



A History of Development

Prepared by Elizabeth Durfee Hengen



CONCORD HOUSING AUTHORITY'S URBAN RENEWAL PROGRAM

Background on Federal Urban Renewal Program: Urban renewal was the country's first formal initiative to redevelop cities. It was intended to rejuvenate inner cities that had been destroyed by the interstate highway system which brought highways through the heart of downtowns, by attracting new development and improving housing stock through "slum clearance" and removal of deteriorating commercial buildings. Reuse of cleared sites had to be for commercial, residential or public purposes. Urban renewal's early projects were often unsuccessful and fraught with controversy. Municipalities frequently undertook large-scale clearance of business districts only to find themselves unable to attract private reinvestment to the sites. In other instances, entire neighborhoods were wiped out, with little thought given to the displaced residents. A critical part of the Housing Act of 1954, the legislative arm of urban renewal, was its 701 Planning Program, which provided planning monies to develop a comprehensive community plan in advance of an urban renewal plan. In New Hampshire, the comprehensive plans were administered by the State Planning Office (then part of Department of Resources and Economic Development). Initially aimed at assisting cities with populations under 20,000, the program later raised the threshold to 50,000, thus making Concord, at just under 29,000, eligible. The planning work was a key piece of urban renewal: the federal government sought assurance that if funds were to be spent on relocation and clearance, the resulting area would be redeveloped and economically sustained. Part of the 701 program was "The Program for Community Improvement Planning," or "Workable Program," with seven pieces that needed to be put into place, including a comprehensive plan and updated housing and building codes. Once conditionally approved, the local urban renewal agency could apply for urban renewal funds administered by the Federal Housing & Home Finance Agency (FHHFA).

An urban renewal program followed seven steps:

(1) purchasing land through negotiation or eminent domain; (2) relocating residents and business; (3) clearing site(s) of all buildings considered blighted or not useful; (4) improving the infrastructure (new streets, sewer lines, water mains, street lights, etc.); (5) determining future uses for the parcels; (6) selling, leasing or donating land to private parties (in some instances land was redeveloped by the urban renewal agency); and (7) overseeing new construction to ensure it adheres to the urban renewal plan.

EARLY URBAN RENEWAL IN NEW HAMPSHIRE

In 1959, New Hampshire passed legislation allowing any housing authority to function as an urban renewal agency. The law gave the authority powers of condemnation and acquisition of blighted property for purposes of redevelopment, but required that the governing body or the city/town approve any redevelopment plan first.¹³ Manchester became the first municipality in New Hampshire to establish a renewal agency, as well as the first northern New England community to embark upon projects.¹⁴ Concord was the third to do so, designating its Housing Authority the redevelopment, or urban renewal, agency. With this additional—and major—responsibility, the city also agreed that the Housing Authority should hire additional staff to administer the urban renewal project. James Griffin soon assumed this position.

CONCORD'S URBAN RENEWAL PROGRAM 1963-1972

Concord had been putting the pieces together for an urban renewal project for some time. The city had a lengthy and strong history of local planning. In 1938, it established a planning board, largely through the efforts of Concord Monitor editor, James Langley, and hired its first planning director, Gustaf Lehtinen, that same year.¹⁵ Lehtinen had long championed the need for an excellent road system, both around and within the city and cultivated a close relationship with the state highway department. He was also a strong advocate for comprehensive plans and modern housing and building codes, all of which had been put in place or were well underway by the time Concord initiated its urban renewal activities. Lehtinen immediately spotted the benefits of the federally financed urban renewal program to solve a critical problem in the downtown transportation system. Thus, he was a close partner with the Housing Authority and the program. While the Housing Authority was planning and constructing its first 100 units of elderly housing, the city embarked upon a Program for Community Improvement, or “Workable Program,” required by FHHFA for financing. The report’s purpose was “to formalize a plan of coordinated action by the city to achieve the desirable objective of banishing standard conditions and blight within the city and to establish and preserve a well planned community with orderly residential neighborhoods of decent homes and suitable living environment.”¹⁶

¹³ RSA 205:1-4.

¹⁴ Manchester’s first two renewal projects, overseen by its housing authority director, Cary Davis, were downtown parking lots and a strip mall on Elm Street, near the site of the Verizon Center. Later projects included major clearing in the Amoskeag Millyard and the Bedford Mall/South Willow Street Shopping Mall (Mall of New Hampshire). [Raymond, 2000: 4]

¹⁵ Concord’s planning program also had a history of continuity: Langley served as chairman of the planning board for nearly twenty-five years, and Lehtinen remained in his position for thirty-eight years.

