



Heritage Commission

Wednesday, October 14, 2026, 4:30 PM

2nd Floor Conference Room, City Hall
3 Washington St, Keene, NH 03431

AGENDA

- I. Call to Order – Roll Call**
- II. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes – September 9, 2026**
- III. November HC Meeting – November 4th or November 18th**
- IV. Sadoques Family Historic Marker Updates**
- V. Updated Demolition Review Committee (DRC) Criteria – Chapter 44, Article III of City Code**
- VI. Certified Local Government (CLG) Grant Updates**
- VII. Staff Updates**
- VIII. New Business**
- IX. Next Meeting – November 4, 2026**
- X. Adjourn**

City of Keene
New Hampshire

HERITAGE COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES

**Wednesday, September 9,
2026**

4:30 PM

**2nd Floor Conference
Room, City Hall**

Members Present:

Rose Carey
Marilyn Huston
Molly Ellis, Councilor
Louise Zerba
Cauley Powell, Chair
Karl Sandy, Alternate (voting)

Staff Present:

Megan Fortson, Planner / Deputy Zoning
Administrator

Mayor Jay Kahn (until 4:49 PM)

Members Not Present:

Acacia Royce, Vice Chair
Jill Bouchillon, Alternate
Julie Emineth
Connie Joyce, Alternate
Kathy Halverson, Alternate

1. Call to Order – Roll Call

Chair Powell called the meeting to order at 4:32 PM.

2. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes - August 12, 2026

Ms. Zerba made a motion to approve the meeting minutes of August 12, 2026. Ms. Huston seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

3. Historic Marker Discussion – Mayor Jay Kahn

Mayor Jay Kahn stated that just like there are murals around the City, there are many places in the City that could have historic markers. What rings for him is the home on Elm St., which historically belonged to a local Abenaki family, the Sadoques. The Sadoques Family has left the community, and the property has found another use, and this is an example of what could happen with other properties. He continued that he thinks the Sadoques Family has the most historic presence of Native American history in the City, and they do not want to lose that. He has been in touch with the Preservation Alliance. He has not approached the New Hampshire Historic Commission, but others have had experience with doing that.

Karl Sandy arrived at 4:36 PM.

The Mayor continued that the Historical Society of Cheshire County (HSCC) is very interested in preserving the Sadoques Family's heritage. They collected a lot of information. Before the property came down, they contacted Joyce Heywood, one of the Sadoques' descendants, and she went through the house with her cousin. They documented every room on video. The family history is well documented through a book written on the family's history ("*Woven Through the Sweetgrass: Memories of a New England Abenaki Family*," edited by Joyce Chicklas Heywood and Margaret Chicklas Perillo).

The Mayor continued that he does not think this historical marker would be a huge undertaking. All of the pieces are in place. When he suggested this at the Regional Roundtable Discussion hosted by the NH Preservation Alliance and the NH Division of Historic Resources, the suggestion that came back from that meeting was that Keene's Heritage Commission has been involved with previous efforts for historic markers. Thus, he is following up to say that the HC's help would be appreciated.

Ms. Zerba asked what house on Elm St. it is. The Mayor replied 454 Elm St. Brief discussion ensued about the location. Ms. Huston asked what they are looking for with the historic marker. The Mayor replied that he does not know if there is guidance that the marker needs to be a certain material or of certain dimensions, or what kind of commitment the City would need to make to preserve it. He does not know those details. Chair Powell stated that there is a program where you apply for that sort of signage, through the State, for recognition of an individual. She thinks a family would probably fit under that.

Chair Powell asked if the HSCC is steering this effort and if they wanted to be the ones to apply, or if it is better coming from a municipal group like the HC. The Mayor replied that he does not know the pathway. He continued that he thinks it could come from the HSCC as well. Chair Powell replied that they will figure out which organization would apply. She asked if the Mayor had communicated with the property owner. Brief discussion ensued about confusion about who the property owner is. Chair Powell stated that regardless, her question is whether there is buy-in from the individual or party on the signage. The Mayor replied that the owner is very interested in having the historic marker.

Councilor Ellis asked if there is a concept yet for what the historic marker would look like. For example, whether it would be the kind on a post, or a bronze plaque on the house, one of the big green signs that the state does, a stone, or something else. Discussion ensued. HC members noted that the house has been demolished, so it would need to be a standalone marker of some sort. Chair Powell stated that the big green signs are through the state program, so if there is an interest in going a different route with a different kind of marker, the application process and the state's approval would be unimportant. It would just be the fundraising related to the creation, placement, installation, and approval of the marker.

