



CITY OF CONCORD
New Hampshire's Main Street™
Community Development Department
Planning Division

Staff Report for Planning Board

Meeting on November 19, 2025

**Project Summary – Determination of Completeness for Major Site Plan
Architectural Design Review, and Conditional Use Permit Applications**

Project: Phenix Block – Major Site Plan (2025-123)
Property Owner: Ciborowski Associates, LLC
Applicant: Northpoint Engineering, LLC
Property Address: 56 North Main St
Tax Map Lot: 6443Z 27

Determination of Completeness:

When determining the completeness of a major site plan application, the Board shall consider the requirements of Sections 11.05 and 36.14(1) of the Site Plan Regulations, the written recommendation of the Planning Division, and any written communications from the applicant, abutters, and parties of interest; **however, no hearing shall be opened nor shall testimony be received on a determination of completeness.**

Project Description:

The applicant is proposing the complete redevelopment of the Phenix Block (Lot 27) along with a new building connection to Phenix Hall (Lot 28). The two existing buildings on Lot 27 will be removed to make way for a new, 8-story, mixed-use building. The new building will have a small parking garage and some limited retail space on the lower level accessible from Low Ave. The second floor will be comprised of office space and the third through sixth floors will be residential apartments (36 units total) – a combination of one-, two-, and three-bedroom units. The top floor will be a restaurant venue with outdoor seating on the roof deck.

The redevelopment of the area surrounding Phenix Hall has been a significant economic development aspiration of the applicant and has been identified as a key redevelopment location by the City as well, to the extent that the project location is specifically discussed in the City's 1997 Downtown Master Plan.

The connection to Phenix Hall (Lot 28) will be a 6-story infill of the discontinued Phenix Ave and a separate major site plan application (PL-SPR-2025-0050) has been submitted for that redevelopment. While two separate site plan applications have been submitted for each parcel (Lot 27 and Lot 28), both applications utilize the same plan set and for all intents and purposes, are a single project.

In order to accommodate the infill portion of the new building of Lot 28, the applicant has also submitted an accompanying minor subdivision application (PL-MIS-2025-0047) for the discontinuance of the existing Phenix Ave and lot line adjustment to reapportion the property lines between Lot 27 and Lot 28 resulting from the discontinuance of Phenix Ave.

Compliance:

The following analysis of compliance with the Zoning Ordinance and Site Plan Regulations is based on an undated 2-page narrative; a 14-sheet civil plan set titled “Phenix Block Redevelopment”, prepared by Northpoint Engineering, LLC, dated October 2025; a 16-sheet architectural plan set titled Phenix Block, prepared by SMP Architecture, dated October 13, 2025; two, undated, 3-page waiver request narratives; a 6-page conditional use permit narrative for the obstruction of view of State House Dome from Interstate, dated October 15, 2025; and, a 3-page conditional use permit narrative for the building height, dated October 15, 2025.

1. Project Details and Zoning Ordinance Compliance:

Zoning District:	Central Business Performance (CBP) District
Existing Use:	Retail
Proposed Use:	Mixed Use
Overlay Districts:	
Flood Hazard (FH) District	None
Shoreland Protection (SP) District	None
Historic (HI) District	None
Penacook Lake Watershed (WS) District	None
Aquifer Protection (AP) District	None
Wetland:	None
Wetland Buffer:	None

Zoning Code Item	Required	Existing	Proposed
Minimum Total Area	N/A	14,454-square-feet	14,711-square-feet
Minimum Buildable Land	N/A	14,454-square-feet	14,711-square-feet
Minimum Lot Frontage	22 feet	144.38 feet	144.38 feet
Minimum Front Yard	N/A	0	0
Minimum Rear Yard	N/A	0	0
Minimum Side Yard	N/A	0	0
Maximum Lot Coverage	N/A	100%	100%
Maximum Building Height	80 feet	Less than 80 feet	89.5 feet

- 1.1 Per Section 29.2-1-2(a)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance, any person or entity which seeks to undertake new development within the City of Concord, shall pay impact fees to the City in the manner and in the amounts set forth in the ordinance. An applicant for the development of permitted nonresidential uses shall qualify for a waiver of the transportation facilities impact fees, but the waiver request must be received prior to the Clerk’s calculation of the impact fees. The Clerk determines the impact fee at the time of building permit application, and **the applicant must request the waiver prior to the date of the determination.**

2. General Comments:

- 2.1 Per Section 6.01(4) of the Site Plan Regulations, staff was unaware of any nonconformities with the Zoning Ordinance at the time the abutter notifications were mailed.
- 2.2 Per Section 6.01(5) of the Site Plan Regulations, a completed conditional use permit application if required shall be made at the same time as the site plan application. This project requires two conditional use permit approvals –for the obstruction of view of State House Dome and for the building height. The conditional use permit application was submitted.

- 2.3 Per Section 12.01 *Research* of the Site Plan Regulations, applicants are responsible for familiarizing themselves with all city, state, and federal regulations relative to zoning, site plan design and approval, land sales, utilities, drainage, health, buildings, roads, and other pertinent data so that the applicants are aware of the obligations, standards expected, and documents to be submitted.
- 2.4 Per Section 25.01 *Nonmunicipal Utilities General Requirements* of the Site Plan Regulations, the applicant is responsible for all coordination with the utility companies to ensure that utilities are installed in accordance with the Board-approved plans. Staff recommends that the applicant coordinate with all nonmunicipal utilities providing services to the site to ensure the existing services are adequate. Any changes to the utilities after the Board's conditional approval will require either administrative approval or an amendment to the conditional approval depending upon the changes proposed.
- 2.5 Per Section 15.03 *Existing Condition Plan*, where minimal changes are proposed to the site, the Clerk may allow the applicant to reduce the amount or extent of the information required from Section 15.03 to be shown on the existing conditions plan provided that the proposed extent and impacts of the proposed improvements to the site, and City at large, can be satisfactorily reviewed and sufficient information is provided on the plan for the Planning Board to act on the application. Accordingly, as the majority of the site remains unchanged, the Planning Board Clerk has determined to reduce the amount or extent required from Section 15.03 as noted below:
- a. Section 15.03(23)(b), (c), (d), (e), and (f), to not require the applicant to provide the required tabulations on the existing conditions sheet.
- 2.6 Per Section 15.04 *Proposed Site Plan*, where minimal changes are proposed to the site, the Clerk may allow the applicant to reduce the amount or extent of the information to be required from Section 15.04 to be shown on the site plan provided that the proposed extent and impacts of the proposed use and improvements to be made to the site can be satisfactorily reviewed and sufficient information has been provided for the Planning Board to act on the application. Accordingly, and whereas the majority of the site remains unchanged, the Planning Board Clerk has determined to reduce the amount or extent required from Section 15.04 as noted below:
- a. Section 15.04(6) *Topography*. The applicant has provided a separate grading and drainage sheet as part of the plan set.
 - b. Section 15.04(11) *Parking, Loading, Access*. Section 28-5-48 *Central Business Performance (CBP) District Standards* of the Zoning Ordinance provides separate requirements for development within the CBP District, which include no parking requirements.
 - c. Section 15.04(13) *Municipal Sewer*. The applicant has provided a separate Utility Plan sheet as part of the plan set.
 - d. Section 15.04(14) *Drainage & Erosion Control*. The applicant has provided a separate Grading & Drainage sheet and Erosion Control sheet as part of the plan set.
 - e. Section 15.04(17) *Municipal Water Supply*. The applicant has provided a separate Utility Plan Sheet as part of the plan set.
 - f. Section 15.04(19) *Other Utilities*. The applicant has provided a separate Utility Plan Sheet as part of the plan set.
 - g. Section 15.04(26) *Lighting*. The applicant has provided a separate Lighting Sheet as part of the plan set.
- 2.7 Staff notes that no building or tenant signage has been proposed in conjunction with this application. Section 16.03(11) *Signs* of the Site Plan Regulations does allow, if tenancy is

