

1 **LONDONDERRY, NH PLANNING BOARD**
2 **MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF FEBRUARY 9, 2011 AT THE MOOSE HILL**
3 **COUNCIL CHAMBERS**
4

5 Members Present: Art Rugg; Charles Tilgner, P.E.; Lynn Wiles; Laura El-Azem;
6 Rick Brideau, CNHA, Ex-Officio; George Herrmann, Ex-Officio; Dana Coons,
7 alternate member; Leitha Reilly, alternate member
8

9 Also Present: Tim Thompson, AICP; John Trottier, P.E.; Libby Canuel, Community
10 Development Secretary
11

12 A. Rugg called the meeting to order at 7 PM. and appointed D. Coons to vote for
13 C. Davies and L. Reilly to vote for M. Soares. He also introduced L. Canuel who
14 will now be attending Planning Board meetings. T. Thompson explained that both
15 she and Jaye Trottier will be coordinating secretarial duties for the Board.
16

17 **Administrative Board Work**
18

19 A. Plans to Sign – Home Depot Amended Site Plan
20

21 J. Trottier said all precedent conditions for approval have been met and the
22 staff recommends signing the plans.
23

24 **D. Coons made a motion to authorize the Chair and Secretary to sign**
25 **the plans. R. Brideau seconded the motion.** No discussion. **Vote on**
26 **the motion: 8-0-0.** A. Rugg said the plans will be signed at the conclusion
27 of the meeting.
28

29 B. Plans to Sign – Stonyfield Expansion Site Plan
30

31 J. Trottier said all precedent conditions for approval have been met and the
32 staff recommends signing the plans for Phase I.
33

34 **D. Coons made a motion to authorize the Chair and Secretary to sign**
35 **the plans for Phase I. R. Brideau seconded the motion.** No
36 discussion. **Vote on the motion: 8-0-0.** A. Rugg said the plans will be
37 signed at the conclusion of the meeting.
38

39
40 C. Extension Request - Vineyards at Hillside Elderly Housing Site Plan and
41 Subdivision - Request 1 year extension of final approval
42

43 T. Thompson referenced the letter dated February 9, 2011 from Michael
44 Lehrman, General Manager of Hillside Senior Housing, LLC, requesting an
45 additional one year extension of the final approvals of the site plan and
46 subdivision plan. The reason given for the extension, as written in the
47 letter, was that due to the current state of the real estate financing market,
48 the builder has been precluded from obtaining construction financing for
49 this project at this time. T. Thompson stated that if granted, the expiration

1 date would be extended to March 7, 2012. This would be their third
2 extension. He said that staff is supportive of the request, as there have
3 been no changes to ordinances or regulations impacting the project.
4

5 **D. Coons made a motion to grant a one year extension to March 7,**
6 **2012. R. Brideau seconded the motion.** No discussion. **Vote on the**
7 **motion: 8-0-0.** Extension for one year was granted.
8

9 D. Regional Impact Determinations

10
11 T. Thompson stated that Londonderry Freezer Warehouse is proposing a Site
12 Plan for an 82,000 square foot warehouse/office expansion on Map 15, Lot
13 124 & 22. He said that staff recommends that this project is not a
14 development of regional impact, as it does not meet any of the regional
15 impact guidelines suggested by Southern NH Planning Commission
16 (SNHPC).
17

18 **D. Coons made a motion to accept staff recommendations that this**
19 **project is determined not to be of regional impact under RSA 36:56.**
20 **R. Brideau seconded the motion.** No discussion. **Vote on the motion:**
21 **8-0-0.**
22

23 E. 1 Commercial Lane - Limited Car Sales

24
25 T. Thompson referred to a letter from Jeff Viens of Jeff's Lex-Toy, LLC which
26 is currently a tenant at 1 Commercial Lane. They originally approached the
27 Building Division seeking a dealer license to sell a limit of three vehicles via
28 internet and/or phone, meaning no customers would visit the property. The
29 Building Inspector directed the owner to the Planning Board for a change in
30 use of the C-II property, since the current tenant is an auto repair business.
31 The question from the Building Division is whether the Board would allow
32 this to be dealt with administratively by staff or if a public hearing for a site
33 plan is in order. T. Thompson reviewed aerial photography of the site,
34 showing the vegetated buffer along Rockingham Road and what should be
35 sufficient parking. No changes will be made to site other than reservation
36 of three parking spaces for this specific business. The owner has indicated
37 he will strictly enforce the limitation of three vehicles on the property for
38 sale at one time. L. El-Azem stated that she is familiar with that site and
39 that it is set back far enough from the street that having cars for sale on
40 the site should not pose an issue. A. Rugg added that the proposed use
41 would not intensify the commercial use of the property. The consensus of
42 the Board was to direct staff to handle the matter administratively.
43

