



**Hampton, NH Town Warrant Articles
March 11, 2025
In the Know Hampton
Your Source for Unbiased
Warrant Article Information**

This document is intended to help Hampton voters understand the Warrant Articles that will appear on the ballot on March 11, 2025. We do not tell you how to vote – that is up to you. The objective is to help voters understand what the Articles mean, what people are saying for and against, and what the cost implications may be.

****At the end of this document is a handy checklist that you may use to make note of your decision on each Article. Bring your notes to the Ballot Box to save time.****

Article 1: Election of Officers To choose by non-partisan ballot:

2025 Candidates for Town Positions		
Positions	Term	Candidate Names
Board of Selectman (1)	3 Yrs	Regina Barnes Amy Hansen Brian Warburton
Board of Selectman (1)	2 Yrs	Derek Beaupre Matthew Flynn Jeff Grip Bruce Theriault
Budget Committee (2)	3 Yrs	Fred Diana William R DiBiasio Michael Plouffe
Budget Committee (1)	1 Yr	Joseph Bamforth Mary Blackwell Aleksandra Ring Patrick Sheridan
Library Trustee (2)	3 Yrs	Christophur Hendry Paul Higgins Mary Saunders
Planning Board (2)	3 Yrs	Caroline Gagan Keith Lessard William McEvoy Sharon Mullen
Supervisor of the Checklist (1)	3 yrs	Jean Power
Tax Collector (1)	2 Yrs	Vivian Considine
Town Clerk (1)	3 Yrs	Beth Frongillo Cheryl Hildreth
Trustees of Trust Fund (1)	3 Yrs	Warren Mackensen
Zoning Board (1)	3 Yrs	Edward Brackett Matthew Saunders

What it means: In 2025, almost all of the open positions have more candidates than openings available. For any opening, you also have the option to write in the name of a candidate.



*****PLEASE REFER TO THE TOWN-ISSUED BALLOT FOR THE FULL WORDING OF ARTICLES. IN THE INTEREST OF SPACE, WE HAVE NOT REPRINTED ALL BALLOT QUESTIONS IN THE DISCUSSIONS THAT FOLLOW. *** Use this link to see the ballot as amended at Deliberative Session.*** <https://intheknowhampton.org>**

Articles 2-10 are Zoning Articles and have no direct tax impact.

Article 2: Elevation of a Non-Conforming Structure

What it means: Under this amendment, a non-conforming structure located in the Special Flood Hazard Area that does not conform due to dimensional setbacks may be elevated if all of the following conditions are met:

- The structure is being elevated from its foundation, pilings or footings;
- The volume of the structure does not increase;
- The footprint of the structure is not changing unless to become more conforming to current requirements;
- The impervious coverage on the lot does not increase beyond what is existing excluding any additional stairs or ramp needed to access the structure;
- The structure is located entirely within the boundaries of the subject property and does not encroach onto any abutting properties;
- The structure height does not exceed the maximum that is permitted under Article IV, Section 4.4; and
- The structure is being elevated in accordance with Section 2.4 – Floodplain Management Ordinance, including that this section shall not be construed as limiting the height of elevation to the minimum requirements of said Ordinance.

Statement Against: The Zoning Board expressed disapproval of this amendment, stating that when a homeowner is planning to elevate a structure, it is a good time to have them come before the Zoning Board to receive input on ways in which the property could be brought into compliance on whatever makes the property “non-conforming” in the first place. The speaker expressed that there might be no additional cost or little additional cost in conjunction with the elevation process.

The changes incorporated in Article 2 are highlighted at this link:

<https://intheknowhampton.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/Zoning-Article-2-Highlighted-Changes-2025.pdf>

Article 3: Parking Ordinance Changes Per NH RSA

What it means: The Article seeks to have Hampton comply with recent NH legislative changes regarding parking requirements and parking alternatives which applicants may propose during the development process.

- This amendment is necessary due to recent changes in State law found under RSA 674:16-a (brought forth as HB 1400). NH Towns and Cities are legally obligated to follow these changes. Local regulations cannot require more than 1.5 residential parking spaces per unit for studio and one-bedroom units under 1,000 SF that meet the requirement for workforce housing under RSA 674:58 IV; and cannot require more than 1.5 residential parking spaces per unit for multi-family developments of 10 units or more. Towns can, however, continue to require one guest parking space per eight dwelling units, and that language remains in the ordinance. These requirements are all addressed under Zoning Ordinance Section 6.3.1.



Alternative Parking Solution for Proposed Residential Uses: If a residential development proposes to meet the on-site parking regulations with an alternate solution due to economic reasons, the Planning Board is required to consider that proposal. However, a third-party review can be requested by the Planning Board before deciding whether the parking demand is met.

This item would not apply to residential uses that existed prior to July 1, 2024, nor to residential uses that were established on or after July 1, 2024 if an alternative parking solution was not previously proposed.

The requirements are addressed under a new Zoning Ordinance Section 6.6. A definition is included in the amendment, which also follows the State law.

Those Opposed Say: Two speakers at Deliberative Session were concerned that without accommodations for appropriate parking, the beach area residents will have an even more difficult time not just parking but also getting around while others are circling to find parking. The response was that by RSA, local regulations cannot require more than 1.5 residential parking spaces per unit for multi-family developments of 10 units or more. Any objection would need to be addressed at the state level.

The changes incorporated in Article 3 are highlighted at this link:

<https://intheknowhampton.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/Zoning-Article-3-Parking-Highlighted-Changes.pdf>

Article 4: Garage Sales – No Permit Required per Ordinances

What it means: This Article aligns the Zoning Ordinance with a prior action that was taken to eliminate permitting requirements for garage/yard sales.

- The requirement for a permit for a garage sale was removed from the Town Code of Ordinances by the Board of Selectmen in 2020 - permits are no longer required to hold a garage sale. However, the Zoning Ordinance was not previously updated to be consistent with the prior action.
- The new definition and replacement section are necessary to prevent misinterpretation that could result from existing language in the Zoning Ordinance which states that any use not specifically enumerated or defined in the code is prohibited.

