City of Concord Planning Board
September 16, 2026 - Draft
Minutes

The regular monthly meeting of the Concord Planning Board was held on September 16, 2026, at 7:00 p.m., in City Council Chambers at 37 Green St, Concord.

Attendees: Chair Richard Woodfin, Teresa Rosenberger (Ex-Officio for City Manager), Amanda Savage, Eaton Tarbell, Councilor Brent Todd, Paige Wilber and Alternate Leon LaFreniere

Absent: Dina Condodemetraky, David Fox, Matthew Hicks and Alternate Frank Kenison

Staff: Tim Thompson – (Assistant Director of Community Development / Acting City Planner), Alec Bass (Assistant City Planner – Community Planning), Krista Tremblay (Administrative Technician III), and Michael Bezanson (City Engineer)

1. **Call to Order**
   Chair Woodfin called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. **Roll Call**
   The Acting Clerk of the Planning Board, Tim Thompson, did the roll call, noting that a quorum is present.

   Chair Woodfin noted for the record that Alternate Leon LaFreniere will be a voting member tonight in the absence of Matthew Hicks.

3. **Approval of Meeting Minutes**
   On a motion made by Member Savage, seconded by Member Wilber, the Planning Board voted 7-0-0 to approve the August 19, 2026, Planning Board meeting minutes, as written.

4. **Agenda Overview**
   On a motion made by Member Savage, seconded by Councilor Todd, the Planning Board voted 7-0-0 to continue agenda item 6C to a date certain of October 21, 2026, at the request of the applicant.

   On a motion made by Member Savage, seconded by Member Tarbell, the Planning Board voted 7-0-0 to continue agenda item 9A to a date certain of October 21, 2026, at the request of the applicant.

   On a motion made by Member Savage, seconded by Councilor Todd, the Planning Board voted 7-0-0 to continue agenda item 9B to a date certain of October 21, 2026, at the request of the applicant.

   On a motion made by Member Rosenberger, seconded by Member Savage, the Planning Board voted 7-0-0 to continue agenda item 9C to a date certain of October 21, 2026, at the request of the applicant.

   On a motion made by Member Savage, seconded by Member Wilber, the Planning Board voted 7-0-0 to continue agenda item 9D to a date certain of October 21, 2026, at the request of the applicant.

   On a motion made by Member Savage, seconded by Member Wilber, the Planning Board voted 7-0-0 to continue agenda item 9E to a date certain of October 21, 2026, at the request of the applicant.

DRAFT

On a motion made by Member Savage, seconded by Member Wilber, the Planning Board voted 7-0-0 to continue agenda item 9I to a date certain of October 21, 2026, at the request of the applicant.

5. Architectural Design Review by Consent

On a motion made by Member Savage, seconded by Councilor Todd, the Board voted 7-0-0 to approve agenda items 5A-5G as submitted, subject to the recommendations of the Architectural Design Review Committee.

5A. Granite YMCA, requests an architectural design review approval for a new 18.76-square-foot internally illuminated projecting wall sign (SP-0822-2026), to replace an existing non-permitted internally illuminated projecting wall sign at 15 North State Street in the Civic Performance (CVP) District. (PL-ADR-2026-0196) (2026-077)

The Planning Board approved the application as submitted with the condition that an opaque background be placed behind the larger white background in accordance with Section 5.4(c) of the Design Review Guidelines.

5B. NEOPCO Signs, on behalf of Capitol Craftsman, LLC dba Romance Jewelers, and Ciborowski Associates, LLC, requests architectural design review approvals for three new, 1.5-square-foot non-illuminated window signs (SP-0852-2026, SP-0853-2026, and SP-0854-2026) at 18 North Main Street in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District. (PL-ADR-2026-0198) (2026-078)

The Planning Board approved the application as submitted.

5C. Carolyn A. Parker Consulting and NE Signs & Awnings, on behalf of Valvoline and Loudon Automotive Properties LLC, requests architectural design review approvals for a new 55.24-square-foot internally illuminated freestanding sign (SP-0818-2026), while maintaining the existing footing, and two new 32-square-foot internally illuminated building wall signs (SP-0819-2026 & SP-0820-2026), to replace existing building wall signs at 232 Loudon Road in the General Commercial (CG) District (PL-ADR-2026-0200) (2026-080)

The Planning Board approved the application as submitted.

5D. Signarama of Concord, on behalf of Live Juice and Concord Area Trust for Community Housing, requests an architectural design review approval for a new 7.56-square-foot non-illuminated projecting sign (SP-0844-2026), to replace an existing projecting sign, at 1-5 South Main Street in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District. (PL-ADR-2026-0201) (2026-081)

The Planning Board approved the application as submitted.

5E. Signarama of Concord, on behalf of Keeler Family Realtors, InkZilla Tattoo, and Stephen Masters, requests architectural design review approvals for a new 6.25-square-foot non-illuminated blade sign (SP-0845-2026), a new 3.59-square-foot non-illuminated awning sign (SP-0849-2026), 2 new, non-illuminated window signs measuring at 0.75-square-feet (SP-0847-2026) and 1.7-square-feet (SP-0846-2026), and a new 3.56-square-foot non-illuminated building wall sign (SP-0848-2026) at 28 South Main Street in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.(PL-ADR-2026-0202) (2026-082)

DRAFT

The Planning Board approved the application as submitted with the condition that the sign for "Inkzilla Tattoo be redesigned so it is on two lines of script and be located below on the cast stone corner pier as the current location interferes with the architecture of the building.

5F. Joe's Equipment Service, Inc, on behalf of ZJBV Properties LLC, requests an architectural design review approval for an existing, non-permitted, 32-square-foot non-illuminated building wall sign at 70 Pembroke Road in the Office Park Performance (OFP) District. (PL-ADR-2026-0203) (2026-083)

The Planning Board approved the application as submitted.

5G. The Mix, LLC, on behalf of Flomac Limited Partnership, requests an architectural design review approval for a new 9.54-square-foot internally illuminated building wall sign (SP-0827-2026) at 8 Loudon Road, building 1, in the Gateway Performance (GWP) District (PL-ADR-2026-0206) (2026-084)

The Planning Board approved the application as submitted.

