

Dear Pittsfield Voter,

I originally planned this mailing to be just the enclosed letter analyzing the planning board's zoning proposal. Since then, the *Suncook Valley Sun* has rejected my letter announcing my candidacy for the 2-year seat on the planning board. Thus I decided to include that letter with this mailing because the rejection shows how desperate my opponents are to silence me. My letter to the *Sun* is on the back of this page. As you can see, that letter contains no vulgarity, illegal threats, or ad hominem attacks. It does contain ugly facts that the *Sun* apparently prefers you not to know when you vote.

The second sheet of this mailing has analysis and voting recommendations for a big zoning revision that the planning board is proposing. That revision includes, among other things, a provision to authorize the building inspector to approve any private dump that the building inspector feels like approving. Private dumps are currently not permissible. The private-dumps provision was specifically proposed by the Central New Hampshire Regional Planning Commission, and it was reviewed, as part of the larger project, by the town attorney, the board of selectmen, the zoning board of adjustment, and the planning board and finally recommended by the planning board. That makes 15 supposedly learned town officials who apparently think that Pittsfield needs private dumps permitted on the whim of the building inspector.

Some of the same people who passed on the private-dumps provision are now moaning that "Pittsfield would be a dumping ground... if zoning were repealed." (Letter of selectmen in *Suncook Valley Sun*, Feb. 9, 2011.) For these people, the issue is obviously not whether dumps should be permissible; the board of selectmen, the planning board, and Dan Schroth (the petitioner for repeal) all agree that they should. The real issue is who gets to decide who gets to have a dump. Mr. Schroth wants everyone to be able to have a dump. By contrast, the town boards want only those people favored by the building inspector.

There is, of course, a third alternative: voters can say NO to both Dan Schroth and the planning board. I am the only candidate exposing the planning board's proposal; I am the only candidate saying NO to dumps whether permitted by right (Schroth plan) or on the whim of the building inspector (planning board plan). Because I am the only candidate and almost the only voice fighting powerful town boards, I cannot defeat these proposals if you do not get informed and vote. Do not let Pittsfield become a dumping ground. On March 8, please vote NO to the planning board's zoning revisions and NO to Dan Schroth, and please honor me with your vote for the 2-year seat on the planning board.

Please also vote for Dan Greene and Clayton Wood for the two one-year seats. Mr. Greene, Mr. Wood, and I disagree on some issues, but we respect disagreement. By contrast, their competition, Ted Mitchell, insultingly calls disagreement obstructive "bickering." (*Suncook Valley Sun*, Feb. 16, 2011.) Mr. Mitchell apparently refers to me because he brags about the volume of work that the planning board did this year without the "bickering" of "prior years." (Ibid.) First of all, an out-of-towner, Matt Monahan, not the planning board, did this year's work. Second, if someone had been reading and challenging Mr. Monahan, or "bickering" with him, then the board might not be proposing building permits to be required for general maintenance, private dumps permissible by the building inspector, and subdivision on driveways. Mr. Mitchell voted for all of these things. By contrast, Mr. Greene and Mr. Wood did not. When candidates say, as I do, that they will fight for you, there is a reason why they use the word "fight."

Thank you,
Jim Pritchard

Letter that the *Suncook Valley Sun* refused to print:

I am running for the 2-year term on the Pittsfield Planning Board. I respectfully ask for your vote.

I am running because this town government treats its citizens more like subjects than citizens. I have been knocking on doors, listening to voters, and asking for votes. Some voters have told me that they do not go to board meetings or town meetings because they feel disrespected and ignored. I know the feeling. Last May, the planning board chair himself wrote in this paper, "This town could function a whole lot better if [Pritchard] were to take his pungent behavior somewhere else." The chair recently told the Concord Monitor that Pittsfield is a "slummy mess." If you elect me, this contempt for Pittsfield and its citizens will stop.

When I was on the planning board two years ago, I did more of the board's work than the other members combined, and I spent NO taxpayer money. By contrast, the planning board majority spent \$17,500 for a zoning revision. What did \$17,500 buy you? It bought you a proposal for an oppressive and expensive bureaucracy. That bureaucracy includes an invasive building-permit requirement that eliminates the current exemption for "general maintenance." EVERYTHING, no matter how minor, will require a permit.

