City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
October 6, 2026 Minutes - DRAFT

The Architectural Design Review Committee (ADRC) held its regular monthly meeting on October 6, 2026, at the second-floor conference room, at 41 Green St, Concord, NH.

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

Absent: Member Claude Gentilhomme

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 September 1, 2026

Co-Chair Hengen moved, seconded by Alternate Member Savage to approve the meeting minutes from September 1, 2026, as written. All in favor. The motion passed. Co-Chair Doherty abstained due to not being present at the meeting.

3. Staff Memorandum

4. Sign Applications

4.1 Paulet Boghosian, on behalf of Who Doesn't Want That and HC Veritas LLC, requests an architectural design review recommendation for a new 8-square-foot non-illuminated window sign (SP-0855-2026) at **31A South Main St** in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District. (PL-ADR-2026-0209) (2026-095)

No one is present to represent this application.

The committee had no objections to the sign.

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 Concord Comprehensive Treatment Center, on behalf of EWT 54 LLC, requests architectural design review recommendations for a new 1.5-square-foot non-illuminated building wall sign (SP-0878-2026) and a new 10-square-foot non-illuminated freestanding sign (SP-0879-2026) at **89 North State Street** in the Civic Performance (CVP) District. (PL-ADR-2026-0211) (2026-096)

Member Thorpe arrived at 8:34 a.m.

Amy Maillet (89 N State St, Concord) is present to represent this application.

Co-Chair Doherty stated it is straight forward and the hours on the building and not on the door seem appropriate.

Co-Chair Hengen suggested the hours be placed on the door instead of drilling holes in mortar because the hours can shift around. Co-Chair Hengen asked if this is for walk-ins or appointments.

Ms. Maillet responded by appointment.

Member Thorpe asked if the sign needs to be that big if you took the hours off and put on the door. It is not intended to be read from the street.

Co-Chair Doherty stated the committee has questions about the sign. Co-Chair Doherty suggested to have vinyl letters for the glass of the door for the hours.

DRAFT

Ms. Maillet stated there is not enough room to do that.

Co-Chair Hengen asked where is the primary entrance.

Ms. Maillet explained in the driveway.

Co-Chair Hengen asked about the name of the business on the sign the word Concord is easy to read on the free-standing sign. Where the Comprehensive Treatment Center has a fairly small script and asked if that is how they want it.

Ms. Maillet replied all of the clinics the town name is larger at all of the company's clinics.

Member Thorpe asked if no one is going to the front door do they need a sign on the curb as it seems redundant.

Member Savage asked if the committee recommends them not to put the hours on the sign attached to the front of the building. If they move the sign to the entrance where patients walk in and asked if that would need an approval if it is not visible from the driveway.

Mr. Tremblay it would if it is visible from off the lot.

Alternate Member Savage made a motion to recommend that the Planning Board approve the application as submitted with the condition that the building wall sign be relocated to the actual business entrance on the side of the building. Member King seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

4.3 Advantage Signs, on behalf of Alera Group and 13-19 Chenell Drive Business, requests architectural design review recommendations for two new, externally illuminated freestanding sign panels of 7.03-square-feet (SP-0864-2026) and 7.9-square-feet (SP-0865-2026), and 1 new 6-square-foot non-illuminated building wall sign (SP-0866-2026), all to replace existing signage, at **15 Chenell Drive** in the Office Park Performance (OFP) District.

Josh Messinger (128 Hall St, Concord) is present to represent this application. Mr. Messinger stated there are two carved freestanding signs with gold leaf that match existing signage on the parcel. One is for the conference room and one is for the building. A sandblasted wall sign would be placed at the door location.

Co-Chair Doherty noted the first two signs match close to the sign above them.

Mr. Messinger noted the intent is to match all signs with the company colors.

Member Savage noted the Cambridge Investment Research and Alera Group asked if the intent is to match the blue so it looks uniform from the street and it is to match the blue of Cambridge.