6. Determination of Completeness Items by Consent

6A. Northpoint Engineering, LLC, on behalf of Granite Municipal Manufacturing & Sales, LLC, requests major site plan and architectural design review approvals 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. As part of the major site plan application, the applicant also requests conditional use permit approval pursuant to Section 28-4-3(d) Conditional Use Permits Required for Certain Disturbance of Wetland Buffers to allow for the restoration of approximately 54,780-square-feet of previous temporary wetland buffer impact for tree clearing and certain temporary and permanent buffer impacts associated with the proposed stormwater management system. (PL-SPR-2026-0066) (PL-CUP-2026-0126) (2026-087)

On a motion made by Member Savage, seconded by Member Wilber, the Board voted 7-0-0 to determine the application complete, not a development of regional impact, per RSA 36:55, and set the public hearing for October 21, 2026.

6B. Wilcox & Barton, Inc, on behalf of St. Paul's School, requests major site plan application 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. As part of the major site plan application, the applicant also requests conditional use permit approval pursuant to Section 28-4-3(d) Conditional Use Permits Required for Certain Disturbance of Wetland Buffers to allow for approximately 754-square-feet of wetland buffer impact for tree clearing and certain temporary and permanent buffer impacts associated with the proposed stormwater management system.(PL-SPR-2026-0067) (PL-CUP-2026-0129) (2026-091)

On a motion made by Member Savage, seconded by Member Wilber, the Board voted 7-0-0 to determine the application complete, not a development of regional impact, per RSA 36:55, and set the public hearing for October 21, 2026.

6C. Gallagher Callahan & Gartrell PC and Jones & Beach Engineers, Inc, on behalf of Onyx Partners, Ltd and Onyx Steeplegate Concord, LLC, requests major site plan application 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) (2026-092)

This agenda item was continued to a date certain of October 21, 2026 in agenda item 4.

*****End of Consent Agenda*****

7. Design Review Applications

7A. Yamas Greek Eatery, on behalf of Yamas Greek Eatery and The Draft, LLC, requests architectural design review approvals for a 16-square-foot, externally illuminated existing non-permitted building wall sign (SP-0767-2026) and a new 1.77-square-foot non-illuminated projecting sign (SP-0792-2026) at 25 South Main Street in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District. (PL-ADR-2026-0179) (2026-047)

Mr. Bass stated this application has previously been before the Architectural Design Review Committee on two separate occasions. The applicant had revised the sign design and received zoning variances to allow the proposed sizes. The Architectural Design Review Committee recommended approval of the application as submitted, with a suggestion that the building wall sign could be increased in size to allow for eight inches of brick from the adjacent pilasters.

Chair Woodfin opened the public hearing, after receiving no public testimony, Chair Woodfin closed the public hearing.

Chair Woodfin stated the findings of fact include the information provided in the staff reports; the applicant's submission materials; testimony provided during the public hearing; and/or other documents or materials provided in the public hearing.

On a motion made by Chair Woodfin, seconded by Alternate Member LaFreniere, the Board voted 7-0-0 to the Planning Board approved the application, with the proposed sign revisions, to both the building and projecting sign, as submitted, with the suggestion that the building wall sign could be increased in size to allow for 8-inches of brick exposed from the adjacent pilasters.

7B. Sousa Signs, on behalf of The Common Man Roadside and BKP Invest 1 LLC, requests architectural design review approvals for 1 new 87.3-square-foot internally illuminated freestanding sign (SP-0828-2026), 1 new 85.4-square-foot internally illuminated building wall sign (SP-0829-2026), 1 new 37.1-square-foot internally illuminated building wall sign (SP-0830-2026), 2 new, 100.7-square-foot internally illuminated building wall signs (SP-0836-2026 & SP-0838-2026), 2 new, 42.9-square-foot internally illuminated building wall signs (SP-0837-2026 & SP-0839-2026), 3 new, 40-square-foot internally illuminated building wall signs (SP-0833-2026, SP-0834-2026, & SP-0835-2026), 1 new, 6.8-square-foot non-illuminated building wall sign, (SP-0832-2026), 1 new, 10.8-square-foot non-illuminated building wall sign (SP-0831-2026), and 3 new, 29.25-square-foot internally illuminated canopy signs (SP-0840-2026, SP-0841-2026, & SP-0842-2026) at 30 Manchester Street in the

Gateway Performance (GWP District. (PL-ADR-2026-0199) (2026-079)

Mr. Bass noted this application involves a master sign plan for a significant multi-tenant commercial development at 30 Manchester Street. Mr. Bass explained that when the site's major site plan was previously approved, tenancy was unknown. The applicant has prepared a master sign plan for all known signs with the master sign plan with the exception of the car wash as the tenancy is still unknown. The Architectural Design Review Committee reviewed the full master sign plan and provided recommended conditions of approval with the understanding that the master sign plan as it is non-conforming with zoning. The applicant has taken an excerpt of that master sign plan and created a zoning compliant package that they brought before Architectural Design Review Committee. They request to move forward with certain signage that are within the master sign plan. Mr. Bass noted some of the signs have been determined that they need conditional use permit applications and other items. For this hearing, the Board is being asked to approve the free-standing pylon sign. There is an element of the pylon sign they are proposing an electronic messaging sign in their master sign plan and that is non-conforming with zoning. In the zoning compliant package, they have removed the electronic messaging. If the Board is willing to approve the zoning compliant package so if they do receive the zoning relief they can slide that in and everything else comes back to the Board.

Jason Gagnon (225 E Industrial Park Dr, Manchester) and Brad Pernoff from The Common Man. Mr. Gagnon explained that the full master sign plan including the majority of wall signs is headed to the Zoning Board of Adjustment on October 7th, and those signs requiring conditional use permits will return to the Planning Board on October 21st for the wall signs. Mr. Gagnon noted the code compliant package the focus is on the freestanding pylon sign (P1), noting that the electronic message center (EMC) component shown in the master sign plan had been removed from the zoning-compliant submission and replaced with a manual changeable copy board. Mr. Gagnon noted the electronic messaging signs are prohibited under the current zoning ordinance. Mr. Gagnon noted that sign cabinet backgrounds have been changed to an opaque beige/ivory color, consistent with an approach previously used at a Manchester location.

Chair Woodfin opened the public hearing, after receiving no public testimony, Chair Woodfin closed the public hearing.

Chair Woodfin stated the findings of fact include the information provided in the staff reports; the applicant's submission materials; testimony provided during the public hearing; and/or other documents or materials provided in the public hearing.

On a motion made by Chair Woodfin, seconded by Member Rosenberger, the Board voted 7-0-0 to the Planning Board approved the zoning compliant "P1" sign of the application as submitted, with the following conditions: If the applicant receives a variance from Section 28-6-7(r), to allow electronic gas price display, the "P1" sign is approved as submitted as shown in the master signage plan; all other signs shall return to the October 21, 2026 Planning Board meeting for final approval.

