

**HERITAGE COMMISSION**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**March 2, 2026 - DRAFT**

The Heritage Commission held its regular monthly meeting in Council Chambers at 37 Green St, on Thursday, March 2, 2026.

Members: Vice-Chair Althea Barton, Carol Durgy Brooks, Chair Richard Jaques, Councilor Aislinn Kalob, Jim Spain, Dr. Bryant Tolles, Jr. and Alternate Member Randall Cotton

Absent: Michael Dunn

Staff: Matt Walsh, Deputy City Manager – Community Development  
Krista Tremblay, Administrative Technician III

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Jaques at 4:32 p.m.

2. Review / Approval of Minutes:

a. February 5, 2026 Regular Meeting

Member Durgy Brooks moved, seconded by Member Tolles Jr., to accept the Heritage Commission minutes from February 5, 2026, with a correction to the name Jaques and agenda item 7 Planning Board add to sentence the February 18<sup>th</sup> Planning Board meeting and on chapter 9 other business the fourth paragraph down word should be thought. Vice-Chair thought with corrections. All in favor. The motion passed.

b. February 12, 2026 Demolition Review Site Walk (210 Bog Road)

Vice-Chair Barton moved, seconded by Councilor Kalob, to accept the Heritage Commission minutes from February 12, 2026, with a correction to the name Jaques. All in favor. The motion passed. Member Durgy Brooks abstained due to not being present at the meeting.

3. New Business

a. Demolition Review Public Hearing: Application DP-0151-2026 from NH Scot for the demolition of the “former nurses building” (constructed 1925; 864+/- SF) located at 210 Bog Road

Chair Jaques handed a piece of paper to the commission in reference to the demolition review process (this will be attached at the end of the minutes).

Vice-Chair Barton stated this process is looking for solutions that help the property owner, community and city.

Chair Jaques stated the building is a wooden building. However, historically it is significant because of the location. Chair Jaques noted the history of Camp Spaulding when it started in the 1920’s when Riverside Park was open. There was a trolley that would go right up to the park. Chair Jaques noted when the camp was open there was not an increase in traffic. Chair Jaques thinks there is history to the place and it was cared for 30 years by the rotary. Chair Jaques noted it was build the old fashion way with the chimney in the middle of the house.

Chair Jaques noted they did it that way so the house would not slide down the hill.

Vice-Chair Barton stated in this phase they are trying to determine if it is architecturally or historically significant. Vice-Chair Barton noted the conservation about can it be saved or can it be moved or whether it is sound out happen in the second phase. Vice-Chair Barton noted they need to stick the criteria and there is nothing in the criteria about condition.

Chair Jaques called for a motion and a second then they can discuss more on the historical significance of the building.

Councilor Kalob noted it is too bad it is not on the national register of historical places or does not have a designation of a historic site. Councilor Kalob asked if anyone knows if NHSCOT considered going down the route for the property or building.

Chair Jaques does not know. Chair Jaques noted after it is registered there are things they can and cannot do after it is on the national register. They can do repairs, paint and change color. However, anything else like windows and door replacement need to be approved.

Vice-Chair Barton noted in a municipal historic district, like North Main St, the Heritage Commission serves as the historic district commission and they are a regulatory body that regulates that district. If there is someone that wants to add a porch or remove windows in that case they are not serving as the Heritage Commission they are serving as the Historic District Commission and they can say no you cannot change windows or install those windows. Vice-Chair Barton stated they can only do that for the one district in Concord. Vice-Chair Barton noted the national register and the state register are completely different it is an honorary designation.

Vice-Chair Barton noted the building is not a mansion or architecturally significant except that there are a number of summer camps juke like this that are in the state register and national register. There is a recognition that even though it is not a fancy building it is still a building that is significant to our history. Vice-Chair Barton stated in her opinion it is architecturally significant in its own kind of modest way.