- unknown at the time of site plan submittal, a master sign plan or sign permits may be submitted for architectural design review prior to occupancy of the building or specific tenant space.
- 2.8 Staff notes that that Planning Board has the authority to, and may require third party investigations or reviews, at the applicant's expense, in order for the Planning Board to satisfactorily complete its review in accordance with Section 13.01(8) *Impact Studies* and Section 13.01(9) *Special Investigative Studies or Third Party Reviews* of the Site Plan Regulations.
- 2.9 The Assessing Department and Fire Department had no general comments.
- 2.10 The Engineering Services Division general comments are noted in the attached 8-page memo to Alec Bass from Paul Gildersleeve and Pete Kohalmi, dated November 10, 2025.
- 2.11 Staff requests that the Board provide guidance on the staff report for this application and the related application for 34-42 North Main St (2025-125). For the purposes of the Board's review of the determination of completeness for both applications, separate memos have been prepared for the Board's consideration. Staff requests the Board determine if separate memos for both applications are desired for the public hearings, or if combining the memos for both applications into a single staff report would assist the Board in the review of the interrelated projects moving forward. Staff is willing to consider both approaches, and will defer to the Board as to how best to provide review for the related projects moving forward.

3. Site Plan Regulations Determination of Completeness:

The items below are missing and **the Site Plan Regulations REQUIRE the items for the application to be deemed complete (unless a waiver from the requirement is otherwise approved).**

- 3.1 Section 12.03(4), Section 16.02(1) *Preparation*, and Section 16.03(1) *Preparation*, requires architectural elevations shall be signed and sealed by a New Hampshire Licensed Architect, or a New Hampshire Licensed Professional Engineer, as allowed by the State of New Hampshire professional licensing boards. Specifically, the 16-sheet architectural plan set titled Phenix Block, prepared by SMP Architecture, dated October 13, 2025 is missing the sign and seal of a New Hampshire Licensed Architect and shall be provided.
- 3.2 Section 12.04(9) requires zoning district designations and boundaries to be shown clearly on the location plan. Specifically, the area plan on the cover sheet satisfies the requirements of the required location plan, with the exception that zoning district boundaries shall be provided along Storrs Street where the Central Business Performance (CBP) District and Opportunity Corridor Performance (OCP) District boundaries meet.
- 3.3 Section 13.01(6) requires a copy of any application made to a State or Federal agency required for the approval of this site plan, including those required for the development of off-site improvements be submitted as part of the application. Specifically, Note 21 on sheet 3 Site Plan states that a NHDES Sewer Connection Permit is required, and a copy of this application shall be provided to the City.
- 3.4 Section 13.02(4) *Other Public Easements*, requires Warranty Deeds or Deeds of Easement for any other public use shown on the plat or required by the Planning Board. Staff notes this application has been submitted in conjunction with a minor subdivision application for the discontinuance of Phenix Ave and lot line adjustment between the two subject parcels. Prior to final approval of the major site plan application, the minor subdivision application (PL-MIS-2025-0047) shall receive final approval and an access easement and plan, to provide public pedestrian access between North Main Street and Low Ave, shall be prepared, reviewed and

- approved by the Clerk of the Planning Board, City Solicitor, and City Engineer as to form and content, and recorded with the Merrimack County Registry of Deeds. Additionally, the easement plan shall be included in the civil plan set.
- 3.5 Section 13.02(8) *State and Federal Permits*, requires copies of all state and federal permits to be submitted to the Planning Division for review and approval prior to the issuance of a certificate of approval. Specifically, Note 21 on sheet 3 Site Plan states that a NHDES Sewer Connection Permit is required, and an approved application shall be provided to the City.
- 3.6 Section 15.03(9) *Easements or Right-of-Way*, requires on the existing conditions plan the location, dimensions, and purpose of any easements or rights-of-way be clearly shown. Specifically, the dimensions of the existing Phenix Ave and Low Ave shall be provided.
- 3.7 Section 15.03(25) *Historic Structures or Sites*, requires on the existing plan, the location and description of any historic structures or sites listed or eligible for the National or State Registers of Historic Places, and any historic markers on the site or abutting properties or rights-of-way. Specifically, the applicant shall provide a note stating whether or not the site is historic, or eligible for the National or State Registers of Historic Places.
- 3.8 Section 15.04(4) *Proposed Use* requires each site plan shall clearly identify each existing and proposed use planned for the site. Specifically, Note 6 on Site Plan indicates the proposed use, but shall also include the existing use of the property in the description.
- 3.9 Section 15.04(9) *Streets and Rights-of-Way* requires on the site plan, the location and the right-of-way and traveled way widths of all existing and proposed streets, alleys, and other public ways. Specifically, the proposed public access way between North Main Street and Low Ave shall clearly shown on the site plan.
- 3.10 Section 15.04(12) *Easements and Rights-of-way* requires on the site plan the location, width, and purpose of existing and proposed easements for road rights-of-ways, utilities, drainage, slope, open space or conservation easements and any other easement as required. Specifically, the boundary and width of the proposed public access way easement shall be shown on the site plan.
- 3.11 Section 16.02(18) *Demolition Plan* requires the demolition plan to show the extent of removal of all building, structures, pavement, and landscaping, etc. Specifically, the removal plan does not appear to show the full scope of removal to property disconnect municipal water services. Additionally, it is unclear how the building is being serviced by non-municipal utilities, including natural gas, electrical and telecommunications. The required removal for the discontinuance or installation of these nonmunicipal utilities shall be considered and shown as part of the removals and restoration limits. Additionally, the demolition plan appears to show a metal sculpture streetscape element on North Main Street within the removal limits, with no clear indication if this feature is to be preserved or removed. A callout shall be added to the plan set indicating if this fixture is to be preserved, removed, relocated, or replaced. Additionally, notes and applicable construction details shall be provided in the plan set clearly establishing how whatever action taken is to be accomplished.
- 3.12 Section 16.02(19) *Traffic Control Plan* requires where work is required or proposed within or immediately adjacent to a travel way of a public street or common private drive, a traffic control plan shall be submitted to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. Specifically, the proposed development has potential to significantly pose impacts daily vehicle and pedestrian traffic on Low Ave, North Main Street, Phenix Ave pedestrian connection, as well as festivities typically held on North Main Street. The applicant shall provide a conceptual traffic control plan demonstrating how these impacts will be mitigated prior to final approval by the Planning Board.

