

To Whom It May Concern,

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the individuals who volunteered to work on the Dalton NH Zoning Ordinance. There is no doubt that a great amount of time and effort was put forth in the development of this document. Though I may take issue with some of the basic tenets of the proposal, my criticism is not directed at those of you who drafted it.

This past spring/summer the zoning ordinance committee asked the residents to give them feedback on a draft proposal. I responded to your request and quite frankly, many of my concerns from then are still present in this document.

It begins with the Preamble which looks at the key principles as to why this ordinance was developed. The very first statement reads "Dalton is a rural, residential community and should remain so in the future". By stating this from the beginning, you are predisposing the town to remain property poor for as long as the state uses property tax as its main taxing source of income. The third statement reinforces this predisposition by stating that the town should remain a community of single-family homes.

Your fourth statement states that "Dalton should continue to encourage forestry, agriculture and recreation/tourist-related activities and businesses". Where, may I respectfully ask, is this happening? Do we have a major logging operation, besides Doug Ingerson's, that I am not aware of? Where do we have a working dairy or vegetable farm in town? Though my family at one point would take produce to a local farmer's market, I would not consider our small farm venture a plus to our community. It certainly did not bring extra revenue into our town's coffers. In regards to recreation/tourist activities, though we may have a state park within our boundaries, how does this help the economy of our town? There are no storefronts in or around Forest Lake State Park and to the best of my knowledge there are no hotel/motel establishments in the town of Dalton. This is all wishful thinking.

Your fifth statement which encourages limited commercial and industrial development goes against the four statements prior to it, that encourages Dalton to remain a property poor, residential community.

Your sixth statement claims that you would like to encourage the town's center, as small as it is, to be transformed into a business center. If this was an attractive area to locate a business, I would assume that it probably would have taken place by now.

The seventh statement of the Preamble claims that "Dalton property owners must be able to count on full protections of their property rights". It goes on to add that the ordinance must "fully respect and protect how Dalton's residents and property owners are currently using their land". How would this ordinance protect Doug Ingerson's right to run his industrial park as he sees fit? He purchased this land approximately 20 years ago to establish an industrial park which would provide for he and his family's future. At the time there were no zoning ordinances in the town of Dalton and to date, he has had

few if any complaints in regards to how his business has been operated. Quite frankly, Forest Lake has coexisted with industry for the past 50 years with little or no issues. If you took a one mile radius around Forest Lake you would find a biomass plant, a wood processing plant, a logging operation, a cement company, an asphalt plant, a gravel pit which consists of six different sites, a commercial business (Gilbert Block), a shooting range, a former Harley Davidson motorcycle dealership and a former drive-in movie theater. None of these ventures have had a negative impact on Forest Lake State Park.

As I move to Article IV which looks at land use regulations, who is to determine what justifies undue noise, traffic, dust, pollution, emission, and adverse effect on adjacent properties? These are all subjective issues that will have different opinions. What may be undue noise for one, may not be for another. To create a document that tries to create rules that are unenforceable is doomed to failure. Further in Article IV the document states that a small business may be allowed as long as it has fewer than 25 employees. Who determined this number? How can we, the residents of the town, dictate how many employees a company within our town may have on their payroll? This I would argue is a lawsuit just waiting to happen.

For the past two years, the residents of Dalton have been inundated with propaganda, half-truths, and fear mongering tactics by an individual who is hell bent on forcing his will upon all of us. Though he appears to be concerned with everyone's well being, he is truly concerned only of his own. His divisive rhetoric has split this town into the haves and the have nots. Those who can easily afford the property taxes that are levied against them, to those who struggle to pay their bills. Those who are not in need of town services, to those who are in desperate need of these same services. This document appears to placate him and his wishes rather than truly help the town move forward in a positive direction in the future.

Thank you again for your efforts.

Scott Kleinschrodt
59 Bush Road
Dalton, NH