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Introduction

The Town of Raymond has witnessed significant population and housing growth in the last several decades which has necessitated growth strategies to address the needs of individuals and families at all income levels. In 1970, the population of Raymond was approximately 3,000, while the latest 2007 figures now show the town’s population hovering closer to 11,000 individuals. The Town of Raymond has been actively planning for many years now with the existing Town Master Plan completed in 2002. As a part of this current Master Plan update, a community-wide master plan survey was conducted and topic groups were formed to identify and address a variety of planning needs. The results of the community-wide survey as related to housing needs in Raymond are summarized below. In addition, a housing topic group was formed to focus on high priority issues and brainstorm solutions for the future. The housing group met throughout the summer/fall of 2007 and prepared the following topic group report.

UNH Survey Results

Between September and October 2007, the University of New Hampshire Survey Center conducted a community-wide master plan survey of the perceptions, interests and attitudes of residents about the Town of Raymond and future planning initiatives for Raymond.

A total of 4,580 surveys were delivered to all Raymond postal patrons in the “On the Common” newsletter on September 14, 2007. In addition, a reminder (post card) was mailed on October 4, 2007.

A total of 409 Raymond residents responded to the survey representing a response rate of nine percent. The following responses were received to Questions 1, 5 and 7 regarding Raymond’s housing needs. An Executive Summary of the Master Plan Survey and a copy of the survey questionnaire are contained within the Appendix of this plan.
**Housing Related Questions**

**Question 1 (a):** Please indicate how high a priority you place on each of the possible goals/activities for Raymond

- Improve the Affordability of Housing
  - Very High Priority: 20%
  - High Priority: 15%
  - Medium Priority: 27%
  - Low Priority: 14%
  - Not a Priority: 24%

**Question 5 (a, j, l, q):** What is your opinion of the following types of development in Raymond?

- Apartments
  - Strongly Favor: 5%
  - Favor Somewhat: 10%
  - Neutral: 26%
  - Oppose Somewhat: 27%
  - Strongly Oppose: 32%

- Low & Moderate Income Housing
  - Strongly Favor: 12%
  - Favor Somewhat: 12%
  - Neutral: 23%
  - Oppose Somewhat: 21%
  - Strongly Oppose: 32%

- Elderly Housing
  - Strongly Favor: 25%
  - Favor Somewhat: 33%
  - Neutral: 28%
  - Oppose Somewhat: 9%
  - Strongly Oppose: 6%

- Single Family Homes
  - Strongly Favor: 30%
  - Favor Somewhat: 28%
  - Neutral: 26%
  - Oppose Somewhat: 11%
  - Strongly Oppose: 9%

**Question 7 (e, f, g):** What impact do you believe the following strategies would have on your property taxes?

- Encourage Affordable Housing for Working Families
  - Will Increase Property Taxes: 46%
  - No Effect on Property Taxes: 39%
  - Will Keep Taxes From Increasing: 15%

- Encouraging Senior/Retirement Housing Developments
  - Will Increase Property Taxes: 36%
  - No Effect on Property Taxes: 43%
  - Will Keep Taxes From Increasing: 19%

- Assessing Impact Fees on New Housing & Other Development Projects
  - Will Increase Property Taxes: 20%
  - No Effect on Property Taxes: 30%
  - Will Keep Taxes From Increasing: 50%
Overall Summary of UNH Survey Results

The results of the master plan survey regarding housing priorities in Raymond are quite interesting. While the survey results reveal a concern among survey respondents regarding the need for affordable housing within the community, a majority (62 percent) feel affordable housing is a priority and 38 percent do not. Further, when asked the question if encouraging affordable housing for working families would impact property taxes, 46 percent of the respondents indicate that it would while 54 percent believed it would not. Clearly, these results demonstrate that there is a real difference of opinion about affordable housing in Raymond which indicates there is a need for housing dialogue, education and effective housing policy solutions within the community.

The same concern related to affordable housing also extends to apartments and low/moderate income housing. A clear majority (53 percent) of the survey respondents oppose this type of housing in Raymond while 24 percent support it and 23 percent are neutral on the issue.

This picture, however, is quite different with respect to single family, elderly and senior/retirement housing. A majority of survey respondents clearly support both types of housing (58 percent in favor of both single family and elderly housing) while only 15 percent oppose elderly and 16 percent oppose single family housing, with 28 and 26 percent remaining neutral respectively.

Similar survey results were found with regard to property tax impacts. While a large number of survey respondents (36 percent) believe encouraging senior/retirement housing would impact property taxes, a majority of respondents (45 percent) believe there would be no impact and 19 percent believe it will keep property taxes from rising. Also, a clear majority of the survey respondents (50 percent) support the use of impact fees on new housing as an effective strategy from keeping property taxes from rising.

Summary of Housing Topic Group Report

In addition to the UNH master plan survey results, the following report was prepared by town residents participating on the Housing Topic Group. This report has been reviewed and updated by the Raymond Planning Board.

Existing Housing Stock:

The majority of existing housing in Raymond is single family homes which accounts for approximately 60 percent of housing stock. There has been an increase in condominium units over the last several years and a mix of townhouse and single family detached units all priced over $200,000. The majority of the units built had age restrictions of 55+. A few condex units were built (fewer than 30) and some existing duplex units have been converted to condex ownership. Two new manufactured housing parks (Paradise Ridge and Harriman Heights) were built in the last few years, but the zoning district
(Manufactured Housing – Zone E) which allows manufactured homes/parks is mostly built-out. No new apartment units have been built.