Chair Powell thanked Mayor Kahn for bringing this to the HC, as it is certainly in their wheelhouse. She continued that the HC would love to be involved. If a different organization

ends up leading the effort, the HC would give a letter of support, but the HC could take the lead. The Mayor replied that it would be perfectly appropriate for the HC to take the lead. He continued that the state's historic commission suggested that. Chair Powell replied that is great. She continued that her only concern is that if the HSCC has already done a fair bit of work on this, they might want to be the ones to lead. The HC could always collaborate with them. They would lean on the HSCC for the writing or narrative that would go on the marker. It sounds like the HC needs to connect with Jenna Carroll of the HSCC and talk about the next steps.

The Mayor thanked the HC and added that he would be glad to lend a letter of support and whatever it takes to help do this. He continued that he thinks they could have a nice ceremony as well. Joyce Heywood is coming back to town for an event the HSCC is having in November. Chair Powell replied that is Indigenous History Month. They can find out more about the HSCC's event.

Ms. Fortson stated that just for her own clarification, it sounds like they still do not know whether this would be a state-funded sign. She continued that she mentioned this to Mari Brunner, who said they would need to research it, because if it is not along a state highway it might not be eligible for the state's sign program. She can look into that. She would be happy to coordinate with the HSCC in conjunction with Chair Powell. It sounds like it is up in the air as to whether it would be a sign installed in the right-of-way or something that gets installed on the property as part of its future development. She asked if that is correct. The Mayor replied yes. He continued that there is a willing property owner.

Chair Powell replied that she thinks those signs can often be in pedestrian areas as well, so maybe not specific to highways, but the Elm St. property is off the beaten path quite a bit. She thanked Ms. Fortson for her work on this. Ms. Fortson replied that she will do some research. She continued that they know, from working with Steve Seraichick of the Yankee Bottle Club, that if something is not under the state's jurisdiction, it would potentially just have to go through the City Council process.

Ms. Carey stated that there are some nice stone benches with plaques or stories, placed on walkways, so that is something to think about, too. Discussion ensued about the possibility. Ms. Zerba stated that she wonders if it would be more appropriate to put the marker in the right-of-way rather than on the individual's property. Others replied that it could be off the edge of the sidewalk on the property. It is becoming a multi-unit property, so there would be more people on foot. The Mayor stated that it would be a good idea to contact the property owner soon, to let him know that the idea of having a historic marker on site is getting some attention.

Ms. Zerba asked if the HC needs to make a motion. Chair Powell replied that she thinks they need to do more research first to determine what exactly they are pursuing, such as whether it would be a state sign or not. Discussion continued.

Ms. Zerba made a motion to pursue continued research and investigation into the idea of a historic marker to honor the Sadoques Family's history at 454 Elm St. Councilor Ellis seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

The Mayor left at 4:49 PM.

HC members asked for more information about the Sadoques' property. Chair Powell stated that her understanding is that the Demolition Review Subcommittee went to the property, and the house was not salvageable. In the spring, the HSCC documented it, took pictures, did interviews, and recorded a walking tour. Ms. Fortson stated that the property owner went to the Planning Board and got approval to construct approximately 18 small, single-family homes on the property. It is almost 2.5 acres.

Ms. Zerba stated that if this property and the house's demolition was on the Heritage Commission's agenda, she must have missed it. Discussion ensued about how it was on the agenda in April, but it might have gotten a little lost because they had to reform the Demolition Review Subcommittee. Ms. Fortson stated that she talked about the Elm St. property at the HC's April meeting. She continued that the property owner's original hope was to relocate the Sadoques' house to somewhere else on the property, but it turned out that it would have cost about \$100,000 to do that. The property owner was in touch with the HSCC, who had some of the descendants come to tour the house, and they did interviews. After the Demolition Review Subcommittee went out and took pictures, the HSCC went back to get even more footage and photos. The HSCC will eventually have a video about it on its YouTube channel. The Demolition Review Subcommittee reviewed and approved the demolition with the understanding that this other documentation was already taking place by the HSCC.

