

**SELECT BOARD MEETING AGENDA
TOWN OF PETERBOROUGH**

Tuesday, August 4, 2026 – 5:00 PM
1 Grove Street, Peterborough, New Hampshire

PUBLIC HEARING

- Pursuant to RSA 31:95-b, the Select Board will conduct a Public Hearing on August 4, 2026 at 5:00pm in the Selectman's Meeting Room of the Town House to discuss the merits of accepting the following money:
 - \$10,000 from the Friends of Peterborough Recreation for the purchase of a box trailer to store and haul the Pedal Together Bikes around.
 - \$500 from MCH for a new program we are starting in the fall. "Mission Move" is an afterschool program designed for the less active child to have a healthy snack and be active in the program. The program will be led by MCH staff, FPU physical therapy students, and Recreation Staff

APPOINTMENT

- Website Updates/Redesign

OLD BUSINESS

- Review and Vote to approve meeting minutes from July 7, 2026 and July 14, 2026

NEW BUSINESS

- Review Building Permit & Third-Party Inspection Policy

ADJOURN

**PUBLIC HEARING
TOWN OF PETERBOROUGH
ACCEPTANCE OF UNANTICIPATED MONEYS**

Pursuant to RSA 31:95-b, the Select Board will conduct a Public Hearing on August 4, 2026 at 5:00pm in the Selectman's Meeting Room of the Town House to discuss the merits of accepting the following money:

- \$10,000 from the Friends of Peterborough Recreation for the purchase of a box trailer to store and haul the Pedal Together Bikes around.
- \$500 from MCH for a new program we are starting in the fall. "Mission Move" is an afterschool program designed for the less active child to have a healthy snack and be active in the program. The program will be led by MCH staff, FPU physical therapy students, and Recreation Staff.

The public is invited to attend and participate in the hearing.

Select Board
Town of Peterborough

Website Updates/Redesign

Why?

Legal Compliance

- Federal Rule from U.S DOJ established under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act that requires state and local government entities to make digital content accessible for every person
- Inaccessible website face risks of civil rights lawsuits and legal penalties

Improve Usability

- Ensures compatibility with screen readers, keyboard-only navigation, and voice commands
- Improve text-to background color contrast, media captions for visual or auditory impairments

What is Title II of the ADA?

- Title II of the ADA requires state and local governments to make sure that their services, programs, and activities are accessible to people with disabilities
- This requires that all web content meets Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.1, Level AA, unless an exception applies.

Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.1, Level AA

4 Core Principles (POUR)

- **Perceivable:** Information and user interfaces must be presentable to users in ways they can perceive (e.g., providing alt text for images, captions for video, and adaptable layouts).
- **Operable:** Interface components and navigation must be operable (e.g., ensuring all features can be used via keyboard, avoiding content that causes seizures, and providing ways to navigate).
- **Understandable:** Information and the operation of the user interface must be understandable (e.g., making text readable, providing predictable navigation, and offering input assistance).
- **Robust:** Content must be robust enough that it can be interpreted reliably by a wide variety of user agents

Who does this apply to?

- The rule applies to all state and local governments (which includes any agencies or departments of state or local governments)
- State and local governments that contract with other entities to provide public services for them also must make sure that their contractors follow Title II.

When is the deadline to comply?

- State and local government entities with a total population of 50,000 or more must comply by April 26, 2027.
- Public entities with a total population of less than 50,000, and special district governments, must comply by April 26, 2028.

How?

- Work with Revize to redesign current website for needed updated to ensure compliance
- Review current forms/documents with accessibility checker and revise as needed
- Train staff who update and add content to the website

Examples of other Towns' redesign with Revize

- <https://www.raymondnh.gov/>
- <https://www.rindgenh.gov/>
- <https://www.marlboroughnh.gov/>
- <https://www.cityofgolden.gov/>

MINUTES
SELECT BOARD MEETING
TOWN OF PETERBOROUGH

Tuesday, July 7, 2026 – 5:00 PM
1 Grove Street, Peterborough, New Hampshire

Present: Tyler Ward, Bill Kennedy, Bonnie Tucker

Also Present: Nicole MacStay, Justine Hanson, Ed Walker, Seth MacLean, Danica Miller, Trisha Cheever-Wolfe

This meeting was broadcast live on Ustream, YouTube, and Channel 22 (Comcast)

Chair Ward welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced the other members of the Select Board, Bonnie Tucker and Bill Kennedy, along with Town Administrator Nicole MacStay. He then reviewed the agenda for the meeting.

PUBLIC HEARING- 5:00PM

Motion: Chair Ward motioned to open the Public Hearing. Mr. Kennedy seconded the motion.

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

CDBG Housing Grant Proposal

Chair Ward opened the first public hearing to discuss a proposed CDBG application to the New Hampshire Community Development Finance Authority (CDFA) for up to \$1,000,000. Jack Ahern, representing the Southwest Region Planning Commission, explained that these funds are available on a competitive basis to benefit low-to-moderate-income persons. Specifically, the town proposed to sub-grant these funds to Catholic Charities New Hampshire for the acquisition and renovation of 10 Vose Farm Road. This project aims to convert the existing building into 32 units of affordable housing with permanent support services.