As a subsequent condition of approval prior to the issuance of a building permit, staff recommends the Board require the applicant to submit a complete traffic control plan, prepared by a qualified and licensed engineer, subject to the review and approval by the City Engineer.

- 3.13 Section 16.02(20) *Offsite Improvement Plan* requires where off-site improvements are required or proposed, an off-site improvement plan shall be submitted in compliance with the Standards of the City of Concord Subdivision Regulations, unless waived by the Planning Board. Staff recommends the Planning Board waive the requirement to provide a separate offsite improvement plan, as the proposed parcels to be developed are relatively small and the full scope of offsite improvements can be clearly shown within the provided plan set.
- 3.14 Section 16.02(22) *Construction Details* requires construction details shall be provided for all utilities, driveways, and parking areas, pavement markings, sidewalks and patios, drainage facilities and structures, information, regulatory and directional signage, outdoor recreation facilities, common mailboxes, street furniture, solid waste receptacles, buffer walls and fences, retaining walls, landscaping, and site lighting. Specifically, the herringbone brick pattern on the Paving Pattern for 7'-0" wide brick furniture zone doesn't appear to match the pattern installed on North Main Street. The pattern of brick shall be verified to match what was installed along North Main Street. Staff recommends the applicant also contact City Engineering about utilizing the same details which were used as part of the original construction of all North Main Street facilities.
- 3.15 Section 16.03(5) *Windows, Doors, and Roofs* requires the type and pitch of roofs shall be noted on the elevations. The size and spacing of all windows and door openings shall be noted on the elevations. Specifically, the type and slope of roofs, size and spacing of windows and doors appear to be missing from the elevations and shall be added.
- 3.16 Section 16.03(8) *Dimensions*, requires horizontal and vertical dimensions shall be provided on the architectural elevations including the maximum height to the top of the roof, any mansard, roof top structure, mechanical equipment, cupola, flag pole, or other appurtenant structure. A vertical dimension from the average ground level on each side of the building to the top of each floor shall be provided. Specifically, none of the required horizontal or vertical dimensions appear to shown and shall be provided.
- 3.17 The Assessing Department and Fire Department had no determination of completeness compliance comments.
- 3.18 The Engineering Services Division compliance comments are noted in the attached 8-page memo to Alec Bass from Paul Gildersleeve and Pete Kohalmi, dated November 10, 2025.

Site Plan Regulations Compliance:

- 3.19 The application submittal has only been reviewed for items specific to the determination of completeness for the Planning Board, which included Sections 12, 13, 15, and 16 of the Site Plan Regulations. Prior to the public hearing, a complete analysis and staff review of the application will be conducted and provided for the Planning Board.

4. Variances:

- 4.1 No variances are requested.

5. Waivers:

- 5.1 The applicant requests a waiver from the following section of the Site Plan Regulations:

- a. Section 16.02(12)(b), to not require a drainage study including 10- and 25-year storm runoff estimates, including all calculations.
- b. Section 16.02(15) *Landscape Plan* & 27.03 *Landscape Plans*, to not require a stamped landscape plan showing the location of existing, required, and proposed landscaping, a plant schedule showing all proposed plant material, and landscape construction details.

6. Conditional Use Permits:

- 6.1 The applicant requests approval for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) pursuant to Section 28-4-1(g)(2), which allows a building located in the CBP or OCP to obstruct the views of the State House Dome from specific locations Interstates 93 and 393, provided the Planning Board grants Architectural Design Review approval and makes the findings listed below in granting the CUP from both Sections 28-9-4(b) and 28-4-1(g)(2). The CUP would apply to the properties located at 44-52 North Main St and 54-56 North Main Street, along with a connection to and renovation of 34-42 North Main St.

Analysis of the required criteria for Section 28-9-4(b) *Conditional Use Permits* for the principal use follows:

- a. The use is specifically authorized in this ordinance as a conditional use;

Review: The use (mixed use residential/entertainment) is permitted in the CBP, and the specific item in question, the maximum height, is permitted to be increased through a CUP by Section 28-4-1(g)(6) to a maximum of 90'. The applicant's proposed building height is 89'-6". **Staff recommends the Board find that this criterion is satisfied by the applicant's proposal.**

- b. If completed as proposed by the applicant, the development in its proposed location will comply with the requirements of this article, and with the specific conditions of standards established in this ordinance for the particular use;

Review: Satisfaction of this criterion is dependent on the Board's decision on the associated CUP for obstruction of the State House Dome. **Staff recommends that if the Dome obstruction CUP is granted, the Board find that this criterion is satisfied by the applicant's proposal.**

- c. The use will not materially endanger the public health or safety;

Review: The uses proposed are permitted under the Zoning Ordinance, and the building will be constructed and inspected per all required building and life safety codes. **Staff recommends the Board find that this criterion is satisfied by the applicant's proposal.**

- d. The use will be compatible with the neighborhood and with adjoining or abutting uses in the area in which it is to be located;

Review: The proposed mixed-use project is consistent with the adjoining and abutting uses along Main Street and generally in downtown Concord. **Staff recommends the Board find that this criterion is satisfied by the applicant's proposal.**

- e. The use will not have an adverse effect on highway or pedestrian safety;

Review: As proposed and currently designed, the properties' use would not have adverse impacts for pedestrians or vehicular traffic, outside of during the construction process. **Staff recommends the Board find that this criterion is satisfied by the applicant's proposal**

- f. The use will not have an adverse effect on the natural, environmental, and historic resources of the City;

Review: While the proposed redevelopment project does include the demolition of the former E&P Hotel building (which had been determined as a contributing structure to a potential downtown historic district), there has been some measure of review completed by the City's Heritage Commission, which voted on October 19, 2023 to determine that the demolition of the building was not significant individually, and therefore could be demolished and be part of an RSA 79-E tax relief incentive for the redevelopment of the property. While this vote was specifically intended to be a necessary component of an eventual RSA 79-E tax relief incentive request (to be considered by the City Council at some future date), it does provide guidance that the Planning Board can draw upon in determining compliance with this criterion. **Staff recommends the Board find that this criterion is satisfied by the applicant's proposal.**

- g. The use will be adequately serviced by necessary public utilities and by community facilities and services of a sufficient capacity to ensure the proper operation of the proposed use, and will not necessitate excessive public expenditures to provide facilities and services with sufficient additional capacity.

