

**MASTER PLAN UPDATE
TOWN OF ATKINSON, NH
APRIL, 1990**

**Atkinson Planning Board
Hans Klunder Associates, Consultants**

1990 Atkinson Master Plan Update

Table of Contents

i	1990 Town Officers
iii	Letter of Transmittal
iv	Introduction

Section 1 - Town Services

Section 2 - Land Use Considerations

Section 3 - Capital Improvement Program

Section 4 - Appendix

**TOWN OF ATKINSON, NH
1990
MASTER PLAN UPDATE**

TOWN OFFICIALS

1990 Board of Selectmen

Chairman Roberte C. Morse, Jr.	Joseph DeRosa
Bergeron J. Norris	

1990 Planning Board

Chairman D. Paul DiMaggio	Jane E. Cole
V. Ch. Philip A. Busby, Jr.	Howard P. Rogers
Diedre E. Morse.	G. Douglas Pope
Alts: Rick A. Schaefer	Ex Officio: Joseph DeRosa
Ronald W. LeBlanc	Advisor: Evelyn B. Shore
A. Henry Riehl	

1990 Conservation Commission

Chairman Deborah F. Byers	Rick A. Schaefer
N. Scott Kukshel	Carole L. Hall
Chester M. Ladd	Michael F. Saviano

1990 Fire Dept. Bd. of Engineers

Chief Michael E. Murphy	First Lt. Robert LaChance
Dep. Chief Daniel Traynor	Second Lt. Earl Lincoln
Capt. John Rockwell	Third Lt. Joseph DeRosa
	EMS Capt. Fred Beckwith

1990 Recreation Commission

Chairman J. Scott Warde	Dennis Heffernan
Jean Melucci	Alt: Edward McGarrigle

1990 Police Department

Chief Philip V. Consentino	Sgt. Patrick Judge
Lt. Vincent J. Dowd	Sgt. Diane Kinney
Lt. Robert Woodbury	Cpl. William Bennett
Sgt. William McNulty	Cpl. John E. Daniels

Board of Adjustment

Chairman John W. Herlihy
V. Ch. Dudley B. Killam
Alts: Merle R. Ashford
David J. Rockwell

Charles R. LeMay
Sanford P. Carter
Richard W. Pyne

Library Trustees

Deborah F. Byers
Paula L. Polito
Sabina A. Barrett

Gloria J. Dodge
Donald L. Blaszk

Historic District Commission

Chairman Gwendolyn Grotenhuis
V. Ch. Douglas Kimball
Marilyn W. Matte
John Goodwin

George Georgian
Daniel Norris
Alts: Linda Frederickson
Donald B. Latham

TO THE CITIZENS OF ATKINSON:

Your Planning Board has adopted this update of the Master Plan for the Town of Atkinson after due public hearing. It reflects the concerns and wishes that we all have for our community now and in the future. The Master Plan itself is not a mandate; but it provides the guidelines and the basis for ordinances and standards as well as regulations that are in effect and have been amended, and will be amended, to provide for Master Plan implementation tools.

This Master Plan update should be viewed as part of a continuing process that must be reviewed over the years and modifications be made in order to reflect not only Atkinson's own desires but regional and state influences as well. This Master Plan update represents many hours of hard work and diligent labor by a large number of people and a considerable financial outlay by the Town to engage professional consulting assistance.

The Planning Board wishes to extend special thanks to the volunteers that have worked on this Master Plan, wish to thank our Town staff and members of our community who attended the public hearings and offered their constructive input into the planning process. We wish to offer our sincere thanks to each one who helped to make this Master Plan update possible and we sincerely hope that the benefits accrued will continue to make Atkinson a good place in which to live and to do business and provide for the orderly development for future generations.

Paul DiMaggio, Chairman
1990 Atkinson Planning Board

INTRODUCTION

The Master Plan attached herewith is one that updates earlier master planning efforts by the Town of Atkinson in 1981 and 1986. This Master Plan is designed not only to serve the community, but it complies with Title LXIV, Chapter 674, Sections 1-4, as amended. This comprehensive plan document has used and thus incorporates and makes part of this update the earlier Master Plan studies conducted by the Town of Atkinson. The Master Plan addresses the Town's development issues, deals with pending Town Center considerations and addresses the need for increased public safety functions.

This Master Plan is implemented and brought into reality through the adoption of ordinances and regulations that are in compliance not only with state statutory provisions but with the interpretation of this Master Plan in mind. The following Master Plan includes among other planning elements: 1. socio-economic considerations, land use, 2. changes that have taken place over the past decade, 3. proposed land use, 4. the Town's transportation system, 5. community facilities, 6. the Capital Improvement Program and Capital Budget, and the 1989 citizens' survey results.

As implementation measures, the capital improvement program and budget process, the zoning amendments and additional site plan review regulations have been submitted to Town Meeting and will be further reviewed and submitted in years to come to implement this Master Plan.

This Master Plan Update is designed to provide not only a guideline for the future of the Town of Atkinson and its ordinances and regulations but to provide for a realistic and feasible growth management process for the orderly development of the Town of Atkinson.

SECTION 1 - TOWN SERVICES

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

I-1	EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES
I-2	TOWN OFFICES
I-2	TOWN GARAGE
I-2	KIMBALL PUBLIC LIBRARY
I-3	PUBLIC SAFETY
I-3	POLICE PROTECTION
I-3	FIRE PROTECTION
I-4	EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES
I-4	SOLID WASTE
I-5	STREETS AND HIGHWAYS
I-6	PATHS AND TRAILS
I-6	ROAD CAPACITY & STANDARDS
I-7	LEVELS OF SERVICE
I-8	UTILITY CONSIDERATIONS (SEWER AND WATER)

I COMMUNITY FACILITIES:

A INTRODUCTION: In nearly ten years Atkinson has grown by almost 1000, reaching a population of approximately 5200 in 1988-89. Over that period of time the Town has made one major public capital outlay by constructing a new municipal building. Rather than restoring and rebuilding the original Grange Hall as suggested in the 1980 Master Plan, the Town, after detail investigation, found it economically unfeasible to adapt that building to the community's use. The new town building is next to the old Grange Hall on Academy Avenue. It is still part of the community's focal point with the elementary school, library, police station, all nearby on Academy Avenue.

The following section of the update reviews existing facilities and sets forth proposed standards for future community needs. These guidelines from the town, state and national sources provide a measure of adequacy for public services and facilities. A third aspect of the following section is the evaluation of today's community demands and the provision in meeting these demands.

B EDUCATION FACILITIES: The Town of Atkinson, now being part of the Timberlane Regional School District, has abrogated its local educational responsibilities to the district for grades 1-12.

The elementary facilities are still provided on the local level at the Academy though administered through the Timberlane Regional School Administration. The original building was recently added to. The old Rockwell School, which at one time served as the Unitarian Church facility, is no longer being used.

The Town's educational responsibility is met by providing funds to the Timberlane Regional School District and by paying for its proportional share based on the number of students enrolled from Atkinson.

Enrollments from Atkinson have shown a continuous decline in spite of the overall population increase for the town. Elementary enrollments in the 1988/1989 school year were 337 plus six special-ed students. Junior high enrollments were 209, and high school enrollments were 300 plus one special-ed student for a total of 853 students. Not since 1975 and 1976 has the school enrollment been that low. However, the enrollment decline has in no way shown a decline in needed appropriations by Atkinson. Quite to the contrary, average student costs have continued to rise, demanding a continual increase in the school appropriations from the Town.

C TOWN OFFICES: The recently constructed town offices were a much needed improvement. The annual payment of \$70,000 until 1996 is money well spent because the Town has made an investment in the future. The quality of the building is enhanced by a pond and landscaping around the town offices. Extra space provided in the town offices allows for future community growth.

Atkinson's town offices today house six full-time employees that, applying a standard of approximately 392 square feet per employee, would require approximately 2315 square feet. Also, making an allowance for 600 square feet for a meeting room would call for a total demand of approximately 3000 square feet of town office space. Atkinson's standard is, translated into square footage for a 5200 population, 6000 square feet of town office space.

For meeting rooms other than conferences, 15 square feet per seat is an acceptable standard. The turnout for public information meetings and selectmen meetings could run as high as 100 persons. This calls for a space demand of 1500 square feet or approximately 300 square feet per 1000 residents. In applying these standards the present town office building should be capable of serving Atkinson's population growth to approximately 10,000 residents.

D TOWN GARAGE: The Town of Atkinson is contracting for major public works projects. This leaves maintenance operations and general minor road construction to the Town road supervisor and his staff. As the demand for maintenance of the road network aside from major construction projects increases, the Town garage facility in the future may not be adequate to serve municipal needs. It is envisioned that a new Town garage facility not be located in the town center. It is thus recommended that no more major improvements at the present location be undertaken, but that a relocation of the Town garage facility be undertaken at the time a major addition or reconstruction is being considered.

E KIMBALL PUBLIC LIBRARY: The Kimball Public Library, an addition in 1974 to the Kimball House, is serving the community very well. The recent decision to convert portions of the downstairs meeting room to a library work room and library space is a further improvement. Additional library space needs should be considered as part of a continued public facilities improvement program.

In determining standards, the Planning Board used library standards measuring the adequacy of the library at required volumes-per-capita as follows: 5.0 volumes or 5000 per thousand population, 16 periodicals per 1000 population, 133 recordings per 1000 population. Kimball Public Library also provides a video collection (for which unfortunately no standards are available). In determining adequacies of the library space and future needs, the attached space needs and volume needs for standards for library planning may be utilized (see appendices).

F PUBLIC SAFETY:

1 Police Department: The Town of Atkinson now has two full-time police officers in addition to its normal "roving" police department. In measuring the adequacy of police protection the following standards should be considered by the Planning Board to be applied to its rendering adequate community services in Atkinson: sworn officers - 1.7 per 1000 population or a need of 8.5 sworn officers. As to the building space needs, the Town should provide 525 square feet per sworn officer and double that for parking and landscaping. There is a tangible deficiency in today's facilities.

2 Fire Protection: The consultant has reviewed the report submitted to the Town by Boyer Bennett and Shaw, Inc. prepared for the fire department. The key recommendations in this are adopted by the Planning Board and incorporated into the Master Plan. Essentially these include: That Atkinson is practicing an excellent building and safety inspection program based on B.O.C.A. Codes providing the safe construction practices and sprinkling practices where required. The report sets forth the need for a new and improved fire station possibly in conjunction with a public safety complex. (The Planning Board supports this as being in keeping with the standards set forth in the Master Plan.) It is also agreed that the fire department continue its active role as a first responder to emergency medical incidents. The continued operation on a volunteer basis should continue as long as the Town can supply volunteer fire protection services adequately on such a basis. This, however, requires, as the report states, that the community: "will be able to provide highly satisfactory fire protection services to the community for many years to come on a volunteer fireman basis provided that the Town continues to minimize the increase in the community fire risk potential through proper planning, inspections, code enforcement and installation of automatic sprinklers."

National Fire Protection Standards suggest one station per two-mile radius or approximately a little over 8000 acres. This indicates that in the proper access, one fire station could serve the community well and adequately with proper community planning, proper highway planning, and maintenance of densities commensurate with the ability to provide such services. Applying acceptable standards for housing three engines and one tanker, four bays at 480 square feet each or almost 2000 square feet would be needed. Additionally, one Jeep, the utility truck, and the rescue truck require an additional 1200 square feet and should be incorporated into a building need based on 240 square feet for a Jeep, 480 square feet for a rescue truck and 480 square feet for a small International 4 x 4 utility truck.

In addition, for a volunteer fire station it is recommended that meeting rooms and communications require approximately 500 square feet per thousand population. This should be incorporated in the building needs evaluation.

3 Emergency Medical Service: In order to provide this service well, additional volunteer personnel should be recruited. It is recommended that any plan for a public safety complex include the provision for first response equipment needs.

In summary of the police/fire protection services it becomes increasingly evident that the Town should consider a combined public safety complex providing for police protection, fire protection services, emergency medical services and a central communication system for the Town. It is incorporated in the Master Plan as a future public need.