8. Public Hearings

8A. Public Hearing for the Planning Board to consider adoption of amendments to the Site Plan Regulations: amending Section 18 (Parking Lot Design Standards), Section 19 (Access and Driveway Standards), Section 20 (Loading and Solid Waste Facility Standards), and Section 29 (Lighting).

Mr. Thompson stated staff is recommending the Board approve the proposed amendments to the Site Plan Regulations, to be effective upon the City Council adopting related Zoning Ordinance Amendments, which are scheduled for public hearing on October 13. This amendment effort follows a robust review of regulatory requirements surrounding parking (including at least a dozen drafts and iterations of proposed regulatory changes), and a collaborative process with many Community Development Department staff members. Through this effort, staff has coalesced around the proposal now being presented to the Planning Board, focusing on mechanisms for relief from the regulatory standards as an interim step, understanding that wholesale policy changes are best suited for development following the completion of the Master Plan process, which is now underway. If adopted, these amendments will provide significantly increased flexibility for relief from the regulatory requirements associated with parking, loading, and driveway access. The shift of the majority of design standards to the Site Plan Regulations allows the use of waivers, a less stringent statutory standard of relief, administered by the Planning Board, eliminating most of the need to seek variance relief from the Zoning Board of Adjustment. For the minority of projects that do not require site plan review, the related Zoning Ordinance amendments will create conditional use permit relief valves, again putting administration of relief in the hands of the Planning Board rather than the ZBA. Lastly, these regulation amendments (in conjunction with the related Zoning amendments) eliminate the challenges associated with differing standards that exist today between the regulations and Zoning Ordinance.

Chair Woodfin opened the public hearing, after receiving no public testimony, Chair Woodfin closed the public hearing.

On a motion made by Chair Woodfin, seconded by Member Rosenberger, the Board voted 7-0-0 to adopt the proposed Site Plan Regulation Amendments to Sections 18, 19, 20, and 29, effective upon the City Council's adoption of the related zoning ordinance amendments.

9. Site Plan, Subdivision, and Conditional Use Permit Applications

9A. TFMoran Inc, on behalf of 94 Manchester St, LLC, requests approval for a major site plan application for a new 4-story, 14,768-square-foot footprint building and other site improvements at Tax Map 781Z Lots 12, 12-1, 12-2 and 12-3, addressed as 94-98 Manchester Street in the Highway Commercial (HC) and Office Park Performance (OCP) Districts. (2026-005) (PL-SPR-2026-0057) (Applicant has requested to continue to the date certain of October 21, 2026)

This agenda item was continued to a date certain of October 21, 2026 in agenda item 4.

9B. Eastern Development, on behalf of Ryan Taber, requests minor subdivision approval for a 2-unit condominium conversion at Tax Map 494 Lot 3, addressed as 3 Palm Street in the Neighborhood Residential (RN) District. (2026-026) (PL-MIS-2026-0049) (Continued to the date certain of October 21, 2026, at the request of the applicant)

This agenda item was continued to a date certain of October 21, 2026 in agenda item 4.

9C. Wilcox & Barton Inc, on behalf of Two Wheeler Holdings, LLC, requests major site plan and architectural design review approvals for the conversion of an existing 30,310-square-foot building along with a 2,470-square-foot addition for a car dealership, 70,270-square-feet of additional pavement for driveways, parking, and vehicle storage, and other associated site improvements at Tax Map 782Z Lot 44, addressed as 110 Manchester Street in the Highway Commercial (CH) and Office Park Performance (OFP) Districts. (2026-044) (PL-SPR-2026-0061) (Continued to the date certain of October 21, 2026, at the request of the applicant)

This agenda item was continued to a date certain of October 21, 2026 in agenda item 4.

9D. Nobis Group, on behalf of The Stabile Group, Bow Mills United Methodist Church, Inc, and D. McLeod Inc, requests approval for a major subdivision application for a new 24-lot subdivision of an existing 10.7-acre parcel known as Tax Map 8814Z Lot 4, including the construction of an approximately 900-foot municipal roadway, proposed as a continuation of Mooreland Avenue, which will connect to an approximately 800-foot municipal extension of Heather Lane, and associated municipal and non-municipal infrastructure. The project also includes a lot line adjustment with the abutting property known as Tax Map 8814Z Lot 3, addressed as 271 South Street, in the Single Family Residential (RS) District. (2026-059) (PL-MAS-2026-0013) (Continued to October 21, 2026, at the request of the applicant)

This agenda item was continued to a date certain of October 21, 2026 in agenda item 4.

9E. Terry Odell, on behalf of Odell Family Trust 2016, requests conditional use permit application approval, pursuant to Section 28-7-8(b) Separation of Driveways in Residential Districts and Section 28-7-11(f) Driveway Separation Alternatives, to allow a second driveway on a lot with less than 40-feet separation between other existing driveways on an adjacent lot and less than 250-feet of lot frontage at Tax Map 201P Lot 46, addressed as 27 Hobart Street in the Single Family Residential (RS) District. (PL-CUP-2026-0124) (2026-085) (Continued to October 21, 2026, at the request of the applicant)

This agenda item was continued to a date certain of October 21, 2026 in agenda item 4.

9F. Raymond Bellia and Justin Daigneault, on behalf of the City of Concord, requests conditional use permit application approval, pursuant to Section 28-7-8(c) Separation of Driveways in Nonresidential Districts (1) and Section 28-7-11(f) Driveway Separation Alternatives, to allow a driveway on a lot with less than 125-feet separation from a local street intersection at Tax Map 1412P Lot 57, an unaddressed Sanders Street parcel in the Central Business Performance (CBP) District.(PL-CUP-2026-0125) (2026-086)

Mr. Thompson stated this project is associated with the adaptive reuse of the former Penacook Branch Library at 3 Merrimack Street (previously granted a CUP in July and variance from the Zoning Board in August to allow the duplex residential use on that property). The City and the applicant have both the 3 Merrimack Street property and the subject property at the corner of Sanders and Merrimack Street under agreement to be sold. A CUP is necessary to allow a proposed driveway to be located approximately 65-feet west of the intersection of Sanders and Merrimack Streets where 125-feet is required. The site will be used for off-street parking associated with the new residential use at 3

Merrimack Street. The subject parcel is part of the purchase and sales agreement between the City and applicant. Based on the size of the parking area, it does not meet thresholds for Site Plan Review, however, there is no area anywhere on the parcel that can accommodate the driveway separation requirements. Staff recommends that the Board find the application complete, and following the public hearing grant the CUP per the recommendations in the staff memo.