¹⁶ Planning Board report authored by Lehtinen and quoted from in Concord Monitor & Patriot 2/10/1962.

Among the program's steps was completing a Neighborhood Analysis, undertaken by city planner, Gus Lehtinen. Lehtinen's report, finished in March 1963, concluded that most of the city's housing stock was in good shape, but two areas in the city proper warranted urban renewal treatment. One area was thirty acres in the South End in the vicinity of Chandler and Perley Streets, and the other was a fifteen-acre site north of the State House around Centre and Montgomery streets. Though Lehtinen favored the South End site for urban renewal activities, a subsequent supplement to his report focused on the State House area, where he deemed sixteen buildings containing 120 units blighted: exceedingly small lots, poor quality construction, generally poor environmental conditions and crowding, with resulting vacancies and even "cellar holes."¹⁷ It was this site that was ultimately selected for urban renewal, in part for the opportunity it provided to improve downtown access, and in part for the opportunity to make physical improvements to a deteriorated area close by the State House.



Map of urban renewal area, showing original layout of Centre and Montgomery Streets and all the buildings within the area. Published in Concord Monitor & Patriot, February 2, 1965.

In early 1964, the Chamber of Commerce requested that the city undertake a study of the central business district, noting that the downtown buildings needed renovation, particularly when compared to the newly opened, modern Capitol Shopping Center on the recently constructed "Baby Bypass" (Storrs Street). The newspaper quoted citizens referring to the Main Street buildings as "old brick shells," and commented that some owners were already contemplating replacement or removal of upper stories. Under the terms of the federal planning program tied to urban renewal, the city appropriated \$3,500 to the Housing Authority to hire a private engineering/planning firm to complete a study to determine what could be done to improve and beautify the central business area.

¹⁷ *Neighborhood Analysis Supplement, 1964: 32.*

The Housing Authority hired the Hartford-based firm James P. Purcell Associates to undertake the study, known as a General Neighborhood Renewal Plan. Its findings, presented in March 1964, concurred that the city's preferred urban renewal area—a roughly 15-acre area site bounded by Pitman and Park Streets on the north and south, and North Main and North State on the east and west—was indeed particularly ripe for improvement. (Three acres were later added, extending the area to Bridge Street for improved vehicular access to the central business district from the highway.)



Speaking before a joint meeting of the Housing Authority, chamber and two citizens committees, Purcell stated “This is a logical starting point for a general neighborhood renewal project.” He went on to explain that the loss of two buildings on North Main Street to fire, coupled with many deteriorated or substandard buildings within this area, so close to the State House, put this area at the top of the list. He recommended that the Housing Authority follow up with a detailed planning study of the area to determine if indeed it was blighted and thus eligible for urban renewal funds. Further studies showed that of the 119 homes in the area, 65 had “deficiencies.”¹⁸ Officials agreed that this was an appropriate area for renewal, and from thereon in the project was called “Capitol Plaza North.” Later that year the Housing Authority received \$121,000 for survey and planning, as well as a set-aside of \$2.5 million in loans and grants for property acquisition, relocating residents, clearing the sites and readying the land for future disposition and redevelopment.¹⁹ The Housing Authority again turned to Purcell for assistance, resulting in a report titled “The Capitol District Plan” and a development plan called “Capitol Plaza North.”

¹⁸ The cost to the city was \$591,000, but only \$31,700 of that was in cash. The balance was in the form of credits for undertaking infrastructure improvements within the renewal area.

¹⁹ The cost to the city was \$591,000, but only \$31,700 of that was in cash. The balance was in the form of credits for undertaking infrastructure improvements within the renewal area.

Purcell's initial vision was extremely radical. The firm suggested demolishing all the old, brick and wood commercial buildings north of Park Street, building a new parking garage east of North Main Street, erecting a lengthy, three-story building to anchor the southwest corner of Centre and North Main, stretching south as far as Warren Street; constructing a thoroughly modern hotel building at the northeast corner of North Main and Bridge Streets, and completely clearing the area enclosed by North Main, Centre, North State and Court Streets.