The changes incorporated in Article 4 are highlighted at this link:

<https://intheknowhampton.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/Zoning-Article-4-Garage-Sales-Highlighted-Changes.pdf>

Article 5: Wetlands Conservation District Ordinance Changes

What it means: Article 5 will improve the Wetlands Conservation District (WCD) Ordinance by enhancing readability and addressing unclear or unnecessary language, along with other changes.

Substantive Changes:

- Define “Temporary Impacts” and “Permanent Impacts”.
- Outline the conditions under which temporary impacts may be allowed.
- Identify where the application of mulch is prohibited.
- Provide for the use of select fertilizers, pesticides, insecticides, or herbicides in the WCD, under certain conditions, for restoration or vegetation management.



- Establish a 6-year permit life for seawall repairs, if the first repair is completed within 2 years, and allowing in-kind repairs and maintenance to be performed for the life of the permit if the Conservation Coordinator is notified in advance.

The changes incorporated in Article 5 are highlighted here.

<https://intheknowhampton.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/Zoning-Article-5-Wetlands-Highlighted-Changes.pdf>

Article 6: Workforce Housing Incorporated in Zoning Ordinance per NH Statute

What it Means: To provide clarity and help address compliance with the NH Workforce Housing Law by formally codifying Workforce Housing and Affordable Housing throughout the Zoning Ordinance. This amendment adds Affordable Housing and Workforce Housing to the zoning districts where residential housing is already allowed. Although the amendment is essentially “housekeeping” (such projects would be allowed today) there is a conflict with the State’s Workforce Housing Law because this is not called out in the Zoning Ordinance. The proposed amendment addresses this by formally codifying that Affordable Housing and Workforce Housing are permitted in all zones that allow residential dwelling units.

The changes incorporated in Article 6 are highlighted here.

<https://intheknowhampton.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/Zoning-Article-6-Workforce-Housing-Highlighted-Changes.pdf>

Article 7: Apartments and Multifamily over Non-Residential Use in the Town Center-Historic Zone

What it Means: This Amendment allows rear buildings in the Town Center-Historic (TC-H) District to consist entirely of residential dwelling units in certain situations. A new footnote provides the following: On lots with multiple buildings, any building(s) located entirely to the rear of another roadway facing mixed-use building(s) which provides dwelling units above non-residential uses, may consist entirely of residential dwelling units.

The changes incorporated in Article 7 are highlighted here.

<https://intheknowhampton.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/Zoning-Article-7-2025-Residential-Units-Highlighted-Changes.pdf>

Article 8: Permanent Outdoor Dining vs Temporary Outdoor Dining - Restaurants

What it Means: This Amendment codifies permanent outdoor dining and temporary outdoor dining in the Zoning Ordinance under the existing “restaurant” use (Section 3.25b Restaurants). There is no change for Permanent Outdoor Dining. The use would continue to require Site Plan Review (public hearing), but this would be clearly codified in the Zoning Ordinance as well.

For Temporary Outdoor Dining, Planning Board review (not a public hearing) would be required under a new application process. This is a change from the current temporary transitional outdoor dining process, which only involves staff review. Under this Amendment, these reviews also include Planning Board oversight.

The changes incorporated in Article 8 are highlighted here.

<https://intheknowhampton.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/Zoning-Article-8-Outdoor-Dining-Highlighted-Changes.pdf>

Article 9: Child Care Ordinance Changes per NH RSA

What it Means: This Amendment complies with recent NH RSA changes regarding home-based child care, while differentiating the use from non-residential programs.



- This amendment is necessary due to recent changes in State law found under RSA 674:16 VI (brought forth as HB 1567). NH Towns and Cities are legally obligated to follow these changes. Per RSA 674:16 VI, home-based child care shall be allowed as an accessory use to any primary residential use by right or by conditional use permit if all requirements for such programs adopted in rules of the Department of Health and Human Services are met.

The RSA also states that “Family or Group Family Child Care...shall not be subject to local site plan review in any zone where a primary residential use is permitted.” This effectively eliminates any possibility of requiring a conditional use permit because any criteria that would be included would also be typical of site plan review and would not be allowed. Therefore, Family Child Care and Group Family Child Care are shown as permitted uses in all zoning districts, if operated in a home that is the primary residence of the provider.

- Family Child Care is defined and enumerated in Section 3.40.
- Group Family Child Care is defined and enumerated in Section 3.41.
- A new use titled “Non-Residential Child Care Programs”, which captures everything that is not categorized by the State as home-based child care, has been added as a prohibited use in the residential zones. Non-Residential Child Care Programs may be permitted with Site Plan Review in the Business, Business Seasonal, Industrial, and General zoning districts.

Question at Deliberative Session: Does child care service now need zoning approval? It does not, as dictated by the change in the RSA.

The changes incorporated in Article 9 are highlighted here.

<https://intheknowhampton.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/Zoning-Article-9-Child-Care-Highlighted-Changes.pdf>

Article 10 – Certificate of Rental Occupancy – Renewable Every 5 Years (Change from 10)

What it Means: This Article reduces the timeframe of the Certificate of Rental Occupancy from 10 years to 5 years, and makes minor adjustments to avoid inconsistencies. This change aligns with current short-term rental requirements. The Building Department has taken the position that the reduced timeframe is necessary for fire and life safety reasons, including the functionality of smoke and carbon detectors. Other essential safety items can also deteriorate well within the current 10-year timeframe.

The changes incorporated in Article 10 are highlighted here.

