



Planning for Housing Opportunities in Sandwich, New Hampshire

**Phase Two Report: Regulatory Audit and Strategies to Address Housing Needs
December 2023**

This project was supported by an InvestNH Housing Opportunity Program (HOP) grant from the New Hampshire Housing Finance Authority to the Town of Sandwich.

Table of Contents

Introduction	2
Part One: Regulatory Audit.....	3
Table of Uses by Zoning District	4
Analysis of Impediments to Housing Development.....	5
Topic 1: Unit Density Limitations	5
Topic 2: Multiple-unit and Cluster Development.....	7
Topic 3: Lack of Clarity in Development Regulations.....	9
Topic 4: Administrative Processes	10
Part Two: Recommendations.....	11
Recommendations By Topic.....	12
Topic 1: Allowing Varied Density to Allow for Housing Choice and Variety	12
Topic 2: Multiple-Unit and Cluster Development	14
Topic 3: Lack of Clarity in Development Regulations.....	16
Topic 4: Administrative Processes	17

Introduction

The Phase Two component of Sandwich's Housing Opportunity Planning (HOP) project is a regulatory report to identify potential barriers in the Zoning Ordinance, Site Plan Review Regulations, and Subdivision Regulations to housing development, and potential recommendations to remove those barriers.

Part one of this report is a Regulatory Audit which identifies several regulatory constraints in Sandwich's land use regulations. The audit focuses on processes that hinder, discourage, delay, or add additional costs to the development of housing, particularly workforce housing. It is important to note that not all development barriers are inherently negative or require removal. Every community has a range of interests and values that compete for a limited amount of land, and towns have the complex task of balancing equally valid and important interests. Environmental regulations, infrastructure capacity, and due process cannot be removed in their entirety, and this audit does not imply that they should.

While the audit identifies barriers to housing in many forms, citing them does not mean the interests they protect are inferior to the purposes of housing creation. Accordingly, the audit should serve as a guide for Sandwich to understand the barriers that do exist, to identify barriers that can be removed, and to draw attention to barriers that constrain housing production in ways that may not have been intended. There are many housing creation barriers in Sandwich that could be removed or modified without compromising valid community planning concerns, but it is up to the Planning Board and

the community to determine which barriers should be addressed, and how to address them.

Part two of this report includes recommendations to address the barriers identified in the Regulatory Audit. This section provides a matrix of potential actions that can be taken to address the barriers identified in the Regulatory Audit. These recommendations are organized by the barrier they address, and are in the same order and format presented in the Regulatory Audit. The intent of these recommendations is to present options that Sandwich might choose to adopt in order to address some or all of the barriers that this Audit has found. In some cases, multiple ways of addressing a barrier are presented.

While this section might appear daunting, given the number of potential recommendations, making any or all of these changes can help Sandwich address its regulatory barriers to housing. Additionally, we urge the Planning Board and Town to view this document as a long-term tool. Zoning amendments are time consuming, complex, and often contentious, and should not be rushed. Instead, it would be preferable for the Town to select a small number of changes to be adopted every year, rather than try to adopt too many changes at any one time.

While no one policy change can remove all of the regulatory and non-regulatory barriers that Sandwich is facing, the adoption of recommendations can help Sandwich remove barriers to housing development, and work to address Sandwich's housing needs.

