Digital data in NH GRANIT represent the efforts of the contributing agencies to record information from the cited source materials. Complex Systems Research Center (CSRC), under contract to the Office of Energy and Planning (OEP), and in consultation with cooperating agencies, maintains a continuing program to identify and correct errors in these data. Neither OEP nor CSRC make any claims as to the validity or reliability or to any implied uses of these data.
1. How many acres does the town represent, and are there any conserved lands within the town. If so what is the percentage of conserved lands?

The Town of Danbury represents 24,343 acres with in the ASLPT region. The total amount of conserved land inside the town of Danbury is 2,135 acres, making Danbury 8.9 % conserved land. This number is far below the 25 % goal of New Hampshire Everlasting for conserved lands within each town. The information to answer this question was found within the data layers brought in from the GRANIT web site. Additional information about he conserved land in Danbury can be found on the following map and table.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># on Map</th>
<th>Name of Area</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Held by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Stiles</td>
<td>Located at the foot of Ragged Mountain. Goats, llamas, and sheep are kept on property. 85 Acres</td>
<td>ASLPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Brinbaum</td>
<td>Well known for its stream, cascading water, and popular swimming holes. 110 Acres</td>
<td>ASLPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Schlage Lot</td>
<td>47 Acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rosemary's Woods</td>
<td>216 Acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>222 Acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hope Forest</td>
<td>340 Acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>69 Acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ray, O. + A.</td>
<td>56 Acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Hope Forest</td>
<td>79 Acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ray, M</td>
<td>143 Acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Chamberlin</td>
<td>94 Acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ragged Mountain</td>
<td>278 Acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Humphreys family</td>
<td>245 Acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Independence Park</td>
<td>23 Acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Victors woods</td>
<td>179 Acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Are there large undeveloped parcels of land in your region?

Unfragmented lands are lands that are not bisected by any roads or any other human development within the town. These lands are important to the town because they provide prime habitat to many forms of wildlife. The larger the size of the unfragmented parcel the more beneficial it is to the local wildlife. The town of Danbury has nine large unfragmented parcels of land the largest of which is located in the northern corner of the town. This parcel of land is 4910 acres and is approximately 5 percent conserved. Four of Danbury’s large unfragmented parcels of land contain no conserved land. Parcel number seven is 1852 acres and is about fifty percent conserved.

Ownership within Parcels

Parcel #1

- Trumpetto, Charles F  
  Wild Meadow RD  
  Lot 401, 1  
  353 Acres

Lot 403, 20  
Wild Meadow RD  
770 Acres

- Michels, John  
  Forbes Mt. RD  
  Lot 403, 24  
  288 Acres

- Brownell, Mary L  
  Forbes Mt. RD  
  Lot 403, 25  
  1161 Acres

- Huntoon, Marjorie & Alex  
  Forbes Mt. RD  
  Lot 404, 5  
  592 Acres

- Long, John & Marjorie  
  Taylor Hill RD  
  Lot 405, 2  
  168.4 Acres

Parcel #2

- SPNHF  
  Rt. 104 Old Flanders RD  
  Lot 410, 43  
  143 Acres

- Bates, Margaret – Estate of  
  Ward Hill RD  
  Lot 410, 62  
  105 Acres
• Fuchs, Henery J & Beatrice J – Trustees
  Murray Hill RD
  Lot 410, 67
  154 Acres

• Donoghue, Gary D
  Poverty Pond RD
  Lot 410, 74
  102.3 Acres

• Devink, Jeffery M
  Moose Meadow LN
  Lot 410, 99
  154.7 Acres

Parcel #3

• Thomas, Edward J
  Searles Hill RD
  Lot 411, 59
  239 Acres

• Rosenblum, Myron & Rachel
  Spears Hill RD
  Lot 411, 105
  239 Acres

Parcel #4

• Quarry Hill Corp
  Plowman RD
  Lot 416, 60
  1466 Acres

  Plowman RD
  Lot 416, 61
  201.53 Acres

• NFTI Limited Partnership
  New Canada RD
  Lot 418, 3
  124.9 Acres
Parcel #5

- Green Crow Corp.
  Rt. 4
  Lot 415, 1
  223 Acres
  New Canada RD
  Lot 415, 18
  373.8 Acres

