

PRESENT: Mack, Chairman; Hawkins, Haley, Joslin, Hommel, Edney, Tivnan, Clerk

Haley moved, Hawkins seconded, THAT WE APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JULY 14, 2005.

PUBLIC HEARING

2684: MICHAEL CASEY FOR CASEY, CASEY, HOFFMAN DBA/ POLLARD SHORES ASSOCIATES: An appeal for a VARIANCE to construct a storage building with a 28' 5" rear setback, 30' required, Tax Map No. U4, Lot No. 16, located at Pollard Shores Road in the Shoreline District. Continued to September 8, 2005.

2690: KEVIN JOHNSON: An appeal for a SPECIAL EXCEPTION to expand a non-conforming structure by more than 400 sq. ft. and an appeal for a VARIANCE to expand a non-conforming lot with 51% lot coverage, 30% allowed, Tax Map U06, Lot. No. 6, located at 137 Main Street in the Residential District.

Kevin Johnson- I am the owner at 137 Main Street. I am proposing a hobby shop garage that is approximately 40' x 48 '. At the last meeting, lot coverage came up. The property is about 21,000 sq. ft. The existing property has a two family home; four garage bays and a driveway. The property abuts Old Mill Construction, which is commercial. This size garage will work for me. I have one employee. I might get to two employees. If the property were commercial, 65% lot coverage would be allowed. I am at 51%. It blends with the neighborhood. It will not change much of the view from the road. Haley –Is the 2080 sq. ft. one floor or is there a loft? Johnson – I would like a second floor for storage. Haley – In arriving at the lot coverage of 51%, you have taken in all the current buildings, the addition, the existing parking and the gravel parking? Is this all in the 51%? Johnson – Yes. (See minutes of July 14, 2005 for Special Exception.) Hearing closed at 9:02 PM

2695: RICHARD P. LACOSS FOR RICHARD P. LACOSS LIVING TRUST: An appeal for a SPECIAL EXCEPTION to construct a garage within the 50' protective buffer of a non-designated wetland, Tax Map U25, Lot No. 20, located at 19 Cummings Cove Road in the Meredith Neck District.

Bill Conaton Building & Remodeling, L.L.C.- I was hired to construct a garage. We ran into a problem when we started construction. It was brought to our attention that we were within the 50' protective buffer of a non-designated wetland. We hired a certified wetland scientist to delineate the parcel. Her letter of recommendations is in your packet. We have also received a letter from the Conservation Commission approving this application. Haley – Looking at the Mortgage plot plan in our packet, I see that the garage is on tract 1. Behind

tract 1 is a tract 3. How does one get to tract 3? Conaton - This is a contiguous lot now. This was part of an old subdivision. Haley – The only thing that will be on this lot is the garage? Conaton – Yes. Ginny Lovett (President of Spindle Point Association) We are in favor of this application. The back part of that lot has deed restrictions and no other building can go on that lot. Haley – Does Spindle Point Association surround this property? Lovett – Yes. Hearing closed at 9:10PM

2696: AMES ASSOCIATES FOR SANDRA M. HALEY: An appeal for a VARIANCE to construct a leachbed 22' from a non-designated wetland, 75' required; an appeal for a SPECIAL EXCEPTION to construct a driveway crossing within the 50' protective buffer of a non-designated wetland and an appeal for a SPECIAL EXCEPTION to construct a single –family dwelling 4' from a non-designated wetland, 50' required, Tax Map S25, Lot No. 18, located on Robin Way in the Residential District.

Ken Haley stepped down.