Part One: Regulatory Audit

Table of Uses by Zoning District

“Y” = Allowed by-right
 “-” = Not allowed by-right

District	Rural/ Residential	Village	Commercial	Shoreland Overlay	Skyline Overlay	Historic Overlay	Groundwater Protection Overlay
Housing Types Allowed							
Single-Family Dwelling	Y	Y	Y	Y	-	Y	N/A
Cluster Residential Development	Y	Y	Y	-	-	Y	N/A
Multiple-Unit Dwelling	Y	Y	Y	-	-	Y	N/A
Manufactured Housing	Y	Y	Y	-	-	-	N/A
Mobile Homes	Y	-	Y	-	-	-	N/A
Attached ADUs	Y	Y	Y	Y	-	Y	N/A
Detached ADUs	Y	Y	Y	-	-	Y	N/A
Dimensional Requirements							
Single-Family Minimum Lot Size	100,000 sq. ft.	43,560 sq. ft.	100,000 sq. ft.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
When slope of lot is 15% or more	260,000 sq. ft.	43,560 sq. ft.	260,000 sq. ft.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Multiple-Unit Minimum Lot Size	175,000 sq. ft.	100,000 sq. ft.	175,000 sq. ft.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
When slope of lot is 15% or more	455,000 sq. ft.	100,000 sq. ft.	455,000 sq. ft.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Minimum Frontage	160 ft.	80 ft.	160 ft.	320 ft+ 50 ft per additional unit	N/A	N/A	N/A
Maximum Height	32 ft.	32 ft.	32 ft.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Impervious Coverage	50%	50%	50%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Minimum Parking ¹	2 spots per unit	2 spots per unit	2 spots per unit	2 spots per unit	2 spots per unit	2 spots per unit	2 spots per unit
Setbacks							
Street or Road ²	75 ft	35 ft	75 ft	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Side and Back ³	50 ft	15 ft	50 ft	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Waterfront or Wetland	100 ft	75 ft	100 ft	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

1. The Zoning Ordinance Requires that each spot be no less than 200 square feet
 2. Measured from the Center Line of the Street or Road
 3. Measured from the lot line or edge of the right-of-way

Analysis of Impediments to Housing Development

Topic 1: Unit Density Limitations

Topic	Findings and Observations
Minimum Lot Sizes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the Rural/Residential and Commercial Districts, the minimum lot size is 100,000 square feet for single-family dwellings, and 175,000 square feet for multiple-unit dwellings. In the Village District, the minimum lot size is 43,560 square feet for single-family dwellings, and 100,000 square feet for multiple-unit dwellings. • As minimum lot sizes in Sandwich are measured in buildable area, lot sizes can in practice require significantly larger lots. Buildable land under Sandwich’s Zoning Ordinance is the total land area, minus all slopes of over 25%, all wetlands, and bodies of water. Given the geography of Sandwich, this means that a legal lot can be significantly larger than the stated minimums. • Large lot sizes require longer roads which serve fewer properties. This means that the costs of building and maintaining infrastructure is higher and spread among fewer taxpayers, raising the per resident cost. • Large minimum lot sizes serve to increase the prices of housing. Sale and rental costs account for both construction costs and the acquisition of land. The larger the minimum lot size, the more land which must be purchased, and the higher the price of each unit in order to support to cost of the land. • Large lot sizes also serve to reduce the future development potential, as large lots make it infill development more difficult in the future.
Limit of 5 Units per Building	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under Sandwich’s Zoning Ordinance, only 5 units may be constructed within a single building. • This requirement limits the ability to create multiple-unit development, especially workforce units. Developers are able to reduce the cost per unit in multiple-unit dwellings by distributing the costs of construction and land among more units in a building. By limiting the number of units in a building, the Zoning Ordinance limits the amount that per unit costs can be reduced. • As the Zoning Ordinance already limits the number of units that may be created on a lot through units per square foot, a limit on building size does not provide a meaningful limit on the number of units created.
Deep Setback Requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within the Rural/Residential and Commercial Districts, no dwellings regardless of type may be built within 75 feet of the center line of any road, and 50 feet from the side and rear lot lines, and the edge of any right of way. All dwellings must also be set back 100 feet from the high watermark of any lake, pond, stream, or wetland. • Sandwich has deep setbacks for dwellings and principal structures. Even though Sandwich has large lot sizes, these deep setbacks can make development more challenging. Given the number of wetlands and unbuildable slopes in Sandwich, the deep setbacks in the front, side and rear, in addition to the setbacks from wetlands and water features, limit the options that builders have to site buildings.
Limitations on Locations for Manufactured	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within the Sandwich Zoning Ordinance, Manufactured Housing and Mobile Homes are not allowed in the Historic Overlay District and Shoreland Overlay District. Mobile Homes are also excluded from the Village District.