G SOLID WASTE: The Town of Atkinson is providing solid waste disposal through contract with a private hauler. With the ever increasing difficulty in rendering adequate solid waste disposal, a different approach may be that Atkinson become part of a regional solid waste disposal system. To that end Atkinson should participate in a review of regional approaches to this. It appears that private hauling is serving adequately in the interim.

In addition to solid waste collection, the Town operates a "stump dump" that is accessible to the community for burnable brush up to five inches in diameter, and a white metal disposal system available through a dumpster provided by the private hauler. Unfortunately these measures are practiced on a year-to-year basis; again, long-term solutions may well lie outside the realm of the community

itself. As an increasing need arises for "stump dump" control the Town will need to adopt local regulations for stump disposal, as the State of New Hampshire appears to have abrogated this responsibility and control. The Planning Board recognizes the need for regulating disposal of stumps and excavating materials in the absence of any existing State regulations. A review of this issue is needed in collaboration with the Board of Selectmen.

II STREETS, ROADS AND HIGHWAYS CONSIDERATIONS:

A STREETS AND HIGHWAYS: Since the 1981 Master Plan, the roadway network has changed very little in the Town of Atkinson. The State has undertaken repaving of Route 121, and the Town has resurfaced sections of residential and collector roads. However in reviewing the Town's own Master Plan of 1981 the policy stated "the policy should be one of adopting road and highway standards that would retain the scenic roads, encourage the continuing maintenance of the road network, and adopt standards and specifications that are designed to meet the needs of assigned functions." Very little to attain that end has been accomplished. The Planning Board, as part of this Master Plan, designates classifications and adopts standards and specifications designed to meet the needs of the growing community. Keep in mind the overall objective of the 1981 Master Plan that states "the objective of such a goal (the goal that discourages thru traffic and calls for a design which primarily services residents of the community) is the creation of the residential community environment." This means that access should be provided to the fast and high-volume traffic areas; but that fast, high-volume traffic be discouraged within the Town. This does not mean the creation of unsafe conditions but the creation of a road and highway network that will primarily serve the residents of Atkinson.

Within the Town there are nine and a half miles of State and Class II highways. The only additional road network that has been created is through approval of subdivision roads at Town Meeting. These new roads have added, according to the New Hampshire Department of Public Works & Highways, 6.76 miles to the local roads. While little can be done by the Town on the nine and one half miles of state roads, a road classification network identifying thoroughfares, collector roads and service roads with appropriate standards is recommended in this Master Plan Update. This means that for future assessment the Town, should impact fees become a reality, identify not only road improvements, but road improvements to certain specifications set forth in the Master Plan.

The Planning Board adopts a street classification network map, the Planning Board adopts street construction specifications, and the Planning Board continues to review the road management study which sets forth priorities and both short-range and long-range costs.

B PATHS AND TRAILS: Only through the efforts of Town Forester Chet Ladd, have hiking trails been established in some of the Town holdings. However the Town has not adopted any formal path or trail network that could be available for the enjoyment of the general public as either cross-country skiing or walking and hiking paths, or jogging trails. The Planning Board adopts as part of its transportation map a trail system, and in its approval of subdivisions will make allowances for a trail and path network throughout the Town.

C ROAD CAPACITY STANDARDS: Facility standards for highways are expressed in terms of a "Level of Service" (LOS). LOS is a qualitative measure for describing operational conditions within a traffic stream and their perception by motorists and/or passengers. Data presented in Table IV - 2 indicates the characteristics of traffic flow at various levels of service. For the purposes of our analysis, a level of service in the range of low "C" to high "D" is considered an appropriate planning standard for two-lane highways similar to those in Atkinson.

PROPOSED LEVELS OF SERVICE: TWO-LANE HIGHWAYS
TOWN OF ATKINSON, NEW HAMPSHIRE

* LOS	Description	ADT
A	Maximum speeds of 60 MPH or higher. Passing demand below passing capacity. Driver delayed average of 30% of time.	2,400
B	Maximum speeds of 55 MPH or higher. Passing demand equals passing capacity. Driver delayed average of 45% of time.	4,800
C	Maximum speeds of 52 MPH or higher. Passing demand exceeds passing capacity. Driver delayed average of 60% of time. Traffic flow becomes susceptible to turning and slow-moving vehicles.	7,900
D	Maximum speeds around 50 MPH. Passing demand is high, capacity is low. Driver delayed average of 75% of time. Unstable traffic flow is approached.	13,500
E	Speeds drop below 50 MPH. Passing is virtually impossible. Driver delay exceeds 75% of the time. Frequent flow interruptions occur.	22,900

(*SOURCE: Transportation Research Board, Highway Capacity Manual: Special Report 209, Washington, D.C., 1985; pages 9-4 and 9-5.)

III UTILITY CONSIDERATIONS:

The Town of Atkinson still has no public utilities in form of sewer, water or gas. The only utilities provided are electricity, telephone, cable television and some water services under a private franchise.

It is the policy of this Master Plan that the Town of Atkinson, because of obvious lack of flow augmentation and inability of having its own treatment facility, will not entertain establishment of a public sewer system unless such a system can be established in collaboration with a closed system in conjunction with Haverhill's sanitary sewer system. The Planning Board adopts this policy in the Master Plan and discourages large major water systems without providing access to a treatment facility that enters into waterways capable of carrying adequately treated sewage. This is adopted as a policy because of the Town's dependence on individualized water supply systems and the Town's continued reliance on its ground water resources now and in the foreseeable future. This lack of sewer and water services is realized and adopted as a policy measure for land use considerations, providing for a density commensurate with continued use of individual sanitary sewer, individualized sewerage disposal facilities, and individualized water supply systems.

SECTION II

LAND USE CONSIDERATIONS

- II-1 INTRODUCTION
- II-2 LAND USE CHANGES,
1980-1990
- II-3 LAND USE DENSITIES &
THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO
IMPROVEMENTS
- II-4 INDUSTRIAL/COMMERCIAL
DEVELOPMENT
- II-5 QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES
RELATED TO LAND USE
ISSUES
- II-6 TOWN'S MASTER PLAN & ITS
RELATIONSHIP WITH RURAL
CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT
- II-6 PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT
- II-7 LAND USE PLAN 1990 UPDATE
- II-8 RECOMMENDATIONS

LAND USE CONSIDERATIONS:

INTRODUCTION: A Land Use Plan, part of a community's Master Plan, is a statutory requisite to the adoption and administration of implementation measures, be they regulatory or legislative. The Planning Board, in administering its subdivision regulations, refers to the Land Use Plan as part of its responsibility in implementing the Town's Master Plan. Statutory requisites which spell out the basis for zoning require the Land Use Plan as part of the community's Master Plan. If a zoning change is made, such a change must also be reflected in the Town's Land Use section of the Master Plan.

In 1982, the Land Use Plan was implemented through the adoption of major zoning changes. Since then several changes have been adopted into the zoning ordinance, such as land use densities and consideration of the special conditions of low or moderate-income housing and high-intensity soils mapping, none of which have been adopted into the Master Plan. The 1990 Update reflects these changes as an amendment to the Land Use Section. They are implemented through zoning amendments.

The Land Use Plan and the Master Plan guides the Planning Board's actions, not only to represent local public interest, but to meet statutory requisites as well.

I LAND USE CHANGES SINCE 1980:

Three major changes since the 1980 Master Plan have been taking place in the development of the Town of Atkinson. One is the establishment of a commercial/office/industrial complex in the northwest corner near Route 111, carrying out an earlier intent of the Town's Land Use Plan.

A second major change that has taken place is the departure from the single-family community to a community that has utilized the density approach and created multi-family, condominium, and duplex-oriented developments.

A third major change in the Town's overall scheme of development is the first step toward the establishment of a community focal point by constructing a new Town Hall in the "Town Center" area. These changes have taken place in accordance with the Town's Master Plan.

There are additional changes that have taken place that have been of some significance. One was changing approximately 1,000 acres from RR-3 to TR-2 in the Providence Hill Road section west of Geary Lane and Old Coach Road. When this change was carried out, there seemed to be little land use planning backup to support this change.

A second zoning change, mandated by court and recently expanded at Town Meeting, is in the northwest quadrant, granting Commercial-Industrial expansions.

Some minor changes were carried out through Town Meeting. What is significant here, and was the intent of the original Master Plan, is the encouragement of development in these areas that are near community services and readily available transportation networks. This has resulted in the majority (almost 70%) of the development occurring in the TR-2 district, with the remainder in the RR-2 and to a lesser degree in the RR-3 districts (i.e. Oak Ridge Development).

Atkinson has indeed implemented the Town's 1981 Land Use Plan. An unexpected high percentage of new development occurred under the "Planned Residential Development" concept. That is, approximately 200 of the 500 units built since 1980 fall under the PRD sector of development.

The 1981 Master Plan recommended a policy to provide for approximately 1,000 acres to be under Town ownership. This constitutes approximately 15% of the total land area for Atkinson. To date, public land holdings have increased to 411 acres, a considerable increase over the public ownership in 1980. As the community develops with approximately 50% of the land area suitable for developmental growth, a continued land acquisition program at the same ratio would accomplish the established goal of 1,000 acres. To that end, the Planning Board proposes to implement this Master Plan policy in its administration through subdivision regulations along with continuation of the successful matching-fund programs with state and federal resources.

II LAND USE DENSITIES AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO IMPROVEMENTS:

The Town of Atkinson has added over 1,000 dwelling units to its inventory (based on building permit records). Taking the 1989 questionnaire returns with a 2.6 per household occupancy, this equals approximately 2,600 people added to Atkinson's population. Relating this growth to the community's public investment program, the only measurable improvement that has been carried out is the replacement of the Grange Hall with a new municipal building on Academy Avenue. Significantly, at the same time elementary enrollments have decreased in growth to close Rockwell School.

The Town's highway network has seen no improvements as to its major highway program. It was indicated in the Transportation Section of this Master Plan Update that a definite highway classification system to adequately handle community growth is a must in the community's orderly development. Even though much of the East Road traffic may be through-traffic, as Bryant Woods and other developments in the southeast quadrant of Atkinson take place, East Road needs improvements. As Route 125 in Plaistow is upgraded in the vicinity of its East Road interchange, much of these developments will require highway improvements for East Road in order to maintain an acceptable level of service and maintain a safe highway network.

Overall the land use densities, and with it the intensity of development in the Town of Atkinson, are wisely planned, particularly as the community not only wishes to maintain a rural character but hesitates to increase public improvement programs beyond a reasonable tax increase. This was documented by the recent questionnaire indications to hold off on public expenditures! This response supports a Land Use Plan Policy that will continue densities and intensities of development not beyond present public improvements. As the residents indicated public improvement programs encouraging any kind of high density or intensity developments should not be part of future planning.

III INDUSTRIAL/COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT:

The Town of Atkinson has, in part through court mandate and in part through private initiative, created an area for local employment opportunities in the northwest quadrant adjacent to Route 111. This development is one that is taking place adjacent to a major traffic carrier (slated for future improvement access to Interstate 93). Even though the area is remote from municipal services providing police and fire protection, the latter is covered through a mutual aid agreement with North Salem. (Additionally, establishments located in the area are taking strides to provide for early response measures such as sprinkler systems, alarm systems, etc.)

The implementation of that element of the 1981 Plan is one that continues to have merit in that it will create local employment opportunities as a primary objective to the community's orderly development. Only secondarily will this industrial area alleviate the taxpayers' burden overall. Commercial/industrial developments are rarely of long-range benefit to local tax revenues that they are promoted to be. It is encouraging, however, to see local employment opportunities created through industrial/commercial development effort. Its being located in the northwest quadrant of the community, without burdening the Town's highway network or creating undue demands on public services, is recognized as good planning.

The Commercial Retail area of Route 121, near the Plaistow town line, is one that has only recently begun to take hold. It is an area with a bank, post office, and restaurant, that is beginning to provide a commercial area with local flavor. The area should strive to retain this

characteristic rather than trying to compete with Route 125 for commercial establishments. It is thus found that the change that is taking place is occurring on a scale that serves the community well, and public planning should encourage it to continue.

