City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
August 4, 2026 Minutes

The Architectural Design Review Committee (ADRC) held its regular monthly meeting on August 4, 2026, in Council Chambers, at 37 Green St, Concord, NH.

Attendees: Co-Chair Jay Doherty, Member Claude Gentilhomme, Member Douglas Proctor, Member Ron King, Co-Chair Elizabeth Durfee Hengen, 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 Doherty called the meeting to order at 8:32 a.m.

2. Minutes – Approve meeting minutes from June 30, 2026

Member Thorpe moved, seconded by Member King, to approve the meeting minutes from June 30, 2026, as written. All in favor. The motion passed. Member Savage abstained due to not being present at the meeting.

3. Staff Memorandum

4. Sign Applications

4.1 Yamas Greek Eatery, on behalf of Yamas Greek Eatery and The Draft, LLC, requests architectural design review recommendations for a16-square-foot, externally illuminated existing non-permitted building wall sign (SP-0767-2026) and a new 1.77-square-foot non-illuminated projecting sign (SP-0792-2026) at 25 South Main Street in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District. (PL-ADR-2026-0179) (2026-047)

No one is present to represent this application.

Mr. Bass noted the applicant did come to architectural design review committee for signage and they put up other sign and they are here to correct that issue. Mr. Bass stated the projecting sign is not up. Mr. Bass noted the building wall sign is installed and the projecting sign is proposed.

Member King asked why the sign says Plymouth.

Mr. Tremblay noted it is referencing their other location.

Co-Chair Hengen noted the legibility makes the sign hard to read. Co-Chair Hengen noted she is not sure what the extra sign is accomplishing as it does not comply with the zoning ordinance.

Mr. Tremblay noted they are going for a variance for going over their square footage.

Member Proctor suggested to do the blade sign or the one on the 45 degree and not do both.

Member Thorpe suggested to not approve the blade sign and keep the sign on the corner.

Co-Chair Hengen suggested to round the sign on the corner to accentuate the building design feature.

Member Savage suggested to not do the blade sign and the 45-degree angle corner sign remove the white square trim to be more of a circular trim.

Member Proctor noted to have it like the blade sign and larger.

Co-Chair Hengen suggested to have exposed brick around the circle of the sign so it is floating and not filling.

Member Savage made a motion to recommend the Planning Board approve the application for the building wall sign only with the following conditions: that the white square trim be removed and modified to remove the square corners and instead have it replicate the circle of blade sign design; the text on the white background be darkened to make it visible, similar to the blade sign coloring; exposed brick shall remain around the outside circle, leaving a minimum of 8-inches of brick on all sides; and, a black border shall be provided on the outermost edge, around the white circle [to be added]. Additionally, to recommend denying the proposed blade sign, as the additional signage becomes too overwhelming for the architectural features of the building pursuant to Section 5.4(A) of the Design Review Guidelines. Member King seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

4.2 Sousa Signs, LLC, on behalf of Price Automotive Sales & Service and D&J Realty Holdings, LLC, requests an architectural design review recommendation for a new 62.7-square-foot internally illuminated freestanding sign panel (SP-0777-2026), to replace an existing sign panel at 79 Manchester Street in the Highway Commercial (CH) District. (PL-ADR-2026-0182) (2026-051)

Jason Gagne (225 E Industrial Park Drive, Manchester) is present to represent this application. Mr. Gagne stated there are two free-standing signs. The sign labeled F-1 is not in the scope because they are deciding what to do with the existing non-conforming sign. On the left side of the entrance there is a double-sided free-standing internally illuminated. They will repaint the steel cabinet with a blue and will add in new illuminated faces which will be acrylic with vinyl.

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 City Buffet, LLC, on behalf of Concord Re Property, LLC, requests architectural design review recommendations for two new internally illuminated freestanding sign panels of 54.55-square-foot (SP-0794-2026) and 35.51-square feet (SP-0795-2026) at 161 Loudon Road in the General Commercial (CG) District. (PL-ADR-2026-0190) (2026-064)

Daniel Fong (161 Loudon Rd, Concord) is present to represent this application. Mr. Fong stated they are changing what is existing with a new name.

Member Savage asked if they are changing the box inside.

Mr. Fong responded yes.

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.