Housing and Mobile Homes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exclusion from these areas forbids a housing type which is typically lower cost than site-built housing from a number of locations in town. The public interest served by prohibiting them is unclear.
Only One Primary Residence per Lot	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At Article III §150-10.A(2), Sandwich’s Zoning Ordinance requires that “No more than one principal dwelling unit shall be allowed on any existing or newly subdivided lot regardless of the size of the lot.” • This requirement can pose an issue for multiple-unit dwellings, condominiums, duplexes, and other forms of housing that by definition contain more than one primary dwelling unit. This can be interpreted to mean that no multiple-unit dwellings are allowed by right in the Rural/Residential and Commercial Districts, as they would require more than one primary dwelling on a lot. • Additionally, there is no definition for a Primary Dwelling in the Sandwich Zoning Ordinance. Instead it is referenced only in the definition for Primary Structure. Therefore, it is not clear if Primary Dwelling is intended to mean a residential structure, which can contain multiple individual dwellings. • This can cause confusion among both developers and the public about what is allowed in Sandwich, and could lead to the rejection of an otherwise compliant application for a multiple-unit dwelling, as it violates the requirement of only one Primary Dwelling per lot.
Exclusions and Limits on Accessory Dwelling Units	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Per Article II §150.7.A(3)(b) detached accessory dwelling units (ADUs) are not allowed in the Shoreland Overlay District, only attached ADUs. • This reduces the options for ADUs within the Town, and forces those seeking to construct an ADU to pursue an attached ADU, which frequently involves renovations to an existing structure, raising costs and limiting the number of units that are actually built. • Sandwich limits ADUs to 1,000 square feet in all cases. This can limit the opportunities and incentives for homeowners looking to construct an ADU, and the Town has received several inquiries from residents about raising this requirement to better meet their needs.

Topic 2: Multiple-unit and Cluster Development

Topic	Findings and Observations
No Distinction Between Two-Family and Larger Scale Multiple-Unit Dwellings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under Sandwich’s current Zoning Ordinance, no distinction is made between two-family dwellings, and other forms of multiple-unit housing. All forms of multiple-unit housing require the same amount of minimum land, setbacks, and other regulatory burdens placed on large scale multiple-unit dwellings of 3 or more units. • By not separating two-family dwellings from multifamily dwellings, the Zoning Ordinance discourages the creation of small-scale development that can fit with the existing housing stock of Sandwich. Since there is no difference in the land required, setbacks, buffer areas, or regulatory application process, developers have no incentive to build 2-unit developments, as they require the same amount of land acquisition and soft construction costs as a larger development, but cannot make as much profit, and must be sold for higher prices. • The lack of provision for two-family dwellings also limits the ability to convert large single-family houses into multiple units. As the minimum lot size for a single-family dwelling is nearly half the size of the minimum required for a multiple-unit dwelling, large homes that could be converted into two or three units cannot meet the required minimum lot size to accomplish this.
200-foot Buffer for Multiple-Unit Developments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under Sandwich’s Zoning, all multiple-unit developments must have a 200-foot wooded buffer from the public right-of-way. • This buffer is onerous for smaller scale multiple-unit dwellings, which could be placed on smaller lots if the Town were to amend the Zoning Ordinance to permit them. This serves to make smaller-scale developments of 2 or three units harder to build, even if the minimum lot size is reduced.
Variable Frontage for Multiple-Unit Dwellings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within the Rural/Residential, Commercial, and Village Districts the minimum frontage is at the discretion of the Planning Board. In all three districts, the Planning Board may require a larger minimum than the stated one, based upon the number of units, and layout of the lot and buildings. In the Village District, this is capped at 160 feet, however in the Rural/Residential and Commercial Districts, there is no maximum provided. • There is no guidance on how the actual minimum should be determined, either to help the Planning Board determine what is a reasonable increase based upon the project, or for the developer to understand what is expected of them. • Lack of clarity can dissuade developers from pursuing multiple-unit development, as they cannot even be sure that the land they intend to build upon is acceptable until the application is before the Planning Board. • Additionally, providing no guidance on how the minimum should be calculated, or what the cap on minimum lot size is in the Rural/Residential could allow those who wished to, to discriminate against multiple-unit housing by imposing arbitrary and unreasonable requirements upon a development, while maintaining compliance with the Zoning Ordinance.
Lack of Reduction of Setbacks and Frontage for Cluster Residential Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sandwich’s Subdivision Regulations and Zoning Ordinance allow for the reduction of the minimum lot size for Cluster Residential Developments. However, there is no provision allowing for the reduction of minimum setbacks and frontages. • This can mean that in order to allow for a significant reduction in minimum lot size, the applicant must seek variances for the minimum setbacks and frontages to accommodate the smaller lots allowed by the Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations.