<https://intheknowhampton.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/Zoning-Article-10-Rental-Cert-Highlighted-Changes.pdf>

Articles 11-30 are Town-Sponsored Articles

How much will approval of a specific Article cost for my tax bill? Taxes are calculated based on the valuation of your real estate property. Throughout this document, the cost is translated to how much approval of that Article would cost a homeowner of a property valued at \$650,000 (roughly the average of all taxed properties in Hampton). Note that some articles on the ballot will have the translation to a \$400,000 home due to a petitioned Warrant Article .



If you want to directly see the cost for your home's value: Get your valuation from your latest tax bill or go to: <http://gis.vgsi.com/HamptonNH/Search.aspx> and enter your street address. This will display the latest valuation for your property. Divide by 1000 (example \$650,000 divide by 1,000 is 650.)

Multiply the result by the cost given in the Article for the tax impact per thousand dollars of valuation.

There is also a Calculator on the Town's website. Enter your home's value, and the see the cost for all Warrant Articles. You can access the Calculator here: <https://www.hamptonnh.gov/738/Warrant-Article-Calculators>

Article 11 – Study of Sewer System Local Limits - \$100,000 Offset by 100% Loan Forgiveness

What it means: DPW is proposing this study to better understand Hampton's capabilities and limits as it relates to pollutant discharge into the Waste Water Treatment facility, thus giving a basis for limiting such inputs in the future, and ensuring that the Town can effectively treat the wastewater and comply with environmental regulations. The cost of this study will be offset by principal loan forgiveness. It requires 60% of the votes to pass (3/5ths), because it is technically a loan.

Discussion: There was discussion about how the financial impact statement is worded, but no one at Deliberative Session spoke to the Article itself, other than to explain it.

Fiscal impact: Cost per \$1,000 valuation is \$0.02. A household valued at \$650,000 would see a tax increase of \$13.00 for 2025, a cost that would be reimbursed to the Town.

Article 12 – Inflow and Infiltration Study - \$100,000 Offset by 100% Loan Forgiveness

What it Means: This Article would cover the upfront cost of an Inflow and Infiltration (I&I) Study, a cost which would later be reimbursed by the State. I&I occurs when stormwater enters sewer pipes through cracks, leaky seals, or faulty or illegal connections. Excess water from I&I can trigger Sanitary Sewer Overflows, contribute to excess filtration and cause the Waste Water Treatment Plant to needlessly exceed capacity. The cost of the study will be reimbursed to the Town by the State. It requires 60% of the votes to pass (3/5ths), because it is technically a loan.

Those in favor say: Water that enters sewer systems through I&I puts costly pressure on wastewater treatment facilities, and increases costs for taxpayers.

Fiscal impact: Cost per \$1,000 valuation is \$0.02. A household valued at \$650,000 would see a tax increase of \$13.00 for 2025, a cost that would be reimbursed to the Town.

Article 13 – Operating Budget of \$36,326,944 versus a Default Budget of \$36,327,011

What it means: The voters are presented with two possible operating budgets. The Proposed Operating budget is what the Town departments feel they need to manage the Town efficiently, safely and effectively. The Default Budget is a calculated budget defined by RSAs (New Hampshire state legislature), which specify certain costs that must be covered in the Town's Budget. Both budgets for 2025 reflect cost of Warrant Articles approved at prior Town Elections. The difference between the two budgets is relatively insignificant this year, with the Proposed Operating budget lower than the Default budget by \$67.00. Both budgets represent a 4.189% increase over the 2024 adopted budget.



A default budget is regulated by RSA 40:13 and starts with the prior year’s approved budget, and is increased by obligations mandated by law; debt service and contracts lawfully entered into; and is reduced by one-time expenditures, salaries and benefits related to positions that may have been eliminated. The Default Budget will be the operating budget for the Town in the event the Proposed Operating Budget fails to pass.

Those in favor say: The Budget Committee, sensitive to the impact of the recent reevaluation, met and worked with each Town department to review the needs and obligations of each department. Each line item of the budget was thoroughly reviewed by the Department Heads, Board of Selectmen, Town Manager and the Budget Committee. The Proposed Operating Budget funds what is necessary to maintain the current level of services to the Town.

Those Opposed say: A proposal at Deliberative Session to cut the Proposed Operating Budget by \$2M was defeated. Those who spoke against the Proposed Operating Budget expressed the negative impact of the recent reevaluation, and the increasing cost of expenses to run the Town.

Fiscal impact: The impact of both the Proposed Operating Budget and the Default Budget is \$0.24 per \$1,000 valuation over 2024. A household valued at \$650,000 will see a tax increase of \$156.00 in 2025.

Article 14 – Winnacunnet Road Article has been Zeroed out – Will not be pursued in 2025

This article will appear on your ballot, but it has been zeroed out because the matching funds that DPW had anticipated will not be available this year. No one spoke to this, other than to explain the reason for the withdrawal. It does not matter how you vote on this Article – the result is the same – it will not be pursued.

Articles 15 and 16 are “Collective Bargaining Agreements” (CBAs) and are the result of extensive negotiations between the Town and the respective Unions regarding topics such as wages, hours, benefits and terms and conditions of employment. The Town has had difficulty hiring due to Hampton’s wages being non-competitive with surrounding municipalities. Thus, there are many unfilled positions. When Departments are understaffed, it affects the service levels for Hampton residents, and contributes to higher costs due to the need to pay overtime wages for the employees that the Town does have.

Article 15: Collective Bargaining Agreement - Police Assoc. Patrolman - \$241,348 in 2025 (39 weeks)

What it means: The costs represent a negotiated agreement between the Town and the union representing the Police Department patrolmen.

Estimated Increase (over previous year level)

- 2025 (39 weeks) \$241,348
- 2026 (52 weeks) \$214,395
- 2027 (52 weeks) \$179,717
- 2028 (13 weeks) \$ 42,945

Hampton’s fiscal year begins in January, but the Town Meeting to approve expenditures occurs in March. Thus, the first year with increased wages in place will have only 9 months (April to December), the second two calendar years represent 12 months and the final 3 months of the contract fall into the last year (2028).