David Ames – The ordinance states that we need to be 75' from a non-designated wetland. We are asking to be 22'. The proposed use would not diminish surrounding property values because it will allow development of the property compatible with the neighborhood, thereby complimenting surrounding property values. Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest because the proposed septic system utilizes the latest wastewater treatment technologies. Denial of the variance would result in unnecessary hardship to the owner because the configuration and area of wetlands make it impossible to maintain the 75' setback. Denial would result in the owner being prevented from using the property as a residential building lot. Granting the variance would do substantial justice because it would allow the owner to realize the full value of this property as a residential building lot as was always intended. The use is not contrary to the spirit of the ordinance because we believe no harm will come to the surrounding properties, the public, and that the environmental compromises made are the minimum required, which surely fulfills the spirit of the ordinance. We are also asking for a special exception to construct a driveway crossing within the 50' protective buffer of a non-designated wetland and an appeal for a special exception to construct a single–family dwelling 4' from a non-designated wetland, 50' required. The construction of a driveway across a non-designated wetland is allowed for providing access to the site for the construction of a home and sewage disposal system and construction of a driveway across a non-designated wetland is allowed for providing access to the site for the construction of a home and sewage disposal system. The property is 3.2 acres with 92% of that being wetlands. The only area available for the development of this lot is 175' plus or minus from Robin Way and no way to access it except through the non-designated wetland. No lesser impact is possible and still be able to access the house site. No lesser impact is possible

to construct a modest home as shown. A wetlands application has been prepared and per that proposal, no excavation will commence until erosion and sediment control measures are in place. The proposed use is residential as previously approved for subdivision by the Meredith Planning Board and the State of NH. All precautions possible will be taken to insure the impact to the wetland is the minimum necessary to construct this single-family two-bedroom home. The Conservation Commission denied this request in its present form. They are concerned that the driveway over time would sink in and cause future problems. They are absolutely right and so we amended our wetlands permit to specify use of Mirafi 600x geotextile stabilization fabric under all areas of where the driveway is. It creates a big trampoline. Hommel – Why the driveway there? Ames – It is the shortest distance to Robin Way with the least impact. Haley – Thirty years ago when my late son and wife bought this property, I cut wood on the property and never got my feet wet. In my 18 years on the Board, I have never sat on a case for Robin Way. There are houses all around the east side and they got their septic systems through normal building permits. How do we set the balance when we sell pieces of land and tax them for 30 years and then to say, no you can't do something on a building lot that was sold under previous rules and regulations? Not valid. Hearing closed at 9:32 PM

2697: KURT B. GUNDLACH: An appeal for a SPECIAL EXCEPTION to construct a 12' x 50' garage within the 75' protective buffer of a non-designated Brook, Tax Map S25, Lot No. 33, located at 144 Waukewan Street in the Residential District.

Gundlach- I am the owner. The house is new construction, about two years old. It is a narrow lot. The creek is usually dry except in the spring. I am proposing a stand-alone garage that will be about 4' from the house. It will be 12' x 50' with one bay wide and three cars deep. It will be a single floor. It will be constructed on already landscaped property. From the back corner of the garage to the creek is about 33'. The Meredith Conservation has no objection to granting this request. Mack – Are you aware that there has been a special exception already granted on this property? Gundlach – For the building of the house? Mack – Yes, and on the application it says no. There was one for the house about 3 years ago. It allowed construction of the house within 75' setback of a brook. Now you are going closer. Gundlach – Right, now 33'. Hearing closed at 9:38PM

2698: ASSOCIATED SURVEYORS FOR ALBERT & DONNA DUCHARME: An appeal for a SPECIAL EXCEPTION to construct a roadway and common driveway crossing of a non-designated wetland and within 50' of a non-designated wetland and a SPECIAL EXCEPTION to create a cluster subdivision in a Forestry/Conservation District, Tax Map R 30, Lot No. 3 & 4, located on New Road.