In the 1981 Master Plan, local service needs in the Town Center area were addressed. Very little has materialized in that regard. In fact, the Town still has not adopted the recommendation of the 1981 Master Plan to develop a Master Plan for the Town Center area itself. To that extent, this town service center has, with the exception of the new municipal building, remained stagnant or has experienced something of a decline through stable stagnation in that sector of Atkinson.

IV QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES RELATED TO LAND USE ISSUES:

The questionnaire-survey conducted as part of this Master Plan Update indicate that the respondents are comfortable and find the Town's present zoning measures adequate (400), too restrictive (88), or not restrictive enough (99). The second response of significance is the Town's dislike of multi-family housing, condominiums, and cluster housing. It showed that 554 favored single-family homes against 26 who are opposed.

The Land Use Plan addresses the need for housing for the elderly, the provision for starter homes and "in-law" accommodations. The Town's desire for professional medical services is highest on the list of needs. Shopping, on the other hand, was of the low priority.

The question about the need for a golf course and for private recreation facilities and their ancillaries such as club house, swimming pool, and health facilities showed a supportive response. The majority of the people have indicated the desire for such development while a tangible number of people felt that such a development need not necessarily provide professional office space nor retail store and unrelated facilities. (294 felt that such development should provide convenience outlets, and 271 responded negatively.)

The response to the questionnaire indicates that Atkinson's town planning is meeting the Town's needs and desires. To that end, the Planning Board considers the recently submitted petitions that would and could depart from land use policies supporting a predominantly residential community counter to the majority expressed needs and wishes.

V THE TOWN'S MASTER PLAN AND ITS RELATIONSHIP WITH RURAL CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT:

Presently in implementing its Master Plan of 1981, the Town is providing through its Zoning Ordinance Planned Residential Development (called in the Atkinson Ordinance RURAL CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT) a permitted use under Article VI. This measure has provided for imaginative and varied types of residential development and has afforded an opportunity for creating open spaces and retaining the rural setting of Atkinson. As such the Rural Cluster Development allows for uses ancillary to residential development including recreational uses. This means in a Rural Cluster Development opportunities are allowed as a permitted use for development.

There are changes the Board adopts as a means of carrying out measures such as the elimination of collector roads as a classification in a cluster development. All roads within a cluster development are to be "service roads." Collector roads are only those as provided for in the functional highway classification in the Master Plan. On reviewing the development in Atkinson since 1980, the density approach as an alternate solution to "standard" subdivision layouts has served the Town well over the past years.

PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT: This is a diversifying means of development not within a normal realm of the Zoning provisions unless specifically provided for. Historically, zoning was designed to prevent conflicts between residential, industrial, commercial and other essentially conflicting uses arising from incompatibility in land use.

If executed properly a PUD can, through sound planning, avoid conflicts of incompatible land uses that often lead to depreciation of property values and marginal conditions. This has often resulted in inflexibility and stereotype development. PRD and PUD's have created greater opportunity for imaginative planning and yet do so within the framework of public welfare.

A PUD allows a town to plan for an entire community within its bounds as one project. Rather than proceeding on a lot-per-lot basis with detailed and cumbersome requirements of traditional zoning, the PUD affords the creation of a new town or section of town in itself. Thus a PUD allows a mix of uses including commercial and industrial on a large tract of land. If a town chooses to provide for a PUD it must then set standards for types of uses such as how and what percentage of different uses of a developable land area could be used for respective uses.

A review of PUD cases finds that they are found in communities with large territories and in communities with public services and a transportation network capable of meeting the demands of a PUD with its diversified and greater intensity of land use. This means that for a town to allow for PUD's, it must have utilities, protective services and a highway network capable of meeting the demands of a new community. Atkinson has none of the ingredients to allow for the PUD as an alternate zoning concept. Except for Route 111 there is really no good access to a major regional highway network. All in all, Atkinson is a residential community. It has geared its development for services to meet such a demand, none of which are really capable of meeting the demands of a PUD, certainly not now and not in the foreseeable future.

Additionally, the Master Plan continues to incorporate the desire of Atkinson's residents to remain a residential community. Implementation measures should be geared to meet that demand; and a PUD creating a mix of uses generally incompatible with the residential community, other than those ancillary to it, should be discouraged. A PUD as an amendment to the Zoning Ordinances would not be in keeping with the Master Plan, its goals and objectives. And last but not least, it would exceed existing and Plan IV transportation capabilities and Town services.

The Planning Board should, however, continue to review and encourage planned residential developments as a means of affording creative residential development and all its appurtenances thereto. It is recognized that this may allow for large scale recreational opportunities with all their ancillary support facilities. This would indeed be in keeping with the responses of the recently conducted community survey and Town Meeting actions of recent years.

VI THE LAND USE PLAN 1990 UPDATE:

Taking into consideration the success of the 1981 Master Plan, the orderly development that has taken place as a result thereof, and the Town's expressed desire through the questionnaire to continue as a residential community, Land Use Plan recommendations and subsequent adoptions should reflect these desires and successes. It is therefore recommended that the Land Use Plan incorporate the following recommendations:

That the Town of Atkinson retain a residential community atmosphere. It is recommended that measures support this overriding policy through public and private development endeavors. To that end, the following Town planning policies recommendations are set forth:

- 1 Any non-residential uses, be they public or private, should meet minimum performance standards. Stringent nonresidential use activities in residential areas should be controlled by regulating home businesses and home occupations. The establishment of buffer zones between residential and nonresidential uses and the adoption of performance standards maintaining a community atmosphere that has been established by the Town and maintained through proper town planning is needed.
- 2 Adopt a policy designed to strengthen community identity and provide for measures strengthening neighborhoods. One such measure is the establishment of a Town Center policy that will create a point of community identity physically and socially. It is recommended that the new Land Use Plan reflect this community need and that Town planning address this through regulatory, legislative, and financial policies.

Continued residential growth is leading to identifiable neighborhood areas. It is recommended that the Land Use element of the Master Plan include planning for neighborhood parks and playgrounds in areas where PRD's are not making such provisions. These must become an element of proper subdivision plan approval and orderly community planning. A policy such as this should be established to create more passive and active recreation opportunities, particularly as less and less open space is "available" for the enjoyment of the residents of the community.

- 3 To reaffirm the 1981 policy that densities and intensities of development be commensurate with community services be they buildings, services, or utilities. It is recommended that the policy be implemented which relies on continued individualized water supply and sewage disposal services and that any development other than this be permitted only if it protects the integrity of groundwater on which the entire community relies.

- 4 Continue to implement a 15% of publicly-owned land policy aimed towards providing adequate community facilities and services as well as preservation of open space in the future. This would render a community of still rural and forested nature in contrast to that of excessive development at the expense of open spaces.
- 5 Provide for housing for the elderly, and at the same time, possibly address the expressed desire for in-law accommodations. The response to the questionnaire clearly indicated the desirability to provide for in-law apartments along with elderly housing in Atkinson. With home occupations and home businesses, however, it should be recognized that in order to avoid undue densities and in fact the creation of duplexes through in-law apartments, strict regulatory measures must be adopted. Land measures should tie in to kitchen facilities but also set possible age considerations as a means of providing housing for the elderly.

SECTION III

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

- III-1 INTRODUCTION
- III-2 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT NEEDS
- III-2 TOWN ADMINISTRATIVE FACILITIES
- III-2 TOWN GARAGE FACILITY
- III-3 FIRE PROTECTION
- III-3 POLICE DEPARTMENT
- III-3 PUBLIC SAFETY COMPLEX
- III-4 TOWN CENTER LAND ACQUISITION
- III-4 RECREATION
- III-5 TOWN LIBRARY
- III-6 OPEN SPACE & CONSERVATION
- III-6 STREET AND HIGHWAY PROGRAM
- III-7 POPULATION PROJECTIONS
- III-8 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM & BUDGET AS AN IMPLEMENTATION TOOL
- III-10 PROPOSED CAPITAL PROGRAM, 1990-1996
- III-11 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PRIORITY LISTINGS

I CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM:

INTRODUCTION: In New Hampshire Statutes under 674, Section 6, a municipality is authorized to prepare a Capital Improvement Program. Such a program "shall classify projects according to the urgency and need for realization and shall recommend a time sequence for their implementation."

The statutory provision outlines the manner in which the capital program shall be prepared, and in conclusion states that it may be of an advisory capacity only.

However, New Hampshire statutes also say now that in order for a community to practice growth management, to exercise measures for off-site improvement requirements and particularly for considerations of any kind of impact, the municipality must have and shall have a Capital Improvement Program in the budget. The Town of Atkinson Planning Board has adopted as part of its Master Planning efforts, a Capital Improvement Budget.

In 1985 the latest revision was conducted, then adopted in 1988. Yet, to fully exercise the meaning of a capital program a Planning Board must be duly authorized and directed to prepare a Capital Improvement Program by Town Meeting.

The following Capital Improvement/Capital Budget is prepared somewhat differently from earlier ones. This time it is prepared with an impact-fee assessment procedure in mind. Standards against which Capital needs are being assessed have been established, and these standards will in turn be applied, not only to the timing of Capital expenditures, but also to population and thus future development. This Capital Improvement Program/Capital Budget takes into consideration the socio-economic aspect as part of basic data and sets forth the program and budget and its effect on future tax rates. It is proposed to be updated annually.

The Planning Board should review the recommendations set forth in this Capital Improvement/Capital Budget which has been prepared in consultation with various Town departments, such as the Building Needs Committee, and in joint consultation with Hans Klunder Associates and Cannon Associates.

The capital program is divided into three basic parts:

- 1 Community facilities inventory and facility needs (See also Section 1).
- 2 The community's basic data consisting of socio-economic information, the community's fiscal history and
- 3 The Capital Improvement Program/Capital Budget itself.

The following is a description of capital projects anticipated for the ensuing six years and a spreadsheet depicting the fiscal history, the capital program and its relationship to increased operating expenditures, assessed evaluations and the resulting tax rates.

Several assumptions have been made in this budget. For example:

- 1 A 4% inflation rate for the next six years for capital costs, and
- 2 A continued increase in operating expenditures based on historic data, continued decline in school enrollment, future assessed valuation data based on historic trends. A 1989 cost data base is used.

II CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT NEEDS:

A TOWN ADMINISTRATIVE FACILITIES: The Town presently is operating out of a new municipal building constructed in 1986 with a debt amortization program until 1996, and with an estimated closing payment of \$72,000.00 in that year.

B THE TOWN GARAGE FACILITY: The Town Garage presently is located in the proposed Town Center complex. The Master Plan urges the Town Center to become a social and physical focal point for the community. A Town Garage is basically a service function establishment and should not be located in a Town/Civic Center. It is recommended that no further expenditures be made at the Town Garage facilities in its present location, but the Town Garage be located on the town-owned land (at its Pope Road holdings) in 1993. At that time an expenditure (with an assumed inflation rate of 4% per year) of \$171,875.00 is anticipated. The estimated 2,500-square-foot structure would make room for four bays plus ancillary facilities. At a \$60 per square foot construction cost, a total of \$150,000.00 in 1990 dollars is recommended.

C PUBLIC SAFETY:

1 Fire Protection: The Town's recently completed Fire Protection Master Plan spells out recommended action for the ensuing 20 years of which the first six years are now being incorporated. This Capital Improvement Program/Capital Budget is submitted reflecting these recommendations of the Boyer, Bennett and Shaw report without a specific and detailed evaluation by the Board. The Planning Board in its recommendations for a capital program and budget will review the fire chief's and the fire engineers' recommendations for equipment replacement. The Planning Board will continue the provision of a Capital Replacement Fund of \$60,000 a year throughout the program until 1993 with \$65,000 to be appropriated for 1994, 1995, 1996.

There will be no anticipated additional capital outlays for fire equipment replacement during this Capital Improvement Program period.