**Critical Issues/Housing Types Needed:**

**Workforce housing**

Workforce housing can be identified in a number of ways but it comes down to what is most affordable. This is housing geared toward people working in support services such as fire, police, teachers, municipal employees, so that they may live in the community they work in and not have to seek housing outside the area. Some options may be Planned Unit Developments, apartments, manufactured homes, duplexes and single family homes with future expansion.

While manufactured housing in the past has been more affordable, it has adjusted to the increased market and when you add lot fees to PITI, a single family home with approximately 1000 sq ft can be priced competitively. Additionally, the finance cut-off is usually about 30 years, where stick built and modular is open-ended.

**Senior or Assisted Living Facilities:**

While the State, including Raymond has seen an increase in the number of 55+ housing units, these types of properties do not fulfill the need for affordable senior or assisted living facilities.

Raymond is home to one of these facilities, Ledgewood Commons, but there is a waiting list for these accommodations. These facilities are privately owned but the rents are based on income and subsidized by the US Department of Housing and Urban Development. Typically, these developments are located as close to services as possible and provide affordable housing to seniors based on age and income/asset documentation.

**Recommended Actions:**

Raymond, NH located on Rte 101 in Rockingham County has experience growth at about the same rate as Rockingham County and the State. This shows a yearly growth of about 1.4 percent which does not lead us to recommend any drastic changes in the housing portion of the master plan, though the lack of workforce housing has a negative impact on business growth and economic development in our community.

What we would recommend is making use of some of the housing programs offered through the State such as Housing Conservation Planning Program (HCCP) and Innovative Land Use Planning Techniques for Inclusionary Housing. Inclusionary housing has already been applied in other area communities such as Chester and Exeter.
The Town, in an effort to retain control of its housing diversity, needs to:

- Document existing housing and distribution;
- Encourage senior housing (62 and older), that is affordable;
- Perform an annual audit of housing;
- Explore mechanisms for conversion criteria and impact on age 55+ (senior) housing;
- Continue to support zoning that allows a diversity of housing, including that which is affordable;
- Explore zoning regulations pertaining to in-law housing and impact fees for conversion.

**Housing and Conservation Planning Program (HCPP) -- NH Office of Energy and Planning**

The HCPP will enable municipal leaders to get valuable finance and technical resources to help them develop local plans to make their communities better place to live, and to bring citizens together to help shape the future of their community. For more information visit [www.nh.gov/oep/programs/HCPP/index.htm](http://www.nh.gov/oep/programs/HCPP/index.htm).

**NH Department of Environmental Services**

*Innovative Land Use Planning Techniques: A Handbook for Sustainable Development,* prepared as part of the Regional Environmental Planning Program by the NH Department of Environmental Services, the NH Association of Regional Planning Commissions, the NH Office of Energy and Planning, and the NH Local Government Center contains valuable information and a model ordinance for inclusionary zoning.

**A. Population and Housing Growth**

Growth in population and housing are typically linked; as a community’s population increases so does the number of housing units within the community. Of course this relationship is subject to many economic factors, including such trends as cost of construction and local permitting, housing pricing and attractiveness, commuting patterns, as well as the overall availability and diversity of housing stock within a municipality.

Following this logic, it is interesting to note that between 1990 and 2000, Raymond’s population and housing growth were basically the same – there was an 11 percent increase in population growth and a 10.7 percent increase in the total number of households in the community (see Table 2 and Table 4 in the Demographics section of this plan).

Similarly, over the past two decades, housing growth has followed pollution growth within the Town of Raymond, as well as the region as a whole. Between 1990 and 2007, Raymond’s population increased 24 percent from 8,713 individuals in 1990 to 10,786 in
2007 (see Table 35). In other communities within the region, population increased as much as 50 to 70 percent in towns such as Bedford, New Boston, and Chester (see Table 35). During roughly the same time period (1990 to 2005), the total number of housing units in Raymond increased by 26 percent (see Table 39).

Whether this population/housing growth trend will continue in the future is difficult to predict. Generally, population growth spurs housing growth. However, at the same time population and housing growth can have an impact on infrastructure and as well as the cost of providing municipal services and facilities. Due to the cost of growth, many municipalities within the region have had to assess their housing and municipal needs and adopt growth management ordinances in order to maintain or seek a balance between the two. Keeping pace with population growth, providing adequate housing for all residents and incomes, and maintaining necessary services and facilities will be crucial in sustaining Raymond’s economic base and community character in the future. Seeking and maintaining this balance, however, in light of the current economic downturn will be a difficult challenge.

### Table 35
**Estimated Population, 2007**
**SNHPC Region**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. Census</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>12,563</td>
<td>18,274</td>
<td>20,856</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goffstown</td>
<td>14,621</td>
<td>16,929</td>
<td>17,688</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>99,567</td>
<td>107,006</td>
<td>108,580</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Boston</td>
<td>3,214</td>
<td>4,138</td>
<td>5,110</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weare</td>
<td>6,193</td>
<td>7,776</td>
<td>8,952</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooksett</td>
<td>8,767</td>
<td>11,721</td>
<td>13,218</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>4,085</td>
<td>4,682</td>
<td>5,092</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candia</td>
<td>3,557</td>
<td>3,911</td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>2,691</td>
<td>3,792</td>
<td>4,617</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deerfield</td>
<td>3,124</td>
<td>3,678</td>
<td>4,349</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derry</td>
<td>29,603</td>
<td>34,021</td>
<td>34,200</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Londonderry</td>
<td>19,781</td>
<td>23,236</td>
<td>24,590</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond</td>
<td>8,713</td>
<td>9,674</td>
<td>10,786</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>2,939</td>
<td>3,701</td>
<td>4,466</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epping</td>
<td>5,162</td>
<td>5,476</td>
<td>6,053</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>2,576</td>
<td>3,510</td>
<td>4,144</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U. S. Census and Office of Energy and Planning
Table 36 provides a comparative summary of the population projections from 2010 to 2030 for the Town of Raymond and surrounding communities adjacent to Raymond and within the region. These population projections will be helpful to the Town of Raymond as it considers future housing policy and develops land use regulations addressing various housing options within the community.