Johnson – This property is located on New Road. There are two parcels. One is 50-acre and the other is 160 acres. The total is just less than 210 acres. The proposal before you is to create a cluster subdivision in the Forestry / Conservation Zone. Associated with that are two wetland crossings and one wetland buffer impact. Because there are two lots, there are two driveway cuts on New Road that would be allowed by right. One was used for logging. There are a couple of thousand feet of road frontage. The road frontage on Roxbury Rd is a Class VI highway so it cannot be accessed from there. In its midsection, New Road has several areas that are not acceptable for driveways or roadways. We have contacted Mike Faller about the driveway entrance and have had discussions about New Road in general. The cluster subdivision will consist of 14 units. The density in the Forestry/Conservation zone is one family dwelling per 10 acres of land. If you had 200 acres of land, you could have 20 lots. The conventional subdivision mandates that you have to have 10 acres for each one of those units. We would have to construct the roadway in such a manner that each lot would have a minimum of 50' of frontage and 10 acres per site for density. The configuration is to have 12 units be accessed from a new road way constructed to Town standards and two units be accessed from one single driveway off of New Road. They are allowed to have two right now and there will be two as a result of the development. The rest of New Road will be undeveloped in terms of access to this property. In conjunction with Mike Faller, we have agreed to deed or grant an easement and ROW width additional to what the Town has, so in the future improvements can be made to New Road that are problematic. This will be worked out by the Public Works Department. The cluster incorporates a large green area. One of the provisions of the special exception for creating a cluster subdivision is that 50% of the land be open space. It does not say green; it says open space. The owners of the property took great care in identifying sites within the 200-acres for the homes. We have tried to create a subdivision whereby the lots are created, the roadways are created and that no additional wetland impacts will be necessary. With the exception of one small crossing under 400 sq. ft., the crossing that already exists and the slight buffer impact, there will be no additional impact to wetlands. A misconception of a cluster subdivision is that when you cluster, you get more. That is not true. The ordinance does allow up to a 10% bonus in density to provide for proper lot layout. We are proposing 14 units and that is about a 30% reduction in what the Zoning Ordinance allows in terms of number of units on 210 acres. We met on site with the Conservation Commission and took a long look at this area. Because of the terrain, we have to create a roadway that is 10% or under in steepness. The total impact to the wetlands is about 3000 sq. ft or less. There is no alternative to access the developable portion of the property without crossing the wetland. Lot 9 with 15 acres may have a slightly reduced buildable area. The rest of the sites are not restricted at all in their proximity to wetlands. We have met with John Edgar, Town Planner, and the Planning Department is supportive of cluster subdivision, primarily because of the retention of open space. There is wildlife habitat out there that will be protected from further impact. A licensed Forester will manage the forest that is there. The

owners have developed a list of what their intentions are and I have given you a copy. Many of these cluster units are in excess of 10 acres. The smallest unit is unit 7 that is 2 acres. The shaded area is the area that is going to be the buffer area or the open space. The requirement in the cluster subdivision part in the Meredith ordinance is that a 50' perimeter buffer be maintained around the cluster. Most of the buffer will be 200'. That is a substantial buffer. There are lots in the surrounding area that are not as big as some of the lots that we are proposing. The density in many areas is much greater than what is being proposed in this subdivision. The proximity of this development is very near to the Forestry/Rural Zone, which is 3 acres. To access the property towards the Meredith area would be through Higgins Rd and out to Chemung and then Meredith Center. Granting a special exception for a cluster subdivision by the Zoning Board does not result in the creation of any lots. If the Board granted the special exception for the cluster subdivision, when we left this meeting, there would be no more lots than when we started. The Planning Board has the authority to create lots if they see fit. We did go to the Planning Board for conceptual discussion on this property and it was well received. By definition, a Cluster Development is, "A subdivision for residential purposes to promote an efficient use of land through networks of lots, utilities and streets, to preserve natural topographic features and create a more desirable environment than possible through strict application of other sections of this ordinance." The utilities will be underground. Another element of a subdivision of 4 or more lots is the creation of a fire-fighting cistern. We have had a meeting with Chief Palm and a 30,000-gallon underground tank would be required. This could be used for abutting properties also. This is filled and maintained by the Fire Department. The owners are planning on moving to the development. Johnson – *Read for the record the "Intentions for Cluster Development on New Road" by the owners.* (See File) The letter from the Conservation Commission is in your packet and they offer no objection to this application. The roadway will be designed by a registered professional engineer and be reviewed by the Towns consulting engineer. We believe this proposal meets the requirements for a special exception for the development of a cluster subdivision in the Forestry/Conservation Zone. The Board did approve a cluster subdivision in the Forestry/Conservation Zone in 1988. Mark Abear – Could you read Article V Section D-1 on page 25? Mack – Do you mean *General Purpose*? Abear – Yes. Mack – *Read for the record.* (See File) Abear – It is my position we should not allow a development to start before the infrastructure is in place. There was a statement that the bulk of the access would be down Chemung Road. For those of us who live in the area, we know that is not right. There are three exits from the area. One is down over Hermit Woods Road onto Rt. 132 that runs through Sanbornton. You go down New Road and come out onto Woodman Road and that brings you out to the Winnisquam Bridge. This property abuts the Town line to Sanbornton. They should be part of this process. Johnson – One of the reasons that the density is three times more restrictive than the Forestry/ Rural density is because of the infrastructure. The Forestry/Conservation Zone is created in those areas where the roadways are not as good as Rte. 3 and Rte