4.4 NEOPCO Signs, on behalf of Capital Vision Center and Red Eagle Management, LLC, requests architectural design review recommendations for a new 36-square-foot internally illuminated freestanding sign panel (SP-0797-2026), to replace an existing freestanding sign panel, and two new internally illuminated building walls signs of 74.75-square-feet (SP-0798-2026) and 49.78-square-feet (SP-0799-2026) at 92 South Street in the Neighborhood Commercial (CN) District. (PL-ADR-2026-0192) (2026-070)

Glen Schadlick (5 Crosby St, Concord) is present to represent this application. Mr. Schadlick noted this is the former Rite Aid building in the south end. It is replacing what is there with LED channel letters and an existing face for the pylon sign. They are looking to have two or more tenants in the back half of the building. They are leaving space in the pylon sign for a future tenant. The faces are black during the day and they have a perforated vinyl overlay so they will illuminate a dim light at night. The owner will paint

the building two different colors so it will look like two buildings and the tenant can have a sign on the back of the building.

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

Discussion

Co-Chair Doherty asked about the pylon sign and is the white illuminated.

Mr. Schadlick stated the white is illuminated vinyl lettering similar to what Rite Aid had.

Member Gentilhomme asked if it is internally illuminated.

Mr. Schadlick responded correct, you will see the white and the letters at night. There will be blue in the pupil.

Member Savage noted they typically do not like white background illuminated at night.

Mr. Schadlick noted the sign has been there for 15 plus years.

Member Savage stated it is not about what has been there for 15 years it is about what they prefer today.

Mr. Schadlick noted it is a recommendation and according to the guidelines it says "*should*" not "*shall*". If they want to make a recommendation to not approve it they will pull it from the consent agenda to get it pass as they are following the guidelines.

Member Gentilhomme noted there is not a huge background with a small sign on it. The sign almost fills the whole background.

Member Thorpe suggested instead of a bright white to have a neutral gray background.

Mr. Schadlick noted they have other locations and in the heights they have white background with the letters for building sign. This is to be consistent with their branding.

Mr. Bass noted in section 5.4C of the design guidelines as part of the illumination of signs it says "*internally lit signs should provide opaque background with translucent letters*". Mr. Bass stated it is in the Committee's purview to recommend conditions of approval that opaque background be provided and the "*should*" does not matter one way or the other. It is not "*shall*" and that would mean every sign all the time.

Member Thorpe noted the legibility having a bright background with thin letters makes it difficult to read.

Co-Chair Doherty stated this property abuts residential properties.

Member Savage noted a white opaque background is within the guidelines.

Member Gentilhomme amended his motion to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted with the condition that an opaque background be provided behind the white of the pylon panel sign pursuant to section 5.4(c) of the design review guidelines especially where this property directly abuts a residential district. Member King seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Schadlick announced he would like to have this agenda item pulled from consent for the August 19th Planning Board meeting.

4.5 NEOPCO Signs, on behalf of Concord Smoke Shop and Remi's Block, LLC, requests architectural design review recommendations for a new 5.5-square-foot internally illuminated projecting blade sign (SP-0806-2026), and a new 11-square-foot internally illuminated building wall sign (SP-0807-2026) at 154 North Main Street in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District. (PL-ADR-2026-0193) (2026-073)

Glen Schadlick (5 Crosby St, Concord) is present to represent this application. Mr. Schadlick noted the signs are not internally illuminated.

Member Gentilhomme noted it is a nice sign.

Mr. Schadlick noted it matches the brick on the building in the middle of their leased space.

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

Mr. Bass recommended the Committee amend the motion to recommend the Planning Board approve the application with the understanding that both signs will be non-illuminated because the application stated it was internally illuminated.

Member Gentilhomme amended the motion to recommend the Planning Board approve the application with the understanding that both signs will be non-illuminated because the application stated it was internally illuminated. Member King seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

4.6 NEOPCO Signs, on behalf of Hvizda Reality Group and HRG Invests, LLC, requests an architectural design review recommendation for a new 9-square-foot internally illuminated blade sign panel (SP-0813-2026) to replace an existing blade sign panel, at 26 Pleasant Street in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District. (PL-ADR-2026-0194) (2026-074).

Glen Schadlick (5 Crosby St, Concord) is present to represent this application. Mr. Schadlick informed the applicant this sign must have an opaque background. The letter will be the only thing that lights up.

Co-Chair Doherty asked if the red letters light up.