44 F. Approval & Signing of Minutes – January 26, 2011

45
46 **L. Wiles made a motion to approve and sign the minutes from the**
47 **January 26, 2011 meeting. C. Tilgner seconded the motion.** No
48 discussion. **Vote on the motion: 6-0-2.** (D. Coons and L. El-Azem
49 abstained since they were not present at the January 26 meeting)
50

1 Minutes for January 26, 2011 were approved and signed at the conclusion
2 of the meeting.

3
4 G. Discussions with Town Staff

5
6 T. Thompson stated that at their February 7 meeting, the Town Council held
7 the first reading for the rezoning from C-II/POD to I-I of the Londonderry
8 Freezer Warehouse on Map 15, Lots 124 & 22. The public hearing has been
9 scheduled for March 7. A site plan has also been submitted and review has
10 begun for an 82,000 square foot warehouse/office expansion. The hope is
11 to expedite the rezoning and advance the project as quickly as possible.

12
13 **New Plans**

14
15 A. Forty Buttrick Road LLC (Elliot Medical Offices), Map 6, Lot 73 – Public
16 Hearing for a waiver to Section 6.01.c of the Site Plan Regulations to allow
17 for certificate of occupancy prior to completion of wearing course of
18 pavement.

19
20 T. Thompson stated that this project was originally approved by the Board
21 in three phases in 2006. Phases I and II have been completed. Phase III is
22 complete with the exception of the wearing course of pavement, resulting in
23 the applicant requesting this waiver so the certificate of occupancy can be
24 issued this week. He noted that the same waiver was granted in Phase I of
25 the project. The applicant has posted a financial guarantee to ensure that
26 the paving is completed per the site plan once weather allows. Since the
27 adoption of the regulation that all improvements be completed before
28 issuance of the certificate of occupancy, only four such requests have been
29 made over the past nine years. T. Thompson stressed the overall
30 importance of the regulation because it has nearly eliminated incomplete
31 site improvements and greatly decreased the need for enforcement, but
32 said the specifics of this particular case lead staff to recommend granting of
33 the waiver. L. Wiles asked if the parking lot will be striped in the meantime
34 for the sake of public safety. J. Trottier replied that if the waiver is granted,
35 staff will work with the applicant to ensure temporary striping is done when
36 the area is free of snow.

37
38 A. Rugg asked for comments from the public. There were none.

39
40 **D. Coons made a motion to grant the waiver to Section 6.0.1 based**
41 **on the applicant's letter of January 14, 2011 and staff**
42 **recommendation. R. Brideau seconded the motion.** No discussion.
43 **Vote on the motion: 8-0-0.** Waiver granted.

44
45
46 B. RHP Investments LLC, Map 6, Lot 33A – **Design Review Meeting** for a Site
47 Plan for a change of use (former fire station to office/storage use).

48
49 T. Thompson explained that this Site Plan was originally submitted as a
50 formal application but was withdrawn to Design Review with a request from

1 the applicant to discuss the process with the Board. On February 9, he
2 received an email from Elmer Pease, property manager for the project,
3 requesting a continuance to March 2, 2011.
4

5 **D. Coons made a motion to continue the Design Review Meeting to**
6 **March 2, 2011. R. Brideau seconded the motion.** No discussion. **Vote**
7 **on the motion: 8-0-0.** Hearing is continued to March 2, 2011 at 7 PM. A.
8 Rugg said this will be the only public notice.
9

10
11
12 **IV. Public Hearing/Workshops/Conceptual Discussions**
13

14 A. Growth Management Ordinance – Determination of Growth Sustainability
15 Public Hearing
16

17 A. Rugg explained that this determination is made annually prior to March
18 1st as required by the ordinance and is designed to limit building permits in
19 order to control growth in town. T. Thompson gave a brief presentation of
20 the findings that must be made in order to make a determination of
21 unsustainable growth (see attachment #1). Because two of the three
22 criteria of the 2002 GMO and three of three criteria of the 1998 GMO have
23 not been met, staff recommends the Board make a determination that
24 Londonderry is in a period of sustainable growth and there be no cap on the
25 number of building permits issued in 2011.
26