Mr. Messinger replied yes.

Co-Chair Hengen stated she is fine with it and looks good.

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

4.4 Spectrum Signs & Graphics, on behalf of Concord Center, LLC, requests architectural design review recommendations for 1 new, 40-square-foot non-illuminated monument sign (FS-S1 – SP-0867-2026), 3 new, 6.2-square-foot non-illuminated wayfinding signs (S-2 – SP0868-2026, S-2D – SP-0872-2026), and S-2F – SP-0874-2026), 2 new, 6-square-foot non-illuminated wayfinding signs (S-2 – SP-0870-2026 and S-2C – SP-0871-2026), and 1 new 24.1-square-foot non-illuminated wayfinding sign (S-2E – SP-0873-2026) at **124-130 Hall Street** in the Industrial (IS) District. (PL-ADR-2026-0212) (2026-099)

Michael Gallagher (97 Eddy Rd #4, Manchester) is present to represent this application. Mr. Gallagher stated this is a wayfinding package for the five-building at a commercial property.

Mr. Bass advised that the application requires zoning board relief. Mr. Bass stated they are here to receive their recommendation and recommend the applicant continue their Planning Board approval to next month because the Planning Board will not approve if they are non-conforming with zoning. They have submitted variance requests for the November Zoning Board of Adjustment.

Member Savage asked what is the zoning relief requested.

Mr. Bass noted it is the number of free-standing signs.

Mr. Tremblay explained it is also the total square footage and what is before the committee is way finding signs and two free-standing signs.

Mr. Bass stated this issue is the size of the way finding signs.

Mr. Tremblay noted anything under four square feet would be considered a way finding sign and no permit required. These signs are over four-square feet at six square feet it brings them into a free-standing sign and a required permit. The signs they are seeing today will be visible from off the property.

Mr. Gallagher stated this is a way finding package that will go through out the property. The material using is aluminum. They are trying to make it so the circulation on the property and visibility to make it easier for all people entering the property.

Member Thorpe asked about the graphics at the top of the sign and if it is a company logo with the tree branches.

Mr. Gallagher stated that is a part of the structure of the sign.

Co-Chair Hengen noted when looking at the signs it is hard to quickly grasp the arrows. Co-Chair Hengen asked if they would consider lumping it together with saying buildings 128 and 124 with a single arrow.

Mr. Gallagher noted that was something they considered and it was dismissed because of the configuration of the property. Mr. Gallagher stated the colors in the text aligning with a building color. For example, building 124 could have a red color for just the number of the building.

Co-Chair Hengen stated that would help. Co-Chair Hengen suggested moving the exit arrow closer to the word "Exit."

Mr. Gallagher stated that is something they will consider.

Member King suggested to center the exit and the arrow it will line up with the peak of the tree.

Mr. Gallagher will take that into consideration.

Member Thorpe asked if on the building numbers to have the background a key color that is on the map. So, when you arrive at 134 the background color is the building color.

Mr. Gallagher liked that suggestion.

Alternate Member Savage made a motion to recommend that the **Planning Board approve the application as submitted with the following conditions: that the exit and associated directional arrows be moved closer together on the wayfinding signs; that the property address number and its arrow within the wayfinding signs match a designated building color, which matches the site map; and a suggestion that building addresses being added to each building have a font or a background added of the associated color designation and the appropriate number located around the building.** Member King seconded.

DRAFT

Discussion

Member Thorpe suggested that the number on the building sign increase the font will increase.

Mr. Bass noted that is why in the motion it included "and the appropriate number located around the building".

All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

4.5 Spectrum Signs & Graphics, on behalf of Concord Center, LLC, request an architectural design review recommendation for a new 12.5-square-foot non-illuminated freestanding tenant directory sign (SP-0875-2026) at **134 Hall Street** in the Industrial (IS) District.

Michael Gallagher (97 Eddy Rd #4, Manchester) is present to represent this application.