The state Office of Energy and Planning (OEP) compiles population data and updates population projections for all municipalities in the state on a regular basis. The projection methodology is somewhat complex, but relies heavily on county population trends for prior historical 20 and 40 year periods. According to OEP, the Town of Raymond will grow by 1,920 more people or 18 percent between 2005 and 2030 (see Table 36).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>20,740</td>
<td>21,810</td>
<td>23,080</td>
<td>23,940</td>
<td>24,810</td>
<td>25,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goffstown</td>
<td>17,800</td>
<td>18,600</td>
<td>19,480</td>
<td>20,260</td>
<td>21,030</td>
<td>21,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>109,970</td>
<td>112,400</td>
<td>115,230</td>
<td>117,620</td>
<td>120,050</td>
<td>121,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Boston</td>
<td>4,970</td>
<td>5,190</td>
<td>5,450</td>
<td>5,690</td>
<td>5,930</td>
<td>6,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weare</td>
<td>8,850</td>
<td>9,280</td>
<td>9,790</td>
<td>10,240</td>
<td>10,700</td>
<td>11,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>5,180</td>
<td>5,360</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td>5,790</td>
<td>5,980</td>
<td>6,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candia</td>
<td>4,110</td>
<td>4,250</td>
<td>4,430</td>
<td>4,570</td>
<td>4,710</td>
<td>4,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>4,620</td>
<td>4,790</td>
<td>5,020</td>
<td>5,220</td>
<td>5,410</td>
<td>5,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deerfield</td>
<td>4,270</td>
<td>4,420</td>
<td>4,620</td>
<td>4,780</td>
<td>4,940</td>
<td>5,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derry</td>
<td>34,660</td>
<td>36,560</td>
<td>37,860</td>
<td>38,980</td>
<td>39,730</td>
<td>40,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Londonderry</td>
<td>24,670</td>
<td>26,210</td>
<td>27,340</td>
<td>28,440</td>
<td>29,540</td>
<td>30,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond</td>
<td>10,640</td>
<td>11,010</td>
<td>11,470</td>
<td>11,840</td>
<td>12,210</td>
<td>12,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooksett</td>
<td>13,240</td>
<td>14,330</td>
<td>15,330</td>
<td>16,360</td>
<td>17,420</td>
<td>18,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>4,370</td>
<td>4,560</td>
<td>4,810</td>
<td>5,010</td>
<td>5,220</td>
<td>5,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epping</td>
<td>5,980</td>
<td>6,150</td>
<td>6,350</td>
<td>6,520</td>
<td>6,690</td>
<td>6,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>4,080</td>
<td>4,220</td>
<td>4,430</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>4,780</td>
<td>4,950</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Energy and Planning (OEP), prepared in January 2007

In a general sense, population projections can be used as a guide to estimate the number of housing units Raymond may need in the future, particularly if the town desires to maintain similar or equal population/housing growth rates as experienced in the past. As can be seen by this data, Raymond is projected to have population growth rates in the order of between 3 to 4 percent every five years between 2005 and 2030. On an annualized basis this represents a population increase of roughly 0.4 to 0.8 percent per year. From a policy perspective, the Town of Raymond may want to consider providing...
opportunities and structuring ordinances which could enable similar or equal housing growth rates. Information on Raymond’s specific housing characteristics and needs follows.

B. Homeowner Characteristics

The lack of affordable housing for young families and young professionals remains a daunting issue for many communities throughout Southern New Hampshire. As Table 37 shows, homeowners under the age of 35 accounted for only 16 percent of the total amount of homeowners in Raymond (2000 Census). Many college graduates are leaving New Hampshire in part because wages and housing options are more attractive in other states and urban centers such as Boston. This is an alarming concern and it is vital that communities such as Raymond offer workforce housing opportunities for young professionals attracted to jobs in Raymond, Manchester, Concord, and the Seacoast, but cannot afford to purchase a home in these areas.

Table 37
Age of Homeowners (Owner Occupied Units), 2000
Raymond and Surrounding Towns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>&lt; 35</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>55-59</th>
<th>60+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candia</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>1,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>1,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deerfield</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derry</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Londonderry</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>2,725</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2000 Census

In order to address this issue, the Town of Raymond should consider allowing more multifamily housing units within the community. As described in the Existing Land Use study in this plan, there are currently only 40 acres of land or 0.2 percent of the town developed for multifamily use, while over 3,000 acres or 15.8 percent of the town is used for single-family homes (see Table 14). Manufacture housing is another option as most young families and professional workers can not afford to buy a single family home.

According to the 2000 Census, the median household income for those under the age of 25 in Raymond was $37,794 (see Table 38). In the age cohort of 25 to 34 years of age, the median household income was $46,949. With the median purchase price of a home
in Raymond reaching $260,000 in 2006, it is difficult for younger workers to afford a mortgage and save money for the future (see Table 43). This is especially true today given the current economic downturn. Even with declining residential properties values, the economy is making it more difficult for young families and professionals to find a job let alone qualify for a mortgage.

As shown in Table 38, the largest number of home owners (1,073) in Raymond in 2000 was in the 35-44 age cohort, and the overall median family income was $48,829.