Review: As it pertains to this criterion, the proposed redevelopment uses do not materially impact public utilities and services. However, as this criterion relates to the proposed building height, there is additional information required by Section 28-4-1(g)(6) relative to the ability to provide adequate water pressure and fire protection services to the building at the proposed height that must be satisfied. **Staff notes the applicant has not yet provided the applicable information relative to water pressure and fire protection under Section 28-4-1(g)(6), and cannot determine at this time if this criterion has been met.**

Analysis of the required criteria for Section 28-4-1(g)(6) follows:

- a. Buildings or structures shall exceed the height limit only to the minimum extent necessary to accomplish the development program as approved by the Planning Board, and in no case shall any building or structure exceed a height of ninety (90) feet from average grade as calculated in Section 28-4-1(f);

Review: As represented by the applicant, the proposed 9'-6" increase above the 80' building height requirement is necessary to provide an additional story of residential units, which provide a revenue stream integral to the overall financial viability of the project. Staff expects that a full and comprehensive review of the project's financial viability will be undertaken by the Assistant Director of Community Development as part of the review of an upcoming RSA 79-E tax relief incentive application associated with the project. Even without this comprehensive review, a cursory understanding of the project costs by City staff is consistent with the applicant's assertion that the residential units are critical to the project's viability. **Staff recommends the Board find that this criterion is satisfied by the applicant's proposal.**

- b. Notwithstanding subsection "a" above, no building or structure shall exceed a height of ninety (90) feet from the elevation of South Main Street if located, or proposed to be located, in the Central Business Performance District westerly of South Main Street, between Pleasant Street and Concord Street;

Review: The proposed building height is 89'-6". **Staff recommends the Board find that this criterion is satisfied by the applicant's proposal.**

- c. Buildings or structures which exceed the height limit shall be designed to minimize shadow impacts and impacts to solar access to public parks and open space, and on adjacent buildings and properties, to the extent feasible to accomplish the development program as approved by the Planning Board;

Review: The applicant notes building "step-backs" intended to address this criterion, however the narrative description does not provide any further evidence or provide any materials in the application that can be reviewed to determine compliance. **Staff recommends the Board require the applicant to provide additional information, study, or analysis of the shadow and solar access impacts on the surrounding area prior to making a finding relative to compliance with this criterion.**

- d. The design of buildings or structures which exceed the height limit shall respect the surrounding vernacular architecture and make a positive contribution to the architectural character of the City's skyline as determined by the Planning Board. Additionally, the design of buildings and structures which exceed the height limit shall respect the view of the State House Dome unless a conditional use permit to obstruct the view of the State House Dome has otherwise been approved by the Planning Board in accordance with Article 28-4-1(g)(2);

Review: Satisfaction of this criterion is dependent on the Board's decision on the associated CUP for obstruction of the State House Dome. **Staff recommends that if the Dome obstruction CUP is granted, the Board find that this criterion is satisfied by the applicant's proposal.**

- e. Unless otherwise approved by the Planning Board in conjunction with a conditional use permit, the design of buildings or structures which exceed the height limit shall be built to conform with Article 28-5-48(g)(2)g. of this Ordinance;

Review: The preliminary review of the applicant's various applications (CUP, minor subdivision/roadway discontinuance, major site plan) indicate that the CBP District's supplemental standards are complied with, or will be complied with through the granting building height and Dome obstruction CUPs, at the time of final site plan approval. **Staff recommends that the Board find that this criterion is satisfied by the applicant's proposal, provided that all relevant approvals (CUPs, Architectural Design Review, minor subdivision/roadway discontinuance, major site plan) are granted as part of the Planning Board's overall actions on the redevelopment project.**

- f. That the applicant has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the City Engineer that buildings or structures exceeding the height limit shall have adequate potable water pressure for fire suppression and domestic use;

Review: The applicant has not provided information for the City Engineer's review, only a narrative statement that the information necessary "can be demonstrated." **Because the**

applicable information relative to this criterion has not been provided, Staff cannot determine at this time if this criterion has been met.

- g. That the applicant has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Fire Chief that buildings or structures exceeding the height limit can be served by the City's tower ladder fire apparatus;

Review: The applicant has not provided information for the Fire Chief's review, only a narrative statement that the information necessary "can be demonstrated." **Because the applicable information relative to this criterion has not been provided, Staff cannot determine at this time if this criterion has been met.**

- h. That the buildings or structures which exceed the height limit shall be directly adjacent to at least one building or structure that is three (3) stories or more in height located on the same side of the street as the subject property for which the conditional use permit has been applied;

Review: The existing adjacent buildings are both greater than 3 stories. **Staff recommends the Board find that this criterion is satisfied by the applicant's proposal.**

- i. That the buildings or structures which exceed the height limit shall not be located at properties that have more than fifteen (15) feet of frontage on North State Street or South State Street, or be in those portions of the Central Business Performance District located westerly of North State Street;

Review: The project is not located on North or South State Street. **Staff recommends the Board find that this criterion is not applicable to the applicant's proposal.**

- j. Buildings or structures which exceed the maximum height limit shall achieve one of the following public benefits for the community:

I. Results in the use or reuse of real estate which will enhance the vitality or vibrancy of the Downtown Central Business District to an extent greater than what would otherwise be achieved within the maximum height limitation; or,

II. Results in the removal of slums, or blight, or the cleanup and redevelopment of a property contaminated with hazardous materials (i.e. brownfield site), or results in the economically viable redevelopment of an underutilized property which could not otherwise be achieved; or

III. Expands the supply of housing units within the Downtown Central Business District by at least ten (10) dwelling units.