2 Police Department: The basic capital expenditures are the annual replacement of rolling stock. The Police Department operates on a cruiser replacement program with annual appropriations of \$16,000.00 to be carried out and proposed for 1990, 91, and be increased to \$17,000.00 in 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995, 1996. Capital outlays for additional full-time officers are assumed to be reimbursed from part-time replacement.

3 Public Safety Complex: Today the Police Department is operating out of, at best a small facility, and at worst a building that is ill prepared to carry out the police protection function. Coupled with this is the increased need for additional bay facilities for the Fire Department. It is thus, upon examining the public safety facilities and in consultation with the Fire Department and Police Department, that the Planning Board recommends a new Public Safety Complex. It is recommended in 1990 that \$10,000.00 be appropriated for expenditures to study and evaluate the feasibility of a Public Safety Complex under the auspices of a Public Safety Board or Committee. In 1993 the Town should initiate architectural and engineering drawings for a Public Safety Complex to be bonded for in 1996 with an estimated total construction of \$750,000 (1990 dollars) in 1996. (This cost is based on \$75 per square foot gross construction for such a new 10,000- square-foot facility.)

Recognizing the still usable fire station and the importance of the fire station, it is recommended that the public safety project be dealt with in two phases. Thus during this six year capital program \$500,000 (1990 dollars) should be expended by floating a bond issue in 1996. By 1998 an additional \$250,000.00 should be anticipated for the completion of the Public Safety Complex with the full fire station to be moved there from its present site. It is recommended that the Public Safety Complex be located as part of the Town Center design on land area near the present Town Hall, including the site of the present Public Works Garage.

D TOWN CENTER LAND ACQUISITION: The Town at the present time has an opportunity to acquire seven (7) acres in the Town Center adjacent to and behind the Town Garage and Academy building and the new Town Hall. It is recommended that in 1991, the Town appropriate an estimated \$152,500.00 for the acquisition of land to be an integral part of the Town Center Complex. It is expected that included at that time would be funding for the "Town Center Master Plan" which is urgently needed should piece-meal decisions be avoided.

E RECREATION: Recreation in Atkinson until now has been primarily a volunteer effort with a limited amount of facilities provided. Applying nationally accepted standards related to the Town of Atkinson, it is recommended that improvements be made to the Recreation facilities. In addition to the facility's program, it is recommended that the Town, especially as the Trinity Camp land acquisition materializes, staff for the Recreation Commission be increased to include a full-time summer recreation coordinator/director with an annual appropriation of \$10,000.00.

By applying nationally accepted guidelines and standards in the State of New Hampshire, we find that Atkinson is indeed lacking several facilities.

The Planning Board recommends that the Town establish an additional multi-purpose ball field for soccer and football at the Pope Road Complex. An estimated \$20,000.00 for the ball field should be set aside in 1991.

For the development of general recreation improvements such as the establishment of trails, improved parking facilities, and beginning the development of Trinity Camp property. An annual appropriation of \$7,000.00 is recommended.

In 1996, the Town should consider the establishment of an indoor multi-purpose court (basketball-volleyball) in conjunction with Trinity property improvement program at a cost of \$50,000.00 (1990 dollars) for the general enjoyment of youth in Atkinson. Such an expenditure should be duplicated for the same purpose in 1992.

In addition, it is recommended that as part of its Master Plan implementation, the Town establish a playground fund in 1991 with \$8,500.00 (1989 dollars) to be allocated for a playground/park in conjunction with the Pope Road area. It is proposed that such a playground facility will be equipped with swings, jungle gyms and benches. It should be for the enjoyment of all age groups as part of an active/passive recreation opportunity program.

Similarly, in 1993 a second playground, possibly in conjunction with Town Center improvements, could be established in the vicinity of Town Hall near Atkinson Academy.

Applying overall recreation standards for Atkinson, it is recommended in 1994 an additional tennis court be provided at the Pope Road field facilities or at Trinity Camp. It is further recommended that in 1995 at a cost of \$24,000 (1990 dollars), a playground for a neighborhood as yet to be selected be provided as part of the Master Plan implementation of improved neighborhood recreation opportunities.

It may appear that recreation and recreational opportunities are playing a heavy role in this capital program. However, it must be recognized that for a community of 5,000 population, the Town has relatively little recreation opportunity for its population. The proposals are measures that must not only provide for future needs, but be provided to meet an already existing demand.

F TOWN LIBRARY: Kimball Library today affords approximately 4,800 square feet on two floors of which 2,400 square feet are on the upper level. A recently completed study by the Library Trustees in collaboration with the State Library Officer applying national library standards (this truly is an average, and Atkinson should be considered an above average reading community) calls for 6,750 square feet now. That means we are nearly 2,000 square feet short. While the Library does have an opportunity to renovate portions of the old Kimball House initially, it is anticipated that by 1993 an appropriation

will be necessary to meet increasing library facility needs. It is therefore recommended that in 1992, \$15,000.00 be allocated for architectural and engineering studies; and in 1993, a \$100,000.00 allocation be made to allow for library expansion. This allows approximately \$72 per square foot for creating an additional 2,000 square feet which by 1993 should meet library needs. This assumes that the Kimball House would provide for some immediate library needs (See Appendices).

G OPEN SPACE AND CONSERVATION: The Town Master Plan calls for approximately 1,000 acres by the year 2010 (if that were indeed the "build-out" year for the community). Realizing that there are approximately 500 acres of public land to be acquired through dedication, subdivision approval process, outright donations, or purchases of land areas for the community, a capital reserve fund for public land acquisition should be established as well. It is recommended that the Town set up \$35,000.00 a year in 1991-1996 for disbursement by the Conservation Commission. (Hopefully with pool-matching funds with federal and state programs.)

H STREET AND HIGHWAY PROGRAM: The Town, through its Board of Selectmen, had a road study prepared in 1986. As part of this, a Capital Improvement Priority listing was submitted. Though this is now five (5) years old none of it has been carried out either on a capital or on a major maintenance basis, except for repaving of Route 121 carried out by the State. The Town is looking at approximately a \$3,000,000.00 program between now and 1996 based on the recommendations by the Planning Board's 1988 priority listings of such a program. Attached herewith is that listing. In conjunction with recommended state highway improvement programs, the Town is looking at approximately \$7,000,000.00 total expenditure over the ensuing years. This improvement program becomes particularly important as alternate sources of funding are being sought. Alternate sources include not only state matching funds, but could include off-site improvements as part of subdivision and development approvals and impact fees assessments. The Capital Improvement Program includes a local bonding program of \$1,500,000.00 in 1991 and \$1,500,000.00 in 1994. These expenditures must be carried out if the Town wishes to reduce its annual operating expenses for road maintenance and wishes to provide for continued safe and acceptable minimum standards of street networks within its bounds.

III POPULATION PROJECTIONS:

Based on the 1986 Master Plan Update the Town's growth has been at the rate of the then identified growth scenario three. This means that since 1980 the Town has added dwelling units at the rate of 53 units per year. This information is based on building permits issued from 1980 through 1989 inclusive.

A second factor taken into consideration is the per-household occupancy. In 1980 the Town had 3.0 persons per household. By 1989, based on the community survey returns, Atkinson had a household occupancy 2.6 persons per household. This decrease is not unique to Atkinson, but is one that reflects a national trend in decrease of children per household. Additionally, Atkinson has assumed a larger portion of multi-family housing occupied by single persons or two-person households.

Taking into consideration the growth from 1980 to 1990 in total number of dwelling units, and multiplying that by a per-dwelling-unit occupancy of 2.6, Atkinson's 1990 population is estimated at 5,803 persons. This is based on a growth of 537 dwelling units from 1980 to 1990.

As far as market value of housing units in Atkinson is concerned, there has been a recent stagnation in housing sales and market increases. Therefore assessed valuations as utilized in the capital program and budget projections must be reviewed annually to realistically relate projected assessed valuation and expenditures, in order to arrive at estimated tax rates and costs to homeowners on a per-thousand-dollar assessed valuation for Town budget purposes.

While there is an estimated increase in non-residential real estate, as well as commercial/industrial growth, it is projected that the largest portion of increased assessments will come from residential growth.

The Planning Board proposes to review population growth and assessed valuation figures annually, using building permit numbers and real estate sales as a basis of population growth and growth in market value.

IV CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AND BUDGET AS AN IMPLEMENTATION TOOL:

The Planning Board can measure future developments against Atkinson's ability to pay for Capital facilities necessary to support such growth. At the same time the Capital Program Budget process is a means of providing input into the Budget Committee Hearings process and Town Meetings. This creates a means of implementing the Master Plan. A Capital Improvement Program and Budget is utilized to realistically measure public expenditure needs to implement programs provided for in the Master Plan and relate them to the Town's growth, then provide for the scheduling for such improvement.

The Capital Budgeting process affords the ability to stabilize the tax rate. This is accomplished by scheduling Capital expenditures and using funding programs other than local taxes. By spacing programs and payments gradually over a period of time, a town can avoid "peaks and valleys" in the appropriations necessary, thus "stabilizing" the tax rate. It is becoming increasingly important, particularly as state and federal funding programs become less and less available to local communities, that alternate sources of funding are sought and utilized.

In having a Capital Program, Atkinson can measure proposed developments (even though in conformance with the Zoning Ordinances and Subdivision Regulations) against the Town's ability to provide means necessary to support such new developments. Prematurity can be measured against Capital resources necessary by the Town to meet service requirements of new development. It is through this process that a Planning Board may require off-site improvements in support of development rather than placing burdens of public improvements on the general public. This is especially true when the only beneficiary will be the developer who is proposing the development and those ultimately living in such development.

It is this process also that makes the Town realize that Capital expenditures necessary for new development and expansions of old ones are creating a burden on the public funding process. New developments can be assessed for their "fair share" of capital facility needs.

Impact fees assessed against new developments are measured against the community's Capital Improvement Program and Budgeting process and the town's ability to provide for services in the future. A town, by fairly determining the impact, can levy fees necessary to support Capital expenditures resulting from new building activity.

For Atkinson to provide services without unduly burdening its financial capability, the Town should use a managed growth process. State Statutes require that a community, before exercising growth management, have a Master Plan and appropriate implementing measures and a Capital Program and Budget. This must not only indicate a community's inability to meet rapid growth, but indicate how financial planning can meet needs arising from future community growth.

Once the Planning Board has adopted Capital Improvement Program and Capital Budget, Growth Management must be related to such a process. The Planning Board measures new and proposed development, determining its inappropriateness in a schedule of timing (premature and scattered), or its appropriateness in keeping with the community's ability to provide services, as well as its relationship to growing physical development.

With continued demand placed on a community by growth and with the ever increasing burden on funding, it is only reasonable that Atkinson use the Capital Program approach as a means to assure that whatever new development is proposed, it is in keeping with the orderly development of the Town.

It is through these means that the Planning Board can measure the need for off-site improvements such as open space and recreation or road and traffic safety, can assess the impact of a proposed development, and can provide for orderly development of the community and implementation of the Master Plan.

This is particularly important in Atkinson which is territorially limited and which has experienced rapid growth over the past years, requiring Capital expenditures today which must meet demands created by earlier growth as well as future expansion.

PROPOSED CAPITAL PROGRAM 1990-1996

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM*	1 FY 1990	2 FY 1991	3 FY 1992	4 FY 1993	5 FY 1994	6 FY 1995	7 FY 1996
ITEM							
Town Hall Bond (existing)	\$107,345.00	\$102,480.00	\$ 97,405.00	\$ 87,115.00	\$ 81,480.00	\$ 75,740.00	\$ 72,000.00
Tax Anticipation Note	24,000.00	24,000.00	24,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Town Garage				198,875.96			
Police Replacement Cruiser	16,640.00	17,305.60	17,997.82	18,717.74	19,466.45	20,245.10	21,054.91
Safety Bldg. Study Arch./Eng. Bond (\$500,000)		54,080.00		10,000.00			86,000.00
Land Acquisition	\$15,000.00	152,505.60					
Fire Department Capital Reserve	60,000.00	60,000.00	60,000.00	60,000.00	65,000.00	65,000.00	65,000.00
Recreation Playground Ballfield Multi-Purpose Tennis Court Skating Rink Horseshoe Pit Volleyball Improvements (incl. Trinity House)		9,193.60 20,800.00		9,943.80 16,224.00 58,492.93 2,339.72 2,339.72	16,872.96 24,333.06	10,755.21	50,000.00 9,211.52
Library Arch./Eng. Expansion	21,000.00	21,000.00	16,872.96	175,478.78			
Conservation Reserve Fund	35,000.00	35,000.00	35,000.00	35,000.00	35,000.00	35,000.00	35,000.00
Road Improvements Bond #1 Bond #2		**195,000.00	189,000.00	183,000.00	177,000.00 **195,000.00	171,000.00 189,000.00	165,000.00 183,000.00
TOTALS:	286,265.60	698,930.40	448,149.83	865,716.65	622,669.03	575,597.55	636,316.43

NOTES:

* New project based on 1990 dollars and a 4% inflation rate.