- Reed, Kathlene A
  New Canada RD
  Lot 415, 21
  233 Acres

- Boatwright, John T. & Barbra
  New Canada RD
  Lot 415, 22
  135 Acres

- Friedlander, Linda H – Trustee
  Wiggen RD
  Lot 415, 34
  121 Acres

- Currier, Richard W
  Wiggen RD
  Lot 415, 35
  147 Acres

Parcel #6

- Huntoon, Marjorie & Alen
  Spear Hill RD
  Lot 412, 7
  362 Acres

- Bodenstein, Nancy M
  Old Grafton Turnpike
  Lot 412, 39
  270.53 Acres
Parcel #7

- Macuch, Carol Ann
  Waukeena Lake RD
  Lot 413, 1
  107.6 Acres

Parcel #8

- Charlotte Realty Trust
  Zaccaria’s RD
  Lot 407, 1
  114 Acres

- Carlson, Douglas & Kelly
  Rt. 4
  Lot 407, 1
  114 Acres

- Ford, Charles & Anna Marie
  Ford Mill RD
  Lot 408, 40
  121 Acres

- Barker Jean & Fossie
  Ford Mill RD
  Lot 408, 39
  108 Acres

- Schurger, Jon
  Ford Mill RD
  Lot 408, 61
  208 Acres

  Waukeena Lake RD
  Lot 408, 78
  126 Acres

- Currier, Frank & Ardena (Heirs of)
  Waukeena Lake RD
  Lot 409, 6
  108 Acres
• Mauiki, Wayne Sr.  
  Sedgewick DR  
  Lot 409, 14  
  132 Acres

• Emerson, James III  
  Rt. 4  
  Lot 409, 66  
  209 Acres

Parcel # 9

• Rondeau & Dessert  
  North RD  
  Lot 406, 4  
  142.5 Acres

• Reed, Alfred S  
  North RD  
  Lot 406, 162  
  133 Acres

• Tisbert, Barry J. Sr.  
  Ford Mill RD  
  Lot 406, 175  
  137 Acres

• Wild, Elenor W. – ADM  
  North RD  
  Lot 406, 178  
  125 Acres

• Agri, Patricia B.  
  Wild Meadow RD  
  Lot 406, 186  
  349.5 Acres

• Reed, Alfred S – Trustee  
  North RD  
  Lot 406, 190  
  218 Acres
• Brownell, Mary L  
  Brad Chase RD  
  Lot 406, 195  
  258 Acres

• Taylor, John A. & David L.  
  Bohonnon RD  
  Lot 406, 232  
  104.6 Acres

  Bohonnon RD  
  Lot 406, 233  
  101.9 Acres
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel #</th>
<th>Size in Acres</th>
<th>% Conserved</th>
<th>Land Cover / Other Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4910</td>
<td>≈ 5 %</td>
<td>Beech / Oak, Paper Birch / Aspen, Mixed Forest, Spruce / Fir, Other Hardwoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Mixed Forest, White / Red Pine, Spruce / Fir,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Mixed Forest, Hemlock, White / Red Pine, Spruce / Fir, Paper Birch / Aspen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2393</td>
<td>≈ 15 %</td>
<td>beech / Oak, Paper Birch / Aspen, Spruce / Fir, Other Hardwoods, hemlock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>≈ 10 %</td>
<td>Mixed Forest, Other hardwoods, White / Red Pines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1026</td>
<td>≈ 2 %</td>
<td>White / Red pine, Beech / Oak, Spruce / Fir, Hemlock, Other Hardwoods, Mixed Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>≈ 50 %</td>
<td>Beech / Oak, White / Red Pine, Spruce / Fir, Hemlock, Other Hardwoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2123</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Beech / Oak, Spruce / Fir, Hemlock, Other Hardwoods, Mixed Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Beech / Oak, Hemlock, Mixed Forest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. What is the rate of development in the past ten years, where has new development occurred, what is the potential for development, and has a build-out analysis been done?