Jeff Lefkovich, Executive Director of Real Estate Housing Development for Catholic Charities, provided a detailed overview of the project, which is identified as Phase 2 of the Vose Farm Road development. He noted that while Phase 1 is functioning well, Phase 2 had faced previous funding challenges and rising construction costs. The renovated facility will include 32 apartments, community recreation spaces, and a resident advisory council to give occupants a voice in managing the property. Mr. Lefkovich detailed a \$14 million project budget, utilizing low-income housing tax credits, loans from New Hampshire Housing, and \$500,000 of Catholic Charities' own funds alongside the CDBG grant.

During the board's inquiry, Ms. Tucker requested clarification on the proportionality of the income levels served. Mr. Lefkovich explained that they follow HUD-defined income limits and area median income (AMI) calculations. For Phase 2, the units will be stratified across several tiers, including three units at 30% AMI, three units at 50% AMI, and several others at 60%, 70%, and 80% AMI, with 10% of units held at market rate (which Catholic Charities sets at 10% below actual market value). Ms. Tucker expressed that including the 30% AMI tier was crucial for the town.

Regarding environmental concerns, Mr. Ahern explained that the environmental review documents in the board's packet were largely standard to allow for initial administrative costs, but a full federal environmental clearance would be required before construction funds are released. Mr. Kennedy

inquired about the current occupancy of Phase 1, which Mr. Lefkovich stated was successful with 59 of 64 units occupied since February. Kate Foley of Catholic Charities added that the CDBG application is due July 27, 2026, with construction projected to start in late summer 2027. Resident Sue Martin asked if the grant was assured, to which Mr. Lefkovich responded that it is a highly competitive process with no "Plan B" if the funding is not awarded.

As there was no further public input, Chair Ward closed the first public hearing.

Motion: Mr. Kennedy motioned to approve the submittal of application and authorize Nicole MacStay as the Authorized Designee to sign and submit the CDBG application, and upon approval of the CDBG application, authorize the Authorized Designee to execute any documents which may be necessary to effectuate the CDBG contract.. Ms. Tucker seconded the motion.

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

Review and adoption of Peterborough's Residential Anti-displacement and Relocation Plan.

Chair Ward opened the second public hearing concerning the town's Residential Anti-Displacement and Relocation Assistance Plan. Mr. Ahern explained that federal law requires a plan to be in place to ensure that any household or business displaced by a project using federal funds is provided with comparable housing or space at a comparable price. While the building at 10 Vose Farm Road is currently empty and no displacement is anticipated, the town is still required to formally adopt the plan as part of the grant application process.

As there were no public comments, Chair Ward closed the second public hearing.

Motion: Mr. Kennedy motioned to adopt the Residential Anti-Displacement and Relocation Assistance Plan. Chair Ward seconded the motion.

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

Review and adoption of Peterborough's Housing and Community Development Plan.

Chair Ward opened the third public hearing for discussion of the Housing and Community Development Plan. Mr. Ahern noted that the plan must be reviewed and readopted every three years to remain eligible for CDBG funding. The updated plan reflects the town's current Master Plan goals, specifically aiming to expand safe, affordable, and diverse housing options.

As there were no public comments, Chair Ward closed the third public hearing.

Motion: Ms. Tucker motioned to adopt the Housing and Community Development Plan. Mr. Kennedy seconded the motion.

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

Motion: Chair Ward motioned to close all the Public Hearings at 5:37pm. Mr. Kennedy seconded the motion.

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

Review and vote to approve minutes from June 2, 2026, and non-public meeting minutes from June 25, 2026, Select Board Meetings

Motion: Chair Ward motioned to approve the meeting minutes from June 2, 2026 and June 25, 2026. Ms. Tucker seconded the motion.

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

NEW BUSINESS

Consider Greater Downtown TIF District Advisory Committee Recommendations

The discussions regarding the Downtown Tax Increment Financing (TIF) District Advisory Committee recommendations were centered on a motion to pause the implementation of a previously designed "parklet" beautification project. Anna Von Mertens, Chair of the committee, explained that because adjacent businesses—including Roy's Market, the Diner, and the Toadstool Bookshop—had all changed ownership since the project's 2022 inception, the current design no longer reflected the needs or desires of those properties. Furthermore, the committee argued that it was illogical to proceed with surface beautification before addressing critical subsurface infrastructure needs, property line delineations, and topographical assessments.

Fire Chief Ed Walker shifted the focus toward the immediate safety hazards at the intersection of Summer, Depot, and Main Streets, describing it as virtually impossible to pull out of Summer Street safely due to obstructed sightlines and an awkward, angled crosswalk. Ivy Vann proposed a "tactical urbanism" approach as a low-cost, immediate trial, suggesting that \$150 in green paint and flexible bollards could be used to "daylight" the corner and improve safety before a permanent, expensive solution is engineered.

Property owner Chris Anderson expressed significant concern over the loss of prime parking spaces, arguing that while safety is important, the most challenging maneuver is actually the left turn from Depot Street onto Main Street, which he felt the parklet design did not adequately address. Resident Elizabeth Little echoed concerns about the intersection's danger but highlighted a major technical flaw in the parklet plan: the area is prone to heavy stormwater runoff that could be blocked by the proposed structure, leading to drainage issues. She further questioned the safety of encouraging people to sit on benches in such a high-traffic, high-risk area.

Sarah Steinberg-Heller strongly advocated for traffic calming, stating that the safety of children and pedestrians should take precedence over a few parking spaces. She expressed concern that "delaying" the project might lead to "derailing" essential safety improvements entirely. Conversely, Melanie Neily and Willard Williams emphasized the necessity of nearby parking for elderly customers using canes or walkers to access the Diner and Roy's Market.