Review: The project is proposed to add 36 new residential units, which satisfies subsection III. **Staff recommends the Board find that this criterion is satisfied by the applicant's proposal.**

- k. For applications involving the demolition and replacement of existing structures, that the applicant has sufficiently demonstrated, and the Planning Board has determined:

I. The existing building or structure is not a viable candidate for preservation, rehabilitation, and adaptive reuse due to the building's or structure's condition, characteristics, or other circumstances;

- II. The demolition of the existing building or structure will not result in a significant adverse impact on the historical, cultural, or architectural resources in the community. The Planning Board may require the Applicant provide to the Planning Board, at the Applicant's expense, reports, documents, or evaluations of the subject property prepared by one or more qualified professional(s) selected by the Applicant, or other parties acceptable to the Planning Board, to assist the Planning Board with its review of the Applicant's project and evaluation of its potential impacts upon historic, cultural and architectural resources;
- III. The replacement building or structure will achieve all of the following public benefits:
 - 1. Results in the use or reuse of real estate which will enhance the vitality or vibrancy of the Downtown Central Business District to an extent greater than what would otherwise be achieved within the maximum height limitation, and if the existing building was otherwise preserved and renovated; and,
 - 2. The vitality or vibrancy resulting from the replacement building or structure will be to a greater degree than if the existing building or structure was otherwise preserved and renovated; and,
 - 3. Results in the removal of slums, or blight, or the cleanup and redevelopment of a property contaminated with hazardous materials (i.e. brownfield site), or results in the viable redevelopment of an underutilized property which could not otherwise be achieved if the existing building was otherwise preserved; and,
 - 4. Expands the supply of housing units within the Downtown Central Business District by at least ten (10) additional units.
- IV. That the existing building or structure is not a viable candidate for preservation and adaptive reuse due to the building or structure's condition, characteristics, or circumstances.

Review: The applicant, though not part of this CUP application, had previously provided information to the Heritage Commission in 2023 which appeared to meet all the various requirements of this criterion. Materials that were used as part of the Heritage Commission's 2023 determination regarding RSA 79-E should be submitted to the Planning Board and be reviewed as part of this application. **Staff recommends the Board require the applicant to provide the information, study, and analysis of the redevelopment that were utilized by the Heritage Commission prior to making a finding relative to compliance with this criterion.**

Staff reminds the Board that, in issuing a CUP, the Board may, upon its consideration of applicable design review guidelines, including the Architectural Design Guidelines and the Main Street Design Guide as adopted and amended, attach conditions to the CUP including, but not limited to requirements related to location, size, scale, mass, height, color, materials, and other architectural details of a building or structure which will exceed the height limit.

- 6.2 The applicant requests approval for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) pursuant to Section 28-4-1(g)(2), which allows a building located in the CBP or OCP to obstruct the views of the State House Dome from specific locations Interstates 93 and 393, provided the Planning Board grants Architectural Design Review approval and makes the findings listed below in granting the CUP from both Sections 28-9-4(b) and 28-4-1(g)(2). The CUP would apply to the properties located at

44-52 North Main St and 54-56 North Main Street, along with a connection to and renovation of 34-42 North Main St.

Analysis of the required criteria for Section 28-9-4(b) *Conditional Use Permits* for the principal use follows:

- a. The use is specifically authorized in this ordinance as a conditional use;

Review: The use (mixed use residential/entertainment) is permitted in the CBP, and the specific item in question, the obstruction of the State House Dome, is permitted to occur if permitted through the CUP by Section 28-4-1(g)(2). Satisfaction of all necessary CUP criteria will be required as part of the overall project (which includes CUPs, minor subdivision/roadway discontinuance, and a major site plan). **Staff recommends the Board find that this criterion is satisfied by the applicant's proposal.**

- b. If completed as proposed by the applicant, the development in its proposed location will comply with the requirements of this article, and with the specific conditions of standards established in this ordinance for the particular use;

Review: Satisfaction of this criterion is dependent on the Board's decision on the associated CUP for building height. **Staff recommends that if the building height CUP is granted, the Board find that this criterion is satisfied by the applicant's proposal.**

- c. The use will not materially endanger the public health or safety;

Review: The uses proposed are permitted under the Zoning Ordinance, and the building will be constructed and inspected per all required building and life safety codes. **Staff recommends the Board find that this criterion is satisfied by the applicant's proposal.**

- d. The use will be compatible with the neighborhood and with adjoining or abutting uses in the area in which it is to be located;

Review: The proposed mixed-use project is consistent with the adjoining and abutting uses along Main Street and generally in downtown Concord. **Staff recommends the Board find that this criterion is satisfied by the applicant's proposal.**

- e. The use will not have an adverse effect on highway or pedestrian safety;

Review: As proposed and currently designed, the properties' use would not have adverse impacts for pedestrians or vehicular traffic, outside of during the construction process. **Staff recommends the Board find that this criterion is satisfied by the applicant's proposal.**

- f. The use will not have an adverse effect on the natural, environmental, and historic resources of the City;

Review: While the proposed redevelopment project does include the demolition of the former E&P Hotel building (which had been determined as a contributing structure to a potential downtown historic district), there has been some measure of review completed by the City's Heritage Commission, which voted on October 19, 2023 to determine that the demolition of the building was not significant individually, and therefore could be demolished and be part of an RSA 79-E tax relief incentive for the redevelopment of the property. While this vote was specifically intended to be a necessary component of an eventual RSA 79-E tax relief

incentive request (to be considered by the City Council at some future date), it does provide guidance that the Planning Board can draw upon in determining compliance with this criterion. **Staff recommends the Board find that this criterion is satisfied by the applicant's proposal.**

- g. The use will be adequately serviced by necessary public utilities and by community facilities and services of a sufficient capacity to ensure the proper operation of the proposed use, and will not necessitate excessive public expenditures to provide facilities and services with sufficient additional capacity.

Review: As it pertains to this criterion, the proposed redevelopment uses do not materially impact public utilities and services. *Staff notes that for this CUP (for the State House Dome obstruction), the issues relative to water pressure and fire protection from the building height CUP are not applicable.* **Staff recommends the Board find that this criterion is satisfied by the applicant's proposal.**

Analysis of the required criteria for Section 28-4-1(g)(2) follows:

- a. Buildings or structures shall only obstruct the view of the State House Dome to the minimum extent necessary to accomplish the development program as approved by the Planning Board;

Review: The applicant has provided a narrative explanation of the proposed obstruction, coupled with a viewshed analysis exhibit, indicating the locations along Interstate 93 where the proposed building would partially obstruct the view of the State House Dome. The applicant contends that the obstruction is minimal, given the highway speed vehicles will be traveling along I-93, and further explains the necessity of the upper story of the building to necessary to provide an additional story of residential units, which provide a revenue stream integral to the overall financial viability of the project. **Assuming the Board agrees that the obstruction is minimalized to the extent practicable, Staff recommends the Board find that this criterion is satisfied by the applicant's proposal.**