<p>Lack of Guidance on Cluster Development</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sandwich’s Cluster Development Ordinance gives a large degree of leeway to the Planning Board in determining what accommodations will be accepted as part of a Cluster Development. • This lack of clarity creates uncertainty for developers, who cannot predict what minimums the Planning Board will accept until the project is before a Board. This can reduce their incentive to use the Cluster Development Ordinance, as they stand the risk of investing extensive amount of time and money into project development, consultant fees and application submission only to find the Planning Board will not accept the lot sizes they have proposed, and they must begin all over again. • Not providing clear guidance also complicates the obligations of the Planning Board, who do not have standards to help guide them in their deliberation process.
<p>Consideration of Multiple-Unit Developments as a Subdivision</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to Sandwich’s Zoning Ordinance, multiple-unit developments are considered a subdivision. As such, all multiple-unit developments are subject to both Site Plan Review and Subdivision Review. • This requirement places additional time and cost burdens on applicants by forcing them to apply for both Site Plan Review and Subdivision Review, doubling the number of fees submitted, applications prepared, and public hearings attended. These additional hurdles increase the costs of development and can serve to discourage developers from building multiple-unit developments.

Topic 3: Lack of Clarity in Development Regulations

Topic	Findings and Observations
15% Slope Requirement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sandwich’s Zoning Ordinance currently states that where a lot is comprised of slopes of more than 15%, the minimum lot size increases by 260%. However, the ordinance does not clarify what comprises a lot where the slope is more than 15%. This makes it unclear if a lot that is only comprised entirely of slopes of more than 15% is impacted by this requirement, or if that rule applies to lots where only a percentage of the land contains slopes of more than 15%. • This lack of clarity directly impacts the feasibility of projects by obscuring how much land must be acquired for a development. This makes it more difficult for developers to ensure their applications comply with Sandwich’s Ordinance. This lack of clarity also makes it harder for the Planning Board and Zoning Board of Appeals to rule on cases without guidance from the Ordinance.
Overlapping Requirements in Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Subdivision Regulations establish the minimum lot sizes, setbacks, frontages, and other development details for subdivisions, applying them to the entire town. • Establishing minimum lot sizes in the Subdivision regulations prevents subdivisions in different Districts to meet the minimum requirements of their Zone. This can create conflict and confusion now. For example, the Subdivision Regulations requires the minimum lot size for a subdivision to be “100,000 square feet.” The Village District allows minimum lot sizes to be 43,560 square feet. Thus, it is unclear if a subdivision in the Village District must comply with the minimum lot sizes allowed in the District, or if it must comply with the minimums established by the Subdivision Regulations. • This is particularly relevant because under §150- 31 of the Zoning Ordinance, a Multi-unit dwelling is considered a subdivision. As a result, it is unclear if multiple-unit dwellings are subject to the zoning of their location, or the minimums established by the Subdivision Regulations.
Lack of Design Guidelines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existing Site Plan Review Regulations and Zoning Ordinance provide very few design guidelines for multiple-unit developments and Cluster Developments in Sandwich. • The establishment of design guidelines can help towns establish a minimum quality of developments and ensure that developments fit the needs and character of the Town. • Clear design guidelines can also serve to speed the development process, by allowing developers to understand the expectations and requirements of the Planning Board before submitting their application, or seeking preliminary consultations, which are limited to high level, non-binding consultations with the Planning Board by the Site Plan Review Regulations. Thus, developers can deliver proposed plans that require fewer times before the Board, fewer revisions, and potentially fewer conditions should an approval be granted. • Establishing clear guidelines also serve the Planning and Zoning Board, as it removes some of the pressure of the current system, which leaves a range of issues up to their total discretion. Establishing guidelines gives the Planning Board direction to base their decisions on, and ensures consistency and quality of developments overtime and across iterations of the Planning and Zoning Board.