Those in favor say: Getting to competitive wages helps control costs, since the Town is not constantly having to go through repetitive hiring cycles. Since the last contract, Hampton has lost 6 more patrolmen, 5 of whom have gone to other Police Departments in the area for higher pay. During negotiations, the Patrolmen made some financial concessions (versus the going in position) and also agreed to a lesser, more cost-effective medical plan. The full-time force also agreed to take on some “priority” shifts in the summertime to help make up for the lack of willing recruits for the part-time work in summer. These shifts were previously outsourced to other agencies at a high taxpayer cost. The willingness of the Hampton Patrolmen to pick up some of the excess work will result in a net savings for the taxpayers.

Fiscal impact: If Article 15 is approved, a property valued at \$650,000 would see a tax increase of \$26.00 in 2025. Cost per thousand dollars of valuation is .04 cents in 2025. Subsequent years would see proportional increases added to the Town’s budget.

Article 16: Collective Bargaining Agreement - Police Association Sergeants - \$57,400 in 2025 (39 weeks)

What it Means: See the “What it Means” discussion under Article 15 above.

Estimated Increase (over previous year level)

- 2025 (39 weeks) \$57,400
- 2026 (52 weeks) \$48,552
- 2027 (52 weeks) \$37,129
- 2028 (13 weeks) \$ 8,730

Those in Favor Say: Sergeants represent the most important employees in the Police Department. They are the backbone of our Police Department. Every shift, every division is supervised by a Sergeant. They are responsible for the safety of each shift and the decisions that are made on that shift. They work with the Patrolmen to assure training and standards are met. There needs to be an incentive for the employees to step up and take on this critical responsibility.

Fiscal impact: If Article 16 is approved, a property valued at \$650,000 would see a tax increase of \$6.50 in 2025. Cost per thousand dollars of valuation is .01 cents in 2025.

Articles 17, 22, 23, 28 and 29 if approved, will draw upon the Unassigned Fund Balance (UFB) for a cost reduction to taxpayers in the current year of \$867,500 - roughly \$90.22 savings for a home valued at \$650,000. This is in addition to \$500,000 from the Unassigned Fund Balance that was used to lower the tax revenue needed to meet general budgetary requirements.

The **Unassigned Fund Balance** consists of excess funding that comes from either more revenues than expected (Example: the Rooms and Meals Tax distribution from the State; or higher than anticipated revenues from Trust Funds) OR from lower than anticipated costs (example an expense approved by the taxpayers that ends up not costing as much as expected, or the project is not pursued.)

There is a required minimum funding that a municipality needs to maintain in the Unassigned Fund. The New Hampshire Department of Revenue Administration (DRA) recommends 5%-17% of the municipality’s overall budget be held as “unassigned” to cover emergencies and to mitigate the fluctuations in the timing of revenue



received and outlays required. The top end of this recommended reserve amount translates to over \$6 million for Hampton. Even with these hold-back requirements, there is excess funding to dedicate to projects the Town Departments feel are needed. If the voters approve these expenditures and if they were NOT being funded by the Unassigned Fund Balance, it would require additional taxation.

If all the Articles that call upon the Unassigned Fund Balance are passed, it would reduce the Unassigned Fund by \$867,500, which would leave adequate backup resources, and would still allow the town to qualify for a lower bond rate for Warrant Articles that are bond-funded.

When you see “no tax impact in 2025” associated with an Article that uses the Unassigned Fund Balance, it means there is *no need to raise new tax revenue* to cover the proposed costs, because the money was previously raised, earned or conserved. However, **the voters have the ability to approve or reject the proposed use of those funds.**

Article 17 – Replacement of Self-Contained Breathing Apparatus \$400,000 in 2025 (UFB)

What it means: Article 17 asks for an expenditure of \$400,000 to replace equipment used to help firefighters breathe when they enter a burning structure. This would be taken from the Unassigned Fund Balance.

Those in favor say: The current SCBA equipment is past its useful life of roughly 25 years, and for safety reasons must be replaced.

Fiscal impact: No tax impact in 2025, as the funds will be withdrawn from the Unassigned Fund Balance.

Article 18: Road Improvement Capital Reserve Fund Addition - \$500,000

What it means: The Town is seeking to add \$500,000 to a Capital Reserve Fund that will help spread the cost of needed road work over multiple years. Savings will be available for future maintenance and improvements to the roadways and associated sidewalks within the Town of Hampton. Approval is required by Town Meeting (your vote) to make use of this Fund in the future. The current value of the fund without this appropriation, is \$3,538,801. Note that the voters approved the use of \$500,000 from this fund for the High Street project, but we did not need it, so the fund continues to grow and can be used to offset larger projects when the time is right.

Those in Favor Say: This is a way of saving money for larger projects so that the town is less reliant on costly bond funding, and can avoid “all at once” expenditures for the taxpayers.

Fiscal impact: A property valued at \$650,000 would see a tax increase of \$52.00 in 2025. Cost per thousand dollars of valuation is .08 cents in 2025. The same amount was in the 2024 budget that passed, so there is no incremental impact in 2025.

Article 19: Replacing/Upgrading Sewer Manhole Covers - \$450,000

What it Means: In 2023, a study was approved by the voters to identify manholes that were contributing to an increase in storm waters infiltrating the Wastewater Treatment System. These structures are often covered with flood water causing concern about saltwater seeping in to our sewer lines, causing corrosion and adding to the volume of water – and thus the cost – of wastewater treatment. With the problem areas now identified



and photographed, this request for funding will cover the design, bid, construction and associated work for the rehabilitation of approximately 22 problematic manholes.

No one spoke for or against this Article at Deliberative Session.

Fiscal impact: Cost per \$1,000 valuation is \$0.07. A household valued at \$650,000 would see a tax increase of \$45.50 for 2025.