On a motion made by Councilor Todd, seconded by Member Wilber, the Board voted 7-0-0 to determine the application complete, not a development of regional impact, per RSA 36:55, and open the public hearing.

Chris Dresher (722 Chestnut St, Manchester), representing the applicant, stated this is a small triangular parcel at the corner of Sanders Street and Merrimack Street. They have received approval from the Planning Board to allow for the ground floor to be residential use as well as a variance to allow the use of a duplex. There is a limited amount of street parking. This is an opportunity to provide off-street parking for future residents of 3 Merrimack Street. Mr. Dresher indicated the applicant intends to pave the parking area, loam and seed where possible, and install fencing to delineate the property boundary.

Mr. Thompson noted there are existing unauthorized encroachments on this property. There is a shed from a neighboring property found to be sitting on the city-owned parcel. Mr. Thompson noted this parcel the city obtained from a church in the 1980's. When the library relocation in the community center project went through the intent was always to convey this parcel with the library to have additional parking. Mr. Thompson noted on the City Council agenda for October there will be a parking ordinance change that would allow for ten-hour parking on Merrimack Street where now it is currently two hours to allow for on street parking. The ten-hour limit is consistent with what the Parking Committee and City Council has done elsewhere in Penacook. Mr. Thompson noted Sanders Street is a one-way so the driveway separation and traffic volumes are appropriate for that type of use.

Councilor Todd asked what is the plan for the encroachment of the shed.

Mr. Dresher stated his client will have to address the shed once he purchases the property.

Mr. Thompson noted you cannot claim adverse possession against a municipality.

Member Tarbell stated concern for people using the parking lot as a cut through.

Mr. Dresher stated the plan is to have fencing and landscaping. Mr. Thompson added that the grade change on the property would preclude cut through traffic.

Chair Woodfin opened the public hearing, after receiving no public testimony, Chair Woodfin closed the public hearing.

Chair Woodfin stated the findings of fact include the information provided in the staff reports; the applicant's submission materials; testimony provided during the public hearing; and/or other documents or materials provided in the public hearing.

DRAFT

On a motion made by Councilor Todd, seconded by Member Tarbell, the Board voted 7-0-0 to **grant conditional use permit approval** to allow the proposed driveway to be located approximately 65-feet west of the intersection of Sanders and Merrimack Streets where 125-feet is required at Tax Map 1412P / 57, and unaddressed parcel on Sanders Street, based on the evidence provided showing that the criteria of Section 28-9-4(b) have been met, with the following precedent and subsequent conditions:

(a) **Precedent Conditions** – to be fulfilled within two years and prior to signature of the conditional use permit plat by the Chair and Clerk of the Planning Board, unless otherwise specified.

1. Revise the conditional use permit plat as follows:
    a. The applicant shall provide the Planning Board Approval Block on the driveway plan.
    b. The applicant shall add notes to the plan indicating how snow will be stored (and removed from the property as necessary) so as to not impede on municipal snow removal operations along Sanders and Merrimack Streets.
    c. The applicant shall clarify the plan to indicate how the driveway will be delineated, generally graded, and the surface materials proposed meeting the approval of the Clerk of the Planning Board.
2. The applicant shall address any of Engineering Services Division's general comments memo, dated August 28, 2026, as determined applicable by the Planning Board.
3. Upon notification from the Planning Division that the project complies with the precedent conditions, deliver to the Planning Division for signature one full-size or 11x17 conditional use permit plan set.

(b) **Subsequent Conditions**

1. The applicant is responsible for compliance with the all applicable municipal codes/regulations, and Construction Standards and Details.

9G. Richard D. Bartlett & Associates, a division of Nobis Group, on behalf of Dwight & Leslie Keeler Family Revocable Trust requests minor subdivision application approval for a lot line adjustment to annex 74.69 acres from Tax Map 07Z Lot 42, addressed as 109 Hoit Road to Tax Map 02Z Lot 6, an unaddressed Hoit Road parcel, both within the Open Space Residential (RO) District. (PL-MIS-2026-0057) (2026-088)

Mr. Thompson stated the applicant is seeking minor subdivision approval for a lot line adjustment between 2 parcels on Hoit Road. The lot line adjustment would move the majority of the acreage for the parcel at 109 Hoit to the unaddressed parcel. The smaller (5.21 acre proposed) lot is intended to be developed for a single-family residential use, and the larger parcel (190.29 acres proposed) would remain undeveloped (partially constrained by an existing conservation easement in addition to extensive wetlands on the remainder of the parcel). Staff recommends that the Board find the application complete, and following the public hearing grant conditional approval per the recommendations in the staff memo.

On a motion made by Member Rosenberger, seconded by Councilor Todd, the Board voted 7-0-0 to determine the application complete, not a development of regional impact, per RSA 36:55, and open the public hearing.

Mark Sargent (18 Chenell Dr, Concord) presented the application. Mr. Sargent noted there are vacant parcels on Hoit Rd. Mr. Sargent stated map 2Z lot 6 has 115.6 acres with 338 feet of frontage on Hoit

Rd and map 7Z lot 42 has an area of 79 acres with 215 feet of frontage on Hoit Rd. The proposal before the Board is to annex 74.69 acres of lot 42 to lot 6. That would give lot 6 a new area of 190.29 acres. It would leave lot 42 with 5.21 acres and no change to the frontage. This property has been before the Board several times over the years. There is a request for a number of waivers due to most of the lot being undevelopable. Mr. Sargent noted much of the larger parcel is undevelopable due to wetlands. They have asked for waivers for existing conditions, tabulations, topography, vegetation and wetlands. The developable portion of the property they have completed topography, wetlands and shown the vegetation.

Chair Woodfin opened the public hearing, after receiving no public testimony, Chair Woodfin closed the public hearing.

Chair Woodfin stated the findings of fact include the information provided in the staff reports; the applicant's submission materials; testimony provided during the public hearing; and/or other documents or materials provided in the public hearing.

On a motion made by Member Rosenberger, seconded by Member Savage, the Board voted 7-0-0 to **grant the waiver requests** from the listed sections of the Subdivision Regulations, listed below, using the criteria of New Hampshire RSA 674:36(II)(n)(2) and Section 35.08 of the Subdivision Regulations:

a. Section 12.07 *Wetland Delineations*, to not provide full wetland delineation information (certified by a wetland scientist) beyond what is necessary to show that the proposed building lot meets minimum requirements; and
b. Sections 12.08(3) and 15.03(4) *Topography*, to not provide full topographic information beyond what is necessary to show that the proposed building lot meets the requirements for buildable and useable area; and
c. Section 12.08(20) *Existing Vegetation*, to not existing vegetation information beyond what is necessary to show that the proposed building lot meets minimum requirements; and
d. Sections 12.08(23)(d) and 15.03(3) *Tabulations*, to not provide tabulation of useable and buildable area, lot coverage for the large parcel where no development is proposed.

