



TOWN OF  
**PETERBOROUGH**  
NEW HAMPSHIRE

**Peterborough Planning Board**

1 Grove Street  
Peterborough, NH 03458  
Office:(603) 924-8000 x 104  
Email: [ocd@peterboroughnh.gov](mailto:ocd@peterboroughnh.gov)  
Web: [www.peterboroughnh.gov](http://www.peterboroughnh.gov)

**AGENDA**

**PUBLIC HEARING**

**Monday, January 10, 2022 at 6:30 PM**

**In the Select Board Meeting Room at the Town House**

***\*This meeting will be streamed to Channel 22 and U-Stream\****

1. Call meeting to order and introductions
2. Minutes of November 29 & December 13
3. **6:30 PM - Continued Hearing - Application for Subdivision for Walden Eco Village Open Space Residential Development at the Well School Staff Housing Site** submitted by Akhil Garland to convert existing accessory structures that were associated with the Well School into an Open Space Residential Development. The proposal consists of converting 7 accessory structures and creating 13 new open space residential development lots with associated site improvements and open space area located at 360 Middle Hancock Road (Parcel No. R010-005-001) located in the Rural District.
4. **6:35 PM – Continued Hearing – Conditional Use Permit Application for Proposed Impacts in the Wetland Buffers** submitted by Akhil Garland for his property located at 360 Middle Hancock Road (Parcel No. R010-005-001) in the Rural District.
5. **6:40 PM – Continued Hearing – Preliminary Review Application for Mixed Use Development at 14 Grove Street** proposing to redevelop the property to include an office use on the lower level, 11-unit multi-family residential condominiums on the upper levels, and with associated site amenities and improvements, located at Parcel No. U017-076-000, in the Downtown Commercial District & Traditional Neighborhood Overlay Zone 1.
6. **6:45 PM – Continued Hearing – Site Plan Review Application for a Shooting Range at Monadnock Rod & Gun Club** to be located at their property at 595 Jaffrey Road, Parcel No. R003-032-000 in the Rural District and Route 202 Rural Gateway Overlay District.
7. **6:50 PM – Public Hearing on Proposed Zoning Amendments:**
  - a. To amend the definition of “Dwelling or Dwelling Unit” under §245-4. This amendment proposes eliminating the use of “mobile homes” which is an outdated term and is redundant because the definition already states that manufactured homes are allowed; manufactured homes is an umbrella-term which includes mobile homes. This amendment to the definition also includes eliminating “overnight cabins and the like” to provide greater flexibility to prospective builders. With this amendment, manufactured homes (mobile homes) will still qualify as dwelling units and overnight cabins and the like will now be able to qualify as dwelling units.
  - b. To amend the definition of “Front Building Setback” under §245-4. This amendment proposes to clarify that some properties have more than one front building setback.
  - c. To amend the definition of “Frontage” under §245-4. This amendment proposes to clarify that some properties have more than one side of a lot abutting a right-of-way.
  - d. To amend the definition of “Manufactured Housing under §245-4. This amendment proposes to eliminate the minimum size requirement from the definition.

- e. To amend the dimensional requirements for dwellings in the General Residence District under §245-7. This amendment proposes eliminating §245-7C(7) which sets minimum dwelling sizes. Elimination of this line will allow for greater flexibility in residential dwelling sizes in this District.
- f. To amend §245-13J by replacing “mobile homes” with “manufactured homes.” The term “mobile home” is an outdated and “manufactured homes” encompasses this type of housing.
- g. To amend §245-14, the Groundwater Protection Overlay Zone, by adding the authority statement to the beginning of the section as sub-section A.
- h. To amend §245-24.1, Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs), by removing the minimum size of an allowable ADU and increasing the maximum allowable size to 1,000 square feet. This amendment will allow for greater flexibility for homeowners wishing to add an ADU.
- i. To amend §245-34 by removing the requirement that manufactured homes must be placed on permanent foundations. The requirement to provide a permanent foundation is a significant barrier for prospective manufactured homebuyers.