27 L. Wiles stated that if construction in town increases, particularly with the
28 development of Woodmont Commons, the Board might want to revisit the
29 ordinance. T. Thompson replied that instead of reexamining an ordinance
30 that has that has worked successfully without challenge, it would instead be
31 prudent to structure the PUD Master Plan in a way that would limit phasing
32 of that project. L. Wiles expressed concern that if a period of unsustainable
33 growth arises along with the development of Woodmont Commons, other
34 home builders would be precluded from obtaining permits. T. Thompson
35 said if there are more requests for permits than what is available, those for
36 Woodmont would be in the same pool as others going through the scoring
37 system. A. Rugg added that in addition to the GMO, the ordinance limits
38 phasing while T. Thompson noted there is also an automatic stay if housing
39 stock increases over 2% from the previous year. D. Coons asked about the
40 additional impact of the impending conservation subdivision on Map 16, Lot
41 38. T. Thompson said that project will be limited to 25 permits per year
42 based on the phasing ordinance.
43

44 A. Rugg asked for public input. There was none.
45

46 L. Reilly asked how many building permits have been approved to date in
47 2011. T. Thompson said he did not have that information, but by the
48 process of the Building Department providing data to the census bureau,
49 monthly totals are generally available by the end of the following month.
50 John Laferriere, 331 Mammoth Road, upcoming Town Manager Appointee

1 from the School Board, asked what amount would be in excess of 2%
2 compared to last year. T. Thompson estimated that number would be
3 approximately 180-190 permits based on the end of 2010 housing stock
4 being 8,535 units. He added that the last time the housing stock increased
5 over 2% was in 2004 when it grew by 2.15%.

6
7 **D. Coons made a motion to determine that the Town of Londonderry**
8 **is not in a period of unsustainable growth based on the**
9 **memorandum from the Town Planner dated February 9, 2011. R.**
10 **Brideau seconded the motion. No discussion. Vote on the motion: 8-**
11 **0-0.**

- 12
13
14 B. Beal Revocable Trust/Omnipoint Communications, Map 12, Lot 34 –
15 Continued Application Acceptance and Public Hearing from December 2010
16 for a site plan and conditional use permit to construct a 146' wireless
17 communication facility and associated accessory equipment and structures.

18
19 T. Thompson referenced the letter from Steven Grill, Attorney from Divine
20 Millimet, requesting a continuance to March 9, 2011 while the applicant
21 continues to resolve outstanding engineering comments in an attempt to
22 meet the deadline submission of February 17.

23
24 **D. Coons made a motion to continue the public hearing to March 9,**
25 **2011 at 7 PM. R. Brideau seconded the motion. No discussion. Vote**
26 **on the motion: 8-0-0.** Hearing is continued to March 9, 2011 at 7PM. A.
27 Rugg said this will be the only public notice.

- 28
29 C. Workshop – Woodmont Commons PUD Master Plan Discussion –

30
31 This discussion was postponed to March 9.

- 32
33 D. Conceptual Discussion – Possible McDonalds Restaurant, MUC Sub-district,
34 conditional use permit requirements (Map 15, Lot 60-2)

35
36 A. Rugg began by explaining the applicants of this proposal had been before
37 the Board in December, were provided with some direction, and have
38 returned to continue those discussions.

39
40 T. Thompson said that staff met with Frank Monteiro of MFH Design
41 Consultants and representatives of McDonalds in January to discuss their
42 last appearance before the Board. Staff had expressed their concern at the
43 December hearing for the inadequate attention to the criteria of the
44 Conditional Use Permit (CUP), particularly with regard to pedestrian access.
45 Since that time, they have developed a plan that stated he believes
46 addresses the CUP criteria.