On a motion made by Member Rosenberger, seconded by Member Savage, the Board voted 7-0-0 to **grant minor subdivision approval** for the lot line adjustment between Tax Map Lot 02Z / 6 & 07Z / 42, 109 Hoit Road and the unaddressed parcel on Hoit Road, subject to the following precedent and subsequent conditions:

(a) **Precedent Conditions –** to be fulfilled within one year and prior to signature of the final plat by the Planning Board Chair and Clerk, unless otherwise specified:
    1. Revise the plat as follows:
    a. Per Section 12.02 the name and address of the owner and applicant shall be provided in the title block.
    b. Section 12.02(4) *Conditions of Planning Board Approval* and Section 15.03(17) *Conditions of Approval* a note shall be added to the condominium site plan that states: "The development is subject to all subsequent conditions of Planning Board approval granted on INSERT ACTUAL DATE HERE for application 2026-088."

DRAFT

c. Per Sections 15.02(10) and 13.03(16), the applicant shall indicate the location of conservation easement on Tax Map Lot 02Z / 6, and provide an appropriate reference note to the easement document (MCRD Book/Page).
d. Per Section 15.03(9), the applicant shall indicate a proposed driveway location for the proposed building lot.
e. Per Section 15.03(12), the applicant shall provide sufficient information on the plan to verify a private septic system can be constructed to serve the proposed residential use of the building lot.
f. Per Section 15.03(14), the applicant shall provide sufficient information on the plan to verify a private well (and protective radius) can be constructed to serve the proposed residential use of the building lot.

2. Revise the plan set for compliance with the Subdivision Regulations and Construction Standards and Details as noted in the attached 2-page memo to Alec Bass from Paul Gildersleeve, dated September 9, 2026.
3. The plat shall list all approved variances, waivers, and conditional use permits with the section numbers and description, and date of approval.
4. Prior to the recording of the plat and as required by Section 12.09 *Electronic Submission* of the Subdivision Regulations, digital information from the plat shall be provided to the City Engineer for incorporation into the City of Concord Geographic Information (GIS) and tax maps. The digital information shall be submitted in a format and media conforming to standards promulgated by the City Engineer. The layers listed in Section 12.09(1) through (8) shall be submitted referencing New Hampshire State Plane Grid Coordinates and shall be based on National American Vertical Datum 1988 (NAVD 88).
5. Per Section 19.04, a New Hampshire licensed land surveyor shall place permanent reference monuments in the subdivision, as required by the Subdivision Regulations and as approved by the City Engineer.
6. Per Section 15.02(12), the applicant shall ensure that the subdivision plat to be recorded complies with the current standards of the Merrimack County Registry of Deeds, including materials, font size, plan size, margins, and plat layout.
7. Upon notification from the Planning Division that the project complies with the precedent conditions, Zoning Ordinance, and Subdivision Regulations, deliver to the Planning Division for signature one full size plan and one mylar of the subdivision plat that contains the signature and seal of the appropriate licensed professionals as required by Section 9.08(7) of the Subdivision Regulations.

(b) **Subsequent Conditions** – to be fulfilled as specified:

1. Per Section 13.02(13), at the time of recording, the applicant shall provide the recording fees required by the Merrimack County Registry of Deeds for all plans and documents to be recorded.
2. This approval notwithstanding, the applicant is responsible for full knowledge of, and compliance with, the municipal code, Subdivision Regulations, and Concord Construction Standards and Details for the project, unless a variance, waiver, or conditional use permit is granted
3. Per Section 4.03 of the Subdivision Regulations, no building permit or certificate of occupancy shall be issued for any parcel or plat of land which was created by subdivision

DRAFT

after the effective date of, and which is not in conformity with, the provisions of the Subdivision Regulations.

4. Per Section 26.02(1) *Underground Utilities*, all utility facilities including, but not limited to, gas, steam, electric power, telephone, telecommunication, and CATV cables, shall be located underground throughout the subdivision. Whenever existing utility facilities are located above ground on the property proposed for subdivision, the above ground utilities shall be removed and placed underground.
5. Per Section 28.07 of the Subdivision Regulations, wetland buffers shall be clearly and permanently marked before, during, and after construction. Building permits shall not be issued until the wetland buffers are marked.

9H. Richard D. Bartlett & Associates, a division of Nobis Group, on behalf of Thomas Kuepper and Allison Kuepper, requests minor subdivision application approval for a 2-lot subdivision at Tax Map 411Z Lot 1, addressed as 61 Mountain Rd, in the Single-Family Residential (RS) District. (PL-MIS-2026-0058) (2026-089)

This application was withdrawn at the request of the applicant.

9I. Richard D. Bartlett & Associates, a division of Nobis Group, on behalf of Dragoon Family Trust, requests conditional use permit application approval, pursuant to Section 28-7-8(b) Separation of Driveways in Residential Districts and Section 28-7-11(f) Driveway Separation Alternatives, to allow a second driveway on a lot with less than 40-feet separation between other existing driveways on the same and adjacent lots and less than 250-feet of lot frontage at Tax Map 7324Z Lot 2 addressed as 109-109.5 Warren Street in the Neighborhood Residential (RN) District. (PL-CUP-2026-0128) (2026-090) Continued to October 21, 2026, at the request of the applicant)

This agenda item was continued to a date certain of October 21, 2026 in agenda item 4.

10. Other Items

10A. In accordance with RSA 36:56 and 36:57, the Town of Hopkinton Planning Board is noticing the City of Concord, and the City of Concord Planning Board, of a Development of Regional Impact, for an 8-lot residential conservation subdivision at 167 Branch Londonderry Turnpike, Hopkinton, NH, for review and to provide comment.

Mr. Thompson recommend that the Board if they have comments to direct staff to communicate with the town of Hopkinton.

Mr. Bass stated a notice was received from the Town of Hopkinton Planning Board regarding a Development of Regional Impact for an 8-lot residential conservation subdivision at 167 Branch Londonderry Turnpike in Hopkinton. Per RSA 36:56 and 36:57, the City of Concord was noticed and given the opportunity to comment. Mr. Bass noted that Hopkinton is aware of the DRI process and has not yet acted, pending comment from the City of Concord and Central New Hampshire Regional Planning.

Mr. Thompson identified no specific concerns with the application.