Town Administrator Nicole MacStay provided technical context, noting that the current crosswalk placement was chosen specifically to avoid dangerous ice sheets that fall from the Unitarian Church roof in winter. She suggested the board separate the "visioning" or beautification aspect of the project from the urgent safety concerns of the intersection. DPW Director Seth MacLean clarified that the parklet design was intended to deliberately narrow the road to slow traffic and that a realigned crosswalk would minimize the time pedestrians spend in the roadway.

Ultimately, the board reached a consensus to take two distinct actions: pausing the broader beautification visioning while instructing town staff to prioritize engineering concepts for the dangerous intersection. It was clarified that the necessary subsurface evaluations would be funded

through existing Downtown TIF funds, which are held in an expendable trust fund overseen by the Select Board

Motion: Mr. Kennedy motioned to delay the visioning project. Ms. Tucker seconded the motion.

Vote: All in favor.

Motion: Mr. Kennedy motioned to focus on safety at that intersection. Ms. Tucker seconded the motion.

Vote: All in favor.

Vote to approve naming of Pocket Street

Chief Walker requested the board name a new private roadway serving a 14-unit development at 35 High Street. Following a suggestion from the original developer, the name "Pocket Street" was proposed as a tribute to the "pocket development" style of the neighborhood. It was noted that this new road will be a private way and is not town-maintained.

Motion: Chair Ward motioned to authorize the naming of Pocket Street. Mr. Kennedy seconded the motion.

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

Vote to Expend from Fire Department Apparatus and Equipment CRF

Chief Walker requested \$31,216.76 from the Fire Department Apparatus and Equipment Capital Reserve Fund to repair the pump on Tanker 1. He explained that the repair involves installing high-durability ceramic packing, which should last the remaining 25-year life of the vehicle.

Motion: Chair Ward motioned to approve the expenditure of up to \$31,216.76 from the Fire Department Apparatus and Equipment Capital Reserve Fund. Mr. Kennedy seconded the motion.

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried unanimously.

Review Responses to Municipal Electricity Supply RFP

Trisha Cheever-Wolfe, Energy Community Planner, presented the results of a recent Request for Proposals (RFP) for the town's electricity supply, as the current contract was set to expire on August 1. The board discussed offers from several providers, including Constellation and BP. A major point of discussion was the DASI initiative (Day Ahead Ancillary Services Initiative), which has introduced significant volatility into electric rates. Bruce Tucker explained that some providers offer a lower rate but leave the town vulnerable to DASI price spikes, while others offer a fixed rate that absorbs that risk.

The board also discussed the town's commitment to 100% renewable energy. Ms. MacStay noted that while BP offered a competitive green rate, she had previously found their customer service to be problematic, whereas Constellation was more responsive. Ms. Tucker advocated for a 24-month fixed-rate contract with Constellation for 100% "Green-E" power, arguing that the predictability was better for town budgeting given the current unpredictability of the Public Utilities Commission..

Motion: Ms. Tucker motioned to select the 24-month Constellation contract, 100% Green-E and a fixed DASI. Mr. Kennedy seconded the motion.

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

Vote to Appoint Sue Martin as an alternate to the Inclusive Community Committee

Motion: Chair Ward motioned to appoint Susan Martin to the Inclusive Community Committee as an alternate member. Mr. Kennedy seconded the motion.

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried unanimously.

Vote to accept Highway Safety Grant

Ms. MacStay overviewed the Highway Safety Grant, stating that it helps cover the costs of traffic stops that the Town conducts on state roads. Ms. Tucker inquired about the documentation of the time and locations of the traffic stops and if there are certain target areas. Ms. MacStay stated that the Police are not required to set up in specific locations, it is more of a continuous patrol along State Routes 101, 123, and 136, and US Route 202. Ms. Tucker also inquired about the Town match portion of the grant and if it is in the budget. Ms. MacStay confirmed that 24/7 Police coverage in the budget.

The Select Board, in a majority vote, accepted the terms of the Highway Safety Grant as presented in the amount of \$8,500.00.

Motion: Chair Ward motioned at accept the Highway Safet Grant in the amount of \$8,500.00. Mr. Kennedy seconded the motion.

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried unanimously.

Consider Proposed Revisions to Welfare Guidelines

Ms. MacStay reviewed the proposed revisions to the Welfare Guidelines, noting that recent changes to RSA 165 prompted the updates. Ms. Hanson and the Town attorney assisted with the revisions. Ms. Tucker asked for clarification regarding Section IX, Non-Resident Assistance, specifically the provision for returning an applicant to their place of residence. She suggested adding language to clarify that the applicant is the one requesting this assistance. Ms. Tucker then asked for clarification on Section XV, Recovery of Assistance. Ms. MacStay stated that most of the temporary assistance applicants are renters and will not have the means to pay back assistance that is provided but The Town can place a lien on property if the applicant is the property owner. Mr. Kennedy asked about Section VIII.B, Legal Standard and Interpretation, item 1, which stated that “an applicant cannot be denied assistance solely because he or she is not a resident.” He noted that this appeared to conflict with the following eligibility section, where residency is listed as the first requirement. Ms. MacStay and Ms. Hanson explained that item 1 had been crossed out during the first round of edits but did not carry over into the final version. They confirmed that the item would be corrected.