- b. The design of buildings or structures which obstruct the view of the State House Dome shall provide a positive contribution to the architectural character of the Downtown Central Business District and Opportunity Corridor, as well as to the visual image of the City's skyline as determined by the Planning Board;

Review: The applicant has presented the design of the project building on multiple occasions over the years, primarily to the Architectural Design Review Committee and Heritage Commission. In general, the applicant has received positive feedback in these preliminary design meetings. A formal recommendation from the Architectural Design Review Committee will occur prior to the public hearing on this application with the Planning Board. **Assuming the Board receives a positive recommendation on the formal application from the Architectural Design Review Committee, Staff recommends the Board find that this criterion is satisfied by the applicant's proposal.**

- c. The design of buildings or structures within the Central Business Performance District which obstruct the view of the State House Dome shall be built to incorporate recommendations set forth in the Architectural Design Guidelines and the Main Street Design Guide, as adopted and amended. Unless otherwise approved by the Planning Board in conjunction with the

Planning Board's conditional use permit approval, buildings and structures shall conform with Article 28-5-48(g)(2)g. of this Ordinance.

Review: The applicant has provided a narrative and renderings of the design responding to this criterion. A formal recommendation from the Architectural Design Review Committee will occur prior to the public hearing on this application with the Planning Board. **Assuming the Board receives a positive recommendation on the formal application from the Architectural Design Review Committee, Staff recommends the Board find that this criterion is satisfied by the applicant's proposal.**

- d. Unless otherwise approved by the Planning Board in conjunction with a conditional use permit, the design of buildings or structures within the Opportunity Corridor Performance District which obstruct the view of the State House Dome, and for which a Conditional Use Permit has been granted to exceed the maximum height limitation in accordance with Article 28-4-1(g)(5), each story of a building for which the floor level is at an elevation of more than sixty-five (65) feet above street level, the front, side, and rear walls of those stories shall be set back ten (10) feet from the exterior wall of those portions of the building located below sixty-five (65) feet; and

Review: The applicant's design does contain the required step-backs at heights above 65' as required by this criterion. **Staff recommends the Board find that this criterion is satisfied by the applicant's proposal.**

- e. Buildings or structures which obstruct the view of the State House Dome shall achieve one of the following public benefits for the community:
 - I. Results in the use or reuse of real estate which will enhance the vitality or vibrancy of the Downtown Central Business District or Opportunity Corridor to an extent greater than that could otherwise be achieved if the view of the Dome was not obstructed; or,
 - II. Results in the removal of slums, or blight, or the cleanup and redevelopment of a property contaminated with hazardous materials (i.e. brownfield site), or results in an economically viable redevelopment of an underutilized property or building which could not otherwise be achieved if the view of the State House Dome was not obstructed; or
 - III. Expands the supply of housing units within the Downtown Central Business District or Opportunity Corridor by at least ten (10) dwelling units.

Review: The project is proposed to add 36 new residential units, which satisfies subsection III. **Staff recommends the Board find that this criterion is satisfied by the applicant's proposal.**

Staff reminds the Board that, in issuing a CUP, the Board may, upon its consideration of applicable design review guidelines, including the Architectural Design Guidelines and the Main Street Design Guide as adopted and amended, attach conditions to the CUP including but not limited to requirements related to location, size, scale, mass, height, color, materials, and other architectural design details of a building or structure which will obstruct the State House Dome.

7. Architectural Design Review:

- 7.1 The applicant is scheduled to appear before the Architectural Design Review Committee for a recommendation on architectural design review on December 2, 2025.

8. Conservation Commission:

8.1 Appearances before the Conservation Commission are not required for this application.

9. Recommendation:

9.1 Staff reviewed the application for completeness based upon the criteria of the Site Plan Regulations, and concluded that not all criteria for completeness have been met, and that the application does not contain sufficient information and detail for a full review and action by the Board. Including items required by Sections 12, 13, 15, and 16 of the Site Plan Regulations as outlined in Section 3 of the staff report. Additionally, Section 15.01(10) requires accompanying conditional use permit applications with a site plan application to be complete. Staff have determined the submission of the conditional use permit applications to be incomplete for a complete review by the Planning Board, as outlined in Section 6 of the staff report.

Based upon staff's review of the application, it is recommended that the Board move to:

- **Determine the application incomplete;**
- **State that the project does not meet the criteria for a development of regional impact per RSA 36:55; and,**
- **Advise the applicant to address the incomplete items noted in Section 3 and Section 6 of the staff report, revise and resubmit the plan set. Additionally, the Board should recommend that applicant also review and consider the compliance comments provided by City Engineering prior to future plan resubmissions.**

However, if the Planning Board, after reviewing the application vote to determine the application as complete, despite staff's recommendation above, then the Board should move to:

- Determine the application complete;
- State that the project does not meet the criteria for a development of regional impact per RSA 36:55; and,
- Set the public hearing for December 17, 2025



CITY OF CONCORD
New Hampshire's Main Street™
Community Development Department

Michael S. Bezanson, PE
City Engineer

MEMORANDUM

TO: Alec Bass, Assistant City Planner
FROM: Paul Gildersleeve, PE and Pete Kohalmi, PE
DATE: November 10, 2025
SUBJECT: Phenix Block Redevelopment & Phenix Hall Renovations– Major Site Plan, Waivers, LLA, and CUP- Engineering Review
34-56 N. Main St; Map 6443Z, Lots 27 and 28; City Projects 2025-122, 123, and 125

The Engineering Services Division (Engineering) has received the following items for review:

- Site Improvement Plans by Northpoint Engineering, LLC, dated October 8, 2025
- Resubdivision Plat by Richard D. Bartlett & Assoc., dated October 8, 2025
- Project Narrative, received October 15, 2025
- CUP Requests, received October 15, 2025
- Waiver Requests, received October 15, 2025

As a supplement to any comments offered by the Planning Division, Engineering offers the following design related comments. With subsequent submissions, the applicant shall provide a response letter that acknowledges or addresses each of these comments and discusses any additional changes to the plans.

1. General Comments

- a. Show the pre- and post-development roof drain flows for the 2-, 10-, and 25-year flood, pursuant to City of Concord Site Plan Regulations (CSPR) 16.02(12)(b) and 22.07(1). Peak flow rates post-development should not exceed pre-development conditions.
- b. The applicant does not show how pedestrian and vehicular traffic will be routed around the work site. Traffic control plans will need to show these details.