** Bond payment @ 8% for 20 years

TOWN OF ATKINSON

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PRIORITY LISTINGS

STREET	CLASSIFICATION	CONDITION RATING	RECOMMENDED IMPROVEMENT	RECOMMENDED INITIAL COST	FINAL COST	ALTERNATIVE IMPROVEMENT	INITIAL COST	FINAL COST
Island Pond Road	Collector	81	Overlay	154,900	464,700	N/A	--	(464,700)
Maple Avenue (Main to Academy)	Collector	76	Reconstruct	619,500	619,500	Overlay	247,800	743,400
North Broadway	Collector (State)	73	Reconstruct	316,800	316,800	N/A	--	(316,800)
Sawyer Avenue	Collector	78	Reconstruct	484,000	484,000	N/A	--	(484,000)
Summit Dive	Collector	86	Part. Recon.	193,600	193,600	N/A	--	(193,600)
Westside Drive	Collector	85	Part. Recon.	20,000	20,000	Part.Overlay	8,000	24,000
Brookside Terrace	Local	83	Part. Recon.	77,400	77,400	Part.Overlay	31,000	62,000
Mosher Drive	Local	64	Reconstruct	55,400	55,400	Overlay	22,200	44,400
Sleepy Hollow Road	Local	69	Reconstruct	185,000	185,000	Overlay	73,900	147,800
Stage Road	Local	81	Reconstruct	176,000	<u>176,000</u>	Overlay	70,400	<u>140,800</u>
TOTALS:					\$2,592,400			\$2,621,500

NOTE: Priority listing from Planning Board decision, 1988.

SECTION 4 - APPENDIX

A-1	SOURCE MATERIALS
A-3	SURVEY RESULTS
A-8	TOWN LAND
A-13	ROCKINGHAM COUNTY HOUSING REPORT
A-17	LIBRARY WORKSHEET FORM
A-19	IMPACT FEES REPORT
A-24	BUDGET PORTION, CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM/BUDGET, 1990-1996

SOURCE MATERIALS

- Atkinson, Town of: Building Needs Committee report on Trinity House Camp
- Building Needs Committee cost estimates for Kimball House
- Department heads capital needs survey, 1986
- Door-to-door survey comments, 1989
- Community survey, Master Plan Update, HKA, summer of 1989
- Building permits records, 1988-89
- Road specs study, 1987
- Road study, 1986
- Town Reports, 1979-1988
- Planning & Land Use Regulations, 1989
- Master Plan, 1981
- Master Plan Supplement for Housing Accomodation for Low-income Individuals and Families, by William W. Hoffman, March 1985
- Master Plan Update, 1986
- Master Plan for Fire Protection, 1989
- Analysis of Housing Market, Municipal Expenditures and Possible Future Growth Impacts for the Town of Atkinson, NH, by RKG Associates, December 18, 1986
- Zoning Ordinance, "Land Subdivision Control Regulations; Map of Atkinson, Road Specifications; Water Supply and Sewage." Planning Board, March, 1989
- Lawrence, Massachusetts: Profile. United States Department of Commerce, Social and Economic Statistics Administration. 1980 census
- Manchester, New Hampshire: Profile. Ibid.
- Nashua, New Hampshire: Profile. Ibid.

New Hampshire, State of: Library survey, 1988

N.H. Land Use Laws, Equity Publishing Co., 1989

Selected Characteristics of New Hampshire
Communities. Office of State Planning, 1988

Rockingham, County of: Water Quality Management Plan and
Environmental Impact Statement for the Southern
Rockingham 208 Project. Strafford Rockingham
Regional Council, July 1979

Timberlane Regional School District: School Enrollment
projections

Census Comparisons, 1989

Viraraghavan, T. and Warnock, R.G. "Water Technology."
Journal AWWA. January, 1968. "Groundwater Quality
Adjacent to a Septic Tank System." Ottawa, Canada

Results of the September, 1986 Planning Board Survey

SECTION I

	No Problem	Problem	Serious Problem	Don't Know
1. Shopping opportunities	228	47	20	
2. Availability of affordable housing	168	54	50	19
3. Trash removal	214	58	20	2
4. Water quality	167	75	35	13
5. Condition of streets	131	116	43	1
6. Street lighting	174	82	31	6
7. Enforcement of life and health safety codes	194	30	14	51
8. Federal and state mandates and and regulations	133	37	12	103
9. Property taxes	107	124	56	8

SECTION II

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Not Satisfied	Don't Know
1. Library	137	122	11	26
2. Protection offered by the Fire Department	165	98	5	27
3. Zoning enforcement	64	122	64	41
4. Conditions of streets	40	128	124	2
5. Availability of recreation services	68	139	61	26
6. Shopping opportunities	123	106	61	1
7. Building code enforcement	60	124	45	59
8. Performance of the Town Officials	59	141	65	25
9. Enforcement of life and health safety codes	84	111	37	55
10. Water quality	83	114	79	14
11. Street lighting	70	134	83	6
12. Trash removal	106	117	63	3
13. Home health care	30	68	20	167
14. Efforts of local police to protect you	137	127	15	13
15. Availability of low income housing	101	81	60	46
16. Property taxes	30	108	142	10
17. Opportunity for citizen participation	79	160	21	29
18. Snow removal	111	136	35	10
19. Street maintenance	50	125	113	3

SECTION III

	Very Import- ant	Import- ant	Not Import- ant	Don't Know	Very Well Achd.	Ade- quate	Poorly Ach- ieved	Don't Know
New Industry	34	56	194	7	26	50	72	108
Civic Pride	130	143	11	8	24	148	65	52
Adequate Zoning	170	109	4	7	44	149	57	36
Local Planning efforts	182	97	3	7	33	143	61	49
Programs for elderly	106	130	17	38	8	95	52	134
Adequate Town Cen- ter parking	56	157	71	3	19	137	84	36
Protection of natural resources	183	76	4	2	132	149	51	57
Protection of historic resources	125	137	26	4	28	156	33	70
Fire ponds for future development	144	110	19	17	21	95	43	129
Regulation of home businesses	128	122	32	2	20	112	79	78

SECTION IV

1. I believe Atkinson -
 - 2-- Has no zoning.
 - 54-- Has very minimum zoning.
 - 182-- Has very strong zoning.
 - 43-- Has excessively restrictive zoning.
2. I am in favor of -
 - 120- Stopping all growth wherever possible
 - 11- No growth control
 - 147- Growth control that will limit growth to about the same rate as surrounding towns.
3. I would like to see -
 - 53-A housing pattern with mostly single homes on their own one acre lot similar to the building that took place in the 1970s in Atkinson. -
 - 34-More cluster housing where condos or single family homes are close together and about half the land is left natural.
 - 185-A housing pattern with mostly single homes on their own 2 or 3 acre lots similar to the building that took place in the 1980s in Atkinson -
 - 14-Other
4. Are you proud of Atkinson?
 - 267- Yes
 - 23- No
5. Would you consider contributing your time and knowledge to making Atkinson a better place to live?
 - 249- Yes
 - 28- No
6. Realizing that Atkinson now owns about 312 acres of the town's 7,040 acres of land, should the town continue to buy land to maintain its rural character?
 - 232- Yes
 - 49- No
 - 2- Don't Know

7. Atkinson now permits mobile homes anywhere in town if they are located in a cluster on a parcel no smaller than 10 acres. State law mandates that a town shall afford reasonable opportunities for the siting of mobile homes in most, but not necessarily all residential areas.

I would like the town to:

- 62-Set aside limited areas of town where mobile homes are permitted on individual lots like houses.
- 39-Set up areas in town where mobile home parks could be built.
- 181-Make no change from present zoning regarding mobile homes.
- 2 No Mobile homes; 1 - mobile homes on 2 acre lots

8. Would you like to have a fire pond in your neighborhood?

-204- Yes -70- No

	Opposed	Neutral	Favor
1. Low Income rental housing	218	41	34
2. Efficiency apartments	168	69	48
3. Family type garden apartments	147	71	64
4. Mobile homes	199	55	32
5. "Affordable" condos (Below \$125,000)	155	70	62
6. Luxury condos (\$200,000 +)	104	77	52
7. Basic starter or retirement homes on state allowed minimum lot size if off-site water is provided (1/2 acre)	164	61	60
8. Single family moderately priced homes homes on minimum land area consistent with state regulations for water supply and sewerage control (1 acre)	111	63	112
9. Single family moderate homes on 2-or 3-acre lots	32	46	206
10. Estates or luxury type single family homes on large lots	41	79	166
11. Opportunities for all the above	138	46	14

Dear Resident:

A town under New Hampshire law may plan, and has to plan, in order to have valid ordinances and regulations pertaining to its future. The voters have authorized updating the Master Plan and this survey is an integral part of that study. In order to give you the opportunity to provide important input for amending the Atkinson Master Plan, we are asking you to complete this questionnaire. Your preferences and suggestions will be used by the Planning Board in making changes, revisions, and additions to the present Master Plan and our Ordinances.

Please complete the questionnaire which is anonymous (remove label section before returning) and return it by August 11th in order to be counted. Fold and staple (or tape) closed if returning by mail. Thank you for your assistance.

Your Atkinson Master Plan Advisory Committee
July 1989

1. How long have you lived in Atkinson?

- a. less than 2 years 70 c. 10 to 20 years 191
b. 3 to 10 years 229 d. over 20 years 123

2. Resident information, check one;

- a. own your home 584 d. unemployed 4
b. rent your home 12 e. retired 71
c. employed 171 f. other 12

3. The recent annual rate of growth in Atkinson has been about 4% ±. In the next ten years, would you like to see the population of Atkinson grow:

- a. slower 325 c. same 227
b. faster 19 d. unlimited growth 18

4. Number according to your priority the issues of greatest concern to you with the most serious being number one:

- a. lack of multi-family housing 7.52 f. lack of community buildings 6.02
b. lack of industrial/commercial 5.52 g. lack of public water system 5.57
c. lack of land use controls 4.36 h. lack of public sewer system 5.44
d. high taxes 1.39 i. lack of elderly housing 4.85
e. traffic/roads 3.39 j. starter homes 5.55

5. Number according to your priorities, the following needs in the town of Atkinson with the most important being number one:

- a. professional medical services 1.68 c. public transportation 2.76
b. private recreational 2.07 d. shopping 2.95
i.e. golf course, indoor tennis

6. Given proper planning, would you be in favor of residential development containing :

- a. golf course 385 yes 190 no
b. clubhouse/banquet facility 337 yes 221 no
c. tennis/swimming/health facility 401 yes 165 no
d. professional office space 331 yes 229 no
e. convenience store & limited retail 294 yes 271 no

7. Please check the column that describes your attitude towards new housing in Atkinson.

	FAVOR	AGAINST	NO OPINION
a. single-family homes	<u>554</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>13</u>
b. multi-family homes	<u>100</u>	<u>407</u>	<u>67</u>
c. condominiums	<u>132</u>	<u>378</u>	<u>62</u>
d. cluster housing	<u>137</u>	<u>385</u>	<u>46</u>
e. subsidized housing	<u>95</u>	<u>412</u>	<u>67</u>
f. home business in residences	<u>277</u>	<u>194</u>	<u>101</u>
g. in-law accommodations	<u>405</u>	<u>87</u>	<u>83</u>
h. starter homes	<u>295</u>	<u>160</u>	<u>115</u>
i. housing for the elderly	<u>441</u>	<u>59</u>	<u>83</u>
j. other ()	<u>9</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>7</u>

8. Rate the following municipal services and indicate if you think the town should spend more, less or the same amount of money on their provisions.