From 1990 to 2000 the population in Danbury has risen from 881 people to 1,071 people, a 21.6% population change. Total number of housing units grew from 541 houses in 1990 to 596 houses in 2000.

In 2003 Danbury amended the town’s subdivision regulations, which were originally created in 1989. The purpose of the amendments was to provide for the future of the town with respect to the towns scenic beauty, agricultural and forest lands, and the preservation of the towns historic aspects. Other priorities of the amendments were to maintain un-congested roads, and to prevent any un-healthy conditions caused by over crowding. The document makes it apparent that a main concern of the town is to maintain a slow rate of development, making sure not to overcrowd the town.

The towns Land Use and Zoning Ordinance regulations assure that the town will continue with slow and steady growth. The ordinance requires that lots in village areas are no smaller then one acre, while lots in the rural district are no smaller then two acres. Article 11.6 mentions the minimum amount of frontage on a public right-of-way as no less then 100 feet in the village area, and no less then 200 feet in the rural district. The preceding articles mentioned help prevent sprawl, and the fragmentation of the land within the town. Article 11.7 helps maintain the rural and historic character of the town by limiting height, and requiring set backs from the property lines for all houses in Danbury.

When sub-division is being considered within the town, Danbury pushes for what is known as cluster development, which is addressed in article 11.10 in the towns Land Use and Zoning Ordinance. Cluster development will decrease the amount of sprawl, which in turn increases the amount of unfragmented. Cluster development allows the contractor to subdivide the lots into much smaller lots then those the zoning ordinance will allow, as long as 50 % of the entire subdivided lot remains un-fragmented common land.

The town of Danbury has not formally conducted a build-out analysis as of this point. However, Linda Wilson a member of the towns planning board feels that a build-out analysis would be a real “eye-opener” for the town, helping the local people realize the potential growth the town could possibly sustain.

Information gathered from:

Danbury land use and zoning ordinance. March 12, 2002

Danbury sub-division regulations. July 22, 2003

Linda Wilson – Planning board member. November 17, 2004
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4. + 5. Does the master plan in your town address conservation? Is there a conservation commission? Are they actively pursuing any parcels?

The master plan for Danbury New Hampshire does not address conservation, with the exception of briefly talking about preserving the town’s historic aspects. This however may have been the primary conservation issue back in 1984 when the master plan was created. Danbury is in the first stages of making a new master plan for the town, which will most likely address the conservation, a topic that has become much more of an issue in the past twenty years.

After speaking with the people who work in the Danbury town offices we found that Danbury did not have a conservation commission. However the people at the town offices said that the town is concerned with conservation, and when a new master plan is created the town will begin to think about creating a conservation commission.

Information gathered from:


6. Are there actively managed agricultural lands in town, do they provide a public or private benefit, and do they have an easement on them?

The current use assessment was obtained from Danbury’s town offices in order to determine what parcels of land could be classified as actively managed agricultural lands. The current use assessment is a program that was designed for the purpose of preserving large parcels of land that without the program could become sold to developers and subdivided because the past owners would not be able to afford the property tax on the land. The current use assessment allows the land owner to pay a significantly lower property tax, encouraging the owner to keep their land in open, undeveloped space.

One of the criteria that was chosen for the actively managed agricultural lands was that the parcel of land must be over twenty acres in order to classify as managed agricultural land. Danbury’s current use assessment only listed three parcels of land that were listed as farm land. Of the three listed parcels none were over twenty acres, and therefore we have no listed Actively Managed Agricultural Lands.

The following map shows aerial photos taken of Danbury in 1998. The large open parcels of land were identified and digitized using GIS. The digitized land was then queried to 10 acres allowing the map to show only the parcels of land greater than ten acres, in accordance to the ASLPT standards. Furthermore the maps were shown to community members to ground truth the findings.

Information gathered from:


Danbury current use document – October 26, 2004
Agriculture
Danbury, NH
7. Are there any actively managed forested lands in town, and do they have an easement on them.