Member Durgy Brooks noted looking at the summary sheet and the ordinance itself the criteria they have to look at are four basic criteria and each one is connected with or. So, each one can be addressed individually. The criteria for developing a conclusion can be any one of those it does not have to be and.

Chair Jaques stated they can go down through the line of criteria all four of them and vote on each one or vote on the whole thing.

Member Durgy Brooks stated it would be a good exercise to look at each of the four criteria. Member Durgy Brooks started with number one and noted there are three key parts with structure associated to events. Those events would have to have significant contribution to

broad patterns of history it is not narrow patterns. The camp movement in New Hampshire appears to be broad patterns of history. It is associated with events that have a contribution and Camp Spaulding has been here since 1921. Member Durgy Brooks stated the criteria in the first item is met because the events of having a camp of this nature from 1921 was significant to the development of Concord and its options to the community. Also, part of the broader state movement of camps and criteria number one is met. Member Durgy Brooks noted she was addressing (1) a. in the ordinance “*The structure is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the board patterns of history; or*”.

Chair Jaques asked Member Durgy Brooks if she wanted to put that into a motion.

Member Durgy Brooks stated with the information the group has discovered and brought to the attention of the full meeting and the public. The criteria and the relevancy of this project meets the criteria of “a” which is number one on the sheet.

Chair Jaques asked if Member Durgy Brooks wanted to put that into a motion.

Member Durgy Brooks responded I though I just did.

Chair Jaques asked if there is a second.

Vice-Chair Barton seconded.

Chair Jaques asked if there is any discussion.

Member Durgy Brooks stated the only discussion she can think of is there any more information that anyone has given that first criteria and in addition to what is informational input in the italic paragraph.

Chair Jaques stated he would add what events happened there that makes it significant.

Member Durgy Brooks stated she thinks that fact that it was an annual camp for young people as an annual event and the annual camping is one event or because it is repetitive from 1921 to the present that is quantitatively quite a few events of camping.

Vice-Chair Barton stated what she read in the national register and state register listings for several camps is that the events they are talking about is the actual summer camp movement. Vice-Chair Barton noted the summer camp movement has made a significant contribution to broad patterns of history and the board patterns of history might be kids who live in the city and never get outside get to go to summer camp. It could be children of wealthier families have a chance to go to a camp in a small town. Vice-Chair Barton stated that is some of the broad patterns of history. Then it is the structures associated with it because the structure is part of the summer camp.

Chair Jaques noted they are sticking on “a”.

Vice-Chair Barton stated that is “a” and all about “a”.

Chair Jaques stated “a” is the events.

Member Durgy Brooks noted that have made a significant contribution the broad patterns of history.

Chair Jaques stated the camp movement is what needs to be added to the motion to explain what event they are talking about.

Vice-Chair Barton stated she does not think so; the motion could be something like yes, the infirmary building.

Chair Jaques stated he is reading from the demolition review process 26-9 article (this will be attached at the end of the meeting minutes for reference). Chair Jaques noted he is reading from criteria from National Register of Historic Places. Chair Jaques noted “b” talks more about the structure and the lives of the significant persons in the past.

Member Durgy Brooks noted that is a different criteria.

Chair Jaques responded yes, it is.

Member Durgy Brooks asked if she needs to revise the motion to clarify one meaning one “a” from the ordinance.

Chair Jaques stated the only thing they need to revise is to include the camp movement.

Member Durgy Brooks stated she though that was addressed with the broad patterns of history and the camp movement is part of that broad pattern of history of summer youth camp. Member Durgy Brooks made a motion that under the ordinance one “a” that the national summer camp movement that started in the 1920’s and started with the 1921 infirmary building at Camp Spaulding is a structure that is associated with the national camp movement and has made a significant contribution in Concord and the surrounding area to the national camp movement which has become part of a broader pattern in the nation of summer camp youth movements.

Chair Jaques called to see if there is still a second.

Vice-Chair Barton seconded.