Table 38
Household Income by Age Cohort, 2000
Town of Raymond, NH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Households</th>
<th>Households by Age of Householder</th>
<th>Under 25</th>
<th>25 to 34</th>
<th>35 to 44</th>
<th>45 to 54</th>
<th>55 to 64</th>
<th>65 to 74</th>
<th>75 and Over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less Than $10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>236</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 to $14,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 to $19,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 to $24,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>165</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 to $29,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>344</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 to $34,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>207</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000 to $39,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>230</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 to $44,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>195</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$45,000 to $49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>191</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $59,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>553</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000 to $74,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>531</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 to $99,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>367</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 to $124,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>163</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$125,000 to $149,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 to $199,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000 or More</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,481</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>1,073</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td></td>
<td>$48,829</td>
<td>$37,794</td>
<td>$46,949</td>
<td>$56,023</td>
<td>$60,250</td>
<td>$35,729</td>
<td>$24,931</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census 2000
C. Housing Supply and Balance

Between 2000 and 2006, housing growth overall in Raymond as well as Southern New Hampshire was strong as the state and national housing market was in the midst of a boom period. Since 2006, however, problems with the sub prime mortgage industry and other economic factors has resulted in a significant cooling off of the housing market, with homes staying on the market longer, property values declining, building construction activity dropping significantly, and the number of foreclosures increasing.

Table 39 provides a comparative summary of the growth in housing units from 1990 to 2005 for the Town of Raymond and communities within the Southern New Hampshire region. As can be seen by the data, the total number of housing units in Raymond increased 10.7 percent between 1990 and 2000 and jumped by 13.8 percent between 2000 and 2005. During this time period (1990 to 2005) Raymond’s housing increases represent an annualized growth rate of 1.55 percent. Communities within the Southern New Hampshire region which experienced similar housing growth as Raymond include the towns of Weare, Bedford and Hooksett. Only the towns of Chester and Deerfield had larger percentage increases, while Manchester, Bedford and Hooksett experienced larger numeric or absolute increases in total units than Raymond.

Table 39
Housing Unit Growth 1990-2005
Town of Raymond, NH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absolute Change</td>
<td>Percent Change</td>
<td>Absolute Change</td>
<td>Percent Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>1,354</td>
<td>1,622</td>
<td>1,745</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>4,156</td>
<td>6,401</td>
<td>7,198</td>
<td>2,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candia</td>
<td>1,192</td>
<td>1,384</td>
<td>1,469</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>1,247</td>
<td>1,461</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deerfield</td>
<td>1,227</td>
<td>1,406</td>
<td>1,666</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derry</td>
<td>11,869</td>
<td>12,735</td>
<td>12,966</td>
<td>866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goffstown</td>
<td>5,022</td>
<td>5,798</td>
<td>5,811</td>
<td>776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooksett</td>
<td>3,484</td>
<td>4,307</td>
<td>4,837</td>
<td>823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Londonderry</td>
<td>6,739</td>
<td>7,718</td>
<td>7,826</td>
<td>979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>44,361</td>
<td>45,892</td>
<td>46,747</td>
<td>1,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Boston</td>
<td>1,138</td>
<td>1,462</td>
<td>1,609</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond</td>
<td>3,350</td>
<td>3,710</td>
<td>4,221</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weare</td>
<td>2,417</td>
<td>2,828</td>
<td>3,218</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNHPC Region</td>
<td>87,233</td>
<td>96,510</td>
<td>100,774</td>
<td>9,277</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 1990 and 2000 U.S. Census, and SNHPC’s 2005 Annual Land Use Report; SNHPC Regional Comprehensive Plan
A diverse supply and balance of housing types and housing densities is essential to meet the social, economic, and cultural needs within any given community. Diversity of housing offers more and affordable choices and allows younger couples and younger wage earners to own a home. It also encourages mixed use and higher density development and affordable housing opportunities for the elderly and senior citizens. Historically, the predominant housing type in Raymond has been single family dwellings with a fairly equal balance between multi-family and manufactured dwellings. However, today this balance no longer exists.

Table 40, Figure 10, and Figure 11 provide the total number and percent of housing unit types in Raymond in 1990 and 2000. This data reveals that single family housing in Raymond increased significantly by 26.5 percent between 1990 and 2000, while multi-family and manufactured housing actually remained the same at 0.1 or declined by 17 percent respectively.

In 1990, there were 1,856 single family homes in Raymond and by 2000 that number had increased to 2,348. As a percentage of the total housing stock, the number of single family homes increased from 55.4 percent in 1990 to 63.3 percent in 2000. During the same period, multi-family and manufactured housing continued to decrease as a percentage of total housing stock from 20.6 and 24 percent in 1990 to 18.7 and 18 in 2000, respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>1,856</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>2,348</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufactured Housing</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>-17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>-17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,350</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3,710</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census, 2000
Figure 10
Housing Units by Type, 1990
Town of Raymond, NH

Source: US Census

Figure 11
Housing Units by Type, 2000
Town of Raymond, NH

Source: US Census
More recent housing data is also available from the Office of Energy and Planning (OEP). As reported by OEP in 2007, there were a total of 4,348 housing units in the Town of Raymond: consisting of a total of 2,751 single family units; 911 multi-family units; and 686 manufactured housing units. This data reflects the number of certificate of occupancy permits reported by the Town of Raymond to the OEP on an annual basis.

Table 41 shows the percent change in housing units in the Town of Raymond between 2000 and 2007. While there has been an increase of 17.2 percent in the total number of single-family housing units in Raymond between 2000 and 2007, single-family housing as percent of the total housing stock actually stayed the same at 63.3 percent.

More importantly, there was a significant increase of 31.1 percent in the total number of multi-family housing units in Raymond as well as small increase of 2.8 percent of manufactured housing. As a percentage of the total housing stock, multi-family increased from 18.7 percent in 2000 to 21 percent in 2007, while manufactured housing continued to decline from 18 percent in 2000 to 15.8 percent in 2007.