Article 20: Road Improvements - \$619,890 (State Highway Block Grant Partial Offset)

What it means: Hampton anticipates receiving a NH DOT Highway Grant that helps to maintain Class IV and Class V “highways” (compact sections of town roads). Funds are applied to specific projects identified by DPW and approved by the Board of Selectmen. The taxpayer funding is used to supplement the Highway Block Grant money provided by the State to improve Town Roadway Networks (including paving). The focus for 2025 funds will be Lafayette Road, based on its condition and heavy use. PCI is a rating system for the condition of a road, which is scored between 0 and 100, with 100 being a perfect surface. Lafayette Road has a Pavement Condition Index (PCI) of 46. Hampton’s overall PCI is 71.

This funding helps DPW improve roads that do not have extensive infrastructure issues, but do need top-level repairs. The work helps to return roads to smooth working order.

Fiscal impact: Cost per thousand dollars of valuation is \$ 0.05. A household valued at \$650,000 will see a tax cost of \$32.50 in 2025. A similar Article was passed last year, and was part of your tax bill. This year’s number is slightly lower; so there would actually be a decrease for this item vs. last year, if approved.

Article 21: Trailer and Freightliner Trash Truck - \$536,890

What it means: Our existing fleet of trash/recycling collection vehicles consists of 6 vehicles - all which are needed to provide collection service. Unit 96 (to be replaced) is a 2007 International Packer with +/-116,600 miles with severe rust and engine issues. Our existing fleet of 7 hauling trailers are all needed to store and haul the collected trash and recycling. Six of these trailers including T-6 (to be replaced) are 2012 Steco Ejector models that are reaching the end of their life span. Not replacing these units now only prolongs and potentially increases the cost to replace vehicles that are needed to provide reliable service to Hampton property owners.

Those in favor say: It takes about a year to receive a truck once ordered, and the Town cannot afford to be without it. The Trailer would likely come in sooner, but they both have age and condition issues, and it would be better if we could replace them before they are completely out of commission.

Fiscal impact: Cost per thousand dollars of valuation is \$ 0.09. A household valued at \$650,000 will see a tax cost of \$58.50 in 2025.

Article 22: New Capital Reserve Fund – Maintenance of Town Buildings - \$100,000 (UFB)

What it means: The Article is asking to establish a Capital Reserve Fund (CRF) specifically for town owned buildings. The \$100,000 that will be deposited to the new CRF is coming from the Unassigned Fund Balance, and will not have a fiscal impact in 2025.



Those in favor say: According to the most recent Annual Report, Hampton owns buildings valued at \$47 million. Some of these properties are aging, and as with any physical property will need occasional repairs beyond routine maintenance. Establishing a Capital Reserve Fund means that we can earmark the funds for needed repairs, and avoid the need to increase taxes for an “all-at-once” expenditure.

Fiscal impact: There will be no tax impact in 2025, because the funds will be transferred from the Unassigned Fund Balance to the new Capital Reserve Fund if this Article is approved.

Article 23: Replace and Upgrade the Public Safety Pier - \$300,000 (UFB)

What it means: The Hampton Public Safety Pier was constructed in 2005 entirely with federal funding, and is used by the fire department, the New Hampshire Marine Patrol and the U.S. Coast Guard. Uses include marine rescue, law-enforcement patrols and access for the U.S. Coast Guard in case of an emergency. The pier is now 20 years old, and needs attention.

Those in Favor Say: The pier is a very important resource for Hampton, and requires maintenance.

Fiscal impact: The funds will be withdrawn from the UFB and will not affect taxes in 2025.

Article 24: Flood Preparedness, Mitigation or Recovery Efforts - \$300,000 (UFB)

What it means: Hampton has seen significant damage from flooding in recent years, and has had to put resources behind recovery efforts. Grants that become available for coastal resilience work often require that the town match the grant money. Having funding that is readily available will prevent delays in additional funding for preparation and mitigation efforts prior to and recovery efforts following flooding events.

Fiscal impact: Cost per thousand dollars of valuation is \$ 0.05. A household valued at \$650,000 will see a tax cost of \$32.50 in 2025.

Article 25: Parks and Recreation Improvements - \$220,000 (100% Offset by Fund Withdrawal)

What it means: There is a set-aside fund that gets replenished using 20% of the revenue from the town owned and run parking lots. This fund supports the maintenance of Parks and Rec facilities. But the voters must approve the use of the funds.

Those in favor say: There is little in the Recreation Department’s budget for maintenance. Money in the Parks and Rec fund is used to improve recreational facilities. The ability to offer good, safe recreational opportunities to residents is part of the culture of our town and this expenditure, which does not require new taxes to be raised, is a crucial part of that. UNH did a study a few years back that indicated that the average cost for Parks and Rec is \$70 per person, whereas Hampton’s is \$17 – largely because of this funding mechanism.

Fiscal impact: There is no tax impact, as the funds are put aside for this purpose and only need voter approval for the intended use.

Article 26: Contributions to Human Service Agencies - \$176,611



To see if the Town of Hampton will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$176,611 for the purpose of funding the following twenty-one human service agencies in the amounts requested for 2025.

Human Service Agency	2024 Funding	2025 Funding
Aids Response Seacoast	\$2,700	\$ 2,700
American Red Cross	2,000	2,000
Area Home Care & Family Services	12,000	12,000
Big Brothers Big Sisters	8,000	8,000
Child Advocacy Center	2,750	2,000
Court Appt Special Advocates (CASA)	1,000	1,000
Cross Roads House	39,000	39,000
Families First Health & Support Center	10,000	10,000
Friends Program Retired & Senior Volunteer Program	1,800	1,800
Gather	5,000	5,000
Haven Violence Protection & Support Services	7,500	7,500
New Generation Shelter	2,000	2,000
One Sky Community Services	5,100	3,700
Rockingham Community Action	25,000	25,000
Rockingham Meals on Wheels	11,811	11,811
Seacoast Family Promise	2,500	1,500
Seacoast Mental Health Center	8,000	8,000
Seacoast Youth Services	5,000	5,000
St. Vincent de Paul	3,000	3,000
Transportation Assistance for Seniors (TASC)	9,600	9,600
Waypoint	16,000	16,000
Total	\$179,761	\$176,611

What it means: Each of the listed agencies will receive a donation from the town in the noted amount. The funds raised and donated last year are provided for comparison. This is an “all or none” Warrant Article. If the Article passes, all the listed agencies receive the specified donations. If it fails, none do.