Chair Jaques asked if there is any more discussion, with none called for all in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Jaques opened discussion for “b” in the ordinance: *“the structure is associated with the lives of significant persons in or past; or”*.

Councilor Kalob stated she noticed Camp Spaulding was named for two former governors and asked if they were associated with the camp in any way or is the camp just named after them.

Vice-Chair Barton stated it is her understanding is that the family were major philanthropists and major donors the gave money to kick start the New Hampshire Charitable Foundation. Vice-Chair Barton noted they donated some of the seed money to start the camp.

Chair Jaques stated “b” does not apply.

Member Durgy Brooks asked why would that be.

Chair Jaques stated other than the fact it is associated with two past governors.

Member Durgy Brooks stated for the sake of discussion this particular criteria stated that the structure is associated with the lives of significant persons in the past. Member Durgy Brooks asked what does associated mean and it could just be naming of the significant person that could be local, national or regional. Member Durgy Brooks noted there is minimal relationship with the Spaulding’s and the camp.

Chair Jaques agreed.

Councilor Kalob feels there is a stronger association with the structure and the lives of these governors for who the camp is named because of the funding. Councilor Kalob stated she feels like “b” does apply.

Member Durgy Brooks stated the criteria is not defined anywhere in the ordinance. Member Durgy Brooks noted it becomes a part of their discussion what does the criteria mean and then is there a minimal, moderate of significant relationship with the building.

Chair Jaques stated they only need to find one thing on this whole list to do what they need to do. Then they can take one of these bullets and define is it a high probability, low probability and they do not know. Chair Jaques stated all they know is it was named after two governors.

Member Durgy Brooks stated she would agree and thinks maybe looking at does the criteria match the facts minimally, moderately or heavily is s way to sort this out. Member Durgy Brooks noted her thought is for any demolition review they should go through each of the criteria to evaluate the property. Member Durgy Brooks noted they only need one of the criteria.

Chair Jaques stated if the other three did not apply and they were all on the fence about “b” they need to figure this out to see how many are really significant or not. Chair Jaques stated

there is enough to make a motion that the structure is associated with the lives of significant persons.

Member Durgy Brooks stated she would second that motion.

Chair Jaques made a motion that the structure is significant with the lives of an significant persons in our past. Member Durgy Brooks seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Jaques stated let's move on to "c" *The structure embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period or methods of constructions, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or.* Chair Jaques noted when he reads "c" some of it is subjective and it is all in the eyes of the beholder.

Councilor Kalob stated the fireplace and the chimney felt like it is from a different time period and the method of construction stands out.

Member Durgy Brooks commented on the criteria itself to aid the discussion. Member Durgy Brooks noted item "c" poses criteria that are of about the structure that asks to be exemplary in it is type of architecture or period, method of construction does not think they have any information. This criteria "c" goes to distinctiveness and they do not know who built this building.

Chair Jaques agree other than the fireplace and the chimney that makes it a little distinctive.

Vice-Chair Barton has a different perspective for the sake of dialogue there are two camps that referenced in her notes that are in the state or national register not because there is any special about them but they are typical of that type of building that would be in a camp.

Chair Jaques noted the only thing it applies to is the first part of the that paragraph up to the word or.

Member Durgy Brooks noted from the discussion and the comments made it would seem on criteria "c" the criteria they are looking at does the structure minimally meet this criteria or is it moderately or heavily favor. Member Durgy Brooks stated that would be helpful to decide if criteria "c" is applicable.

Chair Jaques made a motion that minimally the structure and embodies distinctive characteristics of a type or period.

Vice-Chair Barton asked if it cannot be all a summer camp, work of a master and have artistic values. Vice-Chair Barton noted if it meets one then it is or, or, or then it meets that one.

Chair Jaques responded yes it meets the criteria, and he was spelling it out.

Vice-Chair Barton asked if Chair Jaques wanted to say minimal.