47
48 Attorney Bernard Campbell of Beaumont & Campbell Prof. Association,
49 Salem, NH, was joined by F. Monteiro of MFH Design Consultants to review
50 the updated plan with the Board. B. Campbell addressed the four criteria

1 that must be met to grant a Conditional Use Permit for a fast food
2 restaurant in the MUC sub-district. Regarding the first, he said the
3 proposed use is consistent with the general vision statements and
4 recommendations from the Londonderry Northwest Small Area Master Plan
5 or the most recently adopted Town Master Plan. Criteria two requires that
6 granting the application is in the public interest. Criteria three necessitates
7 that the property is reasonably suited for the use requested. B. Campbell
8 reasoned that McDonalds would be suited to a mixed use area like the one
9 around Exit 5, especially with upwards of 10,000 visitors per month using
10 the NH DOT transportation center across the street and the expectation of
11 further growth in the area. Providing pedestrian access facilities for the site
12 would also benefit the public overall. The final criterion is that the design of
13 the site represent the extent practicable a minimization of impacts to
14 natural resources and maximizes the provision of green space and
15 accommodation of non-vehicular and pedestrian traffic. This plan would tie
16 into an expected crosswalk to the transportation center across the street
17 and extend a pedestrian sidewalk in a southerly direction where it could
18 eventually tie in with anticipated retail uses. It could also be linked to
19 future development to Map 15, lot 61-1, which is currently for sale.

20
21 F. Monteiro illustrated this potential for pedestrian access in the area with a
22 combination of three exhibits; the design plans for the transportation
23 station, the concept plan for the McDonalds site and the conceptual plan of
24 the aforementioned future retail development.

25
26 J. Trottier said the plan for pedestrian access is much clearer with this
27 updated plan.

28
29 T. Thompson agreed, saying the conceptual plan presented at this meeting
30 now meets the criteria for the CUP in staff's opinion, including the
31 requirements for open space and natural resources, given the size of the
32 lot.

33
34 G. Herrmann appreciated the fact that a McDonalds would not only support
35 the tax base but would provide a first step into the workforce for students
36 and young people.

37
38 C. Tilgner asked if the State would need to approve the curb cut for the
39 project and T. Thompson confirmed that they would, adding that access to
40 Route 28 would be essential to allow delivery trucks to enter and leave the
41 site. F. Monteiro said that DOT has seen on the project and he did not
42 anticipate any issues with acceptance of the curb cut. There was consensus
43 amongst staff and the Board that the proposed median on Route 28 would
44 help the overall traffic flow.

45
46 L. Wiles asked if any changes other than the sidewalk systems had been
47 made to the plan since the December version. F. Monteiro said no other
48 changes had been made. He also asked if McDonalds would likely be
49 responsible to clear the snow from their sidewalk since there is no town
50 mechanism to have that done on current sidewalks already in place. A.

1 Rugg said it could be a requirement of the site plan, although J. Trottier
2 noted it would still not be done on the surrounding sidewalks unless those
3 property owners began doing so. C. Tilgner added that it would be in the
4 interest of McDonalds to keep the sidewalk clear for their customers.
5

6 L. El-Azem stated that if sidewalks are planned, they should be
7 accompanied by a plan to keep them clear and useful through the year.
8 She also asked what the anticipated signage would be for a business in this
9 area. T. Thompson answered that for this zoning district, a 10-foot high,
10 65-sq. ft freestanding sign would be allowed along with wall signage similar
11 to the McDonalds on Route 102.
12

13 D. Coons expressed a concern for safety regarding the two handicap
14 parking spaces shown on the plan, given that their location means those
15 users will have to cross the drive-thru lane to access the building. F.
16 Monteiro replied that the only other location considered was on the side of
17 the building closes to Vista Ridge which would expose those users to the
18 traffic leaving the drive-thru. This would be more of a hazard than the
19 current plan where they would cross the lane before the traffic even
20 queues. He added that the issue could be revisited for possible
21 reconfiguration.
22

23 B. Campbell thanked the Board for their input during this conceptual
24 process.
25

26 **Other Business**

27
28 There was no other business.
29
30

31 **Adjournment:**

32
33 **Charles Tilgner made a motion to adjourn the meeting. George Herrmann**
34 **seconded the motion.** No discussion. **Vote on the motion: 8-0-0.** Meeting
35 adjourned at 8:03 PM.
36

37 These minutes prepared by Libby Canuel and Jaye Trottier, Community
38 Development Department Secretaries.
39
40
41

42 Respectfully Submitted,
43
44

45
46 Charles Tilgner, Secretary

2010/2011 Growth Management Ordinance - Determination of Growth Sustainability

Public Hearing

February 9, 2011

How the Annual Evaluation Works

- Requirements spelled out in Section 1.4 of the Zoning Ordinance
 - Board must also make a determination based on the 1998 Ordinance (former Section 1304)
 - Determination must be made by March 1 of each year
 - Current Ordinance requires 2 of 3 criteria to be met to declare "unsustainable growth" and limit building permits
 - 1998 Ordinance requires 3 of 3 criteria to be met to declare "unsustainable growth" and limit building permits
-

What are the Criteria?