These changes represent a significant swing in the type and number of new housing built within the community since 2000. While the increase in multi-family housing provides an improvement in the overall balance of housing types within the community, improvements are still needed to bring the balance of single-family, multi-family and manufacturing housing back to 1990 levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>2,348</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>2,751</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufactured</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,710</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4,348</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census, 2000

**D. Building Permits**

Consistent with the latest OEP data for 2007 as reflected in Table 41, the building permit records reported for Raymond (between 1997 – 2007) indicate that while single family home growth has slowed slightly since 2000, there has been a moderate increase in multi-family housing since 2003 (see Table 42). In addition, the overall trend of the town’s
building permit records do not appear to demonstrate either a steady discernable linear growth or an overall significant decline during this period (1997-2007). As indicated in Table 42, a total of 838 building permits were issued between 1997 and 2007 which represents on average 76 permits per year. While a total of only 42 and 43 building permits were issued during 2006 and 2007 (this is mostly the result of the current economic downturn), these totals are fairly consistent with the annual number of permits issued between 1997 and 1998.

In some years, the number of single family permits were high, but then decreased in the following year. Between 1995 and 2002, multi-family building permits were essentially flat and then between 2003 and 2007, a total of 214 multi-family permits were issued.

In some years, the number of single family permits were high, but then decreased in the following year. Between 1995 and 2002, multi-family building permits were essentially flat and then between 2003 and 2007, a total of 214 multi-family permits were issued.

Table 42
Housing Units Authorized by Permit: 1997-2007
Raymond, NH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufactured</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NHHFA

E. Housing Costs

While national trends have certainly fueled housing growth within the region in past years, Southern New Hampshire’s quality of life continues to remain a large factor in attracting new home buyers from both within and outside the state. Overall, the cost of housing continues to rise incrementally in the Town of Raymond and the region even with the recent downturn in the national housing market. While land values and purchase prices have not recently declined, future demographic trends indicate that housing costs will continue to grow gradually into 2010 as new jobs are created in the region and more
residential units are added. While there has been a strong downturn in the housing market recently due to economic conditions and failure of the sub-prime lending industry and larger credit market, housing growth in New Hampshire is expected to continue and housing costs should not drop substantially in the long term.

Table 43 summarizes all residential real estate sales, 2001 to 2008 in the Town of Raymond and the Southern New Hampshire region as collected by the New Hampshire Housing Finance Authority.

Table 44 also summarizes the median purchase price of primary homes in the Town of Raymond between 1990 and 2008. Despite recent declines in the average purchase price in 2007 and 2008, there has been an overall increase in average price of 36.6 percent in Raymond and 39.5 percent in the region since 2001.

Table 43
Residential Real Estate Sales, 2001-2008
Town of Raymond, NH and the SNHPC Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Raymond Average Price</th>
<th>Raymond Number of Sales</th>
<th>SNHPC Region Average Price</th>
<th>SNHPC Region Number of Sales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>$172,000</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>$172,000</td>
<td>3,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>$194,000</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>$205,000</td>
<td>3,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>$227,000</td>
<td>8,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$247,903</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>$248,424</td>
<td>4,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$248,000</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>$252,733</td>
<td>4,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$259,900</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>$253,600</td>
<td>3070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$234,900</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>$257,000</td>
<td>3,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$234,900</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>$239,900</td>
<td>1,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Change</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NHHFA Purchase Price Database

Conservation Subdivision, Sherman Drive
### Table 44
Median Purchase Price of Primary Homes
Town of Raymond, NH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Median Purchase Price</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Median Purchase Price</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Median Purchase Price</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Median Purchase Price</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Median Purchase Price</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>$112,000</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>$104,857</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>$112,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$112,000</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>$58,476</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>$85,048</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$76,000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$93,700</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$85,048</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>$90,571</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>$89,905</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>$90,571</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$94,000</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>$47,048</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>$87,000</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>$85,500</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>$89,905</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$89,900</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>$59,900</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>$89,900</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>$89,900</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>$93,900</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$89,900</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>$48,900</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>$92,900</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>$87,000</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>$103,000</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>$93,900</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>$64,900</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$96,000</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>$58,500</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>$92,500</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>$112,750</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$96,900</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>$64,000</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>$113,000</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>$107,900</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>$139,900</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$119,500</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>$67,900</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>$118,900</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>$113,500</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>$139,900</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>$71,900</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>$155,000</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>$183,600</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>$159,900</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>$84,900</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>$172,000</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>$155,000</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>$215,000</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$174,900</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>$194,000</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>$184,000</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>$228,900</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>$199,933</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>$206,000</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>$281,000</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$215,000</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>$145,000</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$247,903</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>$235,000</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>$278,500</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>$268,500</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>$207,000</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$248,000</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>$239,900</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>$263,210</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>$279,900</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>$222,900</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$259,900</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>$249,900</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>$275,900</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>$264,900</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>$233,000</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$234,900</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>$239,900</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>$235,000</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>$179,900</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$234,900</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>$214,900</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>$290,455</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>$244,000</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>$214,000</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NHFHA Purchase Price Database

*Non-Condominiums are single family free standing detached homes.

This data set provides an estimate of the median sale price of existing and new primary homes in New Hampshire. A primary home is defined as a single family home occupied by an owner household as their primary place of residence. Multi-family rental housing and manufactured housing is not included in the analysis of this data.
F. Future Housing Needs

An understanding of future needs for housing units is invaluable to the planning process. Housing projections are utilized both in transportation modeling, as well as growth management and land use planning. Prior to 2003, the SNHPC’s housing projections were based primarily on historical data and the annual average increase in housing units. The annualized rate of growth was then assumed to be constant and projections were calculated at five year intervals for both the community and at the traffic zone level. This methodology was acceptable at the time for transportation planning purposes as the projections had to be made independent of population or employment projection data.