The Board directed staff to communicate to Hopkinton that the City of Concord had no particular objections or comments to raise at this time.

11. Other Business

Any other business which may legally come before the Board.

Mr. Thompson reminded the Board members of the upcoming Master Plan City-wide visioning session scheduled for Saturday morning, September 19, 2026, from 9:00 AM to 11:00 AM at the Capital Center for the Arts. Mr. Thompson stated the format as an interactive, science-fair-style event with topic stations, sticky-note feedback opportunities, and a brief opening presentation by staff and consultants from Utile.

Mr. Thompson suggested scheduling a separate meeting date in October to address the advisory subcommittee selection for the Master Plan process, given the density of items already on the October 21st agenda. Mr. Thompson noted that a non-public session would likely be needed to review applicant qualifications.

The Board members indicated general agreement and expressed a preference for a Tuesday or Wednesday evening, starting at 6:00 PM, at an alternative location such as the Community Center.

Mr. Thompson agreed to coordinate with to identify a suitable date and location.

Adjournment
On a motion made by Councilor Todd, seconded by Member Rosenberger, the Board voted 7-0-0 to adjourn the meeting at 7:41p.m.

The next regular meeting is Wednesday, October 21, 2026, at 7:00 p.m.

TRUE RECORD ATTEST:
Krista Tremblay
Krista Tremblay
Administrative Technician III

DRAFT

From: Shay Cameron
To: * Planning
Subject: Oppose AI Data Center (Cannot attend the meeting tonight)
Date: Wednesday, October 21, 2026 3:25:55 PM

[CAUTION: *This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe*]

Good afternoon,

Please do not allow an AI Data Center in Concord, NH. Mini or any type of AI Data Center. The environmental damage from Data Centers is proven, real and very damaging.

I am a taxpayer and I have been a Concord resident for 12 happy years.
The fact that Data Centers have stayed out of our city is great.

I strongly oppose this mini AI Data Center.

Thank you for your time,

Lisa Cameron

From: Caroline Pynes
To: * Planning
Subject: Data center for Concord
Date: Wednesday, October 21, 2026 3:33:04 PM

[CAUTION: *This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe*]

Hello,
I have lived in Concord for the last 12 years and it's a great little city. Putting in a data center will ruin it for all wildlife which I happen to love and our fragile environment. Your greed is disgusting and you should be ashamed! The noise alone will make all creatures go mad! Why are you so greedy? And why don't you see the negatives from data centers and I don't care how small it is, it's still a stupid ugly data center!
Thanks,
Caroline Pynes

Caroline E. Pynes
Library Director-Chichester Town Library

From:	Danyelle Fay
To:	* Planning; * Planning
Subject:	CONCORD DATA CENTER PROPOSAL
Date:	Wednesday, October 21, 2026 3:42:58 PM

[CAUTION: *This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe*]

To whom it may concern,
My name is Danyelle Fay. I am a 29 year old disabled woman living locally here in Concord.

I only just learned about the proposal for the data center yesterday evening and when I read it my jaw dropped. I couldn't believe that my community that I have loved since a little girl was considering something so volatile and harmful to its own people/infrastructure.

Your claim that just because the proximity of the building being smaller will in return make this harmless is almost comical.. if it didn't have such a horrendous outcome to the communities surrounding it. Evidence from other data centers shows that it impacts communities extremely negatively but you already know that.

This is not the first time there has been a proposal for a data center in New Hampshire. Every time the New Hampshire people make themselves extremely clear! we do not want ANY part of this.

Data centers have negative health impacts on the community members surrounding it Concord already has a large homeless population and it holds 2 housing buildings which contain elderly and disabled people. Not to mention the schools and high population of famalies with children. Are you trying to put more people into concord hospital? Because that is what will happen. It also affects things like how internet runs. Like are you forgetting about all of the businesses on Main Street or in concord as a whole this will impact how their businesses run this is going to have a huge effect on everybody.

I am deeply concerned as to how far this proposal has already gone and I am ashamed to have only learned about it last night. I think Your secrecy about this meeting and lack of advertising it Is a red flag.

I sincerely hope that the people on this board whoever is reading this will reconsider all of the environmental risks, Health risks to real people living in the community And our city as a whole how it operates. Data centers are not the future and conquered does not need one now or ever.
Thank you,

Danyelle Fay
Concord, NH
603-496-9284

From: Scott Shorey
To: * Planning
Subject: Concerns for the Proposal of the "Micro" Data Center
Date: Wednesday, October 21, 2026 3:37:12 PM

[CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe]

Hello,

I am a resident of Concord, NH who is highly concerned about ANY data center being built in our beautiful state and beautiful city.

Despite the client's "positive" remarks about how this new style of "micro" data center "alleviates" the bad publicity of hyperscale data centers, many concerns arise.

He does not mention noise pollution. A 15 megawatt data center still produces damaging noise pollution. Any new innovative coolant system does not solve the low constant hum that destroys bee and other pollinator populations. Let alone the health and psychological impacts to the data center's neighbors, wildlife and the community.

The amount of heat that will be pumping out of the data center, despite these new fancy "solutions" is also damaging to the climate and wildlife. New techniques that attempt to avoid criticism are not enough to win me over.

We have enough data centers in the country that can help society solve scientific problems. They DO NOT benefit society by providing servers for AI assistants, ugly generated photos, and taking jobs away from humans. We don't need any more!

What happens when the coolant leaks into the watershed? What happens when our electric bills skyrocket higher than they are now? The country is in a silent depression already as it is.

Data centers do not bring a constant stream of revenue into a community. The money goes to the construction company initially, and then to the data center company, not the community the center sits in.

Do not let this data center company bribe you, fellow city council members. Do not let this company bribe the citizens of Concord. Any data center is not welcome.

The amount of money this country is losing and wasting on investing in this damaging technology is staggering. Look at the stock market, look at the majority of Americans who oppose this stuff. We don't want these data centers for a reason, no matter how "innovative" or "safer" these snake oil salesmen say they are.

Invest in housing, healthcare, jobs for humans. Anything but this. We beg of you. Please don't let this pass city council members. Please don't be bribed.