Motion: Chair Ward motioned to accept the revisions to the Welfare Guidelines as amended. Ms. Tucker seconded the motion.

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

Vote to use GDTIF Expendable Trust Fund for bond payments

Motion: Chair Ward motioned to approve using the Greater Downtown TIF Expendable Trust Fund for the FY2027 Riverwalk parking Bond payment of \$71,043 and the FY2027 Main Street Bridge Bond payment of \$122,805. Mr. Kennedy seconded the motion.

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

ADJOURN

Motion: Mr. Kennedy motioned to adjourn at 6:47pm. Ms. Tucker seconded the motion.

Vote: All in favor. Motion carried.

Respectfully Submitted,
Justine Hanson, Administrative Assistant

PETERBOROUGH SELECT BOARD:

Chair Ward

William Kennedy

Bonnie Tucker

**MINUTES
SELECT BOARD
TOWN OF PETERBOROUGH**

July 14, 2026 – 4:30pm
1 Grove Street, Peterborough, New Hampshire

Present: Bill Kennedy, Bonnie Tucker

Also Present: Nicole MacStay, Seth MacLean

1. Grove Street and Elm Street Bridge Repair Project Update

Project Engineer **Josif Bicja** provided a comprehensive update on the Elm Street and Grove Street bridge rehabilitation projects.

Project Bidding and Contractor Selection

Mr. Bicja reported that the Town received three bids for the combined bridge projects. The contract was awarded to **Cold River Bridges** at approximately **\$977,000**, significantly below competing bids of approximately **\$1.17 million** and **\$1.9 million**.

He noted that the contractor was selected based on experience and value, stating that Cold River Bridges had previously completed the Union Street Bridge and Grove Street pedestrian bridge projects and had "been more than fair to this town" throughout the current project.

Elm Street Bridge

Mr. Bicja reported that Elm Street Bridge repairs are substantially complete. Additional repairs to the underside of the structure are anticipated at an estimated cost of approximately **\$50,000**.

He explained that some temporary closure may be required to install an under-bridge work platform but emphasized that the closure would likely last only one day.

Discussion focused on public communication surrounding the additional closure. Mr. Bicja explained that the repairs could not be completed earlier because water levels were unusually high when the bridge reopened. He stated: "We want to get as low as we can to the lowest elevation that the water would get to repair the face of abutment."

Board members discussed the importance of clearly communicating that the delayed work was due to site conditions rather than project oversight.

Cost Savings and Change Orders

Mr. Bicja reviewed several cost-saving measures implemented during construction, including:

- Negotiation of contract modifications reducing the original contract value from approximately **\$977,000** to **\$854,000**.
- Use of a local paving contractor.

- Town-performed signage work.
- Savings associated with removal rather than replacement of an unexpected approach slab.

He reported that all change orders to date have resulted in overall savings to the project.

Discovery of Significant Deterioration at Grove Street Bridge

Mr. Bicja described substantial unforeseen deterioration discovered after removal of the bridge pavement. While the original project scope anticipated repairs to approximately **15% to 20%** of the bridge deck, investigations revealed extensive deterioration affecting approximately **75% to 80%** of the deck.

He reported that concrete beneath the pavement had deteriorated into gravel-like material, exposing reinforcing steel. Testing conducted by SW Cole Engineering found that while the upper layer of concrete had failed, the underlying structural concrete remained strong. Mr. Bicja stated: "The first thing that went to my mind. I said, 'Oh my God, we can't save this.'" However, subsequent testing confirmed that the underlying concrete remained structurally sound, producing strengths significantly above original design requirements. He summarized the findings by stating: "It was very reassuring for me to see that we have very good concrete underneath."

Utility Conduit Conflict

The Board was informed that previously undocumented utility conduits belonging to Consolidated Communications and other providers were discovered within the bridge deck. Mr. Bicja explained that a phased construction approach was developed to allow utilities to temporarily relocate conduits while repairs are completed. Mr. MacLean praised the responsiveness of utility representatives, noting that discussions had progressed from initial reluctance to active field work within a matter of days.

Project Schedule

Mr. Bicja reported that despite the expanded scope of repairs, the contractor has not requested additional contract time, current completion milestones remain in place, and contract completion remains scheduled for late September and early October. He stated: "The contractor has not asked for additional time. They're still within the original contract." Mr. MacLean added that pedestrian access across the bridge remains a priority and that whichever sidewalk can safely reopen first will be reopened as soon as practical.

Revised Cost Estimate

Mr. Bicja advised the Board that the expanded repair scope is expected to increase project costs by no more than **\$300,000**, while staff continue daily efforts to minimize expenses. He stated: "\$300,000 is going to be the max, and then we hope to be under it when it's all said and done."

Long-Term Bridge Preservation

Mr. Bicja explained that specialized corrosion-control anodes will be installed within repaired concrete to slow future deterioration and extend the bridge's useful life. While the original preservation project was expected to extend the bridge life approximately 25 years, current conditions suggest the repairs will provide

an estimated **10 to 15 years** of additional service life. He recommended that the Town immediately begin advocating for future bridge replacement funding through the State Bridge Aid Program and related funding opportunities. Mr. Bicja stated: "We need to write a letter to the state explaining that we fixed it, but we still have a problem 10 to 15 years from now."