Chair Jaques responded yes, if someone sees a picture of the building ad says we signed off on “c”. What will stick out to them is the work of a master.

Vice-Chair Barton noted the motion could be the structure embodies the distinctive characteristics of a summer camp infirmary.

Member Durgy Brooks seconded.

Chair Jaques asked if there is any other discussion, with none, called for all in favor. The motion passed unanimously

Chair Jaques stated the last one *“the structure has yielded or may be likely to yield, information important in history or prehistory”*.

Vice-Chair Barton made a motion that this building is not likely to yield information like this. Chair Jaques seconded. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Jaques stated they have the demolition application to approve or not based on the discussion.

Vice-Chair Barton stated the question they were just answering is it historically or architecturally significant. If they said yes to any of those then the answer is yes.

Mr. Walsh stated if they jump to page three with number two at the top *“If the building is found to be potentially historically or architecturally significant,”* Mr. Walsh noted the Heritage Commission agreed it satisfies three out of the four criteria even though they only need to satisfy one. Mr. Walsh then continued reading *“then the Heritage Commission may attempt to coordinate with the applicant to identify the alternatives to demolition., or other potential actions to mitigate demolition of the subject building, prior to the conclusion of the sixty (60) calendar days delay period”*. Mr. Walsh stated he believes the 60-day period expires on March 19<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Walsh noted the Heritage Commission has never been able to stop a demolition it never has they have the ability once they find it historically significant to work with the applicant to find an alternative to demolition or ways to mitigate demolition of the building.

Member Durgy Brooks stated having gone through the analysis they found the criteria for “a”, “b” and “c” from the ordinance to be applicable and “d” not applicable. Therefore, worthy of providing the information that they have gained from this discussion provide that to the applicant with suggestions for alternatives. Member Durgy Brooks noted it seems like they have input until the 19<sup>th</sup>.

Chair Jaques responded yes, it is up to the Heritage Commission to get with them and not sure if they do this through planning or how it will work.

Mr. Walsh stated the applicant is not present at the meeting and the applicant does not need to be present or engage. Mr. Walsh stated if the commission has suggestions on how the building could be preserved or relocated or saved or if there are pieces of the building to see salvaged. If the commission has suggestions for the applicant to consider Mr. Walsh stated he can pass them on the applicant in writing.

Chair Jaques would like to see it moved on the property. Chair Jaques noted the cost of demolition is pretty high.

Member Durgy Brooks suggested they have a motion about the criteria they found applicable and then add to it their suggestions and it be a motion that is contained in the letter from the Heritage Commission to the applicant based on the discussion. Member Durgy Brooks noted they can offer to meet or if the letter has specific information or possibilities for moving the building and that can be in the motion and in the letter.

Chair Jaques stated they can put that in the letter.

Vice-Chair Barton asked if Chair Jaques or Mr. Walsh will be putting their thoughts into a letter.

Mr. Walsh stated the commission is responsible for the process to make suggestions. Mr. Walsh noted having a motion to articulate those would be good. Staff can send a letter to NHSCOT to outline the following alternatives to save the building or mitigate the demolition and Mr. Walsh can send a letter to see where it goes from there.

Chair Jaques asked for the plaque for the rotary on the side of the building.

Member Durgy Brooks feels it is a stronger position for the Heritage Commission to analyze to one outline the three criteria they found valuable and why, two here are some alternatives for your consideration and how this could be resolved in a way that eliminates demolition. Then as many of the criteria moving the building on site or moving it off site. Whatever some of the criteria they heard tonight and there maybe more if they discuss further. In parting these are our suggestions to meet with the applicant, it could be a special meeting.

Chair Jaques asked the commission if he were to write a letter with the criteria they have outlined and why. Along with possible alternatives.

Vice-Chair Barton noted there are other alternatives, questions and things to suggest and they will come up with a robust letter.

