HERITAGE COMMISSION
Meeting Minutes
March 2, 2026

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, City 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 spelling of "Jaques" and agenda item 7 Planning Board add to sentence the February 18th 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 spelling of "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 distributed a handout to the Commission in reference to the history of the building and its potential historic significance. The handout is attached to these minutes.

      Vice-Chair Barton stated the purpose of the process is to help the property owner, community and city identify potential alternatives to demolition.

      Chair Jaques stated the building is a wooden building, and discussed its historic significance as outlined on the handout. Specifically, Chair Jaques discuss the history of the property when it was previously Camp Spaulding (which opened in the 1920's), and the former Riverside Park which was nearby. He noted that the subject building was the former nurses building for Camp Spaulding, appears to be in reasonable condition (per February 2026 site visit), and that maintenance of the building has been sponsored by Concord Rotary for 30 years. Chair Jaques

further discussed the construction of the building, and noted that the center chimney provided structural support (which was commonplace for historic buildings so they would not slide down the hill.)

Vice-Chair Barton stated in this phase of the demolition review process, the Commission needs to determine if the building is architecturally or historically significant. If the building is significant, the Commission can then discuss potential alternatives to demolition with the applicant.

Chair Jaques opened discussion on the individual criteria set forth in the demolition review ordinance to determine if the building is significant. It was noted the criteria in the ordinance are materially similar to that used to determine if a building might be potentially eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

It was noted that the property is not currently listed on the State or National Register of Historic Places. Councilor Kalob asked if anyone knows if NHSCOT considered going down the route for the property or building. The applicant was not present to respond to this question.

Chair Jaques suggested that placing the building on the register may place certain requirements or limitations on the property owner regarding future repair, maintenance or expansion of the building.

Vice-Chair Barton clarified that placing the building on the register would not affect such activities, unless they were being funded by State or Federal funds. She further noted that, if the building were in a historic district (which it is not) then it would be subject to design review for any exterior modifications.

Vice-Chair Barton noted that, although the building is relatively modest, there are a number of historic children's summer camps which are similar to the former Camp Spaulding property that have been listed on the state register and national register. Given the subject property's high level of architectural integrity, and associated with the "camp movement" of the late 19th / early 20th centuries, she believes the property is historically and architecturally significant.

Member Durgy Brooks reviewed the handout and associated ordinance criteria, and suggested that the Commission discuss each criterion individually. The Commission concurred with her suggestion.

Member Durgy Brooks discussed criterion #1 and noted there are three key components thereto regarding the structure's association with events. She clarified that said events would have to have significant contribution to broad patterns of history it is not narrow patterns. She suggested that the camp movement in New Hampshire appears to be broad patterns of history, and noted the subject building is associated with a former Children's camp which was established at the property in 1921. Member Durgy Brooks stated the criteria in the first criterion 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 patters of history; or"*.

Chair Jaques invited Member Durgy Brooks to craft a motion to make this finding.

Member Durgy Brooks responded I thought 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 quantitively 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 thought 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 part “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 the subject building only needs to satisfy one of the four criteria set forth within the demolition delay ordinance to determine if the building is historically significant. Regarding these specific criteria, the Commission could take one of these bullets and make a finding that a high probability exists, or a low probability exists, or state the Commission does not know based upon available information. Chair Jaques stated all they know is the property was named after two former governors.

Member Durgy Brooks concurred with Chair Jaques’ comments.

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 historically significant because it is associated with the lives of (historically) 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 then opened discussion on the final criteria of *"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.

Discussion ensued. Mr. Walsh recapped and noted that the Commission determined that the subject building satisfies 3 of the 4 criteria (where only 1 is required). Thus, the Commission has found that the building is potentially historically or architecturally significant. As such, Mr. Walsh informed the Commission that, in accordance with the Demolition Delay Ordinance, 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) day delay period. Mr. Walsh reported that the 60-day period will expire on March 19, 2026. Mr. Walsh clarified and reiterated that the Demolition Delay Ordinance does not grant the Heritage Commission the authority to cancel the demolition of a building. Rather, the ordinance only creates a window to time whereby the Heritage Commission may work with a property owner to identify possible alternatives to demolition or mitigation. He added that the property owner has no obligation to engage with the Heritage Commission in such discussions.

. Mr. Walsh suggested that, to the extent the Commission has suggestions on how the building could be preserved, or relocated, or has insights about materials to be salvaged from the building in the event of demolition, the Commission, working with staff, should communicate those ideas to the applicant in writing.

Discussion ensued. Chair Jaques stated that he would like to see the building preserved and relocated elsewhere on the applicant's property. He noted that relocation might be more economical than demolition.

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 explained that the Commission is responsible identifying any suggestions that it would like to make to the applicant. He noted that a motion articulating any such suggestions would be helpful to staff and the applicant. Mr. Walsh added that staff, with direction from the Commission, can prepare and issue a letter to NHSCOT informing them of the Commission's determination and suggestions.

Chair Jaques suggested that the Heritage Commission should request that the Rotary plaque on the building be salvaged as part of any potential demolition or off-premises relocation.

After additional discussion, Chair Jaques stated that he, working with Vice Chair Barton, would draft a letter to NHSCOT.

Chair Jaques noted this was a public hearing, and asked whether any member of the audience would like to speak.

Shirley Yaevy (12 Penacook St, Concord) stated she was present to receive information about this demolition. She stated that she supported the Commission's determination about the potential historical significance of the building and the ideas the Commission discussed for alternatives in lieu of demolition.

Chairman Jaques closed the meeting.

Member Durgy Brooks moved that the Chair send a letter to NHSCOT informing the applicant that the Heritage Commission had determined that the subject building is historically or architecturally significant per criteria "a", "b" and "c" of the demolition delay, and to convey alternatives and options for demolition for the building including, but not limiting to:

- relocating the building to another location on the property; or,
- offering the building to the public for relocation from the property; or,
- Potentially relocating the proposed emergency access road so that the building does not need to be demolished or relocated.

In addition, if the building is to be demolished, the letter will request that NHSCOT allow for architectural items of importance be salvaged and preserved prior to demolition.

Councilor Kalob seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

4. Old/Continuing Business
    a. Property Recognition:
    Chair Jaques stated this item should be removed from future meeting agendas.
    b. Monuments and Granite Markers:
    There was nothing discussed on this agenda item.

c. Old Penacook Library Update City Resolution #9518
Mr. Walsh reported that the property is under agreement and that the buyer has a six to nine-month due diligence and permitting period. The property will be preserved and converted into a duplex. Chair Jaques stated this item should be removed from future meeting agendas.

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 4th 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 circled back to the demolition application for 210 Bog Road. She noted that the applicant for the demolition had gone before the Planning Board last year. She suggested that it might be beneficial for a member of the Planning Board serving on the Commission to improve communication about development projects involving demolition. She asked whether the enabling ordinance for the Commission would provide for a Planning Board member on the Heritage Commission.

Mr. Walsh responded that the current ordinance does not include a representative from the Planning Board. Mr. Walsh explained that because the Commission is staffed by the City Planner, the Commission should be updated by the Planner regularly about all Planning Board matters.

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 19th 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 <u>one</u> 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 Kuwiyan, 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[1]

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

[1]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)