The current use assessment was obtained from Danbury’s town office in order to determine what parcels of land could be classified as actively managed forest lands. The current use assessment is a program that was designed for the purpose of preserving large parcels of land. The current use assessment allows the land owner to pay a significantly lower property tax, encouraging the owner to keep their land in open, undeveloped space.

There were eleven parcels of actively managed forest lands greater than fifty acres mentioned in Danbury’s current use assessment. Six of the parcels found within Danbury were managed pine forests. Also found in Danbury are two managed hardwood forests, and three other managed forests. The largest parcel of managed land found within Danbury is 336.5 acres owned by the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire’s Forests.

The Quarry Hill Corporation owns twenty properties within Danbury, 19 of which are listed as managed forest lands in the town’s current use assessment. However all 19 parcels are smaller than fifty acres and therefore do not show up on the data table. The one property that the corporation owns in Danbury that’s greater than fifty acres is listed as current use unproductive lands, and therefore is not considered managed land. That particular parcel is 896 acres.

Information gathered from:


Danbury current use document – October 26, 2004
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Parcel #</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Forest Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, John A &amp; David L</td>
<td>406, 232</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>pine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray, Mary Lynn</td>
<td>414, 001</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>pine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPNHF</td>
<td>410, 043</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>pine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPNHF</td>
<td>414, 012</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>pine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stiles, Linford E &amp; Mary E</td>
<td>415, 014</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>pine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curren, Thomas Et All</td>
<td>415, 075</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>pine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodenstein, Nancy M</td>
<td>412, 039</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>hardwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morse, John H &amp; Julie B</td>
<td>412, 076</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>hardwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson, James III</td>
<td>409, 066</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray, Olan B &amp; Artelia Pike</td>
<td>414, 004</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ragged Mountain Fish And Game Club</td>
<td>417, 001</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. What plant communities are in town? Are there any threatened, or endangered species?

The plant communities were determined for the town of Danbury using the state wide land cover GIS layer that was downloaded from the GRANIT website. The acres were calculated and printed out in a chart on the proceeding page. The most abundant type of forest found in the town of Danbury was mixed forest, with five thousand acres, followed closely by the beech / oaks. The endangered species that are found within the town are shown on the map that follows the land cover map. The icons on the map are off set from the actual locations of the endangered species for their protection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Danbury</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hay / Pasture</td>
<td>976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beech / Oak</td>
<td>4522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper Birch / Aspen</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Hardwoods</td>
<td>2600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White / Red Pine</td>
<td>2989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spruce / Fir</td>
<td>2578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemlock</td>
<td>1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Forest</td>
<td>5622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Water</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forested Wetland</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-forested Wetland</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disturbed</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Cleared</td>
<td>879</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information gathered from:

“GRANIT.” GRANIT data. 25, Jan. 2005. GRANIT. 09 Mar. 2005
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9. Are there ecologically important lands in your town to wildlife?

Ecologically important lands in the town of Andover were measures in a number of different ways in this investigation. There are four maps used to show ecologically important lands, they are Un-Fragmented Lands, Connectivity, Forest Continuity Index, and Interior Habitat.

Unfragmented lands are lands that are not bisected by any roads or any other human development within the town. These lands are important to the town because they provide prime habitat to many forms of wildlife. The larger the size of the unfragmented parcel the more beneficial it is to the local wildlife.

The Forest Continuity Index (FCI) is a way of measuring the relative shape of a particular parcel of unfragmented land. If the FCI is low, a parcel of land is more round than a parcel with a higher FCI. If the parcel of land is round then it has less of an edge effect, making the parcel of land more beneficial for wildlife habitat.

The connectivity shows corridors that connect the unfragmented parcels of land. Corridors are important to local wildlife because they allow genetic variation and for many species, they provide more opportunity for breeding.