In 1964, all traffic heading into Concord from the east traveled the fairly new highway (Route 3, now Interstate 93) to a traffic circle and then headed west on Bridge Street, going up a steep hill to a "T" intersection with North Main Street. To continue west, drivers

then had to negotiate an awkward—and dangerous—jog to get onto Centre Street.²⁰ The urban renewal program offered a mechanism to pay for aligning the two streets. However, it did not come without cost to the community. Bridge Street would need to be elevated, thereby depressing the building sites on either side. Furthermore, it would need to be pushed farther north to accommodate four lanes and align with Centre Street,



This map shows the redevelopment parcels (a total of eight) and the road realignments (Centre and Montgomery streets) in the Capitol Plaza North urban renewal project, following necessary site clearance. Prepared by City of Concord, September 2, 1969.

thus necessitating the loss of several buildings along Main Street, as well as the businesses housed therein. In addition, Centre Street would need to move to the south to line up with Bridge Street, resulting in the demolition of St. Paul's Church parsonage and several business blocks at the southwest corner of North Main Street. While none was enthusiastic, affected businesses had mixed reactions to the impending changes. Among the more visionary was John Fanaras, whose pharmacy would be demolished by the realigned Centre Street. Though initially skeptical, he merged his business with another affected pharmacy, owned by Kenneth Fortier, to become The Prescription Centre. Together, the two were the first to purchase a parcel within the urban renewal area for a new store, and a year later even purchased a second parcel for redevelopment. By contrast, the owner of a

²⁰ Redevelopment was soon focused on the commercial area near North Main Street, with a mix of remodeling and removal in the residential area.

²¹ With the recent relocation of Concord Hospital from the South End to its current site on Pleasant Street, a direct east-west route had become even more critical.

furniture store, whose building was also condemned, fought the project and unsuccessfully sued. Angelo's and the Concord Lodge of Elks took the Housing Authority to court to stall eminent domain proceedings. The Upton Law firm on Park Street, housed in a former historic house between St. Paul's Church and the Patriot Building, lost its



Map of urban renewal area, showing original layout of Centre and Montgomery Streets and all the buildings within the area. Published in *Concord Monitor & Patriot*, February 2, 1965.

building to urban renewal, but relocated to another historic house within the renewal area on Centre Street.

Carpenter's Paint Store also relocated within the area. All told, some twenty-five businesses were displaced by urban renewal, including eight rooming or apartment operations, most of which closed down. Nine businesses found new homes outside the renewal area, and the remaining five closed shop.²² In addition to those cited above, affected businesses included a refrigeration business, Carlen's Cafe, and grocery, liquor and hardware stores that served the "blighted" neighborhood.²³

The planned redevelopment of the neighborhood triggered similar mixed reactions

among residents. Many residents were offended at having their neighborhood called blighted. The houses around us are nice old houses and not slums. Our house is brick and is well built. It has been in my husband's family since 1898, and we think a lot of it. We have Indian shutters in the dining room and living room. Not too many such houses are left in Concord. A house across the street from us has been in the owner's family longer than ours. There are other good houses on and near State Street.²⁴

²² *Concord Monitor & Patriot*, 6/26/1970 ²³ *Atherton's Radio, TV & Appliance store moved to Loudon Road. Angelo's Restaurant built a large, new facility on Stickney Avenue; the largest pre-engineered building in New England, it could seat 320 in the main dining room and hold another 100 in the cocktail lounge. The Elks Lodge erected a structure on Airport Road.*

²³ *Montgomery was the southern unit and its near-mirror image at 16 Centre Street was the northern unit.*

²⁴ *Letter from Mrs. Edmund Trombly to Concord Monitor & Patriot, 3/12/1964. Mrs. Trombly's house, at 23 Montgomery Street, was part of the historic Call Block, built in 1833 as an eight-unit tenement block on the site of the present Legislative Office Building on North State Street. The block was split apart when it was moved;*

Knowing that FHHFA required a relocation plan as part of the renewal plan, the Housing Authority and city, early on, set about compiling data on existing residents to develop a viable relocation plan. However, many of the 100 families were in low income brackets and needed to remain close by their work—difficult to achieve when so many affordable downtown units were being removed. Furthermore, the two urban renewal parcels set aside for residential redevelopment not only removed many affordable units, but replaced them with housing that would likely be beyond the reach of current residents. In December, 1966, FHHFA approved the city's urban renewal plan. But Concord was far from united on proceeding. Key issues revolved around wiping out a high number of businesses along North Main Street; the general loss of a large stock of old buildings; and in particular the loss of three historic buildings: a house immediately east of St. Paul's Church on Park Street occupied by the Upton Law office; the Chandler House on North Main Street and thought to be the oldest house in the city; and the Franklin Pierce House on Montgomery Street. The city responded that the only way to redevelop the entrance to the city was through urban renewal; private development just could not assemble the many small parcels that comprised the city's downtown land base. It also argued that the

housing proposed for demolition was not fit for habitation and would be replaced by far more decent quarters. Plus, funds would go toward rehabilitation of existing housing. In March 1967, the Board of Aldermen, under pressure to finally make a decision, voted 8-7 in favor of proceeding with urban renewal.