Councilor Ellis stated that she wants to add that the current property owners were devastated that it would have to be demolished. They really wanted to preserve it because they really cared about the history. But they could not live there anymore, and they were getting too old to keep up with it. They needed to sell it so they could move. When she talked with them in April, their plan was to move into one of the condos on that property once they are developed. They want the developer to be up to standards that they would want to live in. It is a shame the house had to be demolished, but they are saving pieces like the mantelpiece and some pillars. Discussion continued.

Ms. Carey stated that she did not realize there would be 18 units. She continued that they could consider the idea of a community garden with a marker or bench in it. Discussion continued, and the group determined that while such a garden would be beautiful and enjoyable for the residents, there would be concerns about who would be responsible for maintenance and what would happen if the property were sold, and per Ms. Fortson's information, a garden might not be possible if it was not a feature on the plan that the Planning Board already approved in the Conditional Use Permit/Cottage Court process. HC members agreed that they need to do more research about the garden idea. Discussion continued about the property and the possibilities.

4. Certified Local Government (CLG) Grant Updates

Ms. Fortson stated that she met with Brandee Loughlin, the Preservation Planning & Development Coordinator for the NH DHR on August 26. She continued that Ms. Loughlin received the HC's letter of intent and thought that all four ideas were great. She did not have a preference or recommendation for which direction to go in. The NH DHR received nine letters of

intent, so they hope to divide the \$75,000 amongst as many of those projects as possible. Ms. Loughlin said the HC could potentially apply for two projects, if they wanted to do two smaller projects, or just do one bigger project and have this be the “phase one” this year. If they did two projects, Ms. Loughlin said, they could apply for up to \$10,000 in grant funds. The applications are due October 16, 2026. It is up to the group what they want to pursue. Between now and October, they would need to come up with estimates for the application.

Chair Powell stated that she had hoped the NH DHR would help the HC choose, but it sounds like the HC needs to choose what their direction of work for the coming year will be. The four projects the HC were considering are education in Keene, for the 2028 200th anniversary of Keene High School (KHS); the expansion of the graveyard walking tour project; the “What’s No Longer Here” project looking at buildings that have been taken down; and the manufacturing and factories inventory. She asked for others’ thoughts.

Ms. Carey stated that the inventory project would be nearly zero commitment from the HC. She continued that the HC would be doing research if they chose the “What’s No Longer Here” project. The graveyard project would not be a tremendous amount of work for the HC, because the HSCC has done a lot of research on that. The work for the education project would also be something the HC would do. Chair Powell replied that she thinks the funding for the education project would mostly go towards hiring a video person to make the content, based on research the HC would provide. Discussion ensued. Ms. Zerba spoke about a video she and others, either through the HC or another group she was a part of, created about the middle school, before it moved to Maple Ave. Chair Powell noted that the education project is the only one that would have a deadline, because of the upcoming anniversary of the high school. The other projects could be done anytime. For that reason, she leans toward the education project, but she would be glad to do any of them. Ms. Carey agreed. She likes them all, and they all fit the HC’s purview, but the education project is the only one that could not be tabled for another time.

Discussion continued. HC members noted that the research for the manufacturing and factories inventory would be done entirely by a consultant, funded 100% by the NH DHR. The HC would be doing the research for the “What’s No Longer Here” project. Chair Powell spoke about how Alan Rumrill already has his own vision and has done all of the work for the graveyard tours thus far. A grant for that would require a match from the City, which could be, say, volunteering by tabling, promoting an event, or financially supporting a presentation. That would not be as much labor for the HC. She continued that the amount of work the HC would be doing for the education project would be approximately equal to the work they would do for the “What’s No Longer Here” project, doing the research from the ground level, doing write-ups, collecting photos, and compiling all the material so it could be turned into a deliverable. The state funding would be towards those deliverables, not towards any of the research work. All the money for the Recovering Black History Project was towards research, but for the education project, all the money would be towards a deliverable instead. If they hired a consultant to collate it, the consultant would not be able to do that work until the HC did their work. It would be front-heavy in that case. If the grant starts in January, the heavy research period for the HC would be those first few months of the year, then reviewing content.