Good	Fair	Poor	No Opinion		Spend More	Spend Same	Spend Less	No Opinion
<u>429</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>17</u>	a. Police Protection	<u>146</u>	<u>378</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>18</u>
<u>425</u>	<u>93</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>27</u>	b. Fire Protection	<u>154</u>	<u>382</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>24</u>
<u>167</u>	<u>225</u>	<u>160</u>	<u>5</u>	c. Road Maintenance	<u>222</u>	<u>301</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>19</u>
<u>143</u>	<u>192</u>	<u>156</u>	<u>49</u>	d. Road Reconstruction	<u>166</u>	<u>290</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>44</u>
<u>380</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>66</u>	e. Town Library	<u>114</u>	<u>342</u>	<u>44</u>	<u>48</u>
<u>272</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>83</u>	f. Open Space/Conservation	<u>112</u>	<u>262</u>	<u>90</u>	<u>71</u>
<u>214</u>	<u>165</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>89</u>	g. Zoning Enforcement	<u>62</u>	<u>324</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>72</u>
<u>140</u>	<u>201</u>	<u>126</u>	<u>69</u>	h. Recreation	<u>174</u>	<u>258</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>47</u>
<u>233</u>	<u>169</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>104</u>	i. Historic Preservation	<u>53</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>116</u>	<u>75</u>
<u>241</u>	<u>213</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>43</u>	j. Town Government	<u>23</u>	<u>348</u>	<u>133</u>	<u>40</u>

Fill out only one (1) per household for questions 9 thru 13. (head of household)

9. Which type of the following best describes your present housing type?

a. single-family house 552 d. condominium 22
 b. two-family house 6 e. apartment 15
 c. in-law apartment 8

10. How many bedrooms does your residence have?

a. one 22 d. three 316
 b. two 95 e. four or more 175

11. How many school-aged children (ages 6-18) live in your household?

a. none 387 d. three 20
 b. one 111 e. four or more 3
 c. two 61

- 11a. How many attend Timberlane Regional School? 176

- 11b. How many attend other schools? 91

12. Please identify the current grade level of each child:

a. kindergarten 26 h. seventh grade 18
 b. first grade 29 i. eighth grade 21
 c. second grade 28 j. ninth grade 25
 d. third grade 25 k. tenth grade 34
 e. fourth grade 25 l. eleventh grade 29
 f. fifth grade 18 m. twelfth grade 25
 g. sixth grade 19

13. How many school children in your household utilize the school bus for getting to school? 167

14. The town presently owns approximately 300 acres (4%), do you feel we need more town-owned land for the following:

a. recreation 219 yes 367 no
 if yes, is a tax increase acceptable 92 yes 130 no comments:

b. conservation/town forest 276 yes 312 no
 if yes, is a tax increase acceptable 108 yes 161 no comments:

c. new or expanded town buildings and facilities 77 yes 511 no
 if yes, is a tax increase acceptable 42 yes 59 no comments:

15. Do you feel the town buildings need:

a. to be restored and maintained 307 yes 270 no
 if yes, is a tax increase acceptable 111 yes 186 no which ones:

b. to be replaced and reconstructed 64 yes 487 no
 if yes, is a tax increase acceptable 41 yes 55 no which ones:

Atkinson Town Land

Deed Date	Map/Lot-Location	Acquisition	Desig.Use	Size	Bk/Page	Plan #
	13/77-Academy Ave.		Police Station	.025A±		
	13/89-Academy Ave		Cemetery	1.5A		
	17/11-Main St	Unclear Title Terrell		1.3A		
	18/77-Sawmill Swamp	Feuer	Conservation	17.43A		
	18/78-Sawmill Swamp	Feuer	Conservation	45.74A		
	19/76-Plaistow/ Hampstead line		Conservation	2A		
	20/15 Rte #111		Conservation	1A		
	20/15-1 Rte #111		Conservation	3.4A		
	23/40-Stickney Rd		Conservation	.25A		
	3/108-Sawyer Ave		Conservation	13.98A		
	3/114-Corner No. Broadway		Town	small lot		
	7/198 Providence Hill	Arthur Sawyer	Firepond	.36A±		
	7/199-Merrill Dr		Town	5.87A		
	7/204		Well lot			
	9/27-6-Main St Washington Rd	7 1/2% Donation Summers	Conservation	3.475A		D9930
	9/34-10-Maple Washington Rd	7 1/2% Donation Summers	Conservation	5.8A		D9930
1818/12/7	13/88-Main St	Purchase David Howe	Cemetery	2.0A±	239/068 2246/1081	
1891/01/03	13/91-Main St.	Gift William Todd	Town Common	.18A±	519/365	
1907/04/13	13/31-Academy Ave.	Gift Kimball	Library Firehouse	5.8A±	622/415	
1930	4/46-Main st.	McPherson	Conservation	4.2A		
1967/03/09	13/43-Academy Ave Woodlawn Ave	Tax Sale Pentucket Bldrs.	Town	.82A±	1900/122	Nov. 1961
1969/01/07	11/4-Pope Rd Southend	Purchase Radulski	Recreation	5.0A	1948/473	

Atkinson Town Land

Deed Date	Map/Lot-Location	Acquisition	Desig.Use	Size	Bk/Page	Plan #
	12/2-Pope Rd.	Gift Lewis	Recreation	1.0A±	2236/0782	
1969/08/22 1970/04/01	13/70-Academy Ave	Grange	Town Hall	4.5A±	1981/299 2011/092	
1972/04/01	20/13-1-Lakeside Dr	Tax Sale Stickney	Recreation	3.91A	2168/408	Unrecorded
1975/03/06	10/6-East Rd Plaistow line	7 1/2% Donation Campbell	Firepond	1.21A	2234/1037	D5025 Parcel 4
1975/09/22	13/88-Academy Ave (northend)	Purchase	Cemetery	1.5A±		
1976/04/02	19/61-Off Crown Hill (southend)	Federal Funds (BOR) Noyes	Conservation Rock Shelter Forest	5.9A	2258/0461	C6060
1976/05/19	18/70-Maple Ave	7 1/2% Donation Senter	Conservation	4.2A	2274/1162	D5974-2
1976/12/23	17/26-3-Westside Dr	7 1/2% Donation Faxon		.547A	2273/0083	C6531 Lot 3
1976/12/24	19/61-Crown Hill (northend)	Gift Hutcheson	Conservation Town Forest	1.46A	2273-1956	B6691
1977/06/07	18/83-off Knightland Rd	Gift Hutcheson	Conservation	3.85A	2285/0147	
1977/08/23 1978/12/01	7/199-Merrill Dr	7 1/2% Donation Lewis	Recreation	5.87	2292/1892 2328/1771	
1977/10/27	4/11-Sawyer Ave	Purchase Sawyers	Town	20A	2298/0194	D7375
1978/04/03	19/18-East Rd	Federal Funds (BOR)/Fila-Chambers	Conservation Town Forest	23.4A (6.35 in Plaistow)	2308/0935	C7728
1978/04/07	17/29-6 end of Stonewall Ter.	7 1/2% Donation Masse		3.0A	2312/1231	D7831
1978/04/10	12/2-Pope Rd	Federal Funds (BOR) Chadwick	Conservation	28.4A	2308/0938	
1978/04/11	4/11-1-Sawyer Rd	Federal Funds (BOR) Forest Soc.	Conservation Town Forest	48.38A	2308/0940	D7375
1978/05/01	12/5-Pope Rd	Purchase Killey/Stewart	Dump Station Recreation	10A	2311/1323	D6812
1978/11/28	11/4-Pope Rd Old Coach Rd	7 1/2% Donation Lewis Bldrs	Recreation	7.502A	2327/0465	D8172
	12/2-3 Off Merrill Dr	7 1/2% Donation Lewis	Conservation	1.805A	2355/1747	B7453

Atkinson Town Land

Deed Date	Map/Lot-Location	Acquisition	Desig.Use	Size	Blk/Page	Plan #
1979/03/26	18/41-Off Newbury	Tax Delinquent	Conservation Sawmill Swamp	7A	2345/1179	02103
1979/11/09	12/8-1-Main St Pope Rd	Federal Funds (HCBS)-Slade	Conservation	11.67A	2353-0761	D8322
1979/12	20/36-Houles Grove Rd	Federal Funds (HCBS) Marshall	Conservation	35.17A	2356-0667	D8321
1980/04/02	19/17-off Crown Hill Rd	Tax Delinquent	Conservation	.21A	2361/1447	
1980/08/05	12/2-Merrill Dr	7 1/2% Donation Lewis Bldrs	Conservation	.173A	2369/0579	C9510
1980/09/11	3/19-No.Broadway Forest Rd	Federal Funds (HCBS)-Bonin	Conservation	57.87A	2371-1434	D9716
1982/08	20/35-Rte #111	Federal Funds Stickney	Conservation	24.3A		
1989	19/80-East Rd	Donation Balazik		4.07A		D19182
1989/	13/70-Academy Ave		Town Hall (northend)	1A		D19065

Town of Atkinson
Town Land

Map 3, Lot 19 - 57.87A/No. Broadway CONSERVATION LAND
Map 3, Lot 108 - 13.98A/Sawyer CONSERVATION LAND
Map 3, Lot 114 - Small lot on corner of No. Broadway (unbuildable) Town owned.

Map 4, Lot 11 - 20A/Sawyer Ave. Buildable - Town owned
Map 4, Lot 11-1 - 48.38A/Sawyer Ave. CONSERVATION LAND
Map 4, Lot 46 - 4.2A/Main St. unbuildable/ Town owned

Map 7, Lot 63 - 5.7A/Providence Hill Rd. CONSERVATION LAND
Map 7, Lot 198 - No. Broadway/Firepond lot
Map 7, Lot 199 - 5.87A/Merrill Dr. 50' frontage Town owned.
MAP 7, LOT 204 - well lot

Map 9, Lot 27-6 - 3.47A/Main & Washington St. 7 1/2% Zak land
Map 9, Lot 34-10 - 5.8A/Maple Ave. 7 1/2% Zak land

Map 10, Lot 6 - 1.21A/East Rd. Firepond

Map 11, Lot 4 - 12.5A/Pope Rd. Pope Recreation Park

Map 12, Lot 2 - 29.57A/Pope Rd. CONSERVATION LAND
Map 12, Lot 2-3 1.805A/backland Wet unbuildable Town owned
Map 12, Lot 5 - 10A/Pope Rd. Dump & Ball field
Map 12, Lot 8-1 11.67A/Main St. CONSERVATION LAND
Map 12, Lot 17 - 2.6A/backland off Pope Rd. Town owned

Map 13, Lot 18-4 - 7.53A/Bittersweet Lane Town owned wetland.
Map 13, Lot 31 - 5.8A/Academy Ave. Firehouse & Library
Map 13, Lot 43 - .82A/Academy & Woodlawn wetland Town owned
Map 13, Lot 70 - 4.5A/Academy Ave. Town Hall
Map 13, Lot 77 - .25A/Academy Ave. Police Department
Map 13, Lot 88 - 3.4A/Main St. Cemetery
Map 13, Lot 89 - 1.5A/Academy Ave. (backland) Cemetery
Map 13, Lot 91 - Academy & Main Town Square

Map 17, Lot 11 - 1.3A/Main St. Terrell land/unclear title
Map 17, Lot 26-3 - .55A/off Westside Dr. backland/ unbuildable Town owned
Map 17, Lot 29-6 - ?