Views of buildings and businesses along the west side of North Main Street affected by the urban renewal plan. The upper photograph shows Park Street at the far left and the Patriot Building, the only structure left standing south of the Merrimack County Courthouse. The lower photograph, looking southwest, shows Centre Street at the far right; among the businesses depicted is Fanaras' Rexall Drugstore.

CLEARANCE & DISPOSITION OF PARCELS

By early January 1969, the Housing Authority had acquired twenty-nine of the forty-one buildings in the urban renewal area. Another five were purchased by May, while negotiations continued with the remaining property owners. The Housing Authority made temporary housing arrangements for displaced low-income residents in the area, a task made all the more difficult due to the lack of openings in its own only downtown housing project, the Kennedy Apartments (and which was limited to elderly residents). Demolition started in June, 1969 and was completed in September, 1971. The first area to be cleared included five buildings on the west side of Main Street, immediately north of Centre. The buildings (three brick and two wood-frame) had been severely damaged in a 1960 fire. Each of the nine redevelopment parcels within the renewal area was designated for a specific new use and carried certain conditions. For instance, Parcel 1, one of the larger and strategically located at the northeast corner of Bridge and North Main Streets, was to be used for a motel designed to accommodate the needs of government and business visitors, as well as of tourists. Across Main Street, Parcel 2, the largest parcel, was set aside for an office building, or possibly a combination of office and retail stores. Other parcels in the immediate business district were intended for office use, while the two parcels fronting on North State Street were earmarked for residential use.

The Prescription Centre purchased the first parcel in June, 1970 and soon began constructing a two-story retail/office building designed by local architect Guy Wilson. In March of the following year, the two residential parcels on North State Street were sold to Dr. Stephen Ekstrom, a local dentist, and Attorney John Stanley for luxury apartments. They soon erected a two-story building at 50 North State Street with twelve units called The Sycamores. The other project was to be a group of three, two-story buildings that fronted North State, Court and Summer Streets and featured such amenities as air conditioning, electric heat and even some underground parking. However, that project never got off the ground. (It was not until 1986 that the site was developed for residential condominiums.)



In addition to identifying redevelopment parcels, the urban renewal plan designated specific uses for each parcel, as shown on this plan, released in October, 1965. Ultimately, the parking behind the office on North Main Street became the site for a large Concord Housing Authority apartment building (Crutchfield Apartments).

The fourth sale in the renewal area was to the two owners of The Prescription Centre, who erected a two-story office structure at 10 Park Street.



1972 architect's rendering of the original project proposed by Edward Sylvia and accepted by the Concord Housing Authority. It consisted of low-income elderly housing on the west portion of the parcel and a four-story commercial building fronting on North Main Street with a retail extension toward Pitman Street. Although Sylvia erected the housing (to a somewhat different plan), the office building was vastly reduced in scale and built by executives of the Stewart Nelson Insurance Company.

In March, 1972, plans for the fifth parcel were finalized when HUD approved a subdivision of the parcel, the largest within the renewal area, in order to erect a low-income

elderly housing project on the west portion, which fronted on residential Summer Street, and a commercial building along North Main Street. Edward Sylvia, a New Bedford (MA)-based developer, was the winning bidder to construct the 105 housing units (Capitol Plaza Towers, later renamed Crutchfield Apartments), as well as 40,000 square feet of commercial space at the corner of North Main and Centre Streets with a retail extension to the north.²⁵ Construction of the housing began within a year, but the commercial development was delayed.

25 Once construction of the housing project was underway, legislators fought for dedicated on-street parking. City and state agreed to a limited number of spaces, but the real compromise was building a new two-deck parking structure over Storrs Street, the brainchild of local architect Richard Dudley.