Ms. Huston asked what the objective would be for the education project. She asked if it would be education coming into the area and how it has developed over the years. Chair Powell replied that they had talked about focusing on the schools that exist as well as the ones that do not, as well as educational styles in Keene, because the area has many alternative education programs. She continued that it would be the HC's project, so they would get to decide. Discussion continued. Chair Powell stated that if the NH DHR is thinking of splitting the \$75,000 between nine communities, that is a little less than \$10,000 each, which is not actually that much money for some of what the HC was imagining. But that would be the amount from the state, and then the HC would match, with time or money, to cover the difference.

Ms. Zerba stated that she would think that a lot of this information the HC would be looking for is at the HSCC already. She continued that she thinks the research would be minimal. Chair Powell replied that part of it, though, would be finding out the stories behind the research or figuring out what information the HC would want to highlight or share. They would probably have to find or work with partners, such as the Keene School District (KSD), KHS, and the school board. It might involve collecting personal stories from people who went to KHS or documenting a reunion event. Regarding the "What's No Longer Here" project, the HC had talked about a GIS story map outcome, for people to see where the buildings were and what the locations look like now. That would be a lot of feeding that information to whoever they choose to create that story map, providing copy and captions for photos and so on and so forth.

Councilor Ellis asked if the amount of funding they would get from the NH DHR would be enough to cover a consultant for a manufacturing and factory inventory. She asked if they would need to use additional funds from the HC's budget. Ms. Carey replied that inventories are approved to be 100% state funded, but she does not think they would be able to split the \$10,000 into two projects. She continued that she thinks they should choose one project. Councilor Ellis replied that that was her other thought, wondering which two small projects they could potentially do. Maybe two projects would not be a good idea. Ms. Carey replied that her thought is that the education project could only be done now, but the other projects could be done at other times. She continued that much of the history of Keene is disappearing as residents of Keene age and pass away. It would be good to interview KHS former students and teachers while they still can.

Ms. Fortson stated that she just looked it up, and the City had received \$15,000 from the state for the carriage barn inventory, which was 100% of the cost. Chair Powell stated that with the match, the Recovering Black History Project was \$27,000. The Italian neighborhood project was \$16,000. She continued that due to increasing costs in general, they should expect to pay someone more than they have in the past. For example, if they wanted to hire someone to create a story map, they should expect it to cost more than the \$16,000 for the Italian neighborhood project. For that one, the HC got a grant for \$10,000, and the time the HC spent on it was about \$5,000, so they only used about \$1,500 from their budget for that match. Discussion continued. Chair Powell stated that the NH DHR says they want to get as many projects as they can, but they also want to have finished projects. It is possible the HC will apply and not receive funds. She thinks they should choose a project, get quotes to see what it would cost, and apply for that amount. It would then be on the state to decide who to fund.

Ms. Carey stated that she is in favor of doing the education project. She continued that she does not think they should try splitting the funding between two projects. The graveyard tour expansion could happen on its own, due to Alam Rumrill's work. The manufacturing and factories inventory could be done another time. She loves the "What's No Longer Here" project idea, but that could be done another time. Ms. Fortson stated that it occurred to her that the "What's No Longer Here" project might not be well received by the public at this time, given the downtown infrastructure project that is going on right now. The public already feels they are "losing things," so it might not be the best time for a project that reminds them of what has already been lost. Others agreed that that is a good point.

Ms. Carey asked if they think the education project could be done for \$9,500. Chair Powell replied that they could aim for \$10,000 and remember that their time match is a dollar amount. She continued that they need to get a quote, but that largely depends on what their deliverable will be. For example, a five-minute video, a ten-minute video, a five- to seven-minute video plus shorter social media videos, or something else. Councilor Ellis stated that she wonders if KHS is planning something to commemorate their bicentennial. It would make sense to work in conjunction. Chair Powell agreed. If the HC chooses this project to pursue, a first step would be to submit a letter from KHS along with the HC's application. Ms. Zerba asked if KHS still has an audio-visual department, and discussion continued. Chair Powell stated that she could get a quote from a friend who is a video professional, whom she went to KHS with. They could ask KHS if they have A/V facilities and how they might be involved. Discussion continued about what the deliverable would or could be. Ms. Carey wondered if it could be a pamphlet with photos and stories, instead of or in addition to a video. Ms. Fortson replied that she thinks the grant does not cover the cost of printed materials. Chair Powell added that the NH DHR covers the cost of a consultant, who is an expert you hire to produce something, like a video or web presentation to be part of an event. Ms. Carey stated that her other thought was whether the HC would want to give something back to KHS, such as some form of documentation or display.