Thank you,
Scott R. Shorey

From: ANNE HARTSHORN
To: * Planning
Subject: Case 2026-059 South St Subdivision
Date: Wednesday, October 21, 2026 9:53:29 AM

[CAUTION: *This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe*]

Good Morning! I am a lifelong South End resident who has some concerns about the proposed development off of South St. Since that is currently an undeveloped area, not hemmed in by other buildings or structures, it appears that all of the waivers being requested are unwarranted. Perhaps the request to have smaller lots than currently required by the City of Concord is simply to add density in favor of more profits for the developer. The lack of a complete traffic study is also of concern to those of us living in this part of the city. It's my understanding that the plans regarding water and runoff are also of concerns to the direct neighbors.
Please do your due diligence representing the citizens of Concord and require a lot more justification for all of the waivers being requested. Thank you.
Anne Quimby Hartshorn

From: Jeanne Cusson
To: * Planning
Subject: AI center
Date: Wednesday, October 21, 2026 7:05:21 AM

[CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe]

Dear Planning Board members,

Please do not vote to put an AI center, of any size, in our city. We do not know enough about consequences.

Just when many in this country are trying to put the brakes on the proliferation of AI data centers, Concord should not jump in and say, "Bring it here!"

We trust you to protect our environment, and to make a statement about the speed at which this technonlogy is taking over our lives.

Protect us!

Thank you for all your work on our behalf.
Jeanne Cusson
5 Cypress Stret
Concord, NH
Sent from my iPad

From: LDR - Lilise Designer Resale
To: * Planning
Subject: Concerns About a Microdata Center in Concord
Date: Tuesday, October 20, 2026 3:06:49 PM

[CAUTION: *This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe*]

Hello,

I'm writing to express my concerns about bringing a microdata center to Concord. This is a relatively new and rapidly evolving industry, and I don't believe the long-term impacts are fully understood enough to justify introducing this type of development into a small community. Once a project of this scale is approved, the consequences may be difficult to reverse, particularly if the environmental, infrastructure, and financial costs prove greater than anticipated.

Concord should be prioritizing thoughtful, sustainable development that serves the long-term interests of its residents. Before considering a project like this, we need clear, independent evidence of its impacts on electricity demand, water resources, noise, the environment, and local infrastructure, along with transparency about who ultimately bears the costs. We should not put our community in the position of becoming a testing ground for an emerging industry when the long-term risks and benefits remain uncertain. I urge city leaders to proceed with caution and put the well-being of Concord residents first.

Thank you,
Elyssa Alfieri,
owner,
LILISE, LLC dba LDR - Lilise Designer Resale



From: Forum Pub
To: * Planning; Horne,Michele
Subject: Data center
Date: Tuesday, October 20, 2026 1:28:20 PM

[CAUTION: *This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe*]

As a long time resident and business owner, I am opposed to the idea of adding a data center to this area. I would consider the idea of the owner and operator were a local resident, not someone who has only a business interest in NH.

The cost of many kinds of businesses, including this model is not something which can only be measured in dollars and cents. Please prove to us that the city is concerned with both sense and cents in these matters.

Best regards,

Kirk McNeil
[redacted]

From: S Woods
To: * Planning
Subject: Data Center
Date: Tuesday, October 20, 2026 11:47:12 AM

[CAUTION: *This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe*]

I think the city of concord should be open to this proposed micro data center. This is not the type of data center that is in the news. We need to be more business friendly if we are to reduce the tax burden on home owners. And if we freak out every time something new is proposed we continue to reinforce the message that Concord is closed to anything other than office space and retail.
Yes we need to do our due diligence but the hysteria over this is unwarranted.

Don’t roll over but also Please give these folks a fair shake.

Susan Woods
Concord NH
Ward 5

From: Bethany Clarke
To: * Planning
Subject: Data center? No thanks
Date: Tuesday, October 20, 2026 12:57:54 PM

[CAUTION: *This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe*]

Hello committee members,
I'm a resident of ward 7. Obviously I know we're severely hurting on tax revenue and a data center will increase that. However, do we really want to open the door of environmental apocalypse further? When one data center is approved, more will come. Let's take a hint from other (possibly smarter) NH towns like Nottingham and ban these things from Concord. No good will come of it other than a quick, and relatively small dollar. Not worth it!
Sincerely,
Bethany

--
Bethany
pronouns: she/her

Published Work:
Hobart Pulp Poems
Peach Mag Poem
What it's Like Being a Paraprofessional for Students with Disabilities

From: Bethany Clarke
To: * Planning
Subject: Fwd: Proposed Data Center
Date: Tuesday, October 20, 2026 1:24:16 PM

[CAUTION: *This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe*]

See below: there are reasons to deny a data center and I don't see why this project couldn't be delayed to make sure the environmental impact would be minimal at most. Thank you for your time and consideration

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: **Bethany Clarke** <[redacted]>
Date: Tuesday, September 15, 2026
Subject: Proposed Data Center
To: "Champlin, Byron" <[redacted]v>, Jim Schlosser
<[redacted]m>

Hello Byron,

I hope you're doing well. I'm not sure how to get my comments to the Planning Board, so I am sending them to you in hope they can somehow get to those making the decisions about the proposed data center and any future data centers in Concord.

In short, I'm very concerned about them. The negative environmental impacts of data centers, small and large, are well researched and documented. Whereas some data centers benefit people in that they serve universities, banks or healthcare facilities. Others do not, such as those for AI, military, and tech companies.

I'm also concerned about the perception of the site as "blighted" land as stated in the Concord Monitor. It looks like there was some waste dumped there and it used to have an encampment of unhoused people. But that doesn't mean the only better use for the land is to become a data center, something actively detrimental to our environment. In my opinion, any type of data center, large or small, would be much more of a blight. **I would love to see a site like that developed for good, such as a public greenspace, housing or even a grocery store, whatever our community says they need. There are many ways to increase the tax base that do not harm the environment or nearby citizens**

Data centers are a rare bipartisan issue where both Republicans and Democrats have agreed that more regulations need to be put in place before moving forward with building data centers. People in NH do not want data centers (see this proposal from Nottingham which was opposed by the public). I don't think it would be wise for the city to go full steam ahead on this type of project with so many ethical and environmental concerns in the air.

Thank you very much for your time and consideration. I also appreciate your posts about the city visioning session and the coffee with the mayor events. I hope to make it to Flanagens!