An interview with Sylvia in mid-1974 revealed he was in financial distress. His grandiose plans for major projects both in Concord and Franklin fell apart, and the office site went on the auction block.²⁶ Herbert Engineering Company, the Worcester, MA construction firm that erected Capitol Plaza Towers and already had a large sum of money invested in the commercial site, acquired Sylvia's interest in the latter. The company proceeded to erect a two-story, 240' building with 40,000 square feet of office space. Under a prior arrangement, the completed building passed to a partnership comprised of John Nelson and Richard Hill, respectively president and vice-president of the Stewart Nelson Insurance Company, and Earl Flanders. Bank of New Hampshire relocated here to become the primary tenant, and the Stewart Nelson Company became the secondary occupant. It took far longer to dispose of the motel parcel. As early as 1967, Holiday Inn announced plans to build a 150-unit motel on the parcel, with a swimming pool,



Aerial view of southeastern portion of the urban renewal area taken shortly after The Prescription Center (shown bottom right) was completed. Note realigned Centre Street and cleared sites to the right of Prescription Center and around St. Paul's Church.

indoor parking, and banquet and restaurant facilities. However, the project never took off. It wasn't until four years later that the Housing Authority received another serious inquiry, followed by sketches. It came from a New Jersey developer, who indicated either a Sheraton or a Holiday Inn would be erected on the site. Again, little progress was made. Eventually the Housing Authority commissioned an economic study of the motel market. Its findings pointed to an insufficiently high tourist base, high property taxes and too high a price tag on the parcel. Yet, by December, 1972, the Housing Authority was negotiating with Ramada Inn, Inc. to build a 120-unit, six or seven-story motel. The purchase went through on March 21, 1973. Construction started the following year on a 100 unit motel with many of the same amenities proposed years earlier by Holiday Inn. (Coincidentally, the hotel became a Holiday Inn in the mid-1990s.) Just before this final parcel was sold, James Griffin, who had led the urban renewal program for the Housing Authority since its inception and felt it was now essentially "out of business," announced his resignation to take a similar position in Haverhill, Massachusetts.²⁷

²⁶ Sylvia's other Concord projects included an apartment building across from Bishop Brady High School and a development adjacent to the Everett Arena.

²⁷ Prior to his tenure in Concord, Griffin was the urban renewal director in Nashua. After his departure from Concord, his assistant, Leonard Hubbard, took over for the program's final months.

FRANKLIN PIERCE HOUSE

The future of the Pierce House, where United States President Franklin Pierce resided from 1842 to 1848, became a major issue in the urban renewal plans. The 1830s Greek Revival house sat at 18 Montgomery Street, within the urban renewal boundary and directly in the path of the planned extension of Summer Street to Montgomery Street. Not all agreed that the building should be saved. The Historic Sites Committee of the Concord Chamber of Commerce, chaired by David Stark, argued that “no effort be made to preserve the house” as it lacked sufficient historical value to warrant “an expensive and difficult preservation” and that even Pierce seemed to show little interest in the house, since he left it within a few days of his return from the Mexican War. The committee estimated it would take \$40-50,000 to acquire and restore the house. The NH Historical Society concurred with the Chamber’s position, adding that the Franklin Pierce House at 52 South Main Street had greater significance, as the president lived there many years, including when he learned of his election to the United States presidency. Furthermore, this was the house to which he returned when he completed his term and where he died.²⁸

Not all agreed the house should go. Supporters organized as the Pierce Brigade. The group argued the house was significant as the only residence actually owned by Pierce and urged the Housing Authority to realign the street to keep the house at its existing location. When that proved improbable, the Housing Authority offered to relocate the house if private funds were raised to restore it and if it would become an historic site. For the next five years, the Brigade feverishly focused on that goal, fundraising and negotiating with city, state and federal officials. It also sought to list the house on the National Register of Historic Places, the first such attempt in the city, as a means to seek some protection from urban renewal.²⁹ The Brigade initially hoped to move the house only a short distance to Doyen Park (now the parking lot behind the Courthouse). However a deed on that land restricted its use to public use, and the city had no desire to lose the park. Ultimately, the Walker-Woodman family donated land at the foot of North Main Street, where it was moved on April 18, 1971.³⁰ By then, the Chamber and City Council fully supported the save, and both the city and federal government allocated funds to assist with the move.

28 Concord Monitor & Patriot, 2/4/1967; Hengen, Elizabeth, “52 South Main Street,” 1988 (Inventory form on file at NH Division of Historical Resources). The South Main Street house burned in 1983; all that survives are landscape features, including a cast iron fence and granite work.

29 The nomination caused a huge controversy among state officials, and was ultimately rescinded. However, the entire area to which the Pierce Manse was moved became a local historic district in 1967 and was listed on the National Register in 1975.

30 Concord Monitor & Patriot, 4/19/1971. The house opened to the public in 1974 and has functioned as a historic house museum ever since.