Copies of the proposed, amended Zoning Ordinance are available for public inspection in the Office of Planning & Building and can be found on the Town website. For any questions about this Zoning Ordinance proposal, please contact Danica Melone at [dmelone@peterboroughnh.gov](mailto:dmelone@peterboroughnh.gov) or (603)924-8000 ext 116.

- 8. Other Business
- 9. Next regularly scheduled meeting: Monday, February 14, 2021 at 6:30 PM
- 10. Adjourn



TOWN OF  
**PETERBOROUGH**

OFFICE OF  
PLANNING & BUILDING

1 Grove Street  
Peterborough, NH 03458  
Tel.: 603-924-8000 x 104  
Fax: 603-924-8001  
Email: [ocd@townofpeterborough.gov](mailto:ocd@townofpeterborough.gov)  
Web: [www.townofpeterborough.gov](http://www.townofpeterborough.gov)

**STAFF REPORT**

**TO:** Planning Board  
**FROM:** Danica Melone  
**DATE OF WRITE-UP:** Tuesday, January 4, 2022  
**PROVIDED FOR MEETING DATE:** Monday, January 10, 2022  
**RE:** CONTINUED (13) – WALDEN ECO VILLAGE PROPOSAL

---

**Town Planner Considerations:**

The applicant and his engineer have indicated that they will be submitting additional/revised documents for the Board to review. At this time, no documents have been received for me to review and make comment on. Depending on what is submitted and when, the Board may wish to consider continuing the hearing to allow time for review.



**From:** cebranon fieldstonelandconsultants.com

**Sent:** Monday, December 20, 2021 2:54 PM

**To:** Danica Melone <dmelone@peterboroughnh.gov>

**Cc:** Laura Norton <Lnorton@peterboroughnh.gov>; Jim Callahan <jcallahan@atkinscallahan.com>; Ken Cornell <ken@opcmb.com>

**Subject:** FW: 14 Grove street, Peterborough, NH

Hi Danica,

I thought we had communicated on this application already and had decided to put it on hold since I was not able to secure the letters of authorization in time but I received the email below from our client so I am guessing the application might still be active. **If this application is still active please accept this email as our formal request to withdraw the application. Please let me know if you need anything else.**

Thank you, Chad

**Chad E. Branon, P.E.**

Civil Engineer / Principal



206 Elm Street – Milford NH 03055

Tel: 603.672.5456 - Fax: 603.413.5456

Cell: 603.499.5799

[CEBranon@FieldstoneLandConsultants.com](mailto:CEBranon@FieldstoneLandConsultants.com)

[www.FieldstoneLandConsultants.com](http://www.FieldstoneLandConsultants.com)



**CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:** This email transmission, including any attached files, may contain information which is confidential and intended only for use by the individual(s) to whom it was addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this communication is strictly prohibited and may result in legal action against you. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and permanently destroy the original transmission without reading or saving in any manner.





TOWN OF  
**PETERBOROUGH**

OFFICE OF  
PLANNING & BUILDING

1 Grove Street  
Peterborough, NH 03458  
Tel: 603-924-8000 x 104  
Fax: 603-924-8001  
Email: [ocd@townofpeterborough.us](mailto:ocd@townofpeterborough.us)  
Web: [www.townofpeterborough.com](http://www.townofpeterborough.com)

**STAFF REPORT**

**To:** Planning Board  
**FROM:** Danica Melone  
**DATE OF WRITE-UP:** Tuesday, January 4, 2022  
**PROVIDED FOR MEETING DATE:** Monday, January 10, 2022  
**RE:** (4) APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW FOR SHOOTING RANGE

---

The Zoning Board of Adjustment has continued the Appeal of Administrative Decision to Monday, February 7<sup>th</sup> in order to notice the application as a Development of Potential Regional Impact. With that in mind, **it is my recommendation that the Board continue this hearing to Monday, February 14<sup>th</sup> to hear the outcome of that meeting.**





PETERBOROUGH PLANNING BOARD  
TOWN OF PETERBOROUGH  
Monday, December 13, 2021 – 6:30 p.m.  
Peterborough, New Hampshire

**Members Present:** Rich Clark, Ivy Vann, Tyler Ward, Blair Weiss, Lindsay Dreyer, Sarah Steinberg Heller, Lisa Stone, Josh Blair and Stephanie Hurley

**Also Present:** Laura Norton and Danica Melone, Office of Planning & Building

Chair Clark called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. with a welcome and introductions.