Chair Powell asked if the group agrees that they want to focus on the education project. Ms. Huston stated that she thinks it makes sense to do the education project, due to the timing. Mr. Sandy replied that he finds the education project most interesting, and he likes the front-loaded and time-limited nature of it. Councilor Ellis stated that she agrees that it helps the HC to have the deadline, and she also thinks there is a lot of human interest in this one, too. She thinks the community would be receptive to it.

Chair Powell stated that they need to pass a motion to choose the education project for the CLG grant application. She continued that she wonders if they could leave it a little open-ended, for when they talk with people from KHS and the KSD who might have input on something that would be a better fit for what KHS has in mind. For example, maybe people from KHS will ask the HC to do interviews with people instead of making a 10-minute video. Their input would be instructive to what sort of project the HC pursues. Others agreed.

Ms. Fortson stated that originally, the HC was thinking of involving the middle school and other schools. She asked, for clarity, if they are now thinking of focusing mainly on the high school. Chair Powell replied that in her mind, the topic is still education in Keene, and ideally, each HC member would be assigned a school or building, including elementary schools. That collective

work might be a social media post with a photo. But the video or other project they would be receiving funds for would be focused on the high school for the 200th anniversary. Ms. Fortson replied that it sounds like a two-part deliverable. Chair Powell replied that she was envisioning each school having the same deliverable, such as photos, text, and research on a webpage, but there would be extra for KHS because it is the motive for the project. Others might have different perspectives or ideas. Ms. Fortson stated that she does not think it needs to be focused so much on KHS. She continued that the HC could use KHS's upcoming anniversary date as an opportunity to present their findings on education, but it does not necessarily have to focus on KHS, in her opinion. Chair Powell replied that the HC could apply to the state for a KHS-specific project and then, while that work is happening, pursue their larger project on education in Keene that is unrelated to the CLG, but which covers similar territory, looking at other properties and buildings. That might help with budget. They could say to the NH DHR that they originally thought they would have a consultant do something bigger, but in the effort to minimize the budget, they will have the consultant focus on the KHS piece.

Ms. Zerba made a motion to approve the pursuit of the "Education in Keene" project for the application to the 2026 Certified Local Government grant cycle. Mr. Sandy seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Chair Powell asked who on the HC has connections to people in the local schools, and who might be the right person or people to reach out to. Discussion ensued. Ms. Zerba stated that they should start with the KSD Superintendent, Rob Malay. Chair Powell stated that they need to check in with stakeholders and let that help determine the direction and figure out what kind of quote they would be looking for. She asked how people envision the ideal outcome. She pictures a celebratory event for the 200th anniversary, like a party with speakers, which could incorporate the HC's work, such as a historic video. She assumes such an event would be happening at the high school regardless of the HC's project, so they need to confirm that.

Ms. Zerba stated that she is not quite sure what the HC would be trying to create, but she is on board with whatever that would be. Chair Powell replied that for the video notion, it would be the research to write up a history, some photos, and maybe interviews with alumni from different generations talking about the changes and the throughlines. Ms. Zerba stated that a presentation in the auditorium would be good. Ms. Carey stated that they could find people who went to the old high school when it was here.

Chair Powell stated that she might reach out to the HC members individually, with Ms. Fortson's help, to support the grant application process. It all needs to happen by October 16. Mr. Sandy noted that that is two days after the HC's October meeting. Chair Powell stated that if HC members can help, there are three or four sections to write in the application, and the sooner the better, since City staff will need to edit it. Regarding the timing, the NH DHR wants to deliver funds before the end of the year. The HC could take November or December off and start the work in January. They are doing good work to be proud of.

5. Staff Updates

Ms. Fortson stated that staff are completing their second round of interviews for the Assistant Sustainability Planner in the Community Development Department. She continued that hopefully by the HC's next meeting, that person will be on board or very close to it. They also have a new Code Enforcement Officer.

6. New Business

7. Next Meeting – October 14, 2026

8. Adjournment

There being no further business, Chair Powell adjourned the meeting at 5:31 PM.

Respectfully submitted by,
Britta Reida, Minute Taker

Reviewed and edited by,
Megan Fortson, Planner & Deputy Zoning Administrator

ARTICLE III. - DEMOLITION REVIEW

Sec. 44-12. - Criteria.