Heavy Truck Traffic Discussion

The Board discussed the potential benefits of restricting heavy commercial traffic over the bridge to prolong its useful life. Mr. Bicja strongly recommended continued load posting, noting: "I highly recommend that we down-post it. It's going to make this last longer." The Board also discussed improving truck-warning signage and continuing outreach to local businesses and delivery services.

Motion: Additional Bridge Repair Funding

Mr. MacLean recommended that any additional project expenses be funded through the **Bridges, Culverts and Dams Expendable Trust Fund** rather than the Downtown TIF Fund to preserve TIF resources for other priority projects.

Motion: Ms. Tucker moved to authorize an increase in the scope and cost of the bridge repair project, with additional funding of up to **\$300,000** to be provided from the **Bridges, Culverts and Dams Expendable Trust Fund**. Mr. Kennedy Seconded.

Vote: Unanimously approved.

2. Dispatch Console Upgrade Contract

Mr. MacLean reported that the dispatch console upgrade approved through the FY'27 budget is ready to proceed. The Board had previously approved the project but had not formally designated a signatory for relevant contracts.

Motion: Ms. Tucker moved to authorize Seth MacLean to sign contracts associated with the dispatch console upgrade project. Mr. Kennedy seconded.

Vote: Unanimously approved.

3. Canal Bypass Alternative 3 Design Services

Mr. MacLean presented a proposal from **Hoyle Tanner** for engineering services associated with the Canal Bypass Alternative 3 project.

The proposal includes:

- Existing conditions survey
- 60%, 90%, and final design plans

- Shoreland permitting
- Construction documents
- Construction-phase engineering support

Total proposed cost: **up to \$96,500.**

Mr. MacLean explained that Alternative 3 would reroute stormwater entirely within municipal right-of-way, allowing abandonment of the existing canal connection while avoiding private-property easements. Discussion included legal review, title research, communication with affected property owners, and sharing the Town's objective of permanently addressing drainage concerns with Hope Properties. Board members expressed support for moving forward.

Motion: Mr. Kennedy made a motion to:

1. Waive the Town purchasing policy and designate Hoyle Tanner Associates and Wilcox and Barton Environmental as the preferred vendors for this project.
2. Authorize expenditure of up to **\$96,500** from the Downtown TIF Expendable Trust Fund for survey, design, permitting, and construction-phase engineering services associated with the Canal Bypass project.
3. Authorize Seth MacLean to execute the necessary agreements on behalf of the Town.

Second: Ms. Tucker seconded.

Vote: Unanimously approved.

4. Water Conservation Restrictions

Board members discussed public concerns regarding compliance with the Town's current water conservation restrictions. Mr. MacLean reported that state drought conditions remain unchanged but noted that local water system operations have stabilized, and utility staff are not currently observing serious recharge concerns. Board members discussed balancing water conservation with public compliance and community support. Ms. Tucker observed: "The longer you keep a ban in place, the harder it is to maintain the ban." Mr. MacLean suggested that the Town consider transitioning to an odd-even watering schedule if conditions permit.

Board Consensus

The Board reached consensus to:

- Provide updated assessments to the Board as necessary at upcoming meetings.
 - Ease current watering restrictions by implementing an odd-even watering schedule.
 - Continue public messaging encouraging voluntary conservation.
-

5. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at approximately **5:53 p.m.**

Respectfully Submitted,
Nicole MacStay, Town Administrator

PETERBOROUGH
SELECT BOARD:

____NOT PRESENT____
Tyler Ward, Chair

William Kennedy

Bonnie Tucker

PERMITTING POLICY AND PROCEDURES
Town of Peterborough, NH

- I. Purpose:** The purpose of this policy is to provide guidance to property owners and contractors regarding the appropriate process for applying for and obtaining building, electric, plumbing, and mechanical permits.

II. Obtaining Permits – Generally:

- A. Permit applications are accepted during our regular business hours.
- B. In reviewing and administering a permit application the Building Inspector is authorized to exercise all powers and authorities set forth in the New Hampshire State Building Code.
- C. Missing or incomplete information may cause a delay in the processing of permit applications.
- D. If a proposed structure requires other permits or approvals from any Town land use board or from any state or Federal agency, those permits and approvals shall be obtained and provided with the permit application. Building permits will not be issued for any structure or use that would not be compliant with the Town's Zoning Ordinance, Subdivision Regulations, Site Plan Review Regulations, and/or the State Building or Fire Codes.
- E. Applicants are encouraged to consult the Office of Planning and Building prior to submitting a permit to ascertain what information is expected to be submitted with the building permit application.
- F. Depending on the nature of the structure, the Building Inspector may require plans, reports, or other documentation to be prepared by qualified professionals as part of permit application or may seek information beyond what is identified in the building permit application form.
- G. When submitting a permit application, property owners are required to sign the building permit application form.
- H. Building permit fees are due at the time of submission of the permit application. An application is not deemed complete until all information required by the Building Inspector is provided, the permit application is signed by the property owner, and the full permit fee is submitted.
- I. Building permit fees are based on the Fee Schedule adopted by the Town of Peterborough. For the purpose of identifying the "cost" of construction applicants are required to identify the cost that would be anticipated to be incurred for the project utilizing a qualified contractor, inclusive of all labor, equipment, tools, materials, etc. This term is regardless of the source of any labor, tools, materials, or equipment. The term "cost" is synonymous with "value," as that word is used under the New Hampshire State Building Code.