**Minutes:**

A motion was made/seconded (Vann/Heller) to approve the Minutes of November 8, 2021 as with a clarification and a change to the maximum size of an ADU to 750 square feet *or* 30% of the primary dwelling area, whichever is larger, with all in favor.

**Continued Hearing - Application for Subdivision for Walden Eco Village Open Space Residential Development at the Well School Staff Housing Site** submitted by Akhil Garland to convert existing accessory structures that were associated with the Well School into an Open Space Residential Development. The proposal consists of converting 7 accessory structures and creating 13 new open space residential development lots with associated site improvements and open space area located at 360 Middle Hancock Road (Parcel No. R010-005-001) located in the Rural District.

Citing a list of 22 items still outstanding a motion was made/seconded (Heller/Hurley) to continue this application to a date and time certain of January 10, 2022 at 6:30 p.m. to await the additional information requested by the Board, with all in favor.

**Continued Hearing – Conditional Use Permit Application for Proposed Impacts in the Wetland Buffers** submitted by Akhil Garland for his property located at 360 Middle Hancock Road (Parcel No. R010-005-001) in the Rural District.

A motion was made/seconded (Vann/Heller) to continue this application to a date and time certain of January 10, 2022 at 6:30 p.m. to await the additional information requested by the Board, with all in favor.

While the Board awaited the noticed time to open the next public hearing the members considered the following:

**Public Hearing – Proposed Adoption of Amended Master Plan Chapter 2: Vision & Chapter 8: Land Use with their Corresponding Appendices**

Citing the zoning proposal worksheet amendment proposal worksheet Ms. Melone explained “it highlights ever single page in the zoning ordinance reviewed that has a proposed change (noting changes via *highlights* (amended) or *strike outs* (deleted) to the language as a result of their Planning Board Workshop. She went on to note Board must vote to bring the proposal forward for a public hearing (not this public hearing, a future public hearing to vote to put the proposals on the ballot at Town Meeting). “We need one public hearing to do that” she said. Ms. Hurley noted the maximum size of ADUs (as corrected in the minutes, above) with Ms. Vann interjected “there was some scuffling about that, and I was part of it I’m sorry to say” adding “I think I said I did not care and that you guys should decide.” The members reaffirmed the “or 30% of the dwelling size, whatever is larger” in te language with Ms. Hurley noting “that is what is in there now.” “OK, perfect” replied Ms. Vann.

Ms. Melone told the members the Master Plan Steering Committee was considering the next chapter(s) to update. Ms. Heller noted they had pretty much agreed to move on to the *Population and Housing Chapter* as it has a high priority. Ms. Melone added they could update another chapter in tandem to the Population and Housing Chapter “and as they are subcommittee of the Planning Board, I’d like to get your thoughts on what that chapter should be.” She suggested the *Economic Development Chapter* with Ms. Heller interjecting “yes, that is a good one, we don’t want to take on Traffic and Transportation until the second bridge project is completed. I think that Economic Development has a good hand-in-hand relationship with Population and Housing.” Ms. Heller concluded by noting the Master Plan Steering Committee would be meet on January 24<sup>th</sup> at 5:00 p.m. and the public was, as always, welcome.

Chair Clark read the next case:

**Preliminary Review Application for Mixed Use Development at 14 Grove Street** proposing to redevelop the property to include an office use on the lower level, 11-unit multi-family residential condominiums on the upper levels, and with associated site amenities and improvements, located at Parcel No. U017-076-000, in the Downtown Commercial District & Traditional Neighborhood Overlay Zone I.

Chair Clark asked if this was to be a continued case with Ms. Norton replying, “we currently do not have a letter of authorization from the owner of the building, that is still outstanding from the preliminary application.”

A motion was made/seconded (Heller/Vann) to continue the preliminary hearing to a date and time certain of January 10, 2022 at 6:30 p.m. or thereafter with all in favor.