Topic 4: Administrative Processes

Topic	Findings and Observations
Performance Securities Left to the Discretion of the Planning Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both the Subdivision and Site Plan Regulations allow for the Planning Board to require a Performance Security. While the Subdivision Regulations provide specific costs to be taken into account for the amount of the Security, the Site Plan Review Regulations only state that the Security “shall be based upon an engineer’s cost estimate of the necessary improvements”. A lack of clarity in the required Security can introduce confusion about the amount due, and can prevent the developers from preparing the amount of money required in advance, which depending on the amount required can impact financial planning for the project. Additionally, the inclusion of Performance Security in both Site Plan and Subdivision Regulations does not clarify in cases where an applicant must seek both Subdivision and Site Plan Review, such as for multiple-unit developments, if two separate Securities must be paid, or if a single security may serve for both.
Inconsistent usage of terms and lack of definitions for certain terms.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Throughout the Zoning Ordinance, a number of terms are used interchangeably, or inconsistently at different passages. Terms such as dwelling and dwelling unit are used inconsistently, despite having differing definition. Additionally, there are no definitions for works such as principal dwelling, primary dwelling, and other terms that are used inconsistently, and do not have a defined meaning in the Ordinance. Inconsistency in terminology, and missing definitions can lead to confusion, misinterpretation and inconsistency in both the interpretation of the Zoning Ordinance, and in the determinations of the Planning Board and Zoning Board of Appeals. The consistent use of terms and providing definitions where necessary makes a Zoning Ordinance more understandable for the general public, residents looking to maintain or change their property, builders looking to work in Sandwich, and Boards who are responsible for the interpreting the Zoning Ordinance.
Alignment with RSA Timeline of Application Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Subdivision Regulations state that they allow for the Planning Board to seek a 90-day extension from the Board of Selectmen. However, the New Hampshire RSA has since been amended in such a way that this allowance is no longer aligned with the RSA. Under New Hampshire State Law, the RSA’s provisions supersede local regulations on this matter, and therefore the Subdivision Regulations are not in compliance with the RSA.
Uses and Regulations Regarding Manufactured Housing Parks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Zoning Ordinance provides definitions for both Manufactured Homes and Mobile Homes, and both are listed separately as uses in multiple places in the Ordinance. However, while there is a definition for Manufactured Home Parks, there are only regulations relating to Mobile Home Parks. The Zoning Ordinance defines Manufactured Home as both modular pre-built homes and mobile homes. However, New Hampshire statutes defines Manufactured Homes and Mobile Homes separately. It is unclear if the requirements for Article VIII Mobile Home Regulations §150-48 applies to both Manufactured Home Parks as well as Mobile Home Parks.