III. Building Permits:

- A. The Office of Planning and Building is responsible for processing all completed building permit applications in a timely manner. The deadline for the processing of an application is based on the submission of a completed application, inclusive of all information required by the Building Inspector.

- B. Subject to those projects utilizing third-party review of building permits, as set forth in Section X herein, RSA 676:13 allows for up to thirty (30) days for the processing (approval or denial) of any residential building permit and up to sixty (60) days for commercial or residential applications involving 10 or more dwelling units.
- C. If a permit is approved, the applicant will receive an email with a copy of their Building Permit. Applicants may also pick up a hard copy of the Building Permit, if requested. Approved Building Permits will note the list of required inspections. Permits are not routinely mailed but may be upon request.
- D. If an application is denied, the applicant will receive a letter stating the reason for denial, via First Class USPS Mail. This will also include if an application is not processed because it is incomplete, and the applicant has refused to supply such information or materials to make the application complete.
- E. In the case of commercial building or multifamily dwelling units, there may need to be review from other departments or a third party, which could increase the time before the building permit is issued and result in additional fees. The Office of Planning and Building will make reasonable efforts to alert applicants to these instances at the time of an application. The Office of Planning and Building is authorized to require and seek additional information throughout the permitting or administration of a project, as the Office of Planning and Building deems necessary to ensure that the work is done in compliance with all applicable laws, rules, and regulations.
- F. For new construction, building permits are issued in two phases. First, applicants will be issued a permit authorizing the construction of the foundation. After the foundation is constructed, applicants are required to provide a foundational certification prepared by a New Hampshire land surveyor prior to the issuance of a building permit for the remainder of the structure. The Building Inspector may waive the need for a foundation certification when, in the opinion of the Building Inspector, the applicant provides other information confirming that the structure's dimensions and locations are compliant with all applicable laws, rules, and regulations or where such compliance is readily apparent. After the confirmation of a foundation's dimensions and location, the Building Inspector will issue a building permit authorizing the remainder of the structure's construction.
- G. Work shall not be started prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.
- H. The Building Permit must be conspicuously displayed and available for the Building Inspector's signature for the duration of the project.

IV. Electric, Plumbing, Gas Permits:

- A. State of New Hampshire licensed persons may obtain a permit upon presentation of a **valid master's license** (or gas technician's license).
- B. Additional photo identification may be required.
- C. Applicants must have a valid ID.

V. Mechanical (non-gas), Oil Burner, and Other Miscellaneous Permits:

- A. Permits may be obtained in the and Planning and Building office during our regular business hours or online at:
https://www.peterboroughnh.gov/departments/planning_and_building/planning_zoning_applications_and_guides.php.
- B. Additional photo identification may be required.

VI. Proxy Permitting for Corporate/Business Entity Licensing:

- A. The Town of Peterborough will allow proxy permitting under a Business Entity License (BEL) under the following conditions:
 - i. The “Responsible Managing Employee” as shown on the BEL must appear in person to the Office of Planning and Building with their NH State License(s); their BEL; and a list of personnel authorized to obtain permits for the business. This will set up the availability for permitting by proxy.
 - ii. The list of authorized personnel must be on business letterhead with an original signature of “Responsible Managing Employee” as shown on the BEL. No copies or emails will be accepted. That list will be kept on file until the expiration of the BEL.
 - iii. Listed authorized personnel will be required to show photo identification to obtain a permit.
 - iv. It is the responsibility of the business to update the authorized personnel list as well as provide the Office of Planning and Building with a new BEL when renewed. The Office of Planning and Building will not notify holders of a BEL if the BEL is expired. If the authorized personnel list and the BEL are not current, no permits will be issued to it.
- B. The Town of Peterborough will not be responsible for permits issued to personnel on the list who are no longer authorized if that information has not been provided to the Office of Planning and Building in writing.
- C. Electrical, Plumbing, or Mechanical/Gas permits shall not be issued through the mail.
- D. Permitting by proxy is only allowed for Business Entity Licenses. Personal licenses shall not be entitled to permitting by proxy.

VII. Homeowner Permitting: State RSAs allow homeowners to do their own work if: the owner physically doing the work themselves; if the work is for a single-family residence; is the owner’s primary residence; and if a proper permit is obtained. Homeowner Permits shall not be issued for the following types of permits:

- A. Electrical Service/Meter and Panel Work;
- B. Electrical Wiring for Swimming Pools;
- C. Natural or Propane Gas;

D. Oil Tanks and Oil Burners;

E. The Town of Peterborough reserves the right not to issue a permit to a homeowner if the Building Inspector reasonably believes that the homeowner is qualified to do the work identified and the performance of the work would adversely impact the public health, safety, and welfare of the homeowner or any occupant of the structure.

VIII. Work Done Without a Permit:

A. Filing an application is not considered the issuance of a permit.

B. RSA chapter 155-A:7 and :8 authorizes the Town of Peterborough to impose a fine or penalty in the amount of \$275.00 for a first offence and \$550.00 for a subsequent offence, with each day of violation constituting a separate offence, for any work done prior to the issuance of a permit or work performed contrary to the New Hampshire Building Code, the New Hampshire Fire Code, the Town of Peterborough Zoning Ordinance, the Town of Peterborough Subdivision Regulations, or the Town of Peterborough Site Plan Review Regulations. Unpermitted or non-compliant work may be subject to a Stop Work Order, in addition to all other forms of rights and remedies as may be available to the Town of Peterborough under applicable laws.