- The present year number of building permits authorized by the Building Department exceeds the average rate of dwelling unit authorizations in Londonderry over the six preceding calendar years
 - A percentage increase in housing units over the preceding calendar year equal to [or greater than] the rate of increase in housing units for that preceding year summed across the six municipalities which abut Londonderry (Auburn, Derry, Hudson, Litchfield, Manchester, and Windham)
-

What are the Criteria? (cont'd)

- The maximum rate of dwelling units authorizations whose projected to demands can be adequately serviced and provided with facilities at a prudent level of fiscal strain, based upon the following:
 - School enrollment vs. school capacity
 - Strain on public facilities
 - Percentage of total budget appropriations made up of capital improvements
-

Criterion 1: 6 year average analysis

- The average number of permits authorized over the preceding six years is **81**. In 2009, Londonderry authorized **24** permits ($24 < 81$).

■ **CONDITION NOT MET**

- Given that the first condition was not met, Section 1304 of the 1998 GMO will not meet the conditions of unsustainable growth.
-

Criterion 2: Local vs. Region

- The number of housing units authorized by the Londonderry Building Division grew by **0.2812%** between 2009 and 2010; the number of housing units authorized by the building departments in abutting municipalities grew by **0.4567%** between same period ($0.2812\% < 0.4567\%$).

■ **CONDITION NOT MET**

Criterion 2: Local vs. Region (cont'd)


- Section 1.4 of the 2002 GMO requires that 2 of 3 conditions be met.
 - Given that the first 2 conditions were not met, Section 1.4 of the 2002 GMO will not meet the conditions of unsustainable growth.
 - **No further analysis of the remaining criteria is necessary.**
-

Conclusion

- Given that two of three of the 2002 GMO criteria have not been met and three of the three criteria of the 1998 GMO have not been met:
 - **Staff recommends that the Planning Board make a determination that for 2011, the Town of Londonderry will be in a period of sustainable growth, and there will be no cap on the number of building permits issued.**
 - This decision will end on December 31, 2011.
-

MEMORANDUM

To: Planning Board

From: Timothy J. Thompson, AICP 
Town Planner

Date: February 9, 2011

Subject: **2011 Growth Management Determination**

The Planning Board, in accordance with section 1.4 - Growth Management and Innovative Land Use Control of the zoning ordinance must make a determination of sustainability prior to March 1, 2011. The Board must also make a GMO determination using Section 1304 of the 1998 Growth Management Regulations as well.

Both versions of the GMO will be combined this year because the end result will be the same. The current GMO requires that 2 of 3 criteria from Section 1.4 must be met to make a determination of "unsustainable growth." Also, in accordance with Section 1304 of the 1998 Ordinance, 3 of 3 criteria must be met to make a determination of "unsustainable growth."

Evaluation:

In accordance with the Londonderry Growth Management and Innovative Land Use Control Regulation Section 1.4 (2002 GMO Version) and Section 1304 (1998 GMO Version), a determination of unsustainable growth occurs when two of three (or 3 of 3 of 1998 GMO) of the following findings are made:

- A. *The present year number of building permits authorized by the Building Department exceeds the average rate of dwelling unit authorizations in Londonderry over the six preceding calendar years;***

The average number of permits authorized over the preceding six years is **81**. In 2010, Londonderry authorized **24 permits** (24 < 81).

Condition not met

Section 1304 of the 1998 GMO requires that 3 of 3 conditions be met. **Given that the first condition was not met, Section 1304 of the 1998 GMO will not meet the conditions of unsustainable growth.** The remainder of the analysis will focus solely on the 2002 GMO.