Those in Favor Say: Several people at Deliberative Session rose to support this Article, noting that the people of Hampton benefit from the efforts of these agencies. The services provided would not be as easily attainable, and would certainly be more expensive, if the Town had to step in to fill even a portion of the roles currently provided by these non-profits. However, one speaker did suggest that the report submitted by the agencies at the end of the year should be made more readily available (as opposed to having to go to Town Hall to see it.)

Those Opposed Say: No one spoke against this Article at Deliberative Session. However, Article 36 also addresses this funding mechanism for the Social Services Agencies. The reader is advised to review that discussion, found on page 16.

Fiscal impact: Cost per \$1,000 valuation is \$0.03. A household valued at \$650,000 would see \$19.50 incorporated in the tax bill for 2025. However, since a similar cost has been part of the tax base for some time, there is essentially no increased tax (and in fact a slight reduction in the tax bill.)

Article 27: Police Forfeiture Fund - \$90,000 (No Tax Impact)



What it means: During police operations, items of value may be forfeited by individuals. There are expenses associated with the management of such property, including storage, the return of items where appropriate, etc. NH law permits the auctioning of abandoned property, and the proceeds are put into a fund. This Article would allow the funds to be withdrawn to cover departmental costs, as approved via the RSAs. The actual amount is unknown at voting time. The \$90,000 is seen as the upper limit of what may be available to withdraw.

Discussion: No one spoke to this Article at Deliberative Session.

Fiscal impact: There would be no tax impact, since this money is in a set-aside fund. This is a routine measure to allow the withdrawal of the funds for various Police Department needs.

Article 28 – Audit of the Town of Hampton Zoning Ordinance - \$40,000 (UFB)

What it Means: The Zoning Ordinance is referred to for any development in Hampton. Most structural or land use projects must be guided by the Zoning Ordinance. The Master Plan has indicated that making the Zoning Ordinances more organized, readable and clear is a key priority for Hampton. One of the important steps is to identify redundancies, unclear language and sections where the Zoning Ordinances are not aligned with the Master Plan. A robust public participation process is planned for this project.

Those in favor say: The Ordinances were first published in 1949, and there have been many updates since that time. In that decades-long process, many inconsistencies have arisen. It makes sense to identify where the Ordinances are serving the community, and where changes need to be made.

Fiscal impact: There will be no tax impact in 2025, because the funds from the Unassigned Fund Balance will be used if this Article is approved.

Article 29 – Firefighters Turn Out Gear Equipment Fund - \$27,500 (UFB)

What it means: In 2019, voters approved \$200,000 for a new Capital Reserve Fund for the replacement of Firefighter's Protective Gear. This fund needs to be added to regularly, so that as gear is replaced using money withdrawn from the fund, additional funds will be available for future needs. This Article would transfer the funds from the Unassigned Fund Balance to the Turnout Gear Reserve Fund.

Those in favor say: This is an annual procedure to keep our Firefighters safe. A single set of firefighting gear costs upwards of \$6,000. There are strict standards with regard to the amount of service before the gear must be replaced, and that has meant 4-5 new sets of equipment each year. To cover this expense, a reserve fund was established and needs to be regularly replenished. This Article allows funds to be taken from the Unassigned Fund Balance for the replenishment. The value of the fund at the end of 2024 was just over \$130,000. Since it started with \$200,000, it is clear that need for funding is stronger than the annual donations. In the future, the contribution to the Turn Out Gear Fund may need to be increased.

Those Opposed Say: No one spoke against this Article at the Deliberative Session.

Fiscal impact: There is no new tax impact in 2025. This Article is allowing the transfer of funds from the Unassigned Fund Balance to the previously-established Firefighter Turnout Gear Reserve Fund.

Article 30 – Fire Code Changes



What it means: This Article was represented as a “housekeeping” change that deletes unnecessary or outdated language.

Fiscal Impact: There is no cost for this Article.

Articles 31-39 are brought forward (petitioned) by residents (as opposed to the Town.)

Article 31 – Proposed Funding of Hampton Holiday Parade - \$5,000

What it means: This request is for an annual donation to Experience Hampton to help fund the Holiday parade, which generally occurs in early December. It reflects an increase from the \$3,000 that had been in place since 2010. The taxpayers are asked to pay a fraction of cost for the parade, which is in the range of \$20,000.

Those in favor say: The parade involves many groups, including businesses, schools and local officials. It is a community-building event that also attracts people to the area from around the region, since it has become the largest event of its kind in the region.

Those Opposed say: No one spoke against this Article at Deliberative Session. However, Article 38 (see page 17) speaks to whether the taxpayers should be shouldering the cost for this effort.

Fiscal impact: A household valued at \$650,000 would see \$0.55 incorporated into the tax bill for 2025. Last year’s number was .40, so there would be an increase of 15 cents.

Article 32 – Proposed Removal or Regulation of Commercial Businesses in a Residentially District

What it means: Barbour Road is a residentially zoned area, yet several businesses have been allowed to operate from 17 Barbour Rd. and they utilize heavy equipment in the business. The nearby residents believe that the types of activities that the businesses engage in may well be harmful to the aquifer, and the Town should be acting on this disruptive and potentially harmful activity.

Those in Favor say: The types of activities that reportedly occur at this location were stated to be detrimental to the environment and to the aquifer. Despite legal review that indicated that these businesses were pre-existing, the residents argue that data from the NH Secretary of State show that the businesses were not listed at the address at the time the regulations went into effect, and therefore cannot be considered “pre-existing”.