IX. Inspections:

A. It is the responsibility of the homeowner and, if different, the permit holder, to ensure that timely inspections are scheduled upon the completion of each stage of the building, in accordance with the State Building Code.

B. Except for with regard to third-party inspections conducted in accordance with Section X of this Policy, all inspections are prepaid at the time of permitting and are subject to the following protocols:

- i. Any unanticipated/additional inspections needed and not paid for at time of permitting will have to be prepaid prior to scheduling. No inspection will be scheduled that has not been prepaid.
- ii. Minimum 24-hour notice is required for all inspections.
- iii. Failed inspections will be rescheduled upon payment of the re-inspection fee. Missed inspections, or scheduled inspections where the inspector cannot gain reasonable access, will be treated as a failed inspection.
- iv. Unless otherwise indicated on the permit and/or otherwise subject to a self-inspection pursuant to Section X, all inspections are scheduled by contacting the Office of Planning and Building during regular business hours.
- v. When an inspection is scheduled, there must be access during the scheduled window of time. No pre-calls will be made to inform applicants when the Building Inspector is in route to an inspection.

- vi. If the inspector is delayed for any reason, reasonable efforts will be made to contact the permit holder.
- C. Some permits require inspection by other departments, such as the Fire Department or the Department of Public Works. The Office of Planning and Building will strive to inform applicants when a project requires inspections by other department personnel and whether or not there are any additional fees associated with that inspection.

X. Optional Third-Party Permit Review and Inspection Services:

- A. Third-party permit review or inspection services shall only be conducted by an approved agency.
- B. Approved agencies must be licensed professionals, qualified, competent, and capable to perform the permit review and/or provide the inspection services.
- C. Any party wishing to use the services of an approved agency for third-party permit review or inspection services must:
 - i. Provide the complete contact information for the individual performing the permit review and/or inspection services, including, but not limited to, affiliated company, physical address, mailing address, email address, and direct telephone number;
 - ii. Provide documentation reflecting that the third-party's qualification, including, to the extent that the work to be reviewed involves either electrical, mechanical, or plumbing work that requires any license issued by the Office of Professional Licensure and Certification, a current license in good standing to perform the work that is the subject of permit review or inspection;
 - iii. Satisfy all requirements set forth in Section 246:4 to 2025 SB188 (as that bill may be codified into New Hampshire Law);
 - iv. Provide proof of insurance in accordance with Section 246:4, V to 2025 SB 188 (as that bill may be codified into New Hampshire Law), which shall be maintained at all times during the performance of permit review and/or inspection services a certificate of insurance before permit review or inspection services are commence; and
 - v. Provide a statement signed and notarized by the proposed third party swearing, under the pains and penalties of perjury the following:

I, [INSERT NAME], hereby certify that I am capable of providing objective, competent and independent permit review and/or inspection services. I further certify that my fee is not contingent upon any review or inspection services to be provided, that I hold no interest either directly or indirectly in the real estate or improvements that are the subject of any permit to be reviewed or work to be

inspected, and that I have no pecuniary interest in the improvements or real estate or any proceeds or profit to be derived therefrom that are the subject of the permit and/or inspection.

- D. Prior to the approved agency proceeding with permit-review or inspection services, the owner or the owner's authorized agent shall provide the following signed statement to the Building Inspector with the permit application:

I agree to indemnify the Town of Peterborough, its agents, officials, and employees from and against losses, damages, and judgments arising from claims by third parties arising from my use of these licensed or certified personnel to provide development document reviews and building inspections with respect to the building or structure that is the subject of the enclosed application. The indemnification shall include reasonable attorneys' fees and expenses recoverable under applicable law, but only to the extent they are found to be caused by a negligent act, error, or omission of an approved agency or approved agency officers, directors, members, partners, agents, employees, or subconsultants.

- E. Any approved agency shall immediately disclose any conflicts of interest that may exist related to the services to be performed or that may arise thereafter.
- F. Approved agencies performing permit review and/or inspection services shall be responsible for ensuring that the permit reviewed and/or the work inspected adheres to all applicable provisions of the New Hampshire State Building Code and New Hampshire State Fire Code.

G. Permit Review

- i. Applicants may use third-party permit review services from an approved agency that satisfies the requirements set forth in this Section X.
- ii. Any applicant that seeks to use a third-party permit review service shall supply an affidavit, signed and notarized, containing an original ("wet") signature containing the following statement:

The construction documents were reviewed pursuant Section 246 of 2025 SB 188 (as may be codified into New Hampshire) and to the best of the knowledge, information, and belief of the approved agency, the documents comply with the New Hampshire State Building Code and any applicable municipal amendments.

Said affidavit shall identify, with specificity the documents reviewed in providing said certification.

- iii. No approved agency shall certify that any construction document, permit application, and/or any portion thereof, complies with any provision of the New Hampshire State Building Code when that statement is inaccurate.