Except for buildings located in the historic district as defined under the Land Development Code, any building or part of a building in the city will fall under the provisions of this article where:

- 1) The proposed demolition is greater than 500 square feet of gross floor area; and
- 2) The building is listed or is eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or is listed in the New Hampshire State Register of Historic Places.

(Ord. No. O-2025-37, 12-18-2025)

Sec. 44-13. - Procedure.

When an application for a demolition permit, or a building permit involving demolition, or a site plan review involving demolition is made, or a formal written application is submitted to the Building Official for a determination under this article, the Building Official will determine if the building, or section of the building, meets the above criteria. If it does, the Building Official shall:

- 1) Forward a copy of the application to the demolition review committee.
- 2) Within five business days of its receipt of a copy of the application, the committee shall issue a preliminary recommendation regarding the granting of a demolition permit. If the committee issues a recommendation in favor of the granting of such a permit, a demolition permit shall be issued. If the committee determines the building to be potentially significant as defined by subsection 44-8(C), it shall issue a recommendation in opposition of granting the demolition permit. If the committee recommends against granting the demolition permit, within two business days of that decision the code administrator or his designee shall notify the applicant that a sign identifying the building as proposed for demolition is ready for posting in a visible location on the premises. Posting of the sign within five business days of receiving notification from the Building Official shall be the responsibility of the applicant. When the committee issues a recommendation to delay the granting of a permit for demolition, no permit shall be issued until a more thorough investigation is undertaken and a final written recommendation is provided by the committee to the Building Official. Investigation and recommendation shall be completed within 30 calendar days of the committee's receipt of a copy of the application.
- 3) During the maximum 30 calendar-day-period, the committee shall meet with the property owner and conduct such public hearings and investigations as it may determine to be necessary in the formulation of its written recommendation regarding the granting of such permit. The committee shall consider the following criteria in its deliberation:
 - a.

The building or structure is of such interest or quality that it would meet national, state or local criteria for designation as a historic, cultural, or architectural landmark.

- b. The building or structure is of such unusual or uncommon design, texture, or materials that it could not be reproduced or could be reproduced only with great difficulty and expense.
- c. The building or structure is of such architectural or historic interest that its removal would be to the detriment of the public interest.
- d. Retention of the building or structure would help preserve and protect a historic place or area of historic interest in the city.

(Ord. No. O-2025-37, 12-18-2025)

Sec. 44-14. - Demolition review committee responsibilities.

It is the responsibility of the demolition review committee to:

- 1) Render a decision within five business days of receipt of the demolition application as to whether the building might be significant within the standards and specifications provided above. If no decision is made within five business days, the application will be deemed to be approved, and the permit may be issued.
- 2) Hold a meeting between the demolition review committee and the applicant (or applicant's representative) to discuss alternatives to demolition if the committee determines the building is significant and its loss potentially detrimental to the community.

(Ord. No. O-2025-37, 12-18-2025)

Sec. 44-15. - Demolition.

- 1) If no alternatives to demolition have been identified and agreed to by the applicant after the meeting provided for in the preceding section, the applicant is free to proceed with demolition provided a permit is issued by the community development department. Prior to demolition, and if the applicant is in agreement, the demolition review committee shall photographically document the building. The committee shall also encourage the applicant to salvage significant architectural features.
- 2) Nothing in this article shall be construed to prevent immediate demolition where public safety is at stake and the building has been determined by the Building Official to be a public hazard and demolition is the only viable recourse.

(Ord. No. O-2025-37, 12-18-2025)

Sec. 44-16. - Permit fee schedule also in Appendix B of City Code.

In addition to the minimum fee as required under subsection (a) (1) hereof, a fee shall be assessed and paid at the rate of \$8.00 per thousand improvement value rounded up to the nearest thousand when over \$5,000.00 for permits issued under the scope of work as described in the International Residential Code as adopted under

the State Building Code.

In addition to the minimum fee as required under subsection (a) (1) hereof, a fee shall be assessed and paid at the rate of a fee of \$10.00 per thousand when over \$5,000.00 for permits issued under the scope of work as described in the International Building Code as adopted under the State Building Code. A copy of a signed contract will be submitted to verify the value of the work to be performed by a contractor. Whenever during the time that the permit is active, and the scope changes, when that change increases the value the fee will be adjusted. For noncontract work, such as when a homeowner furnishes his own or has furnished free labor, but purchases the materials, the fee shall be based on the actual cost of all material with a multiplier of two applied. When there is a disagreement between the applicant and the department on the value of permit fees, the department may use any recognized method including but not limited to similar projects, nationally recognized construction value tables, or any other source relevant to determining improvement value.