Map 18, Lot 41 - 7A/backland Sawmill swamp/CONSERVATION LAND
Map 18, Lot 58 - small lot on Right of Way
Map 18, Lot 70 - 4.2A/ Maple Avenue Town owned
Map 18, Lot 77 - 17.43A/backland Sawmill swamp/CONSERVATION LAND
Map 18, Lot 78 - 45.74A/backland Sawmill swamp/CONSERVATION LAND
MAP 18, Lot 83 - 3.85A /backland 7 1/2% Brown
Map 18, Lot 88 - small lot on Right of Way

Town of Atkinson
Town Land

Map 19, Lot 17 - .21A/ backland Town owned
Map 19, Lot 18 - 6.35 & 17.05A/off East Rd. CONSERVATION LAND
Map 19, Lot 61 - 7.36A/ off Crown Hill Rd. CONSERVATION LAND
Map 19, Lot 64 - 2.4A/ off Crystal Hill Circle CONSERVATION LAND
Map 19, Lot 76 -
Map 19, Lot 80 - 4.07A/East Road (Balazik land) unbuildable Town owned

Map 20, Lot 13-1 - 3.91A/ Lakeside Drive Town owned
Map 20, Lot 15 & 15-1 - 3.4A/Rte #111 unbuildable Town owned
Map 20, Lot 35 - 24.3A on New Rte #111 Town owned
Map 20, Lot 36 - 35.17A Big Island Pond/Houles Grove Rd. CONSERVATION LAND

Map 23, Lot 40 - .25A/ Stickney Road - Town owned

Rockingham Planning Commission

121 Water Street, Exeter, N.H. 03833 (603)-778-0885

MEMO TO: Planning Board Chairman in Rockingham Planning Commission Region
FROM: Steven Bird, Assistant Director
SUBJECT: Review of Data Used in Regional Housing Needs Assessment Draft
DATE: August 25, 1989

During the 1988 Legislative session, the N.H. State Legislature passed Senate Bill 317, which added new requirements for housing sections of municipal master plans and instructed regional planning commissions to prepare a regional housing needs assessment. RSA 674:2 III now reads as follows:

"A housing section which analyzes existing housing resources and addresses current and future housing needs of residents of all levels of income of the municipality and of the region in which it is located, as identified in the regional housing needs assessment performed by the regional planning commission pursuant to RSA 36:47, II."

The legislation also amended RSA 36:47 II to read as follows:

"For the purpose of assisting municipalities in complying with RSA 674:2, III, each regional planning commission shall compile a regional housing needs assessment, which shall include an assessment of the regional need for housing for persons and families of all levels of income. The regional housing needs assessment shall be updated every 5 years and made available to all municipalities in the planning region."

During the last few months, the Rockingham Planning Commission has been preparing a Regional Housing Needs Assessment. At this point we are asking you to review for accuracy the information for your community in the two tables that are enclosed. Table H-10 contains the base data used in preparing the regional housing needs assessment. Employment, equalized property valuation and vacant developable land are used to estimate each communities' share of affordable housing.

The primary methodology used was recommended by the N.H. Office of State Planning in an effort to have the results from each regional planning agency be comparable. Simply put the method's rationale is that a community with a higher than average tax base, employment base and amount of developable land is better able to absorb affordable housing than a community with lower than average amounts. One recognized problem in preparing a housing needs assessment is the need to rely on 1980 data to estimate housing need. This problem will exist until the 1990 U.S. Census results are available.

Table H-11 contains an analysis to determine the total developable land figure used in Table H-10. The source for each column is provided to make following the methodology a little easier.

Please review the tables for accuracy and send your comments to me by September 29, 1989. I realize that some of this information may be difficult to follow, so give me a call if I can be of assistance to you. Your help in assuring that the information is as accurate as possible is greatly appreciated. Once the entire Housing Chapter has been adopted by our Commissioners, a copy will be sent to each community. We stress now, as we will when the document is released, that it should be used for general guidance only, not to determine the number of affordable housing units that should be provided in a specific community.

DATA USED FOR FAIR SHARE HOUSING APPORTIONMENT

COMMUNITY	INDIGENOUS HOUSING NEED (RENTAL UNITS)	YEAR ROUND OCCUPIED DWELLING UNITS	1987 PERSONS EMPLOYED IN TOWN	1987 EQUALIZED VALUATION	1987 POPN ESTI-MATE	HOUSING CREDITS
Columns: A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Atkinson	49	1428	386	\$316,635,735	4815	14
Brentwood	18	598	174	\$138,469,325	2301	19
Danville	19	439	93	\$97,045,010	2097	126
E. Kingston	3	362	108	\$77,277,029	1347	12
Epping	56	1181	644	\$196,897,082	4157	177
Exeter	410	4406	5898	\$652,895,988	12030	216
Fremont	17	461	265	\$108,890,450	1878	1
Greenland	33	728	894	\$202,094,765	2231	0
Hampstead	13	1319	1432	\$356,360,488	5326	67
Hampton	570	4437	4513	\$1,202,501,310	12114	91
Hmpt. Falls	11	483	483	\$160,635,645	1579	4
Kensington	2	450	117	\$98,305,171	1476	5
Kingston	90	1518	910	\$284,146,869	4969	72
New Castle	19	357	81	\$128,013,142	714	0
Newfields	10	301	1070	\$73,729,576	879	2
Newington	12	219	5128	\$507,689,815	833	11
Newton	65	1073	144	\$149,617,916	3486	2
No. Hampton	64	1255	1653	\$360,128,380	3799	101
Plaistow	95	1827	3359	\$479,855,870	6807	35
Portsmouth	1566	8582	17518	\$1,592,168,373	29014	309
Rye	156	1812	700	\$661,965,073	4954	0
Salem	666	8425	13981	\$1,650,029,821	25204	101
Sandown	12	736	166	\$178,349,858	3306	20
Seabrook	162	2523	4814	\$4,293,666,914	6818	403
So. Hampton	6	223	282	\$55,313,877	700	0
Stratham	30	844	2144	\$316,439,064	3531	3
Windham	49	1726	1445	\$625,749,502	7933	0
Total(Avg.)	4203	47713	68402	\$14,964,872,048	154298	1791

COLUMN A: Rockingham Planning Commission Region

COLUMN B: Housing Need Definition: Earning less than 80% of the median family income (for the county) and spending more than 30% of income on rent.
Source: 1980 U.S. Census(STF-3 Table 132)

COLUMN C: Source: 1980 U.S. Census

COLUMN D: Employment by place of work (Not including Governmental employees)
Source: N.H. Department of Employment Security

COLUMN E: Source: N.H. Department of Revenue Administration

COLUMN F: Source: N.H. Office of State Planning

COLUMN G: Credits include:

Mobile home building permits issued 1980 to 1987.

Structures built or rehabilitated for the provision of rent-assisted housing, 1980 to 1987.

Owner-occupied homes rehabilitated with Community Development Block Grant(CDBG) funds, 1980 to 1987.

Table H-11

25-Aug-89

HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT - ANALYSIS TO DETERMINE DEVELOPABLE LAND

ROCKINGHAM PLANNING COMMISSION

COMMUNITY	-----1982 LAND USE DATA-----								NEW HOUSING		-----POST 1982 DEVELOPMENT-----					TOTAL DEVELOPABLE ACRES
	TOTAL ACRES IN ACRES IN ACRES				UNDEVEL- 1982 DEV-		EOPABLE		UNITS 1982-1987		ACRES		TOTAL		ADJUSTED DEVELOPED ACRES	
	ACRES	AGRICUL.	FOREST	IDLE	TOTAL UN-	OPABLE	ELOPABLE	ACRES	S.F./M.H. MULTI-F.	S.F./M.H. MULTI-F.	USED FOR	USED FOR	HOUSING			
COLUMNS: A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O		
Atkinson	7490	0	3225	0	3225	1187	2038	431	0	752	0	792	985	1045		
Brentwood	11240	1070	5065	100	6235	1864	4371	127	1	233	2	235	294	4077		
Danville	7460	15	5035	0	5050	1853	3197	312	21	624	26	550	613	2384		
E. Kingston	6515	1195	3590	15	4800	1321	3479	88	0	176	0	176	220	3259		
Epping	16620	1180	9555	185	10920	3516	7404	303	103	243	26	269	337	7067		
Exeter	12345	195	5885	55	6135	2166	3959	710	161	489	55	544	681	3289		
Fremont	11175	630	7990	25	8645	2940	5705	333	13	666	10	676	846	4859		
Greenland	8560	1040	2150	75	3265	791	2474	111	135	153	93	246	307	2166		
Hampstead	8770	180	4610	0	4790	1696	3094	657	107	980	160	1140	1425	1668		
Hampton	8905	75	1580	0	1655	581	1074	740	300	340	65	409	511	563		
Hampton Falls	8190	1125	2825	40	3990	1040	2950	126	0	252	0	252	315	2635		
Kensington	7940	1140	3825	95	5060	1408	3652	129	0	192	0	192	241	3412		
Kingston	13065	85	5175	55	5315	1904	3411	317	29	562	53	635	794	2616		
New Castle	1325	0	85	0	85	31	54	7	4	6	2	8	10	43		
Newfields	5155	125	3115	0	3240	1146	2094	33	12	50	12	62	77	2017		
Newington	7660	430	1030	45	1505	379	1126	35	3	48	4	52	65	1061		
Newton	6825	285	2875	5	3165	1058	2107	130	3	239	4	243	304	1803		
No. Hampton	8795	355	3315	20	3690	1220	2470	233	2	466	4	470	588	1882		
Plaistow	7135	140	2440	60	2640	898	1742	363	441	500	101	601	752	991		
Portsmouth	10920	0	1945	30	1975	716	1259	500	613	250	141	391	488	771		
Rye	8685	65	2480	25	2570	913	1657	152	0	154	0	154	192	1465		
Salem	16990	520	3985	240	4745	1466	3279	769	411	794	206	1000	1250	2029		
Sandown	9255	500	6430	20	6950	2366	4584	449	60	618	83	701	876	3707		
Seabrook	6155	30	905	55	990	333	657	433	38	298	26	324	405	251		
So. Hampton	5140	575	2955	35	3565	1087	2478	26	0	52	0	52	65	2413		
Stratham	9955	1670	3750	95	5515	1380	4135	468	164	645	226	871	1088	3047		
Windham	17915	700	10295	45	11040	3789	7251	792	85	1364	146	1510	1887	5364		

Column A: Rockingham Planning Commission Region
 Column B: Source: Depts. of Forest Resources & Resource Economics and Community Development, UNH, 1987.
 Column C: Source: Depts. of Forest Resources & Resource Economics and Community Development, UNH, 1987.
 Column D: Source: Depts. of Forest Resources & Resource Economics and Community Development, UNH, 1987.
 Column E: Source: Depts. of Forest Resources & Resource Economics and Community Development, UNH, 1987.
 Column F: Column F = Column C + Column D + Column E
 Column G: Column G = Column F - (Column F x 36.8%)
 Countywide average of undevelopable land used until town specific soils data is available from GRANIT.
 Sources: Rockingham County Conservation District
 Undevelopable land includes poorly and very poorly drained soils and land sloped greater than 15%.
 Column H: Column H = Column F - Column G.

Column I: Building permits issued for single-family and mobile home units from 1982 to 1987.
 Source: N.H. Office of State Planning
 Column J: Building permits issued for multi-family units from 1982 to 1987.
 Source: N.H. Office of State Planning
 Column K: Column K = Column I x (Average minimum lot size per unit requirement for each community)
 Column L: Column L = Column J x (Average minimum lot size per unit requirement for each community)
 Column M: Column M = Column K + Column L
 Column N: Column N = Column M + (Column M x 25%)
 Source: Estimate of land developed in conjunction with residential development (e.g. roads and parks) and land developed for commercial/industrial uses.
 Column O: Column O = Column H - Column N.