Today, a more reliable methodology has been developed based on a model pioneered by Bruce Mayberry on behalf of the New Hampshire Housing Finance Authority. In this model, three alternative projections are generated for 2010 which are primarily based on 1990 and 2000 census data and employment and population growth for the region. The first projection assumes the region maintains its constant share of the state’s employment through 2010. The second projection assumes the region will retain its share of the state’s 2000-2010 employment growth. Both the first and second projections allow housing unit growth to respond to employment growth within the region. The third method is based on municipal level population projections. The final estimation of the region’s future housing needs is an average of the original historical average method and the three newer methods developed by Bruce Mayberry.

Table 45 summarizes all four projections and computes an overall average. Using the average of all four projection methods, the Town of Raymond is expected to experience a 22 percent increase in dwelling units for the period 2000-2010. Both the City of Manchester and Town of Derry are projected to experience the smallest increase in dwelling units in the region with about a 17 percent increase. The higher projection of dwelling unit growth in the Town of Raymond may be attributed to the fact that Raymond is less built out than Manchester, Londonderry, and Derry which have all experienced tremendous growth in the last three decades thereby decreasing the amount of vacant/undeveloped land in those communities.
Table 45
Comparative Dwelling Unit Projections for 2010
SNHPC Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>2000 U.S. Census</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Constant Historical Average</th>
<th>Projection 1</th>
<th>Projection 2</th>
<th>Projection 3</th>
<th>Average all 4 Projection Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>1,595</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,943</td>
<td>1,920</td>
<td>2,018</td>
<td>1,877</td>
<td>1,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>6,350</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,984</td>
<td>7,645</td>
<td>8,036</td>
<td>7,471</td>
<td>7,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candia</td>
<td>1,371</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,633</td>
<td>1,651</td>
<td>1,735</td>
<td>1,613</td>
<td>1,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>1,233</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,639</td>
<td>1,485</td>
<td>1,560</td>
<td>1,451</td>
<td>1,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deerfield</td>
<td>1,233</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,772</td>
<td>1,485</td>
<td>1,560</td>
<td>1,451</td>
<td>1,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derry</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,417</td>
<td>15,050</td>
<td>15,819</td>
<td>14,708</td>
<td>14,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goffstown</td>
<td>5,694</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,695</td>
<td>6,855</td>
<td>7,206</td>
<td>6,700</td>
<td>6,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooksett</td>
<td>4,255</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,443</td>
<td>5,123</td>
<td>5,385</td>
<td>5,006</td>
<td>5,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Londonderry</td>
<td>7,652</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,974</td>
<td>9,213</td>
<td>9,684</td>
<td>9,003</td>
<td>9,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>45,101</td>
<td></td>
<td>48,515</td>
<td>54,301</td>
<td>57,075</td>
<td>53,066</td>
<td>53,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Boston</td>
<td>1,445</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,896</td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td>1,829</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>1,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond</td>
<td>3,534</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,340</td>
<td>4,255</td>
<td>4,472</td>
<td>4,158</td>
<td>4,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weare</td>
<td>2,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,491</td>
<td>3,211</td>
<td>3,375</td>
<td>3,138</td>
<td>3,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNHPC Region</td>
<td>94,630</td>
<td></td>
<td>107,742</td>
<td>113,932</td>
<td>119,754</td>
<td>111,342</td>
<td>113,193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SNHPC Housing Needs Assessment, 2005

Although the SNHPC Regional Comprehensive Plan provides a vision for the region to the year 2015, housing projections have not been extended to 2015 because the methodology used cannot produce a valid projection beyond 2010. In order to project to 2015, the annualized employment growth rate from 1990-2000 would have to remain constant for 15 years, rather than 10 years. Admittedly, the 2010 projections presented here may be overestimated, since two of the four projection methods assume that the 1990-2000 employment growth rate will remain constant from 2000 to 2010. In fact, the actual annualized employment growth rate from 2000 to 2003 has been only 0.5 percent in the SNHPC Region compared to an annualized growth rate of 2.9 percent from 1990-2000.

G. Housing Needs Assessment

According to RSA 674:2, a Master Plan shall, “analyze existing housing resources and address current and future housing needs of residents of all levels of income of the municipality and the region in which it is located, as identified in the regional housing needs assessment performed by the regional planning commission…” The SNHPC, the regional planning commission for the Town of Raymond, published its first housing needs assessment study in 1988, and recently published its latest housing needs

As described in the 2005 Regional Fair Share Housing Needs Assessment, adequate, affordable housing for everyone is an important factor that is vital to the welfare and security of those residing in the SNHPC region. Affordable housing is defined as housing for individuals or families of low and moderate income (LMI) in which rent does not require more than 30 percent of income. A low-income household earns 50 percent of the median family income in its relevant geographic area, while a moderate-income household earns 80 percent of the median family income.

Since SNHPC prepared the previous Housing Needs Assessment in 1999, a new methodology of fair share allocation was developed by Bruce Mayberry, planning consultant for the New Hampshire Housing Finance Authority (NHHFA). This methodology is adopted in the 2005 edition of the Housing Needs Assessment. The revised model distributes renter occupied moderate and low-income housing needs for 2000, (primarily derived from the 2000 U.S. Census) and projected housing supply for the year 2010. The new NHHFA method developed four models (A through D) which each review a different level of need. This format was established to allow SNHPC flexibility in determining the base need as locally appropriate.