While awaiting the noticed time for the next case Ms. Hurley asked about keeping recordings of the meetings so they would be available to those who could not attend and wondered about any procedure for getting Zoom back as a platform for the meetings, especially with Covid surging. Ms. Melone noted that while they could make limited accommodations for some committee members (“not the public and a cumbersome system”), that authority did not come from the town but from the Governor’s Office and encouraged those wanting a Zoom platform to contact that office and ask for a reinstatement of the emergency order be put back into place.

Chair Clark then officially read the next case:

**Public Hearing – Proposed Adoption of Amended Master Plan Chapter 2: Vision & Chapter 8: Land Use with their Corresponding Appendices** – Copies of these updated chapters are available for download through the Town Website or by contacting Danica Melone at [dmelone@peterboroughnh.gov](mailto:dmelone@peterboroughnh.gov), or can be viewed or at the Office of Planning & Building located at 1 Grove Street, Peterborough, NH 03458.

As Ms. Vann began a motion of “I move we adopt them” she was interrupted from the audience by Loretta Laurenitis who asked, “isn’t this supposed to be a public hearing?” to which Chair Clark replied “yes” with Ms. Laurenitis asking, “aren’t you supposed to be asking for public input on that?” to which Chair Clark replied, “sure.”

Ms. Laurenitis noted she had a question about the Vision Chapter and asked about

the context of how many responses had been received (which she said would help her interpret the various graphs). Ms. Melone noted that information was provided in the appendix to the chapter (all outreach activities and respondents, including the questionnaire respondents). Ms. Laurentis asked if that data could be presented in graph form with Ms. Melone replying that data would not change the overall purpose of the terms of statistical significance of the response rate but “yes, I could, if that is helpful” she said. Ms. Laurentis noted the importance of knowing the response rate and the significant differences between 30 respondents and 100 respondents. Ms. Vann noted that there was ample information on how the outreach was done with Ms. Heller interjecting “it was 420 responses to the comment boards with Ms. Melone adding “that sounds very similar to what the survey response was.” Ms. Heller then suggested they simply add the number of respondents to the description of each outreach project.

Ms. Laurentis then asked about the tax credits associated with the Economic Revitalization Zones (ERZs). “I tried to find them on the website to review them and try to understand what they were about, but I didn’t find anything.” Ms. Melone noted that information was newly posted on the website. Ms. Melone went on to explain the ERZs have been around for “probably two decades,” did not have maps made and had not been on the website. “So part of what we did with this Master Plan update was involve our GIS/IT Department to put together maps of where those ERZs are located and get them onto the website. Ms. Melone then gave a verbal instruction on how to locate the new section on Economic Revitalization Zones with maps and frequently asked questions for businesses and municipalities. Ms. Laurentis asked, “so is this state funding?” “It is” replied Ms. Melone and a brief discussion of the program and how it is renewed followed. In conclusion Ms. Laurentis asked if the ERZs would have any impact on the TIF Districts in town with Ms. Melone replying “no, they are two separate entities. In some instances, they may overlap but you can only use one or the other.”

Noting the Land Use Chapter Francie Von Mertens introduced herself and cited vacant and undevelopable in a category under their conservation easement land over 5000 acres. She noted a typical conservation easement allows animal husbandry, timber, harvests, orchards, and farms and (looking forward) a trend of more and more emphasis on agriculture and growing locally. “A lot of conservation land has good, high-ranking agricultural soils so in terms of development you can also build easements that allow structures to support all of

those things, “so they are not a black hole of nothing but I don’t know how to capture that. Maybe those points can be made in the Open Space Chapter, but it *has* to be in there” she said.

As a member and speaking for the Master Plan Steering Committee Ms. Heller assured her that they were working on it and planning to expand discussion on that kind of land. “Not just the economic impact chapter but also in the new Energy and Environment Chapter, so we are definitely thinking about it and I think you have a really good point about it being integrated into the Master Plan” she said. A very brief discussion on how that may transform into an engaging, informative and readable document followed. Ms. Heller concluded by reviewing the public outreach process that will be involved. “We’ll make the rounds just like we did last time” she said. Ms. Von Mertens suggested the Conservation Commission should have been more involved in the draft stages to possibly talk about conservation easements really being a part of the town’s economy. Chair Clark suggested “when they go forward it would be helpful to have you there” with Ms. Von Mertens replying, “that is great.”