Those Opposed Say: Legal opinion obtained by the Town indicates that pre-existing, non-conforming uses are protected by state law. If it is accurate that the businesses were pre-existing, they would be protected.

Fiscal impact: There is no direct fiscal impact to this Article.

Article 33 – Proposed Increase in Property Tax Rate for Properties Held by Non-Hampton Residents

What it Means: The petitioners ask that there be a differential tax rate for real estate owned by people who do not live in Hampton. The idea is to make up the lost revenue from real estate tax exemptions expanded via the 2024 Town Warrant.

Those in Favor Say: The state of Vermont has a similar rate differential for non-residents.



Those Opposed Say: State law dictates that tax rates are set based on property value, without regard for residential status. Thus, the Article as written would be illegal and not enforceable, according to a legal opinion obtained by the Town. Aside from the legal opinion, speakers against this idea asked – what about elderly people whose homes have been taken over by out-of-state relatives? Or family homes that have been inherited by adult children who live elsewhere? Also argued was the thought that out-of-state owners toften use less of the Town’s services, yet they pay the same tax rate now. Increasing what they pay may not be fair.

Article 34 – Proposal to Accept Ice House Lane as a Town Road

What it means: A group of homeowners who live on Ice House Lane and who have been maintaining it as required by the permitting process and as agreed to by the developer, now request that the Town assume ownership of the roads and maintenance responsibility. The process of transferring the roads will be at no cost to the Town.

Those in favor say: The people who live in the homes on this street indicate that they pay the same taxes as everyone else, but do not receive services such as road maintenance, plowing, trash, recycling, etc. One speaker said that it should be considered a public roadway, since the public used it to access the fish houses prior to the development, and thus the road should be treated as an exception.

Those Opposed say: This Article would add to the demand on Town services, and could potentially be an additional infrastructure cost if road defects are discovered, since the Town would be accepting the roads on an “as is” basis. The road is dedicated to 8 homes, and was allowed by the Town with the understanding that the Developer or the Homeowner’s Association would maintain the street as a Private Way, a fact that is in the Condominium Documents, and should have been understood by the homeowners before they purchased.

Fiscal impact: There is no direct tax impact, but would add to services required by the Town, and could potentially be a cost if work is needed under the roads, which were built privately and thus outside of the Town’s specifications.

Article 35 – Proposed Increase in Net Assets for Elderly Property Tax Exemption

What it Means: Last year, the Elderly Tax Exemption was expanded as it relates to both the exempted amount (amount deducted from the assessed valuation prior to calculating taxes owed) and qualifying net income. However, the net asset limit remained at \$250,000. The petitioners are asking that the net asset limit be increased to \$367,000. Note that this asset value excludes the primary residence (which by state regulations must be in Hampton).

Deduction from the Assessed Valuation Prior to Calculating Taxes Owed		
Age of Homeowner	Current Exempted Amount	Proposed Article 35
65-74	\$175,000	\$175,000
75-79	\$225,000	\$225,000
80+	\$300,000	\$300,000
Income Limit	Current Income Limit	Proposed Article 35
Single	\$42,000	\$42,000
Married	\$75,000	\$75,000
Net Asset Limit*	Current Asset Limit	Proposed Article 35
	\$250,000	\$367,000

* Excludes Primary residence, which must be in Hampton.

Those in Favor Say: This Article is intended to allow additional seniors to take advantage of the exemption.



Those Opposed Say: No one spoke against the Article, except to question where the numbers came from (last year's Town Meeting) or whether the Article should be written as "gross" or "net".

Fiscal impact: There is no direct tax impact, but to the degree that this Article, if approved, reduces the tax revenue, it will mean that other (mostly younger) taxpayers will pick up the difference.

Article 36 – Proposed Changes to Town Funding of Human Services Agencies

What it Means: The petitioners are seeking to put each Charitable organization that may appear on any future warrants as their own Article, presumably so the voters can decide independently if they want to support that group or not. They are further trying to disallow any charity not based physically in Hampton from being considered for this donation from taxpayers. They seem to indicate that the Town should be responsible for auditing the books of each charity.

Those in Favor: No one at Deliberative Session spoke in favor of this Article. However, one speaker indicated that the folks who put this forward were simply seeking fiscal responsibility, and did not mean to suggest any ill will towards the charities listed.

Those Opposed Say: Several speakers referred to the fact that the Warrant Article with the Social Services Agencies request is on our ballots each year and always receives a very high rate of voter approval. If we were to add the Social Services requests to the Warrant individually, we would be adding 20 Articles – this year, that would have increased the number of articles by more than half. That's how Hampton previously posed this funding question, but subsequently, the charitable requests were combined into one question for brevity's sake. Currently, the only time an agency is presented on its own is when it is new to the list. According to Legal Counsel, the 2025 Town vote cannot bind the 2026 Town vote (or subsequent years).

Fiscal impact: There is no direct tax impact, but if the list of agencies changes based on the requirement of physical presence in Hampton, the dollar amount requested might shrink in the future (if this Article passes).

Article 37 – Proposed Real Estate Sale Transaction Fee

What it Means: The petitioners are proposing that a fee of \$5.00 per \$1,000 of the sale price of the home, paid by both buyer and seller at closing. This would be in addition to the New Hampshire Transaction Tax. No one was present at Deliberative Session to explain this new funding mechanism. It is unclear if the petitioners are suggesting that this would take the place of annual property taxes, or be an addition to those taxes. If it would take the place of annual taxation, there is no discussion in the Article as how the Town's budget would be aligned with the amount or timing of Real Estate Transaction fees.

Those in favor say: No one spoke in favor of this Article at Deliberative Session.

Those Opposed Say: According to legal review obtained by the Town, this Article is unenforceable, because all authority to collect real estate taxes comes from the NH Legislature and cannot be amended by the Town.