Table 46 shows the total number of renter and owner-occupied households in each municipality and the percent under the median area income (MAI) for the region either 50 or 80 percent under the MAI, which basically shows the need for affordable housing within each community based upon these income levels. Table 47 shows the proportionate distribution of moderate and lower income housing needs within each community.

While there is no set way of determining the actual number of dwelling units needed for low to moderate income households in a given community, it is possible to estimate such needs by deriving “fair share” estimates from the available data. The “fair share” concept relies on the assumption that all communities have an obligation to accommodate a “reasonable” proportion of a region’s low to moderate-income households.

In 2000, Raymond had 241 households qualifying as affordable for low to moderate income residents, but according to the Regional Fair Share Distribution, the Town should attempt to have 489 affordable housing units available. Furthermore this number should increase to 80 units by 2010. These are only guiding numbers and do not represent concrete mandates or proposals for housing expansion. The communities which shoulder the largest burden of fair share housing are the City of Manchester and the other municipalities with the largest populations in the region such as Londonderry, Derry, and Bedford. The communities with smaller population sizes outlying Manchester, which are sometimes referred to as “bedroom communities”, have a greater disparity of missing their fair share distributions. These communities, largely, have a less diverse housing stock.
Table 46  
Low and Moderate Income Households and Cost Burden by Tenure, 2000  
SNHPC Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Renter Occupied Households</th>
<th>Owner Occupied Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total # of Renter Households</td>
<td>Under 50% MAI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candia</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deerfield</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derry</td>
<td>4,349</td>
<td>1,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goffstown</td>
<td>1,136</td>
<td>553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooksett</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Londonderry</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>23,880</td>
<td>11,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Boston</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Raymond</strong></td>
<td><strong>769</strong></td>
<td><strong>310</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weare</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SNHPC Region</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Under 50% MAI</th>
<th>Under 50% MAI &amp; Pay 35%+</th>
<th>Under 80% MAI</th>
<th>Under 80% MAI &amp; Pay 30%+</th>
<th>Percent of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33,673</td>
<td>15,227</td>
<td>7,538</td>
<td>23,780</td>
<td>10,900</td>
<td>45.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.39%</td>
<td>70.62%</td>
<td>32.37%</td>
<td>15.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: New Hampshire Housing Finance Authority, 2000 U.S. Census  
Note: Low Income is defined as 30% to 50% of the Median Area Income with the upper limit at 50%.  
Moderate income is 50% to 80% of the MAI with the upper limit at 80%.

While the Town of Raymond recognizes the need for affordable housing in the region, it does not feel that the Fair Share Housing Distribution (569 units by the year 2010) recommended for the town are necessarily feasible and feels that it has already provided a diverse housing supply for all income levels within the community.

In 2010, while Raymond will be 49 percent shy of meeting its regional fair share of housing, its neighbors Candia, Chester and Deerfield will be much further away than Raymond in meeting their fair share goal.
Table 47
Proportionate Distribution of Moderate and Lower Income Housing Needs
SNHPC Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Number of Households</th>
<th>Fair Share Distribution</th>
<th>Number of Households*</th>
<th>Fair Share Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>1,029</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>1,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deerfield</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derry</td>
<td>1,404</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>1,688</td>
<td>1,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goffstown</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooksett</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Londonderry</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>1,135</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>1,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>7,923</td>
<td>3,499</td>
<td>9,527</td>
<td>4,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Boston</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond</td>
<td><strong>241</strong></td>
<td><strong>489</strong></td>
<td><strong>290</strong></td>
<td><strong>569</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weare</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNHPC Region</td>
<td>10,900</td>
<td>10,900</td>
<td>13,106</td>
<td>13,106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SNHPC 2005 Housing Needs Assessment
Renters Under 80% MAI and Overpay at 30%+
* Equals the 2000 number of households projected at a 1.8604% annualized growth rate, derived from the average of the four dwelling unit projections for renter occupied households as established in table 9 of the 2005 Housing Needs Assessment.

The SNHPC maintains that the estimate produced by using the fair share formula is only a guideline to which each community should refer in meeting its goal of increasing the housing supply and providing decent, affordable housing. The distribution results should not be used as a directive or requirement that communities must provide a specified number of low to moderate income housing units. It merely provides a mechanism by which each community can assess its fair share needs relative to other communities in the region.

H. Ensuring Energy Efficient Housing Development

Energy is a critical component to the functioning of both urban and rural communities and the long term growth and sustainability of local, regional, and state economies. The Town of Raymond and individual home owners can directly benefit from residential development which is energy efficient. There are many practical energy efficient building standards and model land use regulations which can be considered and adopted by the Town of Raymond. This includes building code equivalents provided through
Architecture 2030 which is a U.S. based non-traditional environmental advocacy group focused promoting innovative and common sense building code standards which satisfy US EPA’s Energy Star Challenge and the US Green Building Council’s standards (more information about these standards is provided in the Public Utilities and Energy Study, Volume II of this plan). Also, the American Planning Association’s Energy Policy Guide states that:

Continued populations growth and technological advances are generating higher demands for reliable energy supply sources. Right now, consumption patterns show that a tremendous amount of energy will be needed in the future to keep the national economy running. While capacity varies from place to place, this is where, with the proper guidance, community-based planning can begin to have some impact. Greater energy efficiency can be achieved through community commitment beyond individual efforts. Even with the advances made with alternative energy sources and conservation efforts employed, the need for new and upgraded electric generation and transmission facilities has continued.46