Part Two: Recommendations

Recommendations By Topic

Topic 1: Expanding Housing Choice and Variety

Topic	Potential Recommendation(s)	Reasoning
Minimum Lot Sizes	Consider reducing the minimum lot size to 85,000 square feet for single-family dwellings.	Reducing the minimum lot size by 15,000 square feet will allow Sandwich to maintain its rural feel, while allowing for slightly more dense development.
	Identify through new zoning districts or overlay districts areas of town where minimum lot sizes can be reduced to 60,000 square feet or 43,560 square feet	Varying minimum lot size would allow for the concentration of density in areas that can best support it, while allowing other areas of town to maintain their current density.
Limit of 5 Units Per Building	<p>Eliminate the 5 unit maximum and instead assign an allowed units per acre for each District. To maintain the current allowable density, this would be 1.25 units per acre in the Rural/Residential and Commercial District, and 5 units per acre in the Village District.</p> <p>This should be paired with additional design guidelines for multiple-unit dwellings, maximum impervious coverage, and other factors to help ensure that development can meet the needs and character of Sandwich.</p>	<p>Removing the units per building maximum would provide developers more options for the creation of economically feasible projects. However, by limiting the density per acre, and setting minimum lot sizes, and imposing design guidelines, the Town will still retain control over the forms of housing created.</p> <p>Lifting the 5-unit limit could also enable the construction of lower cost housing, as developers could divide the cost of construction for the building among more units, reducing each unit's individual price.</p>
Deep Setback Requirements	Reduce the minimum setbacks for development. Front setbacks should be reduced to 50 feet from the centerline of the right of way, and side and rear setbacks should be reduced to 25 feet from the property line.	Reducing minimum setbacks will allow more flexibility in building location, which is important in Sandwich, where much of the land has steep slopes and wetlands. Reducing the setbacks will make it easier for the siting of buildings in the most buildable, and potentially cost effective, areas of a site possible.
Limitations on Locations for Manufactured Housing	Allow manufactured housing in any lot where a single-family dwelling is allowed.	Expanding where manufactured housing is allowed will create more opportunities to create a lower-cost housing option. This will expand the housing types in town, and encourage lower-cost housing options.

Only One Primary Residence per Lot	The Ordinances language should be changed to state that only one single-family detached home is allowed per lot.	This alteration will ensure that multiple single-family homes are not constructed on a single lot, while removing any confusion regarding the legality of multiple-unit housing.
	The Zoning Ordinance should be amended to add a definition for Primary Dwelling.	Adding a definition for Primary Dwelling will provide more clarity than the current provisions.
Exclusions and Limits on Accessory Dwelling Units	Consider raising the maximum ADU size to 1,000 square feet, or 50 percent of the living area of the primary dwelling, not to exceed 1,500 square feet.	Raising the maximum living area for an ADU will allow homeowners more options, incentivizing more residents to build ADUs. Allowing larger ADUs can also allow for more options for those looking for rental opportunities in Sandwich, or better fit the needs of those looking to downsize.

Topic 2: Multiple-Unit and Cluster Development

Topic	Potential Recommendation(s)	Reasoning
<p>No Distinction Between Two-Family and Larger Scale Multiple-Unit Dwellings</p>	<p>The definition of multiple-unit housing should be revised to define multiple-unit housing as any structure containing 3 or more units. A separate definition for two-family dwellings should be created. The Ordinance should be amended to identify minimum lot sizes, frontages, setbacks, and Districts where two-family dwellings are allowed.</p> <p>The minimum lot size for two-family dwellings should be as close as possible to the single-family requirement, with the provision that it must meet the minimum requirements for septic systems and wells identified under New Hampshire Law.</p>	<p>Separating two-family dwellings will encourage a housing type that is already of community interest in, but is not currently supported under Sandwich's Zoning Ordinance.</p> <p>Allowing two-family dwellings separate from other forms of housing will encourage a lower-scale density increase that matches Sandwich's character, and permit a housing type that can be provided at a lower price point than single-family detached dwellings due to reduced construction costs per unit.</p> <p>Additionally, two-family dwellings can more easily support home-ownership than ADUs, as both units have independent deeds, unlike a single-family dwelling with an ADU.</p>
	<p>Consider allowing conversion of existing single-family dwellings into multiple-unit dwellings on a lot smaller than that allowed under normal circumstances under a conditional use permit. As conditions for this use, the individual units should meet a minimum size, and the applicant must demonstrate that the existing sewage and water infrastructure can support the proposed changes, or that any necessary improvements can be supported on the proposed parcel.</p>	<p>Providing for the creation of small-scale multiple-unit dwellings in some single-family homes can create additional housing types that can be sold or rented at a lower cost, without altering the physical feel of the neighborhood. Additionally, this could help support density in the village area without over taxing the septic system.</p> <p>Making such conversions under a conditional use permit will allow the town to maintain oversight over these conversions to ensure they are done safely and responsibly, while allowing property owners options to convert properties where smaller lots and older development patterns are the sole obstacle.</p>
<p>200-foot buffer for Multiple-Unit developments</p>	<p>This requirement should be removed for two-family dwellings, and the proposed conversion conditional use found above.</p>	<p>Eliminating this buffer requirement for certain developments can allow for smaller scale development, and eliminate potential obstacles to siting on complex sites.</p>

