

---

## Letter for tonight's agenda

---

From Tony Esolen <aesolen@gmail.com>

Date Wed 5/14/2025 11:23 AM

To Landuse Secretary <landuse@warnernh.gov>

This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you are 100% sure that it is safe.

Dear Fellow Residents of Warner,

I am writing in firm opposition to the proposal to build 48 “workforce housing units” near the traffic circle at the west end of town. My reasons are as follows:

1. The very name, “workforce housing unit,” is deceitful. There is no requirement that the residents be employed rather than on state and federal aid, nor is there any large business or any factory in Warner or nearby where a large number of people all at once *could be employed*.
2. The \$1 million promised by the state to towns that capitulate to the pressure will be burnt up within a year, by the cost to the schools and to other services. All it would take to burn up that money would be 30 additional schoolchildren, in one school year. But the cost would continue.
3. We in Warner are already taxed to the hilt, with the 3<sup>rd</sup> highest tax rate in the state. Our budgets are bursting at the seams. We cannot afford the extra pressure. And since the presence of such a housing complex in town will make Warner *less* attractive to people who want to live in a small and rural place, real property values will drop, burdening the taxpayers twice over.
4. Building a housing complex next to a busy traffic circle is insane. You are asking for accidents.
5. Why must this proposal in one guise or another be voted down year after year? I see that the state wishes to override local zoning laws – which means that towns lose their most important and rightful authority, to determine what kinds of places they will be, with their distinct characters. The people who live in such complexes have no connection to the town, no loyalty, unlike those who are born here or those who adopt the town as their own, buying property and keeping it up themselves.
6. We have no information about what has happened to other towns in New Hampshire that have taken this bait. One or two years is not at all long enough to tell. When my family and I lived in Rhode Island, we had Section 8 apartments across the street; this was

for 21 years. Police were regular visitors to their parking lot, for drug raids and for domestic disturbances. The nearby walk along the river became off limits to my daughter, who was stalked there by one of the transients. We are not talking about poverty here, but about vices and dysfunctional behaviors and crime. The property was run-down and shabby, as inevitably happens when no one profits by its upkeep; it is cheaper all round to let things slide.

7. This proposal does absolutely *nothing* to address Warner's main issues, and its enactment will make it harder to address them, and perhaps impossible. We have a Main Street with empty business properties. We have the old school building left with restoration incomplete, so that what should be an attraction is a permanent eyesore. Our taxes are sky-high, and the next assessment – based on figures in the air, but *before* the addition of the inevitably ugly housing units – will pummel us. Warner's attraction is that it is a small town, peaceful, rural. Why on earth would we wish to import urban miseries, incoherent with the small town way of life? *Who profits by this?*

Don't take the carrot. Don't make Warner more like Concord and Manchester. Why should it be so? They have their urban attractions *and their urban problems*. Why should we lose our rural attractions at the cost of admitting urban problems?

Yours,

Anthony Esolen and family (Debra, Jessica, David)  
35 School Street

--

**Word & Song** by Anthony Esolen  
*reclaiming the good, the beautiful, and the true*