Unfragmented lands were determined by placing a 500 foot buffer on all the roads within the town. This was done because most development occurs within 500 feet of roads. Once identified, the parcels were color coded according to the size. The interior habitat was represented by placing a 100 foot buffer on the inside of the fragmented land, the land that was not covered by the buffer represented the interior habitat. To determine the corridors from parcel to parcel a 300 foot buffer was placed around the rivers and streams within the town. The sections of the buffer that connected two unfragmented pieces of land were then clipped to the unfragmented land layer. These sections were considered corridors between the parcels of land. The Unfragmented land layer was used to find the FCI within each parcel. The equation used to determine the FCI is:

\[
\text{Perimeter (feet)} = \frac{\text{Perimeter (feet)}}{2\sqrt{\pi \text{area (sq feet)}}}
\]

Once entered into the GIS program, the FCI’s were calculated for each parcel. The parcels were color coded according to their FCI in order to show a visual representation.

Digital data in NH GRANIT represent the efforts of the contributing agencies to record information from the cited source materials. Complex Systems Research Center (CSRC), under contract to the Office of Energy and Planning (OEP), and in consultation with cooperating agencies, maintains a continuing program to identify and correct errors in these data. Neither OEP nor CSRC make any claims as to the validity or reliability or to any implied uses of these data.
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Digital data in NH GRANIT represent the efforts of the contributing agencies to record information from the cited source materials. Complex Systems Research Center (CSRC), under contract to the Office of Energy and Planning (OEP), and in consultation with cooperating agencies, maintains a continuing program to identify and correct errors in these data. Neither OEP nor CSRC make any claims as to the validity or reliability or to any implied uses of these data.
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10. Are there areas in town adjacent to surface waters that are undeveloped, are there any aquifers in town? Identify where impervious surface threatens water quality.

Most of the aquifers in the town of Danbury, New Hampshire fall beneath the main development of the town, which is a common for towns that were developed more than 100 years ago. One of the problems of this is that there is very little of the aquifers in the town lie on conserved land. In Danbury, there is a small section of conserved land on top of the aquifer in the center of town as well as in the lower southwest corner. The majority of the aquifers are not on conserved land.

Digital data in NH GRANIT represent the efforts of the contributing agencies to record information from the cited source materials. Complex Systems Research Center (CSRC), under contract to the Office of Energy and Planning (OEP), and in consultation with cooperating agencies, maintains a continuing program to identify and correct errors in these data. Neither OEP nor CSRC make any claims as to the validity or reliability or to any implied uses of these data.
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11. What are the recreational uses of land in town?

Most of the recreational activities in the town of Danbury are focused around Ragged Mountain, a ski area that went bankrupt in the early eighties. The area was purchased by two brothers, Al and Walter Endriunas, in 1986. The two brothers were able to use their own construction company to help turn the area into one of the fastest growing, and closest ski areas to Boston, in New Hampshire. Today the resort has over 200 acres, nine lifts, and fifty trails in the winter (see attached map). Ragged Mountain also owns an eighteen hole golf course located near the base of the mountain, helping the resort provide recreational activities for all four seasons.

Other recreational activities in the town of Danbury include hiking in the summer and snowmobiling in the winter. Section nine of the Sunapee – Ragged – Kearsarge Greenway trail runs through Danbury, crossing over Ragged mountain on its 75 mile loop through the Lake Sunapee region (see attached map). In the winter, there is also a snowmobile trail that runs through the town of Danbury, the trail can be found on the New Hampshire Snowmobile map (see attached map).

It is important to know that the icons that represent the recreation resources on the recreation resources map are general representation of the actual location were the resource may exist.

Information gathered from:

http://www.ragged-mt.com – November, 2005
Recreational Resources
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12. Where are there scenic viewing opportunities in town?

The following scenic views are areas that were found by driving around the town and identifying what we thought were scenic views. The only scenic view in the town of Danbury that was identified by the town hall was the top of Ragged Mountain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Noise Level</th>
<th>Picture File</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farm</td>
<td>road noise, rt 4</td>
<td>101004, 101005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field / Mountain</td>
<td>little from rt 4</td>
<td>101009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field / Mountain</td>
<td>moderate road noise</td>
<td>1010010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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