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1 GUIDING PRINCIPLE

- Property owners have the right to request a rezoning of land in Dover.
- The public has the right to provide input
- The Planning Board/Council are obligated to review and understand facts, data and make an informed decision
2 PROCESS

All proposed amendments to the Zoning ordinance follow the same path:

- Pre-Approval Phase:
  - Proposal is made
  - PB posts the ordinance and sets public hearing

- Decision Phase:
  - Public Hearing
  - Deliberation (60 days or less)

- Post-Planning Board Phase:
  - City Council Workshop
  - City Council Public Hearing
  - Ratification or Veto
4 STATE REQUIREMENTS

Requirements:

- 674:16 grants the ability for a municipality to regulate land
- Overall ordinance shall meet the purpose outlined in 674:17
  - Eg Health, safety and welfare
- 674:18 grants local control over process
  - 170-53 is the local guidance.
- 674:20 allows the creation of zoning districts, which may allow different uses and dimensions.
and ABUTTER required to be notified per Section D (2).

F. Criteria for PLANNING BOARD Review of Proposed Amendments.

The PLANNING BOARD shall provide to the City Council a report on each proposed amendment. The report of the PLANNING BOARD shall include the PLANNING BOARD’s findings and recommendations on the following:

1. The consistency of the proposed amendment with the Master Plan;
2. The consistency of the proposed amendment with other plans, studies, or technical reports prepared by or for the PLANNING BOARD and the City;
3. The effect of the proposed amendment on the City’s municipal services and capital facilities as described in the Capital Improvements Program;
4. The effect of the proposed amendment on the natural, environment, and historical resources of the City;
5. The effect of the proposed amendment on NEIGHBORHOOD including the extent to which nonconformities will be created or eliminated;
6. The effect of the proposed amendment on the City’s economy and fiscal resources; and
7. The recommendation of the PLANNING BOARD relative to whether the proposed amendment should be adopted or rejected, and any recommendations for modifications to the proposed amendment.

Planning Board reviews:

- Consistency with Master Plan
  - Planning Board or City
- Consistency with other plans
- Effect on municipal services
  - Including capital needs
- Effect on resources
  - Historic, cultural and environ
- Effect on neighborhood
  - Non conformities
- Effect on Economy/fiscal health
5 PLANNING BOARD REVIEW CRITERIA

- **Master Plan:**
  - **Vision Chapter**
    - Promote economic growth
  - Continued investment in industrial parks
- **Land Use**
  - Speaks to diversity of commercial/industrial uses
  - Promotes continued industrial/business park development
  - Notes the lack of available industrial land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Acreage*</th>
<th>Undeveloped*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>8,016</td>
<td>1,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td>2,195</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic**</td>
<td>1,860</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>1,726</td>
<td>1,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial***</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit/Utility</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>15,557</td>
<td>4,010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Does not remove constraints, such as wetlands/steep slopes etc
** Includes Government, Education and Recreation
*** Includes Retail, Office, Restaurants, Services
5 PLANNING BOARD REVIEW CRITERIA

- **Other Plans:**
  - **Council Goals**
    - Supports
  - **Other**
    - Neither conflicts or supports
- **Municipal Services**
  - Non residential uses have less impact on municipal services
- **Historic/Natural/Env Resources**
  - Setback and stormwater requirements are similar with current district
5 PLANNING BOARD REVIEW CRITERIA

- Neighborhood:
  - Land Use
    - Surrounding land use is residential
  - Zoning
    - Surrounding is a mixture of residential and non residential
  - Nonconformities
    - None with dimensional
    - Creates 2 (use)
    - Removes 1 (use)

- Economic/Fiscal Health:
  - Adds jobs
  - Diversity of employment
    - Promotes tourism
  - Provides tax revenue with low draw on municipal resources

- Vote
  - Board voted unanimously that the rezoning should occur.
6 REZONING ANALYSIS

Proposal:

▸ Rezone 63 acres from R-20 to I-2
▸ Rezone 38 acres from I-4 to I-2
  ▶ Relocates existing location of I-2 boundary from Littleworth Road to northerly boundary lines of properties

Context

▸ Land use is residential along Columbus Avenue
▸ Land Use is Industrial with some residential along Littleworth
▸ Zoning is predominantly non residential
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- Rezone 63 acres from R-20 to I-2
- Rezone 38 acres from I-4 to I-2
- Relocate existing location of I-2 boundary from Littleworth to northerly boundary lines of properties

Context:
- Land use is residential along Columbus Avenue
- Land use is industrial with some residential along Littleworth
- Zoning is predominantly non-residential along Littleworth
Purpose Statements:

- R-20: Medium Density residential
- I-4: Advanced Manufacturing
- I-2: Mixture of commercial and industrial uses
- Abutter Impact
  - Site Plan review is proper venue for mitigation of light, noise, traffic and other abutter concerns
    - Applicable to all development
- Stormwater Management
  - Toughest regs in NH
    - Applicable to all development
Existing Conditions Potential Build out:

- Residential with some industrial
  - Conservative in nature
    - 100 new homes/ 80K distribution facility
  - Expects dynamic development (not status quo)
- Revenue/Expense
  - $26.29 tax rate ($8,171/105K)
- Traffic
  - Approximately 100 vehicle trips
- Build Out 5 to 10 years from start
Concept Potential Build out:

- Commercial Recreation and Hotel
  - Conservative in nature
    - Assessed value is based upon construction costs and existing hotel valuations.
  - Revenue/Expense
    - $26.29 tax rate ($525K)
  - Traffic
    - Approximately 58 - 100 vehicle trips
  - Build Out 12 to 18 months from start with future potential
Dimensional Review:

- R-20 vs I-2 vs I-4
- Lot size is same for R-20 and I-2, greater for I-4 to I-2

Uses

- R-20
  - Residential with commercial uses if lot is over 50 acres
    - Theatre
    - Bank
    - Personal Service/retail
    - Restaurant
- I-4
  - Similar industrial based uses
Environmental Review:

- Wetlands
  - Ill defined; survey required.
- Topography
  - Majority of land is at elevation 120

Infrastructure:

- Sanitary Sewer is provided
- Good water on Columbus
- Adequate water on Littleworth
- Gas/Tele/Electricity on Littleworth
- On NH Route 9
- Proximate to Spaulding
7 HISTORIC OVERVIEW

- 1948: Zoning Established in Dover
- 1965*: I-1 Zone, Littleworth to Tolend Rd, 1600’ off Spaulding
- 1979: Rezoning of 500’ off Tolend from I-1 to R-20
- 1992: Rezoning of I-1 to I-2
- 1999: Proposed rezoning of Kay parcel to I-2
- 2003: Proposed rezoning of Kay parcel to I-4
- 2003: Rezoning of I-2 to I-4, area off the Spaulding.
- 2003: Rezoning of land west of Columbus to I-4
- 2004: Area off Tolend Rd rezoned from I-2 to R-20