade alteration for the construction of a loggia to the front of an existing restaurant along Pleasant Street and the relocation of an existing 12-square-foot freestanding pylon sign at Tax Map 7411Z Lot 100, addressed as 60 Pleasant Street, 62 Pleasant Street, and 2-10 N Spring St in the Civic Performance (CVP) District. (2026-033) (PL-ADR-2026-0173)

Tom Wilson (19 Logging Hill Rd, Bow) is present to represent this application. Mr. Wilson stated the owner would like to put a pseudo façade with a new column structure. There are planters in between.

Mr. Bass stated this does require a variance that will go to the June 3rd Zoning Board of Adjustment meeting because the structure is encroaching in their front yard setback. Mr. Bass stated the owner is requesting to continue his approval to the June Planning Board meeting.

Co-Chair Hengen asked what are the materials.

Mr. Wilson stated the columns are square fiberglass and the upper materials have not been selected. Mr. Wilson noted they will use stock items purchased off the web.

Member Gentilhomme noted Mr. Wilson stated square columns and the picture shows round columns.

Mr. Wilson noted there were round columns originally and he changed to square because the detailing of the railing in between the columns it is easier to connect the rail to a flat side. Mr. Wilson noted either one would work.

Co-Chair Hengen stated she is read reading on sheet four square column. Co-Chair Hengen asked if the entire structure is intended to be white.

Mr. Wilson responded yes.

Member King asked if there will be a roof on it.

Mr. Wilson responded yes, they will connect to the existing structure.

Member King noted there are details that are missing.

Member Gentilhomme asked if there is a dimension for the width of the columns.

Co-Chair Hengen noted the dimensions are on sheet three. Co-Chair Hengen asked if the rafters are pitched.

Mr. Wilson responded no.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if they are attaching them with a metal bracket.

Mr. Wilson stated that is a detail they will get into with the construction drawings.

Member Gentilhomme made a motion to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted exclusive of signage with the condition that the construction follow closely to the detail that has been presented. Member Proctor seconded.

Discussion

Member King how would it change things if the logia went all the way to the end.

Mr. Wilson stated it would not make it even. There is a ramp between the car and building and if brought the column over it would be outside the face of the building and into the ramp.

Member Gentilhomme stated if they brought the column to the end it would not be symmetrical design.

Co-Chair Hengen noted the second story projection it all balances. Co-Chair Hengen asked for clarification to the motion that they are omitting both the proposed sign on the second story as well as the relocation of the existing sign.

Member Gentilhomme asked if the sign needs to be approved.

Mr. Tremblay asked for the wall sign.

Co-Chair Hengen stated for the relocation.

Mr. Tremblay stated it is a non-conforming sign and it is unlikely they will be able to relocate the sign to a similar spot in the sidewalk because it is a non-compliant sign.

Co-Chair Hengen stated it makes sense to have the motion as it is to exempt all signs.

Co-Chair Hengen called for a vote and all in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

5.2 Cobb Hill Construction, on behalf of Concord Feminist Health Center, and Equality Health Center, requests an architectural design review recommendation for the replacement of an existing storefront, sidelights, and transom, along with the installation of a fence along the north side of the building at 38 South Main Street in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District. (2026-038) (PL-ADR-2026-0176)

David Wajda (206 N State St, Concord) is present to represent this application. Mr. Wajda stated the facility would like to upgrade the entry way to a more secure and energy efficient entry. The entry way is an old school store front and the assembly would come out. It would be replaced with a level one ballistic rated store front. It would still have the side lights and the transom. The door would be a 3068 ballistic rated door with a half light in it.

Co-Chair Hengen asked about the underlying need for this.

Mr. Wajda stated there has been some protests and they want to provide a more secure location for staff and clients.

Co-Chair Hengen stated what Mr. Wajda is calling a store front is a residential entrance that is all original to the building that is 200 years old. It is beautifully designed and speaks to the history of Main Street. Co-Chair Hengen stated she has a hard time embracing the removal of all of this detailing.

Mr. Wajda stated this could all be taken out and ballistic glass could be fabricated to be put in these openings the door would have to be replaced. The timbers are not ballistic rated.

Member Gentilhomme asked if the ballistic rated construction is designed to stop what caliber of bullet.

Mr. Wajda stated a level one ballistic panel will stop three rounds from a nine-millimeter. Mr. Wajda noted it also has forced entry resistance.

Member Proctor asked about the packet and it says level three.

Mr. Wajda stated that is just the door frame itself. The rest of the materials are level one.

Member Gentilhomme asked if a 38 would go through.

Mr. Wajda stated not a 38 but a 44 magnum would go through and any long gun. It might not be on the first shot but the force of that would diminish.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if they need a different type of structure to make them feel safe. Co-Chair Hengen noted this is a small component of a good size building.

Mr. Wajda stated they have taken protective measures with protective films along the rest of the building.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if they are applied on the interior of the sash.

Mr. Wajda responded yes.

Co-Chair Hengen asked why not consider that here.

Mr. Wajda stated it does not carry the ballistic rating of the forced entry.

Co-Chair Hengen noted they are not providing that type of protection elsewhere.

Mr. Wajda stated he cannot speak to that.

Co-Chair Hengen suggested to do something that is reversable so that this remains. They could build an interior vestibule if they feel the entrance is their most vulnerable.