(a) Permit fees shall be in accordance with the following schedule:

- (1) The minimum permit fee shall be \$100.00
- (2) Substantial modifications to active permits shall require a separate application and fee. Substantial modifications are changes that result in project cost increase greater than 25 percent, or the creation of additional square footage greater than 25 percent, whichever is less. When there is a substantial modification to a permit application, a fee shall be estimated for the work completed in addition to the new work proposed in the modification.
- (3) The permit fee for a modular home installation shall be based on the cost to install the unit as determined by the department.
- (4) Applications for permits shall be issued from the community development department. Completed applications together with all necessary supporting documentation shall be submitted to the Keene Fire Department Prevention Bureau which shall complete the permit, conduct inspection and issue final approvals.

(b) **Additional fees:** Projects completed without a permit, projects begun prior to the issuance of a permit, failure to cure problems raised in plans examination critiques, failure to complete work prior to inspection, and work not done in compliance with permitted plans or in violation of the codes result in, increased cost, diminished efficiency and error. This cost and inefficiency have not been reflected in the fee schedule contained herein and therefore the following additional fees shall be assessed to defray said costs.

- (1) Work commenced prior to permit issuance: 25 percent of the permit fee for the first violation, 50 percent of the permit fee for the second, and 100 percent of the permit fee for the third and all subsequent violations or \$100.00 whichever is greater.
- (2) On individual projects: Permit plans rejected by the department three times: Will incur a penalty of 10 percent of the original permit fee.

- (3) Re-inspection fee: \$50.00 for each inspection of an element of construction after the second rejection.
- (c) **Incentives:** Permit application and plans, which are professionally prepared by licensed architects or engineers, require less effort by staff to review plans for permit. Therefore, the following incentives are created to facilitate the use of licensed architects or engineers.
- (d) Plan reviews:
 - (1) Whenever requested by an owner or owners authorized representative, and when required by the community development department on plan reviews for projects larger than 5,000 square feet or any complex project shall be reviewed by a third-party entity approved by the department and permit fees will be reduced by 40 percent.
 - (2) The fee for any permit for a project shown on any plan prepared by a license architect or engineer where state law does not require such preparation shall be reduced by 15 percent.
 - (3) The fee for any permit for a project that has a licensed electrician and/or plumber where state law does not require such work to be performed by a licensed trade person shall be reduced by 10 percent per trade, maximum of 20 percent reduction allowed.
 - (4) Incomplete applications shall be rejected.

(Ord. No. O-2025-37, 12-18-2025)

From: Loughlin, Brandee
Sent: Friday, October 2, 2026 2:16 PM
To: Schneible, Elizabeth
Subject: FFY26 CLG Grant Applications due date extended + new procedures

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi All,

Please note that the FFY26 CLG Application due date has been moved to FRIDAY, OCTOBER 23rd at noon. I will be out of the office from October 11-19, so I am extending the due date in case anyone has last-minute questions. I want to make sure that I am available for you if needed.

That being said, we are going to be utilizing DHR's EMMIT+ system for most CLG submissions going forward. This includes annual reports, grant applications, periodic progress reports, and reimbursement request submissions. You will see that I have cc'd Liz Schneible on this email. Liz is our EMMIT+ whiz and she will be working with me to administer parts of the CLG program. Please feel free to reach out to her if you have any questions about EMMIT. (You are all BCC'd on this email, though, so don't reply all!)

I'd really like to get everyone on board with using EMMIT for your submittals for this round, if at all possible. If we have not yet set up a time to go over how the program works, please reach out when you have your application ready to submit so we can schedule a time to walk you through the submission process. If you are ready to submit during the week that I will be out of the office, please go ahead and schedule with Liz without me.

You will need to set up an EMMIT+ account before our meeting. The link for EMMIT+ is:
<https://emmit.dnrcr.nh.gov/home>

Please let me know if you have any questions!

Thanks!
Brandee

Brandee Loughlin
Preservation Planning & Development Coordinator
New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources
172 Pembroke Road
Concord, NH 03301