Member Durgy Brooks noted she would like the letter to reflect a motion that they found the

three first criteria so it is not their opinion in the letter and it is this is what the commission examined and looked at under the ordinance.

Chair Jaques will start the letter with the criteria and the alternatives he can think of and he will forward to Vice-Chair Barton to have send out in a day or two.

Chair Jaques asked the only member of the audience to speak in front of the Heritage Commission.

Shirley Yaevy (12 Penacook St, Concord) stated she was present to receive information and they have come up with some alternatives that are a good idea if they want to salvage the building.

Member Durgy Brooks made a motion that they convey in a letter from the chair one that the decision of the Heritage Commission for the proposed demolition meets the criteria “a”, “b” and “c” from the ordinance and that meets three of those “a”, “b” and “c” from the ordinance and two the commission has discussed a number of alternatives and options for demolition for the property including but not limiting to move the building on to another position the property and two offering the building for sale or donation to another piece of property and three move the access road so demolition does not have to occur.

Vice-Chair Barton noted if they plan to demolish will allow architectural items to be salvaged before demolition.

Member Durgy Brooks noted there are four and asked if there is a five.

Chair Jaques asked Member Durgy Brooks if that was the end of her motion.

Member Durgy Brooks stated she thinks so and asked the commission if they have anything else.

Chair Jaques called for a second.

Councilor Kalob seconded.

Chair Jaques asked if there is any more discussion or corrections, with none, called for all in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

#### 4. Old/Continuing Business

##### a. Property Recognition

Chair Jaques stated this agenda item needs to come off the agenda for next month.

##### b. Monuments and Granite Markers

There was nothing discussed on this agenda item.

##### c. Old Penacook Library Update City Resolution #9518

Chair Jaques stated this agenda item needs to come off the agenda for next month.

Mr. Walsh stated the purchase and sales agreement has been signed.

d. Review Section VIII Historic Resources of the Master Plan 2030

Chair Jaques asked to remove bullet points below removed from the agenda for next month.

Chair Jaques noted he handed out chapter d out to everyone.

- Architectural surveys, pdf pages 11 (bottom) and 12
- Exhibit VIII-1 Historic Resources, pdf page 19

5. Heritage Sign Program Review Committee update

Member Durgy Brooks stated there were no new sign applications and the March 4<sup>th</sup> meeting is cancelled.

6. Planning Board Update

Mr. Walsh noted that Phenix Hall project was conditionally approved at the February Planning Board meeting.

7. City Council Update

Councilor Kalob stated they had their priority session and is not sure if the language about historic preservation has been added.

8. Other Business

Member Durgy Brooks noted the applicant for the demolition had gone before the Planning Board last year and begun the process for the plans for the property. Member Durgy Brooks stated in the rules and regulations in the ordinance for a city council representative and they have not had a planning board representative. Member Durgy Brooks asked if it is in the ordinance to suggest to have a planning board representative they could have put their heads together to discuss alternatives to save a building or move a building.

Mr. Walsh stated he does not think in the ordinance it discusses a Planning Board member being on the Heritage Commission. Mr. Walsh noted the City Planner staffs the Heritage Commission. Mr. Walsh stated there are seven positions appointed by the City Manager. Mr. Walsh stated they can ask the City Manager to appoint the next vacancy to see if they can get someone that is also on the Planning Board.

Vice-Chair Barton will email Chair Jaques when they are available to set up an orientation.

9. Adjourn

**Adjournment**

Chair Jaques moved, seconded by Member Durgy Brooks, to adjourn the meeting at 6:05 p.m. All in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

*Krista Tremblay*

Krista Tremblay

Administrative Technician III

## Concord Heritage Commission: Demolition Review Process

The purpose of the demolition review ordinance is "to give Concord residents fair warning when an older building, which may be important to the City's history and character, is proposed for demolition. Such warning will enable the community to determine if the building is architecturally or historically significant, to explore alternatives to demolition, and, if demolition goes forth, to document the building prior to demolition." (2030 Master Plan)

Demolition review is a collaborative process. It helps avoid unnecessary demolitions, and adds predictability to the process. It cannot prevent demolition or delay it beyond the 60-day period. Concord has had many successes, like the 1790 Rolfe Barn and the 19<sup>th</sup> century farmhouse on Clinton Street turned into housing.