Mr. Bass explained that this sign, at a separate property, was part of the previous submission but is zoning compliant and is unaffected by the conditions on agenda item 4.4.

Alternate 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.

5. Building Permit Applications

5.1 Poyant Signs Inc, on behalf of Dunkin Donuts and GTY MA/NH Leasing Inc, requests architectural design review recommendations for a new illuminated building canopy (BP-1804-2026), to replace an existing canopy, 1 new 19.59-square-foot internally illuminated building wall sign (SP-0856-2026) to replace an existing wall sign, and 1 new 19.24-square-foot internally illuminated tenant panel sign (SP-0857-2026) to replace an existing tenant panel in an existing freestanding sign at **333 Loudon Road** in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District. (PL-ADR-2026-0208) (2026-093)

Jenn Robichaud (125 Samuel Barnet Blvd, New Bedford, MA) is present to represent this application. Ms. Robichaud stated there is a replacement of a face on the building. They will slide out the plastic in the existing sign. There is no change in structure.

Member King asked if it is illuminated.

Ms. Robichaud stated yes, it is existing.

Co-Chair Doherty appreciated the night view.

Ms. Robichaud stated the second sign will slide out the plastic and slide in new plastic and there is no change in structure. The next sign they will maintain the existing structure and re-skinned it. There is an upgrade to the menu board behind the building that will not be seen to anyone but the motorist.

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.

6. Site Plan Applications

6.1 Northpoint Engineering, LLC, on behalf of Granite Municipal Manufacturing & Sales, LLC, requests an architectural design review recommendation as part of a major site plan approval for the construction of a new 8,160-square-foot building for the use as a micro-data center, office, garage, and single residential caretaker unit, and associated site improvements at Tax Map 40Z Lot 6, addressed as **52 Locke Road** in the Industrial (IN) and Open Space Residential (RO) Districts. (PL-SPR-2026-0066) (PL-CUP-2026-0126) (2026-087)

Jeff Lewis (119 Storrs St Suite 201, Concord) and Michael Trahan (674 Old Walpole Rd, Surry) are

present to represent this application. Mr. Lewis stated he was before the committee in the spring for this parcel and a completely different project was proposed. Mr. Lewis noted they have decided to go into a different direction. Mr. Lewis stated this will be a micro data center. There will be back up generators. There dry coolers for the heating and cooling for the building. This will be a secure facility as it will be secured with a fence and gate. There are no public that will enter into the facility. There will be a caretaker apartment and garage for 24/7 on-site security. There will be occasional maintenance at the facility.

Member King asked about the noise that will be generated.

Mr. Lewis replied not a lot. The only noise would be when the dry coolers kick on. It is an emerging cooling system which is new technology. The heat will be recaptured and used to heat the building.

Co-Chair Doherty asked how tall are the dry coolers and the generators.

Mr. Lewis responded 96 inches.

Member Thorpe asked about decibel levels for the variable-speed coolers and the generators, and about their cumulative effect near wildlife areas.

Mr. Trahan stated they are low RPM variable speed acoustic fans designed for quiet operation.

Mr. Lewis said noise data was submitted for the Planning Board application and that technical experts will attend that hearing.

Co-Chair Doherty noted the building was painted dark to make it disappear. However, the generator boxes are a silver.

Member Thorpe suggested to have an acoustical surrounding fence around the perimeter of the property to contain or muffle the sound.

Mr. Bass stated that noise impacts are generally outside the committee's purview, which covers fencing, elevations, landscaping, and site appearance.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if there is any visibility of the building from interstate 93.

Member Proctor replied possibly in the winter time with the leaves gone.

Member Savage stated there is a good distance between 93 and this property.

The Committee members agreed the dark building color was acceptable and the generators should be a dark, matte color.

Co-Chair Doherty asked whether the caretaker unit could use the building's volume, such as a loft with a bed area.

Mr. Trahan replied possibly.