Mr. Schadlick noted the letters and the sun light up.

Mr. Bass noted the opaque background was not noted on the application and recommend the Committee condition the approval that an opaque background be placed behind the white leaving the red text and red sun to be illuminated.

Member Gentilhomme made a motion to recommend the Planning Board approve the application as submitted with the condition that an opaque background will be placed behind the white background leaving the red text and red sun to remain illuminated. Co-Chair Hengen seconded.

Discussion

Mr. Schadlick asked if they came up with a semi-opaque background being 10% of the normal light covering in the future.

Member Gentilhomme noted they need to control how semi-opaque.

All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

4.7 Signarama of Concord, on behalf of Uncle Charlie's Eatery and TDL Investments LLC, request architectural design review recommendations for a new 18.28-square-foot internally illuminated freestanding tenant panel sign (SP-0814-2026), to replace an existing tenant panel, and a new 33-square-foot internally illuminated building wall sign (SP-0815-2026), to replace an existing building wall sign, at 376 Loudon Road in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District. (PL-ADR-2026-0195) (2026-076)

No one is present to represent this application.

Co-Chair Doherty noted it is black background with white letters and they are highlighting around their logo.

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.

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
August 4, 2026 Minutes

5. Building Permit Applications

5.1 None

6. Site Plan Applications

7.1 Nobis Group, on behalf of Dartmouth Hitchcock Clinic, in addition to recommendations received as part of an associated major site plan application, further requests an architectural design review recommendation as part of a conditional use permit, pursuant to Section 28-4-1(f)(3) of the Zoning Ordinance to allow for appurtenant structures, or structures not intended for human occupancy to exceed the maximum height restrictions of Section 28-4-1(h) *Table of Dimensional Regulations* of the Zoning Ordinance at Tax Map 734Z Lot 22, addressed as 251 Pleasant Street in the Institutional (IS) District. (PL-CUP-2026-0123) (2026-071)

Co-Chair Doherty recused from hearing this agenda item due to his firm is doing this project and there is still a quorum.

Mr. Bass noted the applicant has submitted a phased approach to the project. Phase one includes items that will require a building permit which will require ADR review. They are trying to get that out of the way as their major site plan.

Joe Lonergan (155 Dow St, Manchester), Garrett Seibert (18 Chenell Dr, Concord) and Tim Bishop (5 Bedford Farm, Bedford) are present to represent this application. Mr. Lonergan stated there are a couple curve mounted units on the roof to replace the existing roof top units. There will be a 14-foot screen on the roof and that is as small as they can get it. Mr. Lonergan noted this is an expansion off of the existing building for Dartmouth Hitchcock.

Member Thorpe suggested to have the screening a different color than the rest of the architectural accent.

Co-Chair Hengen noted the color they are proposing is appropriate.

Mr. Lonergan noted the intent is not to have anything facing Pleasant Street.

Member Proctor asked if the screen will have any vertical joints as it is pretty long.

Mr. Lonergan stated the substructure will be such that whatever the screening is you might have a small joint.

Member Thorpe asked if the top will have some kind of a finish.

Mr. Lonergan stated there will be some type of a cap similar to a roof edge cap.

Mr. Bass suggested to have two separate motions as there is a conditional use permit application because the screening exceeds the height threshold. They are also showing a phase one structural element.

Member Savage made a motion to Recommend the Planning Board approve the conditional use permit application as submitted with the condition that additional screening will be required if it is determined that the mechanical rooftop equipment can be seen from Pleasant Street, anywhere between the Langley Parkway and East Drive intersections. Member Proctor seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Lonergan stated the overall site plan they have been working on and they want to start work on the area highlighted in yellow this fall. The phase one they want to work on the parking before winter. So, in the spring they can move forward with the building.

Mr. Bass noted the MRI unit that is moving will need a building permit and a component of the phase one project.

Mr. Lonergan pointed out how people will walk from the building to the outdoor MRI unit.

Member Savage noted they are interrupting a sidewalk.

Mr. Lonergan noted they will have egress with crash bars.

Member Savage made a motion to Recommend the Planning Board grant architectural design review approval for phase one building and site work 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.

7.2 Adjourn

Member King moved, seconded by Member Savage, to adjourn the meeting at 9:54 a.m. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,
Krista Tremblay
Krista Tremblay
Administrative Technician III