### Steps in process:

- Outreach to owner and site visit
- Determine whether building is architecturally or historically significant (see criteria below)
- Explore alternatives to demolition with the owner and community
- If demolition goes forward, document the building for public record and salvage architectural features

To determine whether the building is architecturally or historically significant, the ordinance requires us to use criteria from the National Register of Historic Places. A building only needs to satisfy one criteria to be determined significant.

[Relevant phrases for heritage commission to consider in bold. Info on infirmary in italics.]

1. The structure is **associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of history**; or
  - *The 1921 Infirmary building at the former Camp Spaulding is part of the 1920s Summer Camp Movement driven by the rise of youth organizations like the Boy/Girl Scouts and the YMCA and a desire to connect children with nature. Camp Spaulding started as a camp for boys, but quickly expanded to include girls. The camp was part of the Fresh Air Movement, giving underserved children a chance to experience activities like camping, hiking, swimming, boating and horseback riding.*
2. The structure is **associated with the lives of significant persons in our past**; or
  - *Camp Spaulding was named in honor of former NH Governors Rolland H. Spaulding and Huntley N. Spaulding.*
3. The structure **embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction**, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or

- *The Infirmary embodies the distinctive characteristics of a 1920s summer camp infirmary.*
  - *The NH Division of Historical Resources just announced that Camp Kuwiyon, a 1920s girls camp in Meredith on Lake Winnepesaukee, was added to the State Register of Historic Places. (The State Register is an honorary designation recognizing significant buildings that reflect the state's history, architecture, and culture. It encourages preservation by making properties eligible for special state financial aid and other benefits.) [Link to NHPR announcement](#)*
  - *The NHSCOT Infirmary appears to be similar in construction to the c. 1920 Mary Knapp Infirmary in Vermont, which is a contributing building to the National Register-listed Aloha Hive Camp. [Link to NR listing, p. 18 and map on p. 54.](#)*
4. The structure has yielded or may be likely to yield information important in history or prehistory.
- N/A

## **ARTICLE 26-9 DEMOLITION REVIEW<sup>1</sup>**

### **26-9-1 Definitions.**

As used in this section, the following words or phrases shall have the meanings set forth below, except when the context in which they are used requires a different meaning.

*Building:* Building is defined as in the International Building Code, "any structure used or intended for supporting or sheltering any use or occupancy." Buildings shall exclude manufactured housing as defined in RSA 674:31, as amended.

*Demolition:* The act of pulling down, destroying, removing, relocating, or razing a building, or part of a building or commencing any such work.

(Ord. No. 3124, § I, 3-14-22; Ord. No. 3183, § I, II, 8-11-25)

### **26-9-2 Criteria.**

Any building or part of a building proposed to be demolished shall fall under the terms of this article when:

- (a) An application for the demolition of a building, except manufactured housing as defined in RSA 674:31, as amended, is submitted to the City; and
- (b) The proposed demolition is greater than five hundred (500) square feet of gross floor area; and
- (c) The building was constructed more than fifty (50) years before the date of application for demolition permit.

(Ord. No. 3124, § I, 3-14-22; Ord. No. 3183, § I, II, 8-11-25)

### **26-9-3 Procedure.**

- (a) When any demolition permit application involving demolition of a building meeting the criteria of Section 26-9-2 is filed with the Code Administrator, and signed and dated by the

---

<sup>1</sup>Editor's note(s)—Ord. No. 3124, § I, adopted March 14, 2022, amended Art. 26-9 in its entirety, in effect repealing and reenacting said Art. 26-9 to read as set out herein. The former Art. 26-9, §§ 26-9-1—26-9-5, pertained to similar subject matter and derived from Ord. No. 2379, § II, adopted April 16, 2001; and Amendment of May 21, 2002.