- iv. The Building Inspector retains full authority to review permits and determine whether said permit complies with the Town's Zoning Ordinance, Site Plan Review Regulations, Subdivision Regulations or other municipal regulations which are not subject to permit review services pursuant to 2025 SB188.
- v. Notwithstanding any provision herein to the contrary, upon the submission of a completed application for a building permit, as determined by this Policy, that includes all required information necessary for a compliant third-party permit review, the Town shall have fourteen calendar days to either issue the permit or deny the permit, identifying the specific features that do not comply with the New Hampshire Building Code or the Town's Zoning Ordinance, Site Plan Review Regulations, Subdivision Regulations or other governmental regulations (including the lack of any required State, Federal, or Local permits, licenses, or approvals). If the applicant submits revisions, the Building Inspector shall have the remainder of the tolled business days plus one business day from the date of resubmittal to issue the building permit or provide a second written notice to the applicant stating which of the previously identified documents or permit features remain in noncompliance with the New Hampshire Building Code or the Town's Zoning Ordinance, Site Plan Review Regulations, Subdivision Regulations or other governmental regulations (including the lack of any required State, Federal, or Local permits, licenses, or approvals). Failure of the Building Inspector to provide timely decisions in accordance with this paragraph shall constitute approval of the permit and said permit shall issue on the next business day.

H. Inspection Services

- i. Applicants may use third-party inspection services from an approved agency that satisfies the requirements set forth in this Section X.
- ii. Any applicant that seeks to use a third-party inspection service shall supply an affidavit, signed and notarized, containing an original ("wet") signature, summarizing the inspections performed (including the date and time of said inspection) and that the work inspected comports with the construction documents and all applicable provisions of the New Hampshire State Building Code.
- iii. No approved agency shall certify that any inspected work complies with any provision of the New Hampshire State Building Code when that statement is inaccurate.
- iv. The Building Inspector retains full authority to inspect any portion of work that is the subject to third-party inspections and determine whether said work complies with the Town's Zoning Ordinance, Site Plan Review Regulations, Subdivision Regulations or other municipal regulations which are not subject to inspection services pursuant to 2025 SB188.

- v. Notwithstanding any provision herein to the contrary, upon the submission of an inspection affidavit, as determined by this Policy, the Town shall have ten (10) calendar days to either issue a certificate of occupancy or deny the certificate of occupancy, identifying the specific deficiencies in the affidavit that do not comply with the New Hampshire Building Code or the Town's Zoning Ordinance, Site Plan Review Regulations, Subdivision Regulations or other governmental regulations. Failure of the Building Inspector to provide timely decisions in accordance with this paragraph shall constitute approval of the certificate of occupancy, which shall issue on the next business day.
 - vi. Applicants are strongly encouraged to inform the Building Inspector of the timing of any inspections to be conducted by third-parties seventy-two (72) hours in advance to allow for the Building Inspector the opportunity to inspect the structure with the third-party inspector.
- I. Fees. When third-party permit review services are used in accordance with this Section X, the permit fee shall be reduced by forty percent (40%). When third-party inspection services are used in accordance with this Section X, the permit fee shall be reduced by forty (40%). When third party permit-review and inspection services are used in accordance with this Section X, the permit fee shall be reduced by 80%.
- J. Assumption of Risk. INDIVIDUALS USING THE SERVICES OF THIRD-PARTY PERMIT REVIEW SERVICES AND/OR INSPECTIONS ACKNOWLEDGE THAT, BY USING SUCH SERVICES, THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND BUILDING WILL HAVE LESS TIME TO INDEPENDENTLY REVIEW PERMITS AND/OR PERFORM INSPECTIONS AND WILL HAVE NO INDEPENDENT DUTY OR EXPECTATION TO PERFORM ANY SUCH INDEPENDENT REVIEW OR INSPECTION FOR COMPLIANCE WITH ANY PROVISION OF THE NEW HAMPSHIRE BUILDING CODE. THE TOWN OF PETERBOROUGH IN ISSUING ANY PERMIT OR CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY AS A RESULT OF THE USE OF THIRD-PARTY REVIEW SERVICES MAKES NO REPRESENTATIONS AS THE SUITABILITY OF ANY SUCH STRUCTURE FOR USE OR OCCUPATION OR ITS COMPLIANCE WITH THE NEW HAMPSHIRE BUILDING CODE, THE SAFETY OF SUCH STRUCTURE, OR THE RISKS OF HARM TO PERSONS OR PROPERTY ARISING THEREFROM. THE USE OR OCCUPANCY OF SUCH STRUCTURES, THEREFORE, IS AT THE INDIVIDUAL'S SOLE RISK.
- K. Work performed by approved agencies are subject to audit by the Peterborough Building Inspector. In the event that violations of the State Building Code or Fire Code are observed, the Building Inspector may take all actions available to the Town, at law or equity, to address the violation. Repeated violations may result in the Building Inspector to determine that the

approved agency is not competent or sufficiently independent to render permit-review or inspection services in accordance with this policy.

- L. Audits. The Building Inspector is hereby authorized to develop a formal audit evaluation to review the performance of approved agencies. The Building Inspector may perform audits of the performance of approved agencies.
 - i. All such audits shall be conducted in accordance with Section 246:8, V of 2025 SB 188(as that bill may be codified into New Hampshire law).
 - ii. The Building Inspector may, upon clear and convincing evidence, decide that an independent provider has been negligent in providing permit-review or inspection services, suspend the approved agency from further work on that project and may suspend that independent provider from providing services in the Town of Peterborough for not more than one year. Notwithstanding any provision of this section, the Building Inspector may also file a complaint per RSA 310-A:22 for engineers, per RSA 310-A:47 for architects, or with the building code review board for ICC-certified building officials upon such determination.

These Policies and Procedures were reviewed and adopted by the Select Board on August __, 2026.