As indicated in the report, “The way we plan urban and rural areas significantly affects the energy usage of individual building sites. Appropriate site design standards and building codes can encourage energy conservation and the use of renewable energy technologies on site.”47 Energy efficient development ordinances are permitted in New Hampshire as a means of carrying forth the purposes of zoning ordinances established in RSA 674:17. Section I (j) of that statute encourages the uses of solar, wind, or other renewable energy systems. When these renewable energy efficiency goals are combined with this enabling legislation (under RSA 674:21 I (h)), communities can develop a comprehensive zoning article that provides incentives to developers in exchange for meeting specific energy efficiency performance standards.48

More information about these standards are described in the following section and in the “Innovative Land Use Planning Techniques” guidebook.49

Solar Roof Installation for Residential Dwellings

47 Ibid.
49 Ibid.
I. Energy Efficiency Regulations and Incentives

The “Innovative Land Use Planning Techniques” guidebook cites three ordinance components that a community can use to assure energy efficiency as a part of future residential and commercial growth. The guidebook states:

To successfully implement regulations to promote energy efficiency there are three ordinance components a community may adopt, dependent on the availability of building inspection and code enforcement personnel and support staff. The more comprehensive the regulatory approach, the greater the level of staff capability is required. The most effective way for a community to generate change and see positive results from their energy efficiency regulations is to adopt a combination of all three regulatory approaches.

For communities just beginning, the easiest and least burdensome on municipal staff is to simply adopt language into development regulations such as subdivision or site plan review regulations that require site development to occur in a fashion that optimizes the passive solar heating and cooling opportunities.

A second level is to adopt additional building codes that exceed the state energy codes for residential and non-residential construction. This, however, requires an established building inspector and code enforcement system.

The third and most comprehensive method is to adopt a performance zoning ordinance encouraging the voluntary implementation of energy efficient practices for new construction in exchange for a set of incentives or bonuses. This however, requires the most staff of any of the three options. When all three alternatives are used in combination the greatest energy savings results will be achieved.50

J. Recent Legislation and Possible Funding Sources

Housing and Conservation Planning Program (HCPP)

The New Hampshire legislature recently passed SB 217-FN-A, an act establishing the New Hampshire Housing and Conservation Planning Program. This program will be of great assistance to municipalities in planning for future housing and economic growth. The text of the bill can be found at the OEP webpage at:

http://www.nh.gov/oep/index.htm

The program establishes four stages of developing and implementing a growth and development strategy to be funded through the housing and conservation planning program. These stages are:

The Office of Energy and Planning (OEP) states that municipalities seeking a technical assistance grant through the program will need to provide a match to the grant. The match amounts are determined according to the amount of funding requested. The state’s 2008-2009 budget contained $400,000 over the biennium for this program. However, the Governor’s recent 2009-2010 budget zero-funded the program. Despite the lack of available state funding at present, efforts are underway to consider alternative funding sources for the future.

Inclusionary Zoning Implementation Program (IZIP)

The new Inclusionary Zoning Implementation Program (IZIP) offered through the New Hampshire Housing Finance Authority (NHHFA) provides direct grants of up to $9,000 to municipalities to help cities and towns develop and adopt inclusionary zoning ordinances. Local governments can apply for the funding on a competitive basis, with application review and determination of successful applicants being made by a team composed of staff from New Hampshire Housing as well as peer and partner organizations. In addition to the grant funds, New Hampshire Housing will also provide grant recipients with technical assistance in economic analysis of proposed inclusionary zoning ordinances and communications strategies to help the public understand the need for affordable workforce housing.

The municipal work will be conducted by professional planning consultants chosen by the municipalities from among a list of consultants that have been previously qualified and trained. The work product will be an ordinance ready for adoption and a campaign to educate the voters about the inclusionary zoning proposal. Ultimately, the goals of the program are to create a larger pool of professionals with experience in inclusionary zoning, and through its implementation in a variety of municipalities the program will provide a series of models. These benefits will be important to the success of future inclusionary zoning efforts statewide.

Funding for this program is being provided by the NHHFA, the NH Charitable Foundation, the NH Community Development Finance Authority, and the NH Department of Transportation’s Community Technical Assistance Program (CTAP). While all New Hampshire communities that have adopted zoning are eligible to apply for this grant, only communities identified by DOT as part of the CTAP process may be awarded CTAP funds.51

51 [www.nhctap.com](http://www.nhctap.com/)
American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009

The Office of Energy and Planning (OEP) expects to receive approximately $59M in funds from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009 for three programs:

- Federal Weatherization Assistance Program ($5 billion nationally, $23.2 million to NH)
- State Energy Program ($3.1 billion nationally, $25.8 million to NH)
- Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant Program ($3.2 billion nationally, $12.5 million to NH)

The ARRA also is providing $3.2 billion for the Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant (EECBG). All cities over 35,000 in population and all counties over 200,000 in population will receive direct funding from the Department of Energy (DOE). In states with smaller populations, the top 10 cities and the 10 counties qualify for direct funding. Smaller cities and counties can compete for funding through their state energy offices, which must pass 60 percent of the funding they receive along to local governments. The remaining $400 million will soon be available for competitive funding to all cities and counties through DOE.

Wind Turbine Legislation

The New Hampshire Legislation recently passed an act that prevents individual municipalities from prohibiting small wind turbine development outright as well as preventing overly restrictive zoning ordinances on new wind turbine development. Other protections for wind turbines included in the act prevent municipalities from adopting system-wide height regulations, noise limits lower than 55 decibels, setbacks greater than 150 percent of the wind generator’s height, and setting design guidelines that exceed state, federal, or international building or electrical codes or laws.

In response to this new legislation, the OEP has prepared a new model wind turbine zoning ordinance for municipalities. Copies of this model zoning ordinance are available at the following OEP website address: