

PLANNING BOARD
Town of Peterborough, New Hampshire

Minutes of March 9, 2020

Members Present: Ivy Vann, Dario Carrara, Sarah Steinberg Heller, Judy Wilson Ferstenberg, Tyler Ward, Alan Zeller and Lindsay Dreyer

Also Present: Peter Throop and Laura Norton, Office of Community Development

Chair Carrara called the Meeting to order at 6:30 p.m., welcomed the audience and introduced the Members and Staff. A motion was made/seconded (Vann/Zeller) to seat Alternate Dreyer with all in favor.

Minutes:

A motion was made/seconded (Zeller/Ferstenberg) to approve the Minutes of February 10, 2020 as written with all in favor but Ms. Vann who abstained.

As the text of the petition was projected on the screen Chair Carrara then read the first agenda item:

Citizen Petition to Amend the Zoning Ordinance: “To amend the Zoning Ordinance by **repealing** Section 245-15.3 “Traditional Neighborhood Overlay Zone I” in its entirety, including all references, related appendices and zoning maps.”

Chair Carrara told the Members and audience that following the public hearing, the Planning Board will vote to either support or *not* support the petition amendment as written. The petition amendment will then be placed on the ballot as submitted by the petitioners.

Sharon Monahan stood and introduced herself. She told the Board she and Andrew Dunbar had initiated the citizen’s petition and had obtained 81 signatures as they competed with the presidential primary election canvassers at the same time. She told the Members she and fellow citizen Lorraine Bishop had prepared statements that would take approximately 15 minutes to present. Chair Carrara replied, “this is a fairly simple petition, why do you need 15 minutes?” Ms. Monahan noted “this is the *only* public hearing on this zoning amendment before it goes on the ballot and a lot people have come out to hear it.” Ms. Monahan also requested that members Sarah Heller and Ivy Vann recuse themselves from the discussion “due to conflict of interest and bias.”

Chair Carrara replied, “well, that is up to them.” Ms. Vann interjected “no, I do not want to do that” adding “I have been a member of the Planning Board for 9 years. I have worked on the Traditional Neighborhood Overlay Zone 1 from its infancy, and I think (you think) this ordinance effects a parcel of land I own and it does not.” She suggested the petitioners carefully read the ordinance which states municipal water and sewer may *not* be extended for the development of a project. “It must be either already served or be able to connect to existing service. My lot does neither and I may not use it. This ordinance does not affect me and it never has” she said.

Chair Carrara suggested they move on and discuss the specifics of the ordinance during deliberation where they will vote to support or not support the petition.

Ms. Monahan then read her prepared statement and when she was finished Lorraine Bishop stood and introduced herself as a resident of Peterborough for the past 40 years, “20 of them on Vale Street.” Ms. Bishop then read her prepared statement.

***Both of these statements in their entirety are included at the end of these Minutes.**

Chair Carrara thanked her and asked if anyone in the audience wished to speak on the petition. Andrew Dunbar introduced himself and noted he was in favor of the Petition.

Stephanie Hurley introduced herself and asked whether or not Ms. Monahan had investigated using the TNOZ 1 ordinance for her residence. Ms. Monahan replied that she had investigated the ordinance but was unable to use it. Ms. Vann interjected “I believe you could not use the ordinance because of a covenant in your neighborhood. It is the covenant that prevented you from using the ordinance.” A brief discussion on whether or not the TNOZ 1 was an innovative zoning ordinance or just a plot ordinance dealing with dimensional requirements followed.

Loretta Laurenitis introduced herself and spoke in favor of repealing what she described as a flawed ordinance that created dimensional standards out of character with existing neighborhoods and was inconsistent with the Innovative Land Use Ordinance. She spoke briefly about the lack of Conditional Use Permit (CUP) criteria as well as the lack of an actual CUP Application form.

Mr. Dunbar inquired as to the status of the flood plain (rising) in the Downtown and a very brief discussion about floodplain studies and changes followed.

Joann Carr introduced herself and expressed that from the beginning as a member of the Conservation Commission she's had concerns of the environmental impacts of greater density, especially over the town's aquifers. She noted inadequate protection for the town water sources and cited the January 27, 2020 Planning Board meeting where a member seemed dismissive of protecting town resources. She concluded by noting the lack of criteria for downsizing, the lack of workforce housing and TNOZ 1's current results of high-density, high-cost housing.

Chair Carrara replied, "I am *well* aware, thank you and with that I will close the hearing on this petition."

Ms. Vann took a moment to speak noting "every town has two problems which are parallel but not the same. First, not enough housing choices, we are 20,000 units short of where we should be in the state." Second, "we have an existing infrastructure that we don't received enough taxes on to maintain it." She gave a brief example the expense of salting, sanding, plowing, ditching and mowing a foot of road for a development where a road already exists versus maintaining a new road with large houses on it in the Rural District. She noted a specific example was the Vine Street project. "A 2.6-million-dollar development yielding \$80,000 a year in property taxes which costs nothing more to salt, sand, plow, ditch or mow." Noting another example of a dead-end road in town Ms. Vann noted it would take 30 years of property tax collection to pave the road *just once*. "Those are the two separate problems" she said concluding "there have been a total of 28 units approved equal to about 5 million dollars in tax revenue, I don't think that is nothing."

Ms. Ferstenberg spoke briefly about a condominium she had recently renovated and sold noting "even at \$150,000 it was hard to sell." She went on to note that there is a demand for residents (including retirees) to willingly develop and live on the outskirts of town. She went on to say she had joined the Planning Board a year ago because she was offended with one individual being so passionate about urban planning, "and we are not even an urban area." Ms. Ferstenberg told the Members "I would like to see the ordinance repealed and let the people decide what they want without having something thrown *at* or forced *on* them. It seems one person is forcing an idealism on everyone else."

Mr. Throop noted Member Rich Clark was unable to be present but had provided a statement and proceeded to read it to the Members:

"Unfortunately, I am unable to attend tonight's meeting due to prior commitment. However I would like to make a statement on the Petition to repeal the Traditional Neighborhood Overlay District 1. The Board had spent many years developing a

plan to utilize our infrastructure with the community involvement. This (ordinance) was passed by the voter's several years ago. Since then we have had multiple developments increasing our tax base without increasing our infrastructure costs. The developments are not out of character within their neighborhoods and have blended well. If we were to return back to the underlying zoning of close to 8-10 years ago; none of this would have been possible. It is unfortunate that a group of citizens are trying to turn back the clock to antiquated zoning by circumventing due process with this petition. I believe being in a community of approximately 6,700 people while we all do not agree on every issue, there is a due process to involve the entire community in drafting new zoning if that is what the town as a whole wants. The draft will not please everyone however this is how our democracy works. To have a few citizens take a stance of the what if's and worse case scenarios as a platform to undermine the due process is unfortunate.”

Ms. Heller took a moment to note it had never occurred to her to recuse herself. “I am on the Housing Task Force and feel ready to do work with my fellow citizens. I am in this to work and not to recuse” she said adding “and we have a lot of work to do.”

Mr. Ward told the Members he remembered the work that had gone into the creation of the TNOZ 1 and that at the time it was overwhelmingly supported by the voters. This statement brought an audible negative reaction from several people in the audience who believed the ordinance was not so popularly adopted. (*The official Town Meeting vote for this ordinance was Yes - 482, No – 392*)

Mr. Ward went on to note recent efforts to conserve land on Cunningham Pond and reiterated the importance of revenues from tax dollars received from TNOZ 1 developments. He told the Members (as they well know) he was not a big advocate of the demolition of existing buildings involved with TNOZ 1 projects.

Ms. Dreyer acknowledged the revenues for the TNOZ 1 projects adding “but affordable housing is tricky, the way to create it without a burden to property taxes is through density.”

With insight from all Members Chair Carrara called for a motion.

A motion was made/seconded (Vann/Zeller) to **not support** the petition to repeal 2455-15.3 “Traditional Neighborhood Overlay Zone I” in its entirety, including all references, related appendices and zoning maps with all in favor but Ms. Ferstenberg who voted no.

Copies of Ms. Monahan and Ms. Bishop’s testimony are included at the end of these Minutes.

Proposed Boundary Line adjustments: Michael and Elizabeth Gordon, owners of Parcel No. U017-090-000 at 14 High Street, are proposing boundary line adjustments with two abutting properties as follows: a) to receive a .015 acre (644 square feet) strip of land from Parcel No. U017-089-000 located at 10 High Street and owned by Timber Home Properties LLC; and b) to send a .007 acre (312 square feet) block of land to Parcel No. U017-086-000 located at 17 Union Street and owned by Todd Fregeau. The result of these adjustments will be as follows: the 14 High Street parcel will increase to .431 acres (18,759 square feet), the 17 Union Street Parcel will increase to .206 acres (8971 square feet), and the 10 High Street parcel will decrease to .377 Acres (16,418 square feet). All parcels are located in the Family Zoning District.

Russ Huntley of Huntley Survey and Design introduced himself as the preparer of the plan and the representative for Mr. Gordon (who was also in the audience). Mr. Huntley gave a brief review of the request and how the pieces of the puzzle had come out of one large parcel of land years ago. “The net result” he said, “is a minor boundary line adjustment between nonconforming lots is allowed.”

With no questions from the Board Chair Carrara opened the hearing to the public. With no questions from the public, Chair Carrara closed the hearing and read the deliberative statement.

Deliberation:

A motion was made/seconded (Vann/Zeller) to accept the application as substantially complete with all in favor.

Chair Carrara began with “this is a straightforward application; I don’t see anything to question.” Ms. Vann interjected “are we ready for a motion?” The Members all agree they were.

A motion was made/seconded (Vann/Zeller) to approve two minor boundary line adjustments between three lots with non-conforming lot sizes, located at 14 High Street, 10 High Street, and at 17 Union Street, as shown on a Plat entitled “Boundary Line Adjustments Plan between lands of Michael and Elizabeth Gordon Tax Map Parcel No. U017-090, 14 High Street and Timber Home Properties LLC Tax Map No. U017-089, 10 High Street and Todd Fregeau Tax Map Parcel No. U017-056 at 17 Union Street, at a scale of 1”=20” prepared by Huntly Survey And Design and dated March 15, 2019.” The Board finds that in accordance Section 245-31.D., the minor lot line adjustments between the non-conforming lots does not render any of the lots unusable for their allowed purposes. With all in favor.

Site Plan Review: Temple Mountain Buddhist Meditation Center, Corp., Owner of Parcel No. R001-014-000 located at 729 Wilton Road is proposing to replace an

existing 3 bedroom house that serves as living space for three resident monks and provides kitchen and dining facilities for the center, is seeking to demolish the house and replace it with a new building in roughly the same location, that will provide 7 single occupancy bedrooms, an office space, a family support room, a commercial kitchen and a dining room that will accommodate 88 people. The project will provide 6 additional parking spaces. The project will increase the impervious surface by approximately 2000 square feet. The property is located in the Rural Zoning District.

Len Pagano stood and introduced himself as the architect for the project and thanked the Board and Staff for their ongoing assistance. He also introduced resident Buddhist Monk Thich Tue Man, two parishioners, and David Prieur, neighbor of the Temple Mountain Buddhist Meditation Center, as well as Project Manager Rob Hitchcock, Civil Engineer from SVE Associates.

Mr. Pagano gave a brief review of the plan to replace the existing multi-use house on the lot with a kitchen, dining room and bathrooms accommodating roughly 50 people. He told the Members the new building would be positioned similarly to the current structure and noted improved site conditions including the driveway, parking areas and retaining walls. "It will be 3960 square feet in size with 7 bedrooms (single occupancy, 3 staff/4 guest, each with an en-suite baths)." He went on to tell the Members the current structure was run down, had been heavily modified over the years and was at the end of its life cycle. "The new building is a "T" shaped structure with a full basement (storage and mechanical), main level dining, kitchen and bathrooms and bedrooms on the third floor" he said. He spoke briefly about the Type 5 wood frame and noncombustible roof as well as the water capacity (which the new building will use along with the existing but modified septic system). He did note the existing well will have to be evaluated to determine if it meets the demand requirements of the new building. "Hopefully we will not need to build new water storage tanks" he said. Mr. Pagano also noted their engineering questions regarding the capacity of the fire pump and distance requirements were being reviewed at this time.

Mr. Pagano then briefly reviewed the architectural designs for the structure stating it was really pretty simple with its traditional building structure with nothing avant-garde being proposed. "It is quite compatible with what is there now" he said. After a few questions about the slab on grade, crawl space, wood frame and location and nature of the retaining walls, Mr. Pagano handed the presentation over to Mr. Hitchcock who reviewed the site plan including the existing conditions; driveway and cul-de sac; parking spaces (an increase of 7 spaces to the existing 23 spaces); the locations of the current wells (and their hope to continue to use them);

and overflow plans for their two major events during the year. Mr. Hitchcock told the Members regular weekend attendance consisted of 25 to 30 people and acknowledged their larger events, while noted to be about 75 attendees were typically much larger (200+). He told the Board all overflow parking (over 30 spaces) would be directed to the Temple Mountain Park parking area with shuttle busses dropping off and picking up attendees. "There will be no parking along the driveway" he said adding "and signage will be installed with Police details to manage these larger events." Mr. Throop noted the Town now has a Large Event Permit application for such festivities at the Temple location. "This is to ensure emergency access and make sure traffic can be handled properly" he said. Mr. Throop briefly touched on the sprinkler code, fire pump and back-up diesel generator integration for the new building. "These are all being reviewed" he said. Ms. Vann interjected that the applicant must apply for and secure a Demolition Permit for the existing building and that a condition of approval will be removal and proper disposal of all construction debris, household debris, pallets and other improper landfill and waste items found on the site.

Mr. Throop noted that with any Site Plan Review the Town's independent drainage consultant had reviewed the plan and suggested concern for an infiltration basin (preferable low impact) and recommended creating a rain garden.

With no further questions from the Board Chair Carrara opened the hearing to the public. With no questions from the public, Chair Carrara closed the hearing.

Deliberation:

A motion was made/seconded (Vann/Zeller) to accept the application as substantially complete with all in favor.

Ms. Vann began with "I think this is OK" followed by Ms. Ferstenberg interjecting "yes, I agree." Looking around the table Chair Carrara said, "I see a lot of (heads shaking) yes" with the remaining Members in agreement. Mr. Throop suggested the Members briefly review the architectural design and site plan. "For the record" he said. As the Members did so they also briefly reviewed the Landscaping Plan and briefly discussed the extension of the existing retaining wall, mixing a natural looking engineered wall with the existing rock walls.

A motion was made/seconded (Vann/Zeller) to approve the site plan requesting replacement of a three bedroom house with a new dining/housing building for the Meditation Center and other site related improvements as shown on plans titled "New Dining & Housing Building for TMBMC, Corp., located at 729 Wilton Road (Parcel No. R001-014-000), prepared by SVE Associates, dated February 10, 2020, revised

thru February 27,2020” as it may be further revised subject to the following conditions prior to signing of the plan:

1. The Applicant shall provide revised plans showing required additional information and design modifications as directed by the Planning Board during site plan review, the Office of Community Development Department, and Town of Peterborough Department Heads, including but not limited to minor changes to site grading, parking lot configuration, underground utility detail, stormwater management design, landscaping details, lighting design details, construction details, and plan notes.
2. The applicant shall demonstrate State approval that the Septic system is adequate to meet the combined requirements of the temple building and the new building. During large events, if site occupancy is anticipated to exceed the capacity of the septic system, the Applicant shall provide adequate portable toilets to meet anticipated needs.
3. The applicant shall demonstrate State approval of the proposed water supply for the new building as may be required by State law.
4. A Demolition Permit may be required prior to removing existing structure on the site. During demolition, the applicant shall be required to remove and properly dispose of all construction debris, household debris, pallets and other improper landfill and waste items found on the site.
5. The applicant shall be required to obtain a large event permit from the Town for each large event, in accordance with current Town policy. In anticipation of these events, the Applicant is directed to work with the Police and Fire Departments and Town Staff to develop a parking and site access plan that ensures adequate emergency access, and traffic and pedestrian safety during large events.
6. Prior to breaking ground or initiating any site work the following shall occur:
 - a. A preconstruction meeting shall be held with the site development team and Town Staff prior to initiating and work on the site.
 - b. All erosion control measures shall be installed before initiating site work. Throughout the construction process, and until all disturbed soils have been stabilized, regular inspections will be conducted by the Planning Board’s Storm Water and Erosion Control Consultant at the Applicant’s expense, as directed by the Office of Community Development Staff. With all in favor.

Other Business:

Chair Carrara noted this meeting was his last as the Planning Board Chairman. He told the Members he had enjoyed his tenure and believed the Board and Staff were very professional with their handling of applications and plans. With his resignation he asked if the Board felt they needed to act before the Town Meeting in May. The Members unanimously decided no action would be necessary with only one month before the May elections.

From the audience Alan Bannister introduced himself and inquired about other (if any) zoning amendments on the Ballot for the May Town Meeting. Chair Carrara confirmed there were none with Mr. Throop interjecting “tonight was the last possible date for a first public hearing on any other amendments, we are all done.”

The meeting adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Norton

Administrative Assistant

Sharon Monahan

3.9.20 Planning Board Presentation Citizen Petition Zoning Amendment to Repeal TNOZ1.

1. I request that Ivy Vann and Sarah Heller Steinberg recuse themselves from the PB due to conflict of interest and bias. I would also like to invite any other members of the Board to voluntarily recuse themselves and participate as a citizen if impartiality regarding this zoning amendment is a problem.

2. I am Sharon Monahan of 3 Central Street. Andrew Dunbar and myself initiated this citizen petition and obtained 81 signatures. We could have easily obtained more, but we were competing with primary election canvassers at the time.

3. As you can see, this is a single subject citizen petitioned zoning amendment.

Repeal Section 245-15.3 Traditional Neighborhood Overlay Zone I

in its entirety and delete any references to it appearing throughout the zoning ordinance. This includes the Appendix to §245-15.3 Traditional Neighborhood Overlay Zone I Site and Building Design Guidelines and Article X Zoning District Boundary Description and Zoning Map for Traditional Neighborhood Overlay Zone I.

(Note: Dimensional standards will revert back to the underlying Family and General Residence zoning districts prior to §245-15.3 (2014) enactment so that new uses and dimensional standards may be proposed “By-Right” for 2021 Ballot after more public input.)

The petition included the map of TNOZ1 so it will need to be included in the voting booth at voting time.

4. The primary purpose for repealing TNOZ1 is to clean the slate, and have all Family and General Residence districts have the same zoning prior to 2014. This is so our neighborhoods are included in any discussion concerning residential properties. Repealing TNOZ1 now, would put all family and general residence district neighborhoods on equal footing and at the same starting line as everyone else.

I would like to call your attention to the Map of TNOZ1:

TNOZ1 is the red boundary close to downtown. It excludes the downtown district itself and any rural zoned properties. It only includes the Family District (yellow) and General Residence District (green) properties. Town owned properties such as the elementary school, Adams playground and playing fields, the fire station, the rivers, roads, cemetery etc. are excluded. From Administration’s calculation of TNOZ1 last year, since the protest petition was only against the TNOZ1 portion of Amendment 15, we know that TNOZ1 consists of only 272 acres. This is only 1% of the land area in Peterborough. This means that 99% of the Town is not subject to this “special” zoning. When you reside in that 1%, it’s a little difficult not to feel targeted or picked on. Also, If you are only allowing “housing opportunities” in 1% of Peterborough, how is that really benefitting the other 99%?

This 1% area is the Town’s existing densest area. So far, the only TNOZ1 projects have been in the General Residence district where multifamily is already allowed. Traffic and congestion and lack of parking is already a problem. So to increase and concentrate the housing and population on 1 % of the area close to Downtown through New Urbanism planning, is not creating housing opportunities, it is just

compounding an existing congestion and affordable housing problem. This was the number one reason people signed this petition. To add insult to injury, the densities allowed are greater than any city in New Hampshire – and we are just a Town. The number two reason for people who signed the petition was that this special zoning has not created any affordable housing or increase in rental units. And the Number three complaint about TNOZ1 is that the density, setbacks, and architecture allowed does not fit in with our existing neighborhoods. As one signatory put it, “I can’t believe the Planning Board cares more about porches than they do about parking.” Some other interesting comments were:

“I thought the purpose of zoning was to prevent urban sprawl, not create it.” “How could they possibly think to turn this area into a walkable village when a State highway goes through it?” “Have you noticed that so far every project approved has involved demolishing an existing building to create expensive housing outside the income brackets for the people who live here?”

5. As an environmental person, I am alarmed that TNOZ1 is completely within our Groundwater Protection District (which is our aquifers), Floodplain, and Shoreland Protection. What are the consequences of dense development to the water quality and supply of Peterborough’s drinking water?

Someone might say- Oh who cares? TNOZ1 is only impacting 1% of Peterborough. However, Groundwater and surface water doesn’t stay within zoning district boundaries. This 1% zone impacts the Public Health concerns for ALL of Peterborough.

6. As a technical person, I can’t help it, I care about the details of the zoning language itself. Flaws in rules and regulations are going to become apparent eventually, as are the consequences.