Member Thorpe asked about the lighting around the fixture locations and asked if they are not directed towards the wildlife.

Mr. Lewis replied the lighting is all pack lighting for security.

The committee has no comments on the building itself.

Member Thorpe asked about the fencing height and material.

Co-Chair Doherty noted the plan states eight-foot height.

Mr. Lewis replied chain link fence.

Co-Chair Hengen suggested a dark chain.

DRAFT

Co-Chair Hengen made a motion to recommend that the **Planning Board approve the application as submitted with the following conditions: that the generators have a dark color exterior cladding that is matt (non-reflective); and, that any fencing that will be installed shall also have a dark non-reflective coloring.** Member King seconded.

Discussion

Member Thorpe asked that the decibel information be available before the Planning Board.

Mr. Bass agreed to carry that request forward.

All in favor. The motion passed. Member Thorpe abstained from voting.

6.2 Wilcox & Barton, Inc, on behalf of St. Paul's School, requests an architectural design review recommendation as part of a major site plan approval for the construction of a new 2,208-square-foot building, for the use as a mail and drop off center, serving the St. Paul's School campus, along with associated site improvements at Tax Map 723Z Lot 13-1, addressed as **7 Rectory Road** in the Institutional (IS) District.(PL-SPR-2026-0067) (PL-CUP-2026-0129) (2026-091)

Erin Lambert (2 Home Ave, Concord) and Brian Apito (75 Central St, Boston) are present to represent this application. Ms. Lambert presented a revised plan that differs from the committee's packet. The applicant will go to the November Planning Board and sought feedback in the interim. They do not need as much parking so they have a revised site plan. The revised site plan reduces impervious pavement by right-sizing parking on the site of an existing parking lot, reserves a turnaround, and adds walkways. The building has been shifted to be closer to Dunbarton Road. The building will be for food delivery services for students and staff to pick up. They only need enough pavement for two delivery trucks. They are applying for a conditional use permit application to reduce the parking.

Mr. Apito stated the building footprint was reduced to approximately 1,850 square feet. It is a one-story building with a gable roof and shed dormer. It contains a smart-locker package pickup area, reception, back-of-house storage, a limited-hours food delivery pickup area (7 to 9 PM), and a separate side entry for contractor and visitor check-in under a wraparound porch. The materials include composite siding and trim, a standing seam metal roof, wood-clad windows with simulated divided lights, and stained douglas fir columns and beams. Site lighting will match campus light poles.

Co-Chair Hengen asked if there will be expressed exterior muttons.

Mr. Apito replied yes, similar to vinyl.

Co-Chair Hengen asked about the columns.

Mr. Apito responded they will be stained and pressure treated underneath.

Member Thorpe liked how the building fits the agricultural character of the nearby barn. Member Thorpe noted the bank to the south of the building is a great place to sit to over see the playing fields. Member Thorpe asked if they gave thought to installing trees across the bank to shade while watching.

Mr. Apito replied that is something they can bring to St. Paul's. They do not want to have too many sight lines from the new admissions building and the porch view of the fields.

Ms. Lambert noted the sight line for the admissions and would not be able to put trees directly in front.

Co-Chair Doherty noted they are not going to Planning Board until November and they are asking for the committee approval now.

Ms. Lambert stated that would be great however, she recognizes that they did not have a chance to see the site or the updated plans. If they can give their thoughts on the building.

Co-Chair Doherty noted what is in the packet is not what they are showing and they need what was

presented today to be approval.

Mr. Bass stated the Committee can recommend architectural design review approval as submitted or with conditions based on what was provided today during the public meeting or they can not make that action.

Co-Chair Doherty stated the character is still the same of this verses what they saw.

Member Thorpe asked about the lighting selection.

Ms. Lambert noted there are a number of light poles that are consistent with the current lighting in use now. They will have to get an updated photometric plan. The fixtures are compliant with the regulations.