---

property owner or the property owner's designee, the Code Administrator shall within five (5) business days of the filing:

- (1) Notify the applicant in writing that the demolition must be reviewed before proceeding, and that the delay will not exceed sixty (60) calendar days from the date of the filing of a demolition permit application by the property owner or owner's agent.
  - (2) Notify the Heritage Commission's staff liaison that a demolition permit application has been received that meets the criteria of Section 26-9-2, along with the date the application was filed.
- (b) Within forty-five (45) calendar days of the filing (including the date of the filing), the Heritage Commission may coordinate with the property owner or the property owner's designee to conduct a publicly noticed site visit, including the interior of the building with the permission of the property owner, preferably during daylight hours. Also within forty-five (45) calendar days of the filing (including the date of the filing), the Heritage Commission shall hold a public hearing to determine whether the building is potentially historically or architecturally significant utilizing the following:
- (1) Criteria from the National Register of Historic Places shall be used in making the determination of potential historical or architectural significance as follows:
    - a. The structure is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of history; or
    - b. The structure is associated with the lives of significant persons in or past; or
    - c. The structure embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
    - d. The structure has yielded or may be likely to yield, information important in history or prehistory.
- (c) The Planning Division shall post a public hearing notice in two (2) separate and distinct public places not less than ten (10) calendar days in advance of the hearing.
- (d) The Planning Division shall also prepare a notice for posting at the site that identifies the building proposed for demolition and the date, time, and place of the public hearing. The notice shall be posted on the site by the Planning Division in a location that is visible from the street, at least five (5) calendar days prior to the public hearing. The sign shall be posted continuously as required.
- (e) Within five (5) business days following the public hearing, the Planning Division's staff liaison to the Heritage Commission shall notify the Code Administrator in writing of the determination made by the Heritage Commission.

- 
- (1) If the building is found to not be potentially historically or architecturally significant, the Code Administrator may issue a demolition permit for the subject building, provided all other requirements have been satisfied.
- (2) If the building is found to be potentially historically or architecturally significant, then the Heritage Commission may attempt to coordinate with the applicant to identify alternatives to demolition, or other potential actions to mitigate demolition of the subject building, prior to the conclusion of the sixty (60) calendar days delay period.

(Ord. No. 3124, § I, 3-14-22; Ord. No. 3155, § I, 11-13-23; Ord. No. 3183, § I, II, 8-11-25)

## **26-9-4 Demolition.**

- (a) , after sixty (60) calendar days from the date an application involving demolition of a building is accepted by the Code Administrator, no alternatives to demolition, or other potential actions to mitigate demolition of the subject building, have been identified and mutually agreed to by the property owner and Heritage Commission, the Code Administrator shall issue the demolition permit, provided all other requirements have been satisfied.
- (b) Prior to demolition, and subject to the written permission from the property owner, the Heritage Commission may photographically document the building. The Heritage Commission shall coordinate directly with the property owner or the property owner's designee for an appropriate time for the photography session. The Heritage Commission may encourage the property owner to salvage significant architectural features.
- (c) Whenever the Code Administrator has determined that a building which constitutes either an attractive nuisance, or an imminent threat to public health and safety, or an imminent threat to public or private infrastructure, or is otherwise subject to a Hazardous Building Order in accordance with NHRSA 155-B, the demolition review process set forth in Article 26-9, shall be automatically waived and the Code Administrator shall be authorized to immediately issue a demolition permit for any such building which satisfies any of the aforementioned criteria set forth herein.

(Ord. No. 3124, § I, 3-14-22; Ord. No. 3155, § I, 11-13-23; Ord. No. 3183, § I, II, 8-11-25)