- B. *A percentage increase in housing units over the preceding calendar year equal to [or greater than] the rate of increase in housing units for that preceding year summed across the six municipalities which abut Londonderry (Auburn, Derry, Hudson, Litchfield, Manchester, and Windham).***

The number of housing units authorized by the Londonderry Building Division grew by **0.2812%** between 2009 and 2010; the number of housing units authorized by the building departments in abutting municipalities grew by **0.4567%** between same period ($0.2812\% < 0.4567\%$).

Condition not met

Section 1.4 of the 2002 GMO requires that 2 of 3 conditions be met. **Given that the first 2 conditions were not met, Section 1.4 of the 2002 GMO will not meet the conditions of unsustainable growth.** No further analysis of the remaining criteria is necessary.

Conclusion:

Given that two of three of the 2002 GMO criteria have not been met and three of the three criteria of the 1998 GMO have not been met:

Staff recommends that the Planning Board make a determination that for 2011, the Town of Londonderry will be in a period of sustainable growth, and there will be no cap on the number of building permits issued.

This decision will end on December 31, 2011.

Table 1. RECENT REGIONAL BUILDING INVENTORY

Year	Nearby Municipalities										Totals	
	Londonderry	Auburn	Bedford	Derry	Hudson	Litchfield	Manchester	Merrimack	Windham	Nearby	Abutters	
ADDED HOUSING UNITS AUTHORIZED ON PERMITS 1990 - 2007												
1990	69	12	56	171	122	49	322	58	25	815	701	
1991	103	13	87	177	99	91	59	36	22	584	461	
1992	118	22	117	169	104	58	104	119	53	746	510	
1993	84	31	147	147	99	43	(32)	123	71	629	359	
1994	85	28	138	111	102	65	116	86	65	711	487	
1995	101	25	159	33	83	59	127	74	79	639	406	
1996	112	25	372	60	106	43	283	97	66	1,052	583	
1997	161	19	352	88	118	66	454	164	81	1,342	826	
1998	187	34	297	74	182	74	166	174	120	1,121	650	
1999	150	46	227	111	197	111	183	191	94	1,160	742	
2000*	146	42	309	105	48	71	176	200	259	1,210	701	
2001*	117	34	217	39	136	18	272	239	157	1,112	656	
2002*	44	33	197	58	218	67	719	71	177	1,540	1,272	
2003*	132	45	116	66	202	61	361	101	111	1,063	846	
2004*	177	43	139	43	152	65	572	89	141	1,244	1,016	
2005*	90	32	142	44	131	123	336	49	128	985	794	
2006*	97	65	155	60	150	140	706	60	150	1,486	1,271	
2007*	57	11	33	159	52	48	199	15	61	578	530	
2008*	41	4	21	74	29	13	176	17	50	384	346	
2009*	24	4	19	18	24	20	98	28	34	245	198	
2010*	24	19	33	23	44	13	200	15	77	424	376	
TOTAL HOUSING UNITS 1990 - 2010												
1990	6,739	1,354	3,853	11,869	6,902	1,845	44,361	7,915	3,327	81,426	69,658	
1991	6,808	1,366	3,909	12,040	7,024	1,894	44,683	7,973	3,352	82,241	70,359	
1992	6,911	1,379	3,996	12,217	7,123	1,985	44,742	8,009	3,374	82,825	70,820	
1993	7,029	1,401	4,113	12,386	7,227	2,043	44,846	8,128	3,427	83,571	71,330	
1994	7,113	1,432	4,260	12,533	7,326	2,086	44,814	8,251	3,498	84,200	71,689	
1995	7,198	1,460	4,398	12,644	7,428	2,151	44,930	8,337	3,563	84,911	72,176	
1996	7,299	1,485	4,557	12,677	7,511	2,210	45,057	8,411	3,642	85,550	72,582	
1997	7,411	1,510	4,929	12,737	7,617	2,253	45,340	8,508	3,708	86,602	73,165	
1998	7,572	1,529	5,281	12,825	7,735	2,319	45,794	8,672	3,789	87,944	73,991	
1999	7,759	1,563	5,578	12,899	7,917	2,393	45,960	8,846	3,909	89,065	74,641	
2000*	7,718	1,622	6,401	12,735	8,165	2,389	45,892	8,959	3,906	90,069	74,709	
2001*	7,835	1,664	6,710	12,840	8,213	2,460	46,068	9,159	4,165	91,279	75,410	
2002*	7,879	1,698	6,927	12,879	8,349	2,478	46,340	9,398	4,322	92,391	76,066	
2003*	8,025	1,731	7,124	12,937	8,567	2,545	47,059	9,469	4,499	93,931	77,338	
2004*	8,202	1,776	7,240	13,003	8,769	2,606	47,420	9,570	4,610	94,994	78,184	
2005*	8,292	1,819	7,379	13,046	8,921	2,671	47,992	9,659	4,751	96,238	79,200	
2006*	8,389	1,851	7,521	13,090	9,052	2,794	48,328	9,708	4,879	97,223	79,994	
2007*	8,446	1,916	7,676	13,150	9,202	2,934	49,034	9,768	5,029	98,709	81,265	
2008	8,487	1,927	7,709	13,309	9,254	2,982	49,233	9,783	5,090	99,287	81,795	
2009	8,511	1,931	7,730	13,383	9,283	2,995	49,409	9,800	5,140	99,671	82,141	
2010	8,535	1,935	7,749	13,401	9,307	3,015	49,507	9,828	5,174	99,916	82,339	
ANNUAL % INCREASE IN DWELLING UNITS												
1990	1.02%	0.89%	1.45%	1.44%	1.77%	2.66%	0.73%	0.73%	0.75%	1.00%	1.01%	
1991	1.51%	0.95%	2.23%	1.47%	1.41%	4.80%	0.13%	0.45%	0.66%	0.71%	0.66%	
1992	1.71%	1.60%	2.93%	1.38%	1.46%	2.92%	0.23%	1.49%	1.57%	0.90%	0.72%	
1993	1.20%	2.21%	3.57%	1.19%	1.37%	2.10%	-0.07%	1.51%	2.07%	0.75%	0.50%	
1994	1.19%	1.96%	3.24%	0.89%	1.39%	3.12%	0.26%	1.04%	1.86%	0.84%	0.68%	
1995	1.40%	1.71%	3.62%	0.26%	1.12%	2.74%	0.28%	0.89%	2.22%	0.75%	0.56%	
1996	1.53%	1.68%	8.16%	0.47%	1.41%	1.95%	0.63%	1.15%	1.81%	1.23%	0.80%	
1997	2.17%	1.26%	7.14%	0.69%	1.55%	2.93%	1.00%	1.93%	2.18%	1.55%	1.13%	
1998	2.47%	2.22%	5.62%	0.58%	2.35%	3.19%	0.36%	2.01%	3.17%	1.27%	0.88%	
1999	1.93%	2.94%	4.07%	0.86%	2.49%	4.64%	0.40%	2.16%	2.40%	1.30%	0.99%	
2000	1.89%	2.59%	4.83%	0.82%	0.59%	2.97%	0.38%	2.23%	6.63%	1.34%	0.94%	
2001	1.49%	2.04%	3.23%	0.30%	1.66%	0.73%	0.59%	2.61%	3.77%	1.22%	0.87%	
2002	0.55845%	1.9435%	2.8439%	0.4503%	2.6111%	2.7038%	1.5516%	0.7555%	4.0953%	1.6668%	1.67223%	
2003	1.64486%	2.5997%	1.6283%	0.5102%	2.3579%	2.3969%	0.7671%	1.0666%	2.4672%	1.1317%	1.09390%	
2004	2.15801%	2.4212%	1.9199%	0.3307%	1.7334%	2.4942%	1.2062%	0.9300%	3.0586%	1.3096%	1.29950%	
2005	1.08538%	1.7592%	1.9244%	0.3373%	1.4684%	4.6050%	0.7001%	0.5073%	2.6942%	1.0235%	1.00253%	
2006	1.15628%	3.5116%	2.0609%	0.4584%	1.6571%	5.0107%	1.4609%	0.6180%	3.0744%	1.5284%	1.58887%	
2007	0.67488%	0.5741%	0.4299%	1.2091%	0.5651%	1.6360%	0.4058%	0.1536%	1.2130%	0.5856%	0.65219%	
2008	0.48309%	0.2076%	0.2724%	0.5560%	0.3134%	0.4359%	0.3575%	0.1738%	0.9823%	0.3868%	0.42301%	
2009	0.28199%	0.2071%	0.2458%	0.1345%	0.2585%	0.6678%	0.1983%	0.2857%	0.6615%	0.2458%	0.24105%	
2010	0.28120%	0.9819%	0.4259%	0.1716%	0.4728%	0.4312%	0.4040%	0.1526%	1.4882%	0.4244%	0.45665%	

* Data is based on actual Census reported building permit information. net of demolitions

Building permit data source through 1996: NH OSP, net of demolitions.