- c. Phenix Avenue is proposed to be discontinued and the 25-foot wide right-of-way area is largely proposed to be converted to what is called an “open air lobby” with reserved rights for pedestrian access between North Main Street and Low Avenue. Because of the 10-foot elevation difference proposed between this “open air lobby” and Low Avenue, an elevator has been proposed to provide an accessible public pathway between North Main Street and Low Avenue. Although an elevator could be designed in this situation to meet the requirements of ADA/PROWAG, the City does not desire to take on the significant on-going maintenance associated with an elevator. If this “open air lobby” is proposed to be a City sidewalk, please propose a reasonable alternative for an accessible pathway, such as a ramped access way that meets ADA/PROWAG. It is understood that this may need to be accomplished by sacrificing some of the proposed basement space underneath the so-called “open air lobby”.
- d. Because Phenix Avenue is proposed to be discontinued as a public right-of-way and a building is proposed above and below the proposed “open air lobby”, public water and public sanitary sewer utility mains in Phenix Avenue need to be addressed in some manner as part of the proposed project. It is understood that there is some history with the development of the proposed plan with the previous City Engineer. It was recognized that the proposed plan would need approval from the City Engineer, as the proposal does not meet the City’s Construction Standards. Although the proposed utility changes could physically be constructed, as attested by a local contractor during meetings with Engineering Services Division staff, the proposal is not desirable for the following reasons. First, new City infrastructure (public water and public sanitary sewer mains) are being proposed beneath a building. Although there is an “open air lobby” above, there is also basement and mechanical room space proposed directly above the utilities. There will be no ability to excavate and access these utilities for any maintenance. Second, the pipe sleeves proposed to mitigate the lack of access to the utility mains will require significant access pits be excavated on both ends of the “open air lobby” to cut and remove the proposed pipe at depths greater than 12-feet and 15-feet to install replacement pipe when needed. This would be a very significant effort causing very significant disturbance to both North Main Street and Low Avenue at very significant cost. Third, the pipe material proposed is not an approved pipe material according to the City’s Construction Standards. It is understood that HDPE pipe is proposed in an attempt to mitigate the lack of access to maintain the mains in a normal manner, however the City’s maintenance crews are not equipped to provide maintenance to HDPE pipes. Fourth, the proposed pipe within a sleeve underneath a building will not allow for normal leak detection

and monitoring of the City's utility mains. Issues would likely not be detected until the issue became significant, likely affecting private property. As such, please propose relocation of the public water and public sanitary sewer mains within City right-of-way. It is likely that public water could be looped from the 20-inch water main in North Main Street at the intersection with Depot Street, along Depot Street to the intersection with Low Avenue, and along Low Avenue to the existing 10-inch water main. It is also likely that the public sanitary sewer could be relaid/laid in North Main Street from the intersection with Phenix Avenue to the intersection with Depot Street, and along Depot Street to an existing sanitary sewer manhole at the intersection of Low Avenue.

- e. The City owns in fee, two strips of land within the public highway limits of Phenix Avenue, with both being 6.81 feet wide. The northerly strip abuts the southerly line of Map 6443Z, Lot 27, and the southerly strip abuts the northerly line of Map 6443Z, Lots 28 & 28A. See MCRD Book 898, Page 344.
- f. The Resubdivision Plat contemplates a public highway discontinuance of Phenix Avenue, and a lot line adjustment between Map 6443Z, Lot 27 and Map 6443Z, Lots 28 & 28A. Prior to the lot line adjustment occurring, the Concord City Council will need to vote on the public highway discontinuance of Phenix Avenue, and vote on the conveyance of the two strips of land to Ciborowski Associates, LLC (Map 6443Z, Lot 27) and Phenix Hall, LLC (Map 6443Z, Lots 28 & 28A).
- g. Any discontinuance of a city street requires input and a recommendation from the planning board. See Concord Code of Ordinances 30-2-20(d)(10).

30-2-20 - Community Development Department.

(d) The Division of Community Planning shall be under the immediate supervision of the City Planner. It shall perform the following functions:

(10) Make recommendations of Mapped Line of Future Streets, street acceptances or discontinuances, and disposition of tax deeded properties on behalf of the Planning Board.

- h. A draft petition and resolution of the proposed discontinuance will need to be submitted to the City Council.

2. Conditional Use Permit

- a. The applicant is applying for a conditional use permit under Article 28-4-1(g)(6) and 28-4-1(g)(2), to allow a portion of the proposed mixed-used building to be constructed to a maximum height of 89.5', and to allow a partial obstruction of views of the State House Dome from Interstate 93,

respectively. The requirements of Article 28-9-4(b)(4)(a-g) have been addressed. Engineering takes no position on these requests as they are non-technical in nature.

3. Waiver Request from 16.02(12)(b)

- a. A waiver has been requested from 16.02(12)(b), which requires a drainage study for the 10- and 25-year storms, including pre- and post-development characteristics. Since the roof area appears to increase post-development, the roof drains would need to be sized to handle this increased flow and velocity. A pre- and post-development calculation is needed to ensure more flows are not collected downstream of the roof drains. The 2-year flows required by CSPR 22.07(a) are also needed. Therefore, Engineering does not support this waiver request.

4. Sheet 1 of 1, Existing Conditions Plat

- a. Show the ROW width of Phenix Avenue, pursuant to CSPR 15.04(9).
- b. Please include a list of plan references pursuant to CSPR 12.06(4,5).
- c. Show the existing electric and telephone lines, pursuant to CSPR 15.03(11).
- d. Show landscaping irrigation conduit on Main St. The City can provide plans for reference.

5. Sheet 2 of 11, Removals Plan

- a. Please show disposition of the snow melter on the sidewalk in front of Phenix Ave.
- b. What is the function and disposition of the inspection port against the north side of the Phenix Hall building?
- c. What is the disposition of the metal sculpture in the sidewalk in front of the alley?
- d. What is the disposition of the existing water and sewer mains under Phenix Ave?
- e. What is the disposition of the monitoring well on the southeast corner of Phenix Hall where an elevator is to be installed?
- f. Note 5 calls for existing water services to be cut and capped outside the trench limits of the new foundation and then abandoned in place. However,

Concord's Construction Standards require water service abandonment at the water main.

6. Sheet 3 of 11, Site Plan

- a. Indicate which parking spaces will be restriped in Low Avenue.
- b. Site Plan shows granite pavers in the sidewalk area where a raised sculpture feature exists today. Some feature is necessary in this area to accommodate the change in grade from below the granite step to above the granite step that exists in the middle of the sidewalk area along North Main Street. The Grading & Drainage Plan does not adequately address how this will be resolved. Please indicate whether the raised sculpture feature will be replaced in-kind or with some other feature around which the grade of the granite pavers could be gradually adjusted to match existing grades.