Fiscal impact: There is no direct tax impact, although future taxation might decrease if there were money from this effort to help offset town spending requirements.

Article 38 – Proposed Discontinuation of Taxpayer Funding for the Holiday Parade



What it Means: The petitioners are asking that the voters discontinue the tradition of supporting the annual Holiday Parade. See Article 31 on page 14 for the reference. A “yes” vote means you want to discontinue funding the parade out of taxpayer dollars. A “no” vote means you want to continue the tradition as it stands. If both Article 31 and this Article are passed by the voters, this Article is voided.

Those in Favor: No one at Deliberative Session spoke in favor of this Article.

Those Opposed Say: The comments against this Article closely mirror the comments in favor of Article 31 (funding the Holiday Parade). Speakers wondered what the petitioners were intending since the Parade, even at the higher amount requested this year, still adds less than a dollar to the average tax bill. The Parade gives the whole community a chance to work together, and to have some fun.

Fiscal impact: There is no direct tax impact in 2025, but if this article passes it could decrease the total tax bill of a home valued at \$650,000 by approximately 55 cents in future years.

Article 39 – Proposed Deletion of Recommendations by Board of Selectmen on the Ballot

What it Means: The petitioners are asking to stop the practice of Selectmen stating whether they believe an Article should be passed, or not. (“Recommended” or “Not Recommended” on most questions.)

Those in Favor: No one spoke in favor of this Article at Deliberative Session.

Those Opposed Say: Legal Counsel has indicated that Selectmen are required by statute to provide recommendations for all appropriations, including Special Warrant Articles. A “special warrant article” is defined by RSA 32:3, VI and includes any article with an appropriation that is a petitioned warrant article; an article involving capital reserve funds, trust funds or special reserve funds; an article designated as non-lapsing; and appropriations for capital projects. Selectmen recommendations are also required for Collective Bargaining Agreements. Even if this Article passes, it will not remove those requirements.


By state law, a Select Board may also include both its vote tally and its recommendation in in the town warrant next to the affected warrant article, at its discretion. Thus, even where it is not required, it is allowed by statute and passing of this Article would not change that. Further, the language of the articles and presentation on the Town’s Warrant is the purview of the Select Board, per the NH Supreme Court, Olson v. Town of Grafton.

Fiscal impact: There is no direct tax impact.

Voting Day is Tuesday March 11th at Winnacunnet High School.

**Use the handy chart on the next page to record your choices.
Then bring the page with you to the voting booth to save time.**



			
2025 Hampton Town Meeting Tuesday March 11th			
Your Notes - Circle if you are choosing to vote "yes" or "no".			
Then bring this with you to the voting booth to save time.			
Highlighted Articles = Bond or Loan Funding - Requires 60% "Yes" Vote to Pass			
UFB = No new tax impact in 2025.		Yes	No
Article #	Topic		
2	Elevation of a Non-Conforming Structure		
3	Parking Ordinance Changes Per NH RSA		
4	Garage Sales – No Permit Required per Ordinances		
5	Wetlands Conservation District Ordinance Changes		
6	Workforce Housing Incorporated in Zoning Ordinance per NH Statute		
7	Apartments and Multifamily over Non-Residential Use in the Town Center-Historic Zone		
8	Permanent Outdoor Dining vs Temporary Outdoor Dining - Restaurants		
9	Child Care Ordinance Changes per NH RSA		
10	Certificate of Rental Occupancy – Renewable Every 5 Years (Change from 10)		
11	Study of Sewer System Local Limits - \$100,000 Offset by 100% Loan Forgiveness		
12	Inflow and Infiltration Study - \$100,000 Offset by 100% Loan Forgiveness		
13	Operating Budget of \$36,326,944 versus a Default Budget of \$36,327,011		
14	Winnacunnet Road Article has been Zeroed out – Will not be pursued in 2025		
15	Collective Bargaining Agreement - Police Assoc. Patrolman - \$241,348 in 2025 (39 weeks)		
16	Collective Bargaining Agreement - Police Association Sergeants - \$57,400 in 2025 (39 weeks)		
17	Replacement of Self-Contained Breathing Apparatus \$400,000 in 2025 (UFB)		
18	Road Improvement Capital Reserve Fund Addition - \$500,000		
19	Replacing/Upgrading Sewer Manhole Covers - \$450,000		
20	Road Improvements - \$619,890 (State Highway Block Grant Partial Offset)		
21	Trailer and Freightliner Trash Truck - \$536,890		
22	New Capital Reserve Fund – Maintenance of Town Buildings - \$100,000 (UFB)		
23	Replace and Upgrade the Public Safety Pier - \$300,000 (UFB)		
24	Flood Preparedness, Mitigation or Recovery Efforts - \$300,000 (UFB)		
25	Parks and Recreation Improvements - \$220,000 (100% Offset by Fund Withdrawal)		
26	Contributions to Human Service Agencies - \$176,611		
27	Police Forfeiture Fund - \$90,000 (No Tax Impact)		
28	Audit of the Town of Hampton Zoning Ordinance - \$40,000 (UFB)		
29	Firefighters Turn Out Gear Equipment Fund - \$27,500 (UFB)		
30	Fire Code Changes		
31	Proposed Funding of Hampton Holiday Parade - \$5,000		
32	Proposed Removal or Regulation of Commercial Businesses in a Residentially District		
33	Proposed Increase in Property Tax Rate for Properties Held by Non-Hampton Residents		
34	Proposal to Accept Ice House Lane as a Town Road		
35	Proposed Increase in Net Assets for Elderly Property Tax Exemption		
36	Proposed Changes to Town Funding of Human Services Agencies		
37	Proposed Real Estate Sale Transaction Fee		
38	Proposed Discontinuation of Taxpayer Funding for the Holiday Parade		
39	Proposed Deletion of Recommendations by Board of Selectmen on the Ballot		