Building permit data source 1997-2000: US Census, net of demolitions.

Analysis by Herr & James Associates.

2002 analysis provided by the Planning & Economic Development Office

2000 Census Figures

Table 2. LONDONDERRY LOCAL NORMS ANALYSIS

1/27/2011

Year	Dwelling units authorized			Enrollment grades K-12		
	#	Previous 6-year avg	Dwelling units total	Actual	Projected	Capacity
1980	119		4,408			
1981	105		4,513			
1982	79		4,592			
1983	206		4,798			
1984	316		5,114	3,455		
1985	451		5,565	3,600		
1986	407	213	5,972	3,720		
1987	293	261	6,265	3,884		
1988	272	292	6,537	3,959		
1989	133	324	6,670	3,999		
1990	69	312	6,739	4,078		
1991	103	271	6,808	4,234		
1992	118	213	6,911	4,301		
1993	84	165	7,029	4,385		
1994	85	130	7,113	4,496		
1995	101	99	7,198	4,639		5,037
1996	112	93	7,299	4,738		5,037
1997	161	101	7,411	4,911		5,037
1998	187	110	7,572	5,138		5,037
1999	150	122	7,759	5,199	5,176	5,037
2000	146	133	7,718	5,338	5,311	5,037
2001	117	143	7,835	5,654	5,711	5,289
2002	44	146	7,879	5,700	5,716	6,347
2003	132	134	8,025	5,549	5,734	6,347
2004	177	129	8,157	5,514	5,756	6,347
2005	90	128	8292	5,571	5,728	6,347
2006	97	118	8389	5,452	5,626	6,347
2007	57	110	8446	5,323	5,607	6,347
2008	41	100	8487	5,409	5,501	6,347
2009	24	99	8511	5,170	5,501	6,347
2010	24	81	8535	5,154	5,501	6,347

Enrollments data source: Londonderry School District Profile (3/24/2010) and Bruce Mayberry School Impact Fee Methodology 2002.

Dwelling units source: see Table 1 notes.

Table 3. LONDONDERRY GROWTH STRAIN ANALYSIS

1/27/2011

Year	Londonderry				Abutting communities			
	Public school pupils		Housing units authorized		% Housing increase	% Housing increase		H. units authorized
	Enrollment	Capacity	Annual	Prior 6yr avg		x 100%		
1990	4,078		69	312	1.02%	1.00%		701
1991	4,234		103	271	1.51%	0.71%		461
1992	4,301		118	213	1.71%	0.90%		510
1993	4,385		84	165	1.20%	0.75%		359
1994	4,496		85	130	1.19%	0.84%		487
1995	4,639	5,037	101	99	1.40%	0.75%		406
1996	4,738	5,037	112	93	1.53%	1.23%		583
1997	4,911	5,037	161	101	2.17%	1.55%		826
1998	5,138	5,037	187	110	2.47%	1.27%		650
1999	5,199	5,037	150	122	1.93%	1.30%		742
2000	5,338	5,037	146	133	1.89%	1.34%		701
2001	5,654	5,289	117	143	1.49%	1.22%		656
2002	5,700	6,347	44	146	0.56%	1.67%		1,272
2003	5,549	6,347	132	134	1.64%	1.09%		846
2004	5,514	6,347	177	129	2.16%	1.2995%		1,016
2005	5,571	6,347	90	128	1.0854%	1.0025%		794
2006	5,452	6,347	97	118	1.1563%	1.5889%		1271
2007	5,323	6,347	57	110	0.6749%	0.6522%		530
2008	5,409	6,347	41	100	0.4831%	0.4230%		346
2009	5,170	6,347	24	99	0.2820%	0.2410%		198
2010	5,154	6,347	24	81	0.2812%	0.4566%		376

Current year indicator demonstrating "unsustainability."

Year with two or three indicators demonstrating "unsustainability."

* - Building data is through December, enrollment is based on latest School District Report.

Abutting communities: Auburn, Derry, Hudson, Litchfield, Manchester, Windham.

Data source: Table 2.