A motion was made/seconded (Vann/Blair) to approve the adoption of Amended Master Plan Chapter 2: *Vision* and Chapter 8: *Land Use* with their corresponding Appendices with all in favor.

Ms. Melone then passed around two sheets (one for each Master Plan Chapter zoning amendment) for member signatures to certify the adoption.

**Continued Hearing – Site Plan Review Application for a Shooting Range at Monadnock Rod & Gun Club** to be located at their property at 595 Jaffrey Road, Parcel No. R003-032-000 in the Rural District and Route 202 Rural Gateway Overlay District.

Ms. Melone told the members the applicant has not yet been before the Zoning Board of Adjustment (they are on the agenda for January 3, 2022). “So my recommendation is to continue this to your January 10, 2022 meeting.”

A motion was made/seconded (Vann/Hurley) to continue the public hearing to a date and time certain of January 10, 2022 at 6:30 p.m. with all in favor.

**Other Business:**

Ms. Vann noted a presentation by Sara Bronin, founder of DesegregateCT (a nonprofit coalition of nonprofits including Sierra Club) that are looking at zoning deregulation and zoning changes in Connecticut. Ms. Vann noted the presentation was about how they are going about change and the tools they are using. "It is worth a watch" she said.

Ms. Vann also noted a conversation she'd had with the Mike Miller, Chief Planner in Montpelier Vermont and a warrant article they collected for a revolving loan fund for people who wish to build accessory dwelling units. "It is a no interest loan that you pay back when you sell the building, and they have had good success with it" she said. Ms. Vann noted the program did not use state or federal funds "so there are no strings attached, it is the town's money, so the town gets to decide what to do with it. I thought that may be a really interesting way to go about creating more housing." She went on to briefly describe the financial aspect of the program for homeowners, "how they spend their money and how they get it back."

Before adjourning James Kelly introduced himself and said he had another "other business" question. Once acknowledged he asked, "when do you think you will discuss the Walden Eco Village given it was delayed tonight, when is it going to be discussed?"

Chair Clark replied, "we are having trouble getting new information and without new information there is nothing to discuss." "They have homework to do" interjected Ms. Dreyer with Ms. Heller adding "we continued it to January 10<sup>th</sup> with Chair Clark noting "and that is not a hard date, if they don't provide the information, we can't have a discussion because they have not answered our questions." "So, there are questions for them to answer before that meeting?" "Yes" replied Chair Clark with Ms. Heller quickly going down the list for Mr. Kelly's edification. She read the list which included questions, issues or discussion that were necessary regarding the *75-foot vegetated buffer; 50-foot buffer lines for wetlands; variance for illegal nonconforming structures; density bonuses; existing structures (not overnight cabins); utility system for heat; utility easements; maintenance, storage and community use area; shared facilities; pump house structure; trash locations; state wetlands permitting; stormwater management report; landscaping plan; lighting; parking; parking lot sheds/storage; snow storage; common septic system approval; woodshed and mailboxes.* "All those things need to be addressed in full" she said. Ms. Vann noted some of the problem was that the Board has seen various iterations of the plan without a full updated plan. We need a plan that has *everything* on it" she said. Mr. Kelly asked about the

need for a (legal) settlement before the Board could proceed with Ms. Vann noting replying “no I don’t think so” but deferred to Ms. Melone

Ms. Melone explained the applicant must bring the entire site into compliance. “One option to completely demolish it, the second option is to get variances for everything to exist out there as it is and the third option is to an Open Space Residential Development (which is what they have chosen) and through that they should be able to bring everything into compliance, but we are a year out and still missing a lot of information.”

As a point of order Ms. Von Mertens reiterated that it seemed to the Conservation Commission that the Conditional Use Permit needs to come before the bigger question of the subdivision. Chair Clark terminated any potential for discussion as there was no representation from the applicant. “That is unfair to them” he said.

The meeting adjourned at 7:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Norton  
Office of Planning & Building