<p>Variable Frontage for Multiple-Unit Dwellings</p>	<p>A set minimum frontage for multiple-unit developments must be established. This can either take the form of a uniform frontage for all multiple-unit development, or as a simple formula based on the number of units proposed.</p>	<p>Establishing a set frontage will reduce confusion and provide improved guidance for both the Planning Board and developers. This will encourage uniformity in rulings, and help all parties understand the requirements of the Ordinance.</p>
<p>Lack of Reduction of Setbacks and Frontage for Cluster Residential Development</p>	<p>The Cluster Residential Development Ordinance should be amended to allow for reduced minimums on par with the reduction of minimum lot sizes. Within Cluster Residential Developments the setbacks and frontage could be reduced to a minimum of 45 feet from the center of the right-of-way in the front and 10 feet on the side and rear property lines, and 80 feet of frontage.</p>	<p>Allowing reduced setbacks in the Cluster Residential Development Ordinance will allow developers to more easily use the Cluster Residential Development option, and allow for smaller lots, resulting in more units and more preserved open space.</p>
<p>Consideration of Multiple-Unit Developments as a Subdivision</p>	<p>This should be removed, as there is no subdivision of land in a multiple-unit development. The Ordinance should rely upon the regulations established in the town's Site Plan Regulations and the State's Condominium Regulations.</p>	<p>This will reduce the number of applications developers must prepare, without compromising the quality of design or review.</p>
<p>Lack of Guidance on Cluster Development</p>	<p>The Town should adopt improved design standards for Cluster Residential Developments.</p>	<p>Introducing improved design standards will ensure that future developments meet the needs and character of the community, and provide improved standards for both developers and Boards.</p>

Topic 3: Lack of Clarity in Development Regulations

Topic	Potential Recommendation(s)	Reasoning
15% Slope Requirement	The 15% slope requirement should be clarified to provide when larger lots are required. As the increase is substantial, a reasonable provision could be to stipulate that the increase is required when more than 50% of the buildable land is comprised of land at a slope of between 15% and 25%.	Clarifying this requirement will ensure consistency in rulings, and help the developer understand what is being asked of them, and Boards to understand when this rule is triggered.
Overlapping Requirements in Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations	The Site Plan Review and Subdivision Regulations should be reviewed in their entirety to ensure both are serving their purposes, and are consistent both internally and between documents, and that each document can stand alone should someone be seeking just a Site Plan Review, or a Subdivision Review.	These changes will ensure that the documents are serving their purposes, remove any overlap or missing details of each document.
	The provisions for minimum lot sizes, frontages and individual site divisions should be removed from the Subdivision Regulations. This should instead be determined by the minimums established in the Zoning Ordinance.	Removing the minimums set in the Subdivision Regulations will ensure that subdivisions can match the requirements of the underlying Districts.
Lack of Design Guidelines	The Town should adopt improved design standards for Multiple-unit Development, which can more effectively control development and its quality.	Establishing strengthened design guidelines will ensure that future developments meet the needs and character of the community.

Topic 4: Administrative Processes

Topic	Potential Recommendation(s)	Reasoning
Performance Securities Left to the Discretion of the Planning Board	The amount required for a security should be provided in the Site Plan Review Regulations to match the details provided in the Subdivision Regulations.	Establishing a clear standard for securities will ensure that developers and the Planning Board understand the amount of security that must be provided, and eliminates any concerns or confusion about the amounts requested for an individual project.
Alignment with RSA Timeline of Application Review	The Subdivision Regulations should be corrected to reflect the new extension process established in the RSA 676:4.	Updating the Subdivision Regulations will ensure that the Town's practices are consistent with the State's requirements.
Uses and Regulations Regarding Manufactured Housing	Article VIII should be clarified to state if it applies for both Mobile and Manufactured Homes, or just Mobile Homes.	Clarifying what types of development are subject to these provisions will eliminate any confusion on the matter.