Planning Board Determination of Correct Acreages:

B: 7,235	C: 120.5	D: 4,844.6	E: 378.8
F: 4,844.6	G: 1,995	H: 2849.6	I: 290
J: 194	K: 580	L: 388	M: 968
N: 1,210	O: 1,684.6		

Appendix C

Space Needs Worksheet

Library _____
 Person completing form _____ Date _____

Step 1. Design Population

- a. Current local population (for comparison only) _____
- b. Projected local population _____
- c. Projected nonresident population _____
- d. Design population (b + c) _____

Step 2. Collection Space

- a. Books _____ volumes ÷ 10 _____ sq. ft.
- b. Recordings _____ items ÷ 10 _____ sq. ft.
- c. Periodical display _____ titles ÷ 1.5 _____ sq. ft.
- d. Periodical storage _____ titles × 0.5 × _____ years retained _____ sq. ft.
- e. TOTAL (a + b + c + d) _____ sq. ft.

Step 3. User Seating Space

- a. _____ seats × 30 _____ sq. ft.

Step 4. Staff Work Space

- a. _____ stations × 150 (list specific stations on reverse) _____ sq. ft.

Step 5. Meeting Room Space

- a. General meeting space _____ seats × 10 _____ sq. ft.
- b. Conference room space _____ seats × 25 _____ sq. ft.
- c. Children's programming space _____ seats × 10 _____ sq. ft.
- d. TOTAL (a + b + c) _____ sq. ft.

Step 6. Special-Use Space

- a. Collection space (from 2.e.) _____ sq. ft.
- User seating space (from 3.a.) _____ sq. ft.
- Staff work space (from 4.a.) _____ sq. ft.
- Meeting room space (from 5.d.) _____ sq. ft.
- b. SUBTOTAL 1 _____ sq. ft.
- c. Multiply subtotal 1 by 0.1 _____ sq. ft.
- (Alternately, list on reverse specific types of special-use space and their representative space allocations from Appendix A and enter the total in 6.e.)

Step 7. Nonassignable Space

- a. SUBTOTAL 1 (from 6.b.) _____ sq. ft.
- b. Special-use space (from 6.c.) _____ sq. ft.
- c. SUBTOTAL 2 (a + b) _____ sq. ft.
- d. Multiply subtotal 2 by 0.25 _____ sq. ft.

Step 8. Putting It All Together

- a. Collection space (from 2.e.) _____ sq. ft.
- b. User seating space (from 3.a.) _____ sq. ft.
- c. Staff work space (from 4.a.) _____ sq. ft.
- d. Meeting room space (from 5.d.) _____ sq. ft.
- e. Special-use space (from 6.c.) _____ sq. ft.
- f. Nonassignable space (from 7.d.) _____ sq. ft.
- g. GROSS AREA NEEDED (a + b + c + d + e + f) _____ sq. ft.

Population range	Volumes per capita	Periodicals per 1,000 pop.	Recordings per 1,000 pop.*
Less than 2,000	6.0**	20.0***	118
2,000 to 3,999	6.0	20.0	150
4,000 to 7,999	5.0	16.0	133
8,000 to 14,999	3.5	12.5	116
15,000 to 24,999	3.25	11.0	121
25,000 to 49,999	3.0	8.5	111
50,000 and over	2.5	7.0	100

* The standards do not make a specific recommendation regarding audio recordings, but these are the median rates of holdings per 1,000 population reported by Wisconsin libraries in 1985.

** But not less than 6,000 volumes total.

*** But not less than 20 titles total.

- **Formula.** To calculate the recommended collection size using current standards, multiply the standard by the design population.
- **Example.** Applying these recommendations to a design population of 12,000, the Sampleville Public Library should plan for a collection of 42,000 volumes (at 3.5 volumes per capita), 150 periodical subscriptions (at 12.5 titles per 1,000 population), and roughly 1,395 recordings (at 116 per 1,000 population).

Some libraries may already meet or exceed these quantitative minimums, even when applying them to a design population. This could suggest that these libraries have no need to continue expanding their collections and should instead focus on weeding and developing present collections to optimum effectiveness. For other libraries, there may be unique local conditions suggesting that a larger collection is necessary to meet the needs of the design population, and other methods for projecting collection size may be explored.

Specifically, a library's current rate of addition to its collection can be extended through the 20-year planning time frame. This assumes that the current rate of additions will remain constant over time. The library's current rate of additions should reflect the net additions to the collection—additions minus withdrawals—and the rate should be averaged over a period of time, typically four or five years, to minimize the effect of unusually generous or restrictive years for acquisitions.

- **Formula.** To project collection growth using the net additions method, multiply the average annual net additions by 20; then add the result to the current collection size.
- **Example.** The Sampleville Public Library's collection numbers 28,000 books. Over the last five years 3,550 volumes have been added and 925 volumes withdrawn. If the average annual rate of 525 net additions continues for the next 20 years, the library will add 10,500 net volumes, to bring its total holdings to 38,500 volumes.

Calculating Collection Space

Once the size of the collection has been determined, the amount of space necessary to house that collection can be estimated.

CANNON ASSOCIATES

Planning and Development Consultants

MEMORANDUM

1990 11
DATE: January 5, 1989
TO: Hans Klunder
FROM: Niel Cannon, Consultant NK
RE: Impact Fees for Atkinson, New Hampshire

I have given some considerable thought to the problems of calculating impact fees for the Town of Atkinson. As I perceive the situation, there is an apparent conflict between our recommendations re: impact fees and the evolving position of the Planning Board on the issue.

I have taken the liberty to summarize these positions as outlined below.

CONSULTANTS' RECOMMENDATIONS

Both you and I have recommended that the Planning Board and the Board of Selectmen consider the assessment of impact fees for the following capital facilities:

- o Police and Fire (Public Safety)
- o General Government (Town Hall)
- o Town Roads

Our recommendation was based on the findings that: (1) the CIP recommends substantial capital outlays in conjunction with these facilities in the 1990 - 1995 period; and (2) a significant portion of the cost of new and/or improved facilities, or debt service associated with existing facilities (ie: Town Hall), can be attributed to the demands of new development.

The cost of calculating impact fees for these facilities would be \$7,500, which is broken down as follows:

- o Police and Fire (Public Safety): \$4,000
- o General Government (Town Hall): \$2,000
- o Town Roads: \$1,500

Based on verbal authorization received at the Planning Board meeting of October 25, 1989, I commenced the background research involved in the calculation of these fees. I have incurred \$1,500 in costs and have billed you for same.

PLANNING BOARD'S POSITION

It is my understanding that, subsequent to the above - referenced meeting, members of the Planning Board began having second thoughts about the appropriateness of impact fees for Atkinson. Consequently, all work on impact fees was suspended by me on or about November 15, 1989.

Based on information which you have provided me, my admittedly imprecise perception is that the Planning Board has the following concerns:

1. The Legal Basis of Fees. The Board is concerned that there is no legal basis for impact fees in New Hampshire. An enabling statute is pending before the Legislature and should be acted upon during the current session.

RESPONSE: There is general agreement among experts in municipal and planning law that authority currently exists to assess impact fees. Indeed, as many as 20 New Hampshire communities are currently assessing impact fees for one or more facilities, including roads, sewer and water systems, recreation facilities, public safety, etc.

The authority to levy fees is based in existing statutes (RSA 674:36 and 674:44) as well as court decisions (Land/Vest Properties, Inc. v. Town of Plainfield, 117 N.H. 817 [1977]). The purpose of the proposed impact fee statute is merely to standardize the methodology by which fees are calculated.

2. The Cost - Effectiveness of Impact Fees. There is some concern that the amount of fees collected may be negligible in comparison to the costs of administering the fee program.

RESPONSE: Until the fees are calculated, there is no precise way of determining the correct response to this concern. However, comparison to another, similar - sized community may provide some insight. Jaffrey, New Hampshire is similar to Atkinson in size (1988 Population: 5,247) and grew at an annual average rate of 2.6% - as compared to Atkinson's 2.1% - in the 1980 - 1988 period. We have just completed calculating impact fees for the Town of Jaffrey. We expect that annual fee income for similar facilities (ie: general government, town roads, public safety) will amount to \$80,000 - \$100,000.

Moreover, in the next six years, this fee income will off - set about 30% - 35% of the capital facilities costs - including debt service - identified in the CIP.

The annual cost of administering the fees is minimal. It involves: (1) calculating and collecting the fee at the time of building permit (say .5 hours/permit); (2) depositing fee revenues in separate trust or revenue accounts (say 10 - 20 hours per year); and (3) preparing an annual report of revenues/expenses (say 20 - 30 hours per year).

The long - term cost involves updating and monitoring the CIP in order to: (1) account for fee revenues; and (2) assuring that revenues are expended in such a manner as to provide benefit to the fee - payer. Total annual time required for these activities would probably involve 40 - 60 hours.

We have developed mechanisms and reporting procedures to account for and track impact fee revenues and currently assist several communities in this regard. By way of quantifying costs, CANNON ASSOCIATES would be willing to provide all administrative services, including an annual update and monitoring of the CIP, for an annual retainer in the amount of \$5,000. It should also be noted that many communities utilize a portion of interest income from impact fee accounts to pay for administration.

3. Appropriateness of Town Road Fee. There is some concern that adoption of a road impact fee ordinance would limit the authority of the Planning Board to require developers to make specific off - site improvements.

RESPONSE: The purpose of the road impact fee is to off - set the town - wide impact of additional vehicle trips generated by new development. Pursuant to subdivision and site plan review regulations, the Planning Board currently retains authority to require specific off - site and site - adjacent improvements.

Most impact fee ordinances address this problem by allowing a waiver of the town road impact fee in instances where the amount of specific off - site road improvements required by the Planning Board exceeds the cost of the impact fee.

Since: (1) this potential situation would exist only in rare instances in the case of Atkinson; and (2) the CIP has identified \$3,000,000 in needed road reconstruction projects, I still believe that road impact fees would be most appropriate for the Town of Atkinson.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As I see it, there are three options for the Planning Board and Board of Selectmen. These are summarized below.

1. Proceed with our recommendations. I still support this option, especially since I believe that:

- o Upon completion of the work, the fee calculation and assessment methodology will be in place, even if the Town elects to defray adoption of fee schedules until enabling legislation is enacted.

- o The cost of administration is insignificant;

- o As indicated by responses to the community survey, the concept is well - received in Town; and

- o If the CIP is to be taken seriously, alternative financing sources must be explored.

As indicated above, the cost of implementing this option is \$7,500.

2. Conduct further investigations. Although I believe that I have adequately addressed the concerns of the Planning Board, there is no doubt that these concerns are legitimate. Therefore, if the Planning Board does not elect Option 1, above, I would propose that CANNON ASSOCIATES conduct a study to determine the "impact of impact fees" in Atkinson.

Although our approach to this study would not result in precise fees which are calculated pursuant to the proportionate share methodology embodied in the rational nexus doctrine, we could estimate "pro - forma" fee revenues based on local facility standards and costs, as well as

actual fees charged in other communities. Therefore, we could also estimate fee income based on three growth scenarios (ie: slow, continuation of twenty year trend line, high). Our data could then be used to project:

- o The amount of fee revenue which will be available to off - set the costs of identified CIP projects over a ten year period; and

- o The likely future property tax burden with and without impact fees.

In addition to estimating fee revenues for public safety, general government, and Town roads, I would suggest that pro - forma fees for schools be included in this analysis.

The cost of this study would be \$3,500. Furthermore, implementation of this option would reduce the additional cost of precise fee calculations at a later date.

3. Do nothing. In the event that the Planning Board and Board of Selectmen believe that the Town lacks the resources and commitment to begin implementation of the CIP, and to collect and administer an impact fee program in support of the CIP, this is an option which must be seriously considered.

**BUDGET PORTION OF THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM/BUDGET
1990 - 1996**

The enclosed is historic data, the basis for operating and capital budget projections which are also part of the spread sheet. It is the Planning Board's responsibility to see to its annual updating by incorporating Town Meeting action. To retain the six-year budget program, one year from the historic data base should be deleted, while a new year be added in the projection section of the CIP/B.

The Capital Improvement portion of the Capital Improvement Program/Budget is contained in the main text. Because of uncertainties resulting from Town Meeting action, protections are not contained on this spreadsheet. Thus, Capital Improvement items must be incorporated into tax rate computations for the respective years subsequent to Town capital appropriations.

The budget spreadsheet
referenced above has not been
scanned - August 25, 2022