Member Savage asked about pathway lighting, and the applicants said the lit light poles cover the paths.

Ms. Lambert noted it is lighted but not with bollards.

Co-Chair Hengen made a motion to recommend that the **Planning Board approve the revised application, as presented during the meeting, as submitted with the understanding that the revised landscape plan yet to be revised will be similar to the original submission.** Member King seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

6.3 Gallagher Callahan & Gartrell PC and Jones & Beach Engineers, Inc, on behalf of Onyx Partners, Ltd and Onyx Steeplegate Concord, LLC, requests an architectural design review recommendation as part of a major site plan approval for the construction of a 4-story, 133,600-gross-square-foot, 110-unit multifamily building and associated site improvements at Tax Map 611Z Lot 40, addressed as **270 Loudon Road** in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District. (PL-SPR-2026-0068) (PL-CUP-2026-0130) (PL-CUP-2026-0130) (2026-092)

Doug Richardson (40 Franklin St, Needham MA), Ian McKinnon (100 Dominic Dr Suite 201, Exeter) and Joe Ford are present to represent this application. Mr. Richardson noted the first residential building of a 600-unit master plan at the former Steeplegate Mall site. The design was reduced from a five-story, structured-parking building to a four-story, 110-unit building with surface parking at 1.5 spaces per unit. There are 50 two bedroom, 50 one bedroom and 10 studio apartments. This building will take 18 months of construction. They are timing it to be completed with the two large retail anchors to the west. There is a traffic study as part of the CDP. They have received staff and state DOT comments. It is a wood-frame building with real thin brick, Hardy panel, lap siding, and double-hung windows. The first floor includes about 7,500 square feet of amenity space, a leasing office, small fitness, Amazon room and a pool area with fencing and security access.

Member Thorpe asked what material will be used for the fencing.

Mr. Richardson stated it would be black aluminum to look like a rot iron fence.

Member Savage asked for screening for all of the meters.

Mr. Richardson noted the intent for the electric meters is to put them in a large room.

Mr. Richardson noted the site plan cannot be approved before the CDP is approved.

Member King felt the site layout and pedestrian are hemmed in by the parking and the building's proximity to it.

Member Thorpe noted there are two little trees planted along the entire length of the building. Member Thorpe suggested to have one parking space further away to allow for landscaping.

Mr. Richardson stated this is not a suburban apartment project. This is an urban mixed feel.

Mr. McKinnon noted the CDP is active and will be before the Board. Mr. McKinnon noted this is phase one. Mr. McKinnon stated there is a street scape and separated sidewalk. There will be an eight-foot multiuse path that will go along all of the project surround Loudon Road and D'Amante Drive. There is a

desire to provide open space.

Mr. Richardson noted there will be out door patio.

Mr. McKinnon stated the parking exceeds the city minimum.

Mr. Bass stated the ordinance stated two parking spaces per unit and the state has a law that requires one parking space per unit.

Mr. Richardson stated they have the exact number of spaces they need plus visitor parking.

Member King stated everything is pushing up against the building and this is a residential. Member King asked for the city point of view.

Mr. Bass stated the city did not design the project. As part of the CDP there are binding elements however, full site development is not one of them. What is before them is a major site plan application on an existing property. The Committee can review based on the design review guidelines and apply recommendations to the Planning Board.

Member Savage stated this parcel to be looked at they are not looking at the CDP. They are looking at the site plan. Member Savage noted they are using the pool area instead of a green space.

Co-Chair Doherty asked for discussion on the building.

Member Thorpe asked if an island can be moved and there could be a walkdown towards the front door and a hedge by the pool area.

The applicants agreed to the island, sidewalk, and parking adjustments, and to consider a softer hedge buffer at the pool.

Mr. Richardson noted for the building there is a variation of materials and colors.

Co-Chair Doherty asked to go up to A and asked if there should be windows at the end.

