

Hampton Conservation Commission
Work Session
September 23, 2013

Jay Diener, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 7:05 in the upstairs Town Hall meeting room. Conservation Commission members, Gordon Vinther, Barbara Renaud, Diane Shaw and Jay Diener were present. Conservation Coordinator, Rayann Dionne, was also present.

The purpose of this meeting was to continue the discussion on a potential 2014 Warrant Article to reduce the maximum allowable sealed surface.

There was a brief discussion and review of a proposed impervious surface definition that would be added to the Section 1.3 (Definitions) in the Zoning Ordinance. The proposed definition closely mirrors the NHDES definition.

The discussion then shifted to reducing the 85% impervious surface allotment to at least 60%. A review of scientific data shows that waterbodies become impaired when the amount of sealed surface in a watershed is greater than 10% and degrade when there is 25% or more. It would be ideal to reduce the maximum to below 25% but Commissioner agreed it would be very difficult to get voters to agree to that big of a change. Ms. Dionne presented a table showing the maximum impervious allowances for residential, commercial/industrial, and aquifer protection zones in surrounding towns such as Brentwood, Exeter, Greenland, Seabrook, Stratham and Portsmouth. These towns have residential impervious surface maximums between 20-60%, none of them were as high as Hampton. All of the towns with an Aquifer protection area had impervious maximums ranging from 10-35% which are all much lower than Hampton. In the commercial/industrial zones it varied from 35-100%.

Ms. Dionne also presented an impervious surface coverage graph of Hampton since 1990 that was prepared by the Rockingham Planning Commission. The graph showed that in 1990, 20.3% of Hampton was cover with impervious surface which jumped to 32.04% in 2010. The fact that Hampton has an impervious percentage greater than 25%, means that the water quality in our watershed(s) is degrading.

The Commission talked about the importance of educating the public on the negative impacts of impervious surface. This will be a critical piece to getting support for reducing the maximum impervious allowance.

It was recommended that the business and business seasonal zones be allowed to have greater impervious maximum than other zones because these are already highly developed areas. Mr. Diener suggested that perhaps in those two zones (B and BS) that the maximum be 75% which is a reduction but still allows a great deal of building/development. Ms. Dionne reminded commission members that the amount of sealed surface could be greatly reduced in these areas by just using permeable pavement or parking areas and parking lots.

The Commission members revisited the issue of what would “trigger” non-conforming lots to meet the new standard. It was agreed that substantial redevelopment or alteration would be any project where greater than 40% of current lots’ impervious surface was being altered. In this situation, they would need to meet the new standard and treat 100% of the site’s stormwater. See Table 1 for a summary of how this new standard would be applied to new construction, partial

redevelopment or complete redevelopment. It was acknowledged that a property owner could go to the Zoning Board for a variance to exceed the new standard.

Table 1. Summary of how proposed impervious surface maximum allowance

Current Impervious Coverage	Type of Construction		
	New Construction	Redevelopment (<40% of current lot's impervious surface)	Tear down/Rebuild or Redevelopment (>40% of current lot's impervious surface)
> 85%	NA	1) 60%/75%* 2) No impervious surface increase 3) Zoning Variance to exceed threshold	1) 60%/75% 2) No impervious surface increase 3) Treat or infiltrate 100% of site generated stormwater 4) Zoning Variance to exceed threshold
≤ 85%	NA	1) 60%/75% 2) No impervious surface increase	1) 60%/75% 2) No impervious surface increase 3) Treat or infiltrate 100% of site generated stormwater 4) Zoning Variance to exceed threshold
0%	60%/75%	NA	NA

* - 60% maximum allowable sealed surface in all Zones except B and BS where 75% maximum would be allowed

NA - Not applicable

Motion to adjourn at 9:05 by Mr. Diener, second by Ms. Shaw and all were in favor.

Respectively Submitted
Rayann Dionne