Best,

--
Bethany
pronouns: she/her

Published Work:
Hobart Pulp Poems
Peach Mag Poem
What it's Like Being a Paraprofessional for Students with Disabilities

--
Bethany
pronouns: she/her

Published Work:
Hobart Pulp Poems
Peach Mag Poem
What it's Like Being a Paraprofessional for Students with Disabilities

From: Kimberly Porter
To: * Planning
Subject: Micro-Data Center
Date: Tuesday, October 20, 2026 2:07:05 PM

[CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe]

To the City of Concord Planning Board,
When I look around, I see this city and state often focussing on and addressing things that are questionably important.
Instead of focusing on making sure our city firefighters are paid appropriately or helping our most vulnerable community members (the unhoused, elderly, those struggling with finances in an increasingly expensive country), we spend money revitalizing a golf course and country club. Instead of looking at a piece of undeveloped land on a dead end road and allowing it to continue being supporting the wildlife already there or developing a green space, the city is contemplating the development of a “micro” data center.
We have all seen the reports on data centers being built around the country. Seen and heard about the evidence of polluted water, exorbitant bills dumped on the community, increased and constant noise pollution, stress to the existing wildlife. There is a frenzy to build data centers to keep up with a population that has become increasingly dependent on technology. A population being told by the government that AI is the future and important to progress. But to what end? Though we have, as I mentioned, heard first-hand accounts of the effects these centers have on communities, there are no long term studies. Why rush this through? Why not allow more research? Study the existing data centers.
I would urge the city planning board to postpone approval of any data center, micro or otherwise, until there have been more actual scientific studies into the impact on our communities.
Respectfully submitted,
Kimberly Porter
Resident, Concord NH

From: Chris Moore
To: * Planning
Subject: No to Data Center plans
Date: Wednesday, October 21, 2026 7:17:38 AM

[CAUTION: *This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe*]

Dear Concord Planning board.

I am in 100% opposition to any data center being situated in Concord, or frankly anywhere in New Hampshire. Data centers are energy and water guzzlers. They wreak havoc on the environment and they produce a ton of noise pollution.
They have no business in this rural community.

Please vote to oppose!

Chris Moore
9 Cypress Street
Concord, NH

From: Cuong Ngo
To: * Planning
Subject: No to Proposal for a "mini" (15 megawatt) AI data center for East Concord
Date: Tuesday, October 20, 2026 7:51:05 PM

[CAUTION: *This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe*]

I would like to voice my opposition to the AI data center in east concord. The blatant disregard for the wildlife via the cutting down in the surrounding areas, in addition to the noise these "mini" AI data centers will ruin the habitat as well as us humans. I have yet to see any benefit in this for the city.

Best,
Cuong Ngo (CN)
Ward 9

From: Heather
To: * Planning; bryon gilmartin
Subject: Opposing the micro data center
Date: Tuesday, October 20, 2026 12:50:52 PM

[CAUTION: *This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe*]

Hello, my name is Heather Dimond-Gilmartin, I am a resident at 49 Taylor Lane in concord. I am opposed to the mirco data center being build at 52 Locke Rd, Concord.
Thank you.

From: Carissa Kutz
To: * Planning
Subject: Opposition to Proposed Micro-Data center
Date: Tuesday, October 20, 2026 3:21:52 PM

[CAUTION: *This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe*]

Carissa Kutz

From: bryon gilmartin
To: * Planning
Cc: Heather
Subject: Re: Opposing the micro data center
Date: Tuesday, October 20, 2026 1:01:24 PM

[CAUTION: *This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe*]

Hello,

My name is Bryon Gilmartin. I am a resident at 49 Taylor Lane in Concord. I am opposed to the data center being build at 52 Locke Rd, Concord.

Thank you.

From: Dan NH
To: * Planning
Subject: Regarding the AI data center for East Concord
Date: Wednesday, October 21, 2026 8:32:16 AM

[CAUTION: *This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe*]

My name is Daniel Hebert. I live on the heights in Concord. Regarding the AI data center for East Concord, I'm writing to you with my objection to the proposal. I read the Nashua article about what is proposed.
I have concerns about:
* noise pollution
* impact on the utilities and utility rates (especially during the summer)
* we already have drought messages asking us to conserve water, how are we going to feed the AI data center?
* Environmental pollution. The article is describing someone already improperly having cleared the land. I know that parcel of land, and there's no way somebody spends the money to clear that without a plan.

It's unclear about the safety of how they are cooling this plant, the utility impact, the benefit to Concord, and the companies (plural) involved.
No one wants this. Please don't sell us out to AI companies.

Daniel Hebert
12 Branch Turnpike
Concord, NH 03301
[redacted]

From: JENNIFER BEAUDOIN
To: * Planning
Subject: Micro data center proposal
Date: Wednesday, October 21, 2026 10:34:36 AM

[CAUTION: *This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe*]

Good morning,
I am writing in response to the proposed "micro" data center that will be discussed at tonight's meeting as I will be unable to attend and give feedback.

I have been a resident of Penacook for 13 years and a lifelong NH resident. I love my city, and our state because of the community and our natural beauty.

Reading the article on Nashua Ink Link, the only place I could find any information about this, I don't see any benefits to the city or state and I see immense potential for harm. We need jobs, we need housing, we need accessibility. We do not need a building that sucks up our resources and only creates one job.

I am concerned that the information about this proposed data center has been very late disclosed. I received an email on 10/20 from one of the organizations I follow, but nothing from the city. That is simply not enough notice for the public to be aware of this discussion and provide input.

I am strongly against this proposal and I ask that this be rejected since the city can do so much more to help the residents instead of causing harm.

Thank you,
Jennifer Beaudoin
Penacook, NH

Yahoo Mail: Search, Organize, Conquer

From:	Charity Ross
To:	* Planning
Cc:	Bass, Alec; Charity Ross; Kevin Shields
Subject:	Letter of Opposition for Application #2026-059
Date:	Wednesday, October 21, 2026 2:11:31 PM
Attachments:	Opposition to Subdivision - C.Ross 2026-10-21.pdf

[CAUTION: *This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe*]

Good afternoon - Attached, please find my written opposition to the proposed 24-lot South End Development - Application #2026-059 for review and consideration at tonight's public hearing.

I will prepare printed copies at the meeting for distribution to each board member as I recognize that I have missed the deadline for it to be included in the board packet.

Thank you,
Charity

From: ANNE HARTSHORN
To: * Planning
Subject: Case 2026-059 South St Subdivision
Date: Wednesday, October 21, 2026 9:53:29 AM

[CAUTION: *This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe*]

Good Morning! I am a lifelong South End resident who has some concerns about the proposed development off of South St. Since that is currently an undeveloped area, not hemmed in by other buildings or structures, it appears that all of the waivers being requested are unwarranted. Perhaps the request to have smaller lots than currently required by the City of Concord is simply to add density in favor of more profits for the developer. The lack of a complete traffic study is also of concern to those of us living in this part of the city. It's my understanding that the plans regarding water and runoff are also of concerns to the direct neighbors.
Please do your due diligence representing the citizens of Concord and require a lot more justification for all of the waivers being requested. Thank you.
Anne Quimby Hartshorn