So my secondary purpose for repealing TNOZ1 is to eliminate conflicting deceptive zoning. The most obvious flaw in TNOZ1 is the conflicting zoning. My parcel of land is listed in family district and in the TNOD1 district. Which one is my zoning? You cannot impose two very different dimensional standards and densities on the same land. The only conditional use permit listed for Family and General Residence District properties in the zoning ordinance is a Bed and Breakfast. The conditional use permit (TNOZ1) that allows complex housing projects with different setbacks from the abutting properties is not listed. If I want to put an addition on my house but can’t meet the 25’ setback, I have to get a variance. But if I demolish my house, I can put up two houses with garages that are 10’ from my neighbor? This is not flexible zoning. It is conflicting and deceptive zoning.

Just as the HTF is to receive more public input for the Housing Chapter of the Master Plan, it is my hope that the planning board will solicit more public input and scrutiny of the zoning ordinance itself.

The Master Plan is not a legal document, but the Zoning Ordinance is. It cannot be “tweaked”, nor should it be. The more it is tweaked – the more fragile it becomes. People have the right to know what their zoning is, how it will affect them, and if there is a public benefit to be gained by the zoning.

So repealing TNOZ1 also cleans the slate from these technical flaws.

Peterborough is an educated, compassionate, and inclusive community. Let’s make sure our zoning reflects that. I hope that you will vote to support the repeal of TNOZ1.

Introduce Lorraine Bishop.

I am Lorraine Bishop, I live at 10 Vale Street and I am here to speak in favor of the petition to repeal TNOZ1.

I moved to Peterborough in 1980 and lived on Old Street Road for 20 years and have now lived on Vale Street for the past 20 years. I continue to live in Peterborough because it is a small town with the traditional attributes of small town life, where I can live and work in my community.

I supported the adoption of Amendment 15 and I would have been satisfied with the compromise that offered between the underlying district zoning and TNOZ1. I am not opposed to the principle of “infill” and I am very much in favor of mixed housing with both workforce and affordable housing being offered in Peterborough. A diverse population makes for a more interesting and sustainable community! I am NOT however in favor of the density that TNOZ1 imposes - up to 16 units per acre in the General Residence District.

My observation of development that has occurred since the enactment of TNOZ1 is that what has been built are “smaller” houses on smaller lots at a high price- certainly not the type of housing that encourages or allows many young families to live in Peterborough. There is a need for a comprehensive, integrated approach to our town’s future. TNOZ1 is not that! It appears rather to be the superimposition of one element of the “New Urbanism” on one part of our town without the integrated approach that takes into account not only the physical, but also the social, emotional and cultural infrastructure that high density requires. As has been pointed out many times during the debate on this issue, TNOZ1 density exceeds that of Milford, Keene, Nashua and downtown Manchester.

Now, you may well ask, “Lorraine Bishop, where have you been for the past 5 years since TNOZ1 was adopted?” I suspect that I am not very different from many people when it comes to zoning - I’m very busy with an active life, and quite frankly, tend to glaze when it comes to all the facts, figures and terminology of zoning. I will admit that I have often turned to the recommendations of the Planning Board when voting on zoning and planning issues. For my negligence in not paying closer attention, I am responsible. It was during the debate on Amendment 15 that I became aware of my negligence, and when after the voice of the majority of the voters did not prevail, I welcomed the opportunity to be involved with Citizens for Sensible Zoning, a group of townspeople who certainly had been paying attention and doing their homework. (I want to emphasize that I am here this evening as an individual resident, taxpayer and voter, not as a member of that or any other group, nor do I speak for any member of Citizens for Sensible Zoning.)

The repeal of TNOZ1 will give space to the Housing Task Force in its current important work. If I could remind us all of the Task Force's Group Mission:

“The focus of the work of the Peterborough Community Task Force on Housing is to design and carry out a community-based process for gathering input from a majority of residents and stakeholders of Peterborough about their concerns, hopes, needs and wants for short & long term housing policy.”

Since it is acknowledged that it will be at least 2, possibly 3, years before the work of the Task Force is presented to the electorate, if TNOZ1 remains in place, those of us living within this overlay district are deprived of being on the same footing as everyone else in Peterborough in having input into our neighborhood's zoning. The repeal of TNOZ1 will not damage our town in any way, but will simply level the playing field so that all residents can have their “concerns, hopes, needs and wants for short and long term housing policy” addressed.