7. Sheet 4 of 11, Grading and Drainage Plan

- a. Turn off the water and sanitary sewer symbols.

8. Sheet 5 of 11, Utilities Plan

- a. Since the roof drain from Lot 27 is in the Low Avenue ROW, revise the roof drain material from HDPEP to either RCP, PVC, or DIP, pursuant to City of Concord Construction Standards and Details (CCSD) Section 6(2)(4)(a).
- b. Include a tee wye and invert callout where the proposed 6" sewer service on Lot 27 connects to the sewer main.
- c. Show MH 9693 on the storm line in Low Avenue, as shown in the included City of Concord GIS pdf.
- d. Show the sewer service from Lot 28 connecting to the existing sewer line with a tee wye. Include an invert callout for the tee wye.
- e. An existing water-valve symbol is shown on the southeast corner of the Lot 28 building. Please show how this valve connects to a water line.
- f. Please show the proposed water service for the proposed building on Lot 27. Fire suppression connections shall be identified.
- g. Show a sewer clean-out near the connection to the main in Low Ave.
- h. The sewer service for Phenix Hall shall be a minimum of 6" dia.

- i. Clarify or depict how the public will access the proposed walkway and the proposed elevator shaft at the former Phenix Ave and state who will maintain this proposed walkway and elevator shaft. Please provide a detail of this proposed walkway and elevator shaft.
- j. A relocated water service is shown for Phenix Hall. Provide size and material for this service. Provide a shut-off.
- k. A call-out near the eastern end of the proposed water main refers to the sleeve as 15" dia. Other details indicate this to be 18" dia.
- l. Construction Note 3 refers to the 2016 Construction Standards. Please revise to the 2020 Construction Standards.
- m. Construction Note 9 refers to obtaining permits from General Services but it is the Engineering Division who issues Utility Connection and Excavation permits.

9. Sheet 6 of 11, Utilities Profiles

- a. On the Sewer Profile show the existing 12" AC sewer main (and upstream MH) in an existing linetype. Show the existing 12" AC sewer pipe and MH on the downstream section of the profile near station 1+58, also in an existing linetype. Show the existing sewer pipe and MH. Disregard this comment if the sewer design will be revised as commented above in 1d.

10. Sheet 7 of 11, Erosion Control Plan

- a. The Proposed Construction Exit and Silt Fence shown in the legend cannot be found on the plan. Please show these on the plan and detail sheets, or remove them from the legend. Also show a detail of the catch basin inlet protection that is shown in the legend and plan view.

11. Sheet 8 of 11, Construction Details

- a. Show callouts for Details C-1 and M-1 in plan view, or remove the details from this sheet if they're not needed.
- b. On the Concrete Sidewalk Finish Detail, the note "Expansion or Control Joint" states to see plans; should this not refer to sheet 9? Also, two notes refer to this sheet for additional details, even though they are not located on this sheet but sheet 9 instead. Please revise.
- c. On the Sanitary Sewer Main/Service Trench Detail, and the Water Main/Service Trench Detail on Sheet 9, note the Open-Air Lobby floor section as a surface type (instead of cross country/under roadway).

12. Sheet 9 of 11, Construction Details

- a. In the Joint Details, revise the depth of the joints for the Tooled Control Joint and the Saw Cut Control Joint to be $\frac{1}{4}$ slab thickness. Also, revise the width of the cut in these two details, and the Expansion Joint Detail, to $\frac{5}{16}$ " to $\frac{1}{4}$ ", pursuant to CCSD Section 3(3)(O)(4).
- b. In the Pedestrian Concrete Sidewalk and Brick Paver Details, revise W1.4xW1.4 to W2.9xW2.9, pursuant to CCSD Section 3(2)(D)(3).
- c. Please add a Granite Paver Detail to depict construction of these pavers in a manner consistent with the existing pavers.

13. Sheet 10 of 11, Construction Details

- a. On the Paving Pattern at Utility Detail, Note 1, specify which specifications are being referred to.
- b. Include a bituminous paving section for the area of Low Avenue that will be removed.

State/Federal Permits

The project may require the following state and/or federal permit(s) associated with the site design:

- EPA General Construction Permit
- NHDES Alteration of Terrain Permit
- NHDES Sewer Connection Permit

Per Site Plan Regulation 13.02 (8) and/or Subdivision Regulation 13.02 (10), a copy of the State and Federal permit(s) shall be submitted to the City prior to final approval.

Post-Approval/Pre-Construction Requirements

The following items are required prior to the start of construction:

1. The following permit(s) will need to be obtained from the Engineering Services Division:
 - Excavation Permits for Drainage, Sewer, and Water
 - Other permits deemed necessary by the City Engineer

Please note that all Engineering permits must now be applied for online using the City's new Citizen Self Service (CSS) Permit Portal, which can be found here:

<http://concordnh.gov/1915/Engineering-Permits-Fees>

2. Per Site Plan Regulation 36.24, the Applicant is responsible for paying engineering permit inspection fees to ensure work is consistent with City standards and the Approved Plans.

Prior to scheduling the pre-construction meeting, the Applicant should apply for the required Engineering permits listed above and provide an estimate of the anticipated number of inspections for review by Engineering. The Applicant shall provide a project schedule when applying for the required permits.

The permit fees shall be paid prior to scheduling the pre-construction meeting.

3. Establish a performance surety (bond, letter of credit, or cash deposit) for work within the Right-of-Way and proposed public improvements or common private improvements per Subdivision Regulation 10.09, prior to subdivision plat signature (13.02 (7), and 30.01. An engineer's cost estimate, prepared by the Applicant and based on the current NHDOT weighted average unit prices, shall be submitted a minimum of two weeks prior to scheduling the pre-construction meeting.
4. When above requirements have been met, request to set up a pre-construction meeting with the Engineering Services Division to discuss construction requirements, site inspections, associated fees, schedules, etc. Engineering permits will not be authorized (unless explicitly stated otherwise) until final revised plans have been submitted and approved to the satisfaction of Planning and Engineering.

Construction Requirements

1. Shop drawings/submittals shall be submitted to Engineering for the proposed water, sewer, drainage improvements as applicable.
2. Per Site Plan Regulation 12.09, prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy (CO), the contractor shall submit digital as-built drawings that are to the satisfaction of Engineering and conforming to the Engineering as-built checklist. A copy of the as-built drawing requirements is available on the Engineering Services Division section of the City of Concord website.
3. Retaining wall design drawings (stamped Structural Engineer licensed in the State of NH) shall be submitted to Engineering for proposed retaining walls that are greater than 4 feet high. In addition, walls greater than 48 inches require a Building Permit from the Code Administration Office.