Jinelle Hall (38 S Main St, Concord) is the Executive Director of the Health Center stated they have put level three filming on all of their windows. Ms. Hall noted they had a security assessment from the national abortion federation and they provided many recommendations. Part of the recommendation was the filing on the windows. This front door entrance to have a ballistic glass and ballistic door. Ms. Hall stated the other reason for the door is for energy efficiency. Ms. Hall stated if they were to change the entrance to have a vestibule to be added to the back of the property. Ms. Hall noted this is for safety of staff and patients.

Member King asked about the film on the windows.

Ms. Hall stated they installed level three film.

Member Kings asked why can they not do that here.

Ms. Hall stated they cannot put the film on antique glass because it could risk shattering.

Co-Chair Hengen would like to work with them to figure out a solution that would address their needs and concerns and address a 200-year-old entrance that is the most beautiful in the city. Co-Chair Hengen suggested to come up with something that is reversable rather than removing everything that is there.

Member Gentilhomme suggest to have the whole surround up to the hinges of the door and then replace the door. It will cover the frame with protection and the door with protection. Member Gentilhomme noted they do not need to do the transom.

Ms. Hall stated they would have to replace the transom.

Co-Chair Hengen noted they can build a false wall. Co-Chair Hengen asked if staff uses this door.

Ms. Hall stated this is for the patients.

Co-Chair Hengen made motion to recommend the Planning Board not approve this this application due to the loss of an intact and historic entry way that show cases the history of Main Street and recommend the applicant further pursue a way of accomplishing need for the increase of security by working on the interior of the entryway so that the existing entryway can remain as is and any new construction on the interior be reversable down the road. Member Gentilhomme seconded.

Discussion

Member King does not think they will have a problem if they push the door in further and not asking to keep the door on the same plain.

Member Gentilhomme asked about entryway is exclusive of the door.

Co-Chair Hengen modified her motion to say that by entryway they are referencing the pilasters, sidelights, transom and the sidewalls but not the existing door.

Member Proctor asked if there is a reason they are changing the door to a half light door.

Mr. Wajda stated it is so they can see who is standing in front of it. Mr. Wajda will look to see if there is a way to do a store front on the interior. Mr. Wajda noted having a door on the inside could create a thermal break and be prone to moisture getting in there. Mr. Wajda asked if they determine that they can do something on the interior would there be an additional review required.

Co-Chair Hengen stated if they are not changing the exterior they do not need to come back.

Mr. Bass read back the motion as he understood it to be to recommend the Planning Board deny the application, due to the loss of the historic and intact entry way that showcases the history of Main Street as the proposal does not adequately retain the existing architectural details of the entry way per Section 5.3(D) *Architectural Features and Details* of the Design Review Guidelines or use materials appropriate to maintain the character of the building per Section 5.3(E) *Materials and Colors* of the Design Review Guidelines. By entry way, the committee means the plasters, sidelights, transom, and sidewalls, not the existing door. Instead, the Committee suggests the applicant pursue their need for security by working on the interior of the entry way, so the outside can remain as is, excluding the door, and whereas the interior be constructed in such a way that it is reversible in the future.

All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

6. Site Plan Applications

6.1 Stonefield Engineering and Design, on behalf of Associated Enterprises Inc, requests architectural design review recommendation as part of a major site plan application for the conversion of an existing 15,341-square-foot office building into 21 residential dwelling units and associated site improvements at Tax Map 6414Z Lot 1, addressed as 103 North State Street in the Civic Performance (CVP) District. (2026-028) (PL-SPR-2026-0059) (PL-CUP-2026-0108)

Craig Jones, Josh Klein and Nick Salvesen are present to represent this application. This is a conversion of an office building into an apartment building. It is an old historic building. The front elevation retains it historic look. The side elevation which is more of a common entrance off of a parking lot. This district has been repurposed into office buildings or apartments. They are not proposing any changes to the exterior of the building. They will modify the stoop to have a ramp for the main entrance. They will address the door on the front of the building to keep in with the American Four-Square style of building.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if they are replacing the window sash on the original building.

Mr. Jones responded no, there are no windows that are being replaced.

Mr. Salvesen stated given the building location and size there is not much they can do on the exterior. They are reconstructing the driveway to meet the standards when they can and they are seeking a conditional use permit to allow it to exist where it is today. The drive isle will remain on the right side of the building. They will reduce the amount of impervious and adding two landscape islands. They are providing headlight screening shrubs around the parking lot area.

Member King asked what do they do with the snow removal.

Mr. Klein stated they pile it in different areas across the site. Mr. Klein showed the two landscape areas at the bottom left will be used for snow storage.

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

7. Other Business

7.1 Any other business which may legally come before the Committee.
Member Proctor asked about the Service Credit Union pylon sign at the end and they approved it.

Co-Chair Hengen stated she thought it was a new face sign.

Mr. Bass stated it was two building wall signs and a pylon sign.

Member Proctor stated they did not look at the pylon sign.

Member Gentilhomme stated they talked about it.

Member Proctor noted the night time view is blue.

Member Gentilhomme stated the night time view looks like it should be the day time view.

Member Proctor asked if it is Service Credit Union now.

Mr. Bass responded no.

Member Gentilhomme asked for clarification.

Mr. Bass will follow up with the applicant.

Member Proctor stated they are fine with either of these as long as it is not a lit white background.

Co-Chair Hengen responded correct.

7.2 Adjourn
Member Gentilhomme moved, seconded by Member King, to adjourn the meeting at 10:00 a.m. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,
Krista Tremblay
Krista Tremblay
Administrative Technician III