Mr. Richardson stated they are not allowed by code to go more than 19 feet from the door. Mr. Richardson noted elevation H and F have windows. Mr. Richardson noted the two end units will have a common wall between them and they are not allowed by code to extend more than 19 feet beyond the door handle.

Co-Chair Doherty asked to return to the elevations and asked about elevation H.

Mr. Richardson replied elevation H the parking does not run along it cuts across.

The Committee asked for screening of the 110 gas meters on the southwest end of the building.

Mr. Richardson and Mr. McKinnon agreed to provide screening with fencing and evergreen plantings.

The Committee members recommended that elevation G match the materials and feel of elevation H.

Member Savage suggested simplifying elevation B as it is not visible.

Mr. Richardson agreed with elevation B and elevation C and elevation D they want to leave because it matches the rendering.

Co-Chair Doherty stated elevation H and elevation G should look the same.

Mr. Richardson stated they will add brick to elevation G.

Co-Chair Hengen noted the roof over hang and asked if there is a good profile.

Mr. Richardson replied there is an 18-inch parapet because these units will require condenser units in the middle of the roof element. They can show the Committee through a sight line that they will not be seen on the roof.

DRAFT

Co-Chair Hengen asked if looking at this section would there be an overhang.

Mr. Richardson replied it is a small gravel stop which sites on front of the siding.

Co-Chair Doherty suggested to look at the three dimensions to look at the corners that do not line up.

Member Thorpe likes the mix of materials.

Member Thorpe asked about the lighting for the parking lot.

Mr. Richardson stated the parking lot will be consistent for the whole project with a 25-foot black shoe box.

Member Thorpe asked if you will see it on the first floor.

Mr. Richardson noted they might see it on the first floor but it is a shoe box. Mr. Richardson noted a third of the first floor is commercial space.

Mr. McKinnon presented the photo metric plan and using one foot per candle. They will use LED lighting.

Member Savage suggested using salt-tolerant species along Sheep Davis Road.

Co-Chair Doherty asked the Committee if they want to approve with conditions or have the applicant come back with updated plan.

Mr. Richardson stated this site plan cannot be approved before the CDP approval.

Mr. Bass noted there is a lot of conditions and suggested to receive updated plans.

Mr. McKinnon and Mr. Richardson said they would provide a package of revised plans for the October 21, 2026 Planning Board meeting, the November 3rd Architectural Design Review Committee meeting and the November 18, 2026 Planning Board meeting.

Co-Chair Hengen made a motion to recommend that the **Planning Board continue the application to the date certain of November 18, 2026 and that the applicant return to the November 3rd, 2026 ADRC meeting with the following revisions: provide screening to the external utility meters near the southwest corner of the building; revise the parking lot layout to install a landscape strip between all double rows of parking spaces and to also remove some parking to allow safe and accessible pedestrian walkways from the further parking spaces to the building. Additionally, make effort to gain some additional green space on internal perimeter of the building and south elevation; Elevation "G" shall be revised to have similar materials and feel as the adjacent "H" elevation; the roof elevations should be considered to add more detail; elevation "E" shall be revised to have similar materials and feel as the adjacent "F" elevation; elevation "E" shall also be revised to accurately show that there won't be windows and instead it will be where the external utility meters are going to be; rooftop mechanical equipment shall be shown or noted (with dimensions) on the elevations, along with how it is to be screened; lighting fixtures shall be looked at to try reduce the height necessary and to include the location and detail of pedestrian fixtures which will be proposed; salt tolerant landscape species should be considered along Sheep Davis Road; and, to create a soft hedge line between the parking spaces adjacent to the pool area to reduce visibility.** Member King 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 Savage moved, seconded by Member King to adjourn the meeting at 11:17 a.m. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

DRAFT

City of Concord, New Hampshire
Architectural Design Review Committee
October 6, 2026 Minutes - DRAFT

Respectfully submitted,
Krista Tremblay
Krista Tremblay
Administrative Technician III

DRAFT