A SECOND URBAN RENEWAL EFFORT

By the late 1960s, the focus of urban renewal nationally had shifted from a program of demolition and redevelopment to one of rehabilitation and revitalization. However, it took longer for public perception to follow course. In Concord, the Housing Authority, with support from the city, sought to bring a HUD-funded Neighborhood Improvement Program to Wards Six and Seven, an area bounded by Pleasant, South, Allison and South State Streets, with nearly 140 targeted buildings. The Housing Authority held several meetings with local residents to explain the program's objectives: rehabilitation and preservation of deteriorated housing stock through low-interest loans; removal of select buildings deemed too far gone to save; and infrastructure improvements, such as sewers, sidewalks, and street trees. Yet, despite several years of presentations, memories of eminent domain, the Franklin Pierce House debacle, and the loss of the beloved Carlen Cafe, coupled by the lack of a specific plan for the proposed South End project proved its demise. The Housing Authority failed to win citizen support, and without it federal funds were not forthcoming.³¹ From thereon in, the Housing Authority abandoned future revitalization efforts and, with the exception of the small-scale Ceriello project, instead focused on managing its existing housing projects.

Concord's Urban Renewal Legacy

It took a decade before Concord's urban renewal program was finished, two years longer than initially anticipated. At its outset, much of its momentum came from the ready availability of federal funds and the perceived need to compete with the spiffy new Capitol Shopping Center, compared to which Main Street buildings appeared old and decrepit. Yet, from the start, Concord had the benefit of learning from others' mistakes.

At the national level, Lady Bird Johnson called for a report to analyze the destruction of older buildings, city centers and neighborhoods wrought by federal programs, particularly urban renewal. The resulting publication triggered public awareness of the issue and resulted in the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, which required any federally initiated actions that affected National Register properties to be reviewed by the state historic preservation office. Though Concord's

³¹ Unlike in Concord, similar projects won support in Manchester and Portsmouth. *Concord Monitor & Patriot*, 1/27/1971

plan was already approved by then, the Preservation Act assisted the efforts of those working to save the Franklin Pierce House and led to some federal funding to assist in its relocation. Even prior to the Preservation Act, the CHA never intended to clear the entire urban renewal area. Most of the northern one-third portion of the renewal area was slated for rehabilitation through low-interest, long-term loans. In fact, the first such loan in New Hampshire occurred in Concord. Ultimately, eighteen houses were rehabbed. In its second, if unsuccessful, urban renewal program proposed for the South End, the Housing Authority and city focused even more on preservation and rehabilitation.

Unlike many urban renewal agencies in earlier projects, the CHA involved potential local investors early in the process, to avoid condemning and clearing a property before a redevelopment project was solidified. Of the seven parcels readied for redevelopment, all but one were built upon within six years of initial clearance. All told, Concord's urban renewal program brought in upwards of \$6,000,000 in new construction and created \$3,500,000 (a net increase of \$2,200,000) in non-residential taxable property.³² Some thirty-six residential buildings were demolished and another eighteen rehabilitated. Nine non-residential buildings were demolished, and nine were rehabilitated.³³ Most today are grateful urban renewal clearance did not extend farther. The architectural merit of some of the buildings now standing at the city's gateway remain questionable. Some are excellent examples of early 1970s architecture, while others lack distinction; none relates back to the rest of the business district. However, urban renewal programs were not designed to incorporate architectural review; once the land was sold, the Housing Authority had no further input. (Under Architectural Design Review, introduced to city zoning during the urban renewal period, the Planning Board did have some input.) Luckily, the renewal program spared some of the most significant residences within the area, such as the former units of the Call Block, and other important buildings along Centre, North State and Montgomery Streets. Urban renewal did serve as a mechanism to build upon Concord's already established planning program, adding a comprehensive land-use plan, housing inspection program, and updated building code, all requirements for participating in urban renewal. Throughout the urban renewal program, the city and the Housing Authority maintained a firm and positive working partnership.

32 Concord Monitor & Patriot, 2/12/1973. 33 Urban Renewal Area plan; Concord Monitor & Patriot, 3/6/1973.

33 Urban Renewal Area plan; Concord Monitor & Patriot, 3/6/1973.

Concord Housing Authority stands ready to partner with companies and organizations throughout the Concord region to bring leading-edge financing, construction, renovation and operational practices to housing and neighborhood initiatives.

15 Pitman Street

Concord, New Hampshire 03301

603-224-4059

Fax: 226-2941

www.concordha.com