In following letters I will discuss the planning board's zoning proposal, but my web site is better because I have space there to point you to the exact parts of the proposal that matter. <http://czop.wordpress.com>

My opponents are planning board chair Bill Miskoe and member Dan Schroth. Bill supports the new bureaucracy while Dan wants no zoning whatsoever. I am in the middle supporting sensible regulations. Please honor me with your vote on March 8.

Thank you,
Jim Pritchard

Dear Pittsfield Voter,

The March 8 town meeting ballot will have a well-publicized petition from Dan Schroth to repeal the Pittsfield zoning ordinance. The ballot will also have several other zoning-related proposals from the planning board. The planning board's proposals are less well known, but they deserve your attention because they will have a big impact on land-use regulation. The planning board will explain why they recommend voting YES on their proposals, so I will explain why I recommend voting NO.

I do not have enough space here to cite by article number the specific provisions that I describe, but my web site, <http://czop.wordpress.com>, has all of the citations and documentation, including a sample ballot, that you need to verify everything. Please cast an informed vote!

Ballot Article 2 recommendation: Vote NO.

Why vote NO: Among other reasons, this article would dramatically expand the town's building-permit requirement.

Currently, the town requires that "All construction shall require a permit other than general maintenance, such as painting, papering, residing, replacement windows, and reroofing, so long as no structural work is to be done as part of the maintenance." The new article would eliminate the "general maintenance" exception and would require a building permit for any "alteration," no matter how minor, of any "structure" without exception.

In addition, every application for a building permit would have to supply very detailed information about the whole property, no matter how small the "alteration" to the subject "structure." Required information includes anything that the building inspector might feel like requiring.

Ballot Article 3 recommendation: Vote NO.

Why vote NO: Among other reasons, this article would authorize the building inspector to approve any private dump that he feels like approving.

Currently, private dumps are not permissible because they require approval from a nonexistent "Board of Health." The planning board wants to "correct" this supposed "defect" by authorizing the building inspector to approve dumps. That authorization will make private dumps permissible—and will do so by someone who is unqualified to judge the health impact and who can do as he pleases.

Ballot Article 4 recommendation: Vote NO.

Why vote NO: Among other reasons, this article includes a definition of "frontage" that would allow subdivision on Class VI highways, which are unmaintained, and on driveways, which the town politely calls "private roads." The town overwhelmingly rejected functionally identical definitions in 2005 and 2009. In 2009, the rejection was by about 3 to 1.

New lots should front on maintained town roads because emergency vehicles, such as fire trucks, police cars, and ambulances, need safe access to the property in an emergency, such as, for example, if someone has a heart attack or a fire and if snow is on the ground.

Ballot Article 5 recommendation: Vote NO.

Why vote NO: This article would expand the planning board's power to waive parking-space requirements.

Ballot Article 6 recommendation: Vote YES.

Why vote YES: This article would repeal Pittsfield's shoreland protection ordinance. The state has a stricter shoreland protection ordinance, which would govern in any case, so the repeal of Pittsfield's ordinance helps to avoid conflict, confusion, and other legal difficulties.

Ballot Article 7 recommendation: Vote NO.

Why vote NO: This article would let residential housing developers evade the normal lot-area, density, and frontage requirements of the zoning ordinance.

The article would allow duplexes in the Suburban and Rural districts, which are otherwise reserved for single-family dwellings.

The article calls itself "Senior Housing Ordinance" and says that its purpose is "to serve the needs of people age fifty-five (55) years and older." But the article never defines those needs and thus does not assure that the housing will meet those needs. In contrast, the article allows children in 25% of the dwelling units and 3 bedrooms per every dwelling unit, and nothing stops any of the dwelling units from being rented.

* * * * *

I am running for a seat on the Pittsfield planning board. I support land-use regulation when—and only when—the regulation is well defined, clearly stated, authorized by state law, and necessary to fulfill a well-defined, clearly stated, and necessary public purpose. I oppose regulations that do not meet those standards.

I believe that zoning is necessary because haphazard development makes property values go down and taxes go up. For that reason, I oppose Dan Schroth's petition to repeal the zoning ordinance. But zoning can be overdone or poorly done. For the reasons above, I oppose most of the planning board's proposed zoning amendments.

My web site has more information about my credentials and positions.
<http://czop.wordpress.com>. Please honor me with your vote on March 8.

Thank you,
Jim Pritchard