

TOPIC AREA	RSA SECTION(S)	STATE RSA REQUIREMENT	ZONING ORDINANCE MISALIGNMENT	SUBDIVISION REGULATION MISALIGNMENT	SITE PLAN REGULATION MISALIGNMENT	HOUSING-BARRIER FRAMING (WHAT THE CONFLICT DOES)
A.	RSA 674:1, VII (HB 2)	Planning board authority to identify municipally/county-owned land suitable for residential; advisory power.	<b>None found</b> (no ordinance language contradicting advisory inventory role).	N/A	N/A	No direct housing barrier—this is an enabling/administrative change.
A.	RSA 674:43, VI–VIII (HB 2)	Adds planning authorities (expedited review & pattern zoning authority).	<b>None found</b> (no direct conflict identified in zoning text via this audit pass).	N/A	<b>None found</b> (regs cite Ch. 674 authority and operate within it).	Potential opportunity area, not a barrier. This could be used to streamline housing forms if the municipality chooses.
B.	RSA 674:21, V (HB 168)	Impact fees expanded to include public works facilities.	<b>None found</b> in the zoning ordinance. The ordinance makes no reference to impact fees.	N/A	N/A	Not a prohibition; more about what municipalities <i>may</i> include. Impact fees do create a cost/risk barrier to housing.
B.	RSA 674:16, VIII (HB 457)	Adds limits on residential occupancy regulation (e.g., “2 persons/bedroom; no relationship limits”).	<b>None found</b> in ordinance sections reviewed for direct conflict.	N/A	N/A	If local “family” definitions cap unrelated occupants or effectively limit bedrooms, that can suppress shared housing and affordability.
B.	RSA 674:71–72 (HB 577)	Updated ADU definitions and core ADU requirements; intent is to normalize ADUs and reduce administrative delay.	<b>Conflict (process):</b> The zoning language is not explicit about ADUs being allowed by-right and approved administratively. <b>Conflict (size):</b> Size language in condition “F” is not fully aligned with state-law. <b>Conflict (definition):</b> Zoning Ordinance does not contain a definition for an Accessory Dwelling Unit, what is described in condition “H” is not fully aligned with state-law. <b>Conflict (parking):</b> State-law requires ADUs be held to the same zoning standards as the primary home. Condition “K”, makes the location of parking for an ADU more restrictive than it is for single-family homes.	N/A	<b>Missing Information:</b> Table B – Off-Street Parking Requirements refers to section 2.3.1.6 & 7 in the zoning ordinance. No such section exists.	Aligning ADU language in section 5.18 of the zoning ordinance with the new state ADU law will clarify rules for homeowners seeking to build an ADU. This will boost homeowner confidence while also reducing the risk of the town’s zoning language creating confusion about what constitutes an ADU and under what circumstances they are allowed.
B.	RSA 674:73 (HB 577)	Detached ADUs must be allowed by-right where single-family dwellings are allowed.	<b>Point of Clarity (detached ADU limitation):</b> ADUs are described as “Attached” or “free-standing”. The zoning ordinance distinction of ADU type is not aligned with the state-law. <b>Conflict (existing structures):</b> The zoning does not contain language exempting ADUs in existing structures from bulk standards.	None found	None found	Detached ADUs are a low infrastructure way to add housing units. Providing clarity about the scenarios in which ADUs are allowed will improve homeowner confidence.

TOPIC AREA	RSA SECTION(S)	STATE RSA REQUIREMENT	ZONING ORDINANCE MISALIGNMENT	SUBDIVISION REGULATION MISALIGNMENT	SITE PLAN REGULATION MISALIGNMENT	HOUSING-BARRIER FRAMING (WHAT THE CONFLICT DOES)
C.	RSA 674:79–80 (HB 631)	Zoning <b>must permit</b> multifamily/mixed-use residential on land zoned primarily commercial; cannot require discretionary approvals that effectively deny it.	<b>Conflict:</b> Residential in commercial districts is largely achieved via discretionary review; multifamily is not permitted by-right as a principal use in most scenarios. Mixed-use residential is described as only permitted as “ <i>affordable</i> ” in a very limited acreage within the town, creating a functional prohibition.	None found	None was found. Site plan review will apply once a use is allowed. Then, the required parking ratios cannot be greater than 1 space/unit. Developers can choose to build more parking if desired.	This is a <b>high-impact housing barrier:</b> if commercial corridors cannot host housing as a principal use, supply gets pushed into low density residential districts, raising price pressures and reducing the diversity of housing types.
D.	RSA 674:41, I(c) & I(d)(1) (SB 281; HB 296)	A municipality <b>may not deny</b> a building permit <b>solely</b> because a lot is served by a <b>Class VI road</b> or a <b>private road</b> ; denials must be grounded in objective safety findings.	<b>Potential conflict (frontage standard as proxy prohibition):</b> multi-family/workforce housing standards include frontage on a <b>state highway or Town maintained Class V or better</b> . This creates risk of treating frontage on a Class VI road as categorical disqualifier.	<b>Potential conflict (subdivision access standard):</b> “ <i>Every subdivision shall have safe access to a class V public road or better.</i> ” Instead, objective standards for roads should be referenced.	<b>Potential conflict (site plan access standard):</b> “All sites shall have safe access to a <b>class V public road or better.</b> ” Objective standards for roads should be made clear to demonstrate there is no categorical denial.	If frontage standards are used as an automatic gatekeeper (instead of using a safety-finding framework), they have the potential to block development of otherwise buildable lots, restricting development of small-scale housing on existing roads.
E.	RSA 674:16 , VII (SB 284)	<b>Residential parking requirements capped at 1 space per dwelling unit.</b>	<b>Conflict:</b> zoning text includes a “ <b>minimum of two (2) parking spaces per dwelling shall be provided in the AR-1 district</b> ” (zoning section 4.2.1.5)	None found	<b>Conflict (direct):</b> Residential Uses parking ratios exceed 1 space/unit (e.g., <b>Live-Work 3.0/DU; Multi-family 2.0/DU; Elderly 1.5/DU</b> ). <b>Conflict (missing):</b> parking footnotes refer to missing parking ratio requirements in the zoning.	Parking minimums are one of the most consistent “silent” housing suppressors: they increase land consumption, construction cost, and often reduce achievable unit counts.
E.	RSA 674:77–78 (SB 283)	Defines FAR/below-grade area and requires zoning to exclude below-grade area from FAR. Londonderry does not use FAR as a zoning control.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Not a barrier. FAR isn’t used in the zoning. If FAR is introduced later as a later date, be sure to align definitions to avoid inadvertent bulk limits.
F.	RSA 674:39 (HB 413)	Extended vesting/exemption periods.	None found	None found	<b>No conflict found:</b> site plan revocation references the <b>time periods in RSA 674:39</b> rather than imposing a shorter local clock.	Predictable vesting reduces “approval-risk premium,” which supports feasibility—especially for housing projects that require financing certainty.