25. That is why the zoning ordinance requires the minimum lot size to be so big. There is nowhere in the ordinance that says a subdivision shall not take place in the Forestry/Conservation Zone. The proposal we have put together is more restrictive than the 10-acre net density. In terms of traffic trips per day, the American Society of Engineers has information on traffic trips per day. If you live in an urban area, the national average is 10 trips. The further you go from an urban area the traffic trips go down dramatically. The general provision of the ordinance is being met. There is no requirement at this level to notice Sanbornton. Sanbornton will be noticed when it gets to the Planning Board. Peter Meyer (95 Carlton Rd.) *Read a letter from Jack Rogers into the record.* (See File) Johnson – I agree with a lot of what he says and I think I have covered most of that in my presentation. Some people don't like cluster subdivision and some do. The Town of Meredith happens to endorse them. There are positive points to both arguments. I think the Town of Meredith realizes that the benefits of a cluster far out weight the detriment portion of it. In terms of setting a dangerous precedent, a cluster subdivision was created in the Forestry/Conservation Zone in 1988 with a net density of 10.2 acres per lot. That was 17 years ago. I don't think this is a dangerous precedent. The Planning Board has the ability to require expert testimony. This is not something that the Zoning Board typically gets into. The result of an approval tonight does not create any lots. It allows us to go to the Planning Board. Mary Lou Higgins Lavelle (Higgins Rd) Our concern is the potential environmental impact on the surrounding area around the development. There are two brooks that leave from this land. One flows into Randall Pond and one flows into Hermit Brook. In the proposal I have seen tonight, I have not seen any indication of these brooks. Mack – Carl, are they part of the impact area? Johnson – No. There are brooks on this property that have not been delineated because all portions of the developed lot areas are beyond the setbacks. The Town of Meredith has a 75' setback from a non-designated brook and it can go up to a 100' for a designated brook. Paul Fournier – It seems like the owners have made every effort to minimize the impact and have gone beyond the standards required for green space. I think we are hung up on the word cluster. These are large lots and there is plenty of green space. Ames Associates- I did the soil testing on this property. It is rare that I am not asked to go out and dig test pits all over 200 acres to see how many lots I could get. Both Donna and Albert were there and went to each site and decided where the house would be. That was unique. Mark Abear (Higgins Rd.) *Read into the record his letter to the ZBA and read the Response to the Ducharme Intention for Cluster Development.* (See File) Mack – Several items that you were discussing are not within the purview of this Board, including soil and slopes, lot sizing etc. That is taken at the Planning Board level. Those arguments are not germane to this Boards decision tonight. Johnson The Planning Board will review the document, which identifies the purpose and intent of the open space. This will be permanently prevented from future development. Each one of the deeds will reference this fact. This project was not rushed. No one rushes me. I started the process on this project one year

ago. We do believe we have met the conditions for a special exception. Paul Chase- It looks like nice work, and it looks like the owners are trying to do it right but it just doesn't seem right to me. Mack – *Read into the record a letter from Richard & Margaret Higginbotham* (See File) Carol Maguire (Hermit Woods Rd) – All ways into Hermit Woods Rd are dirt for at least two miles, which are not wide. Olga Robinson (Chemung Rd) – I want to reinforce that Chemung Rd is a dirt road and also a designated scenic road. Any improvements will have an impact on the definition of a scenic road. (? Can't Hear) We don't want the roads to be improved. It will just make people drive faster. (? Can't Hear-Carlton Rd.) There are three exits out from that area, two of which go through Sanbornton, both of which are very difficult to traverse. People will be going down through Chemung Rd. How many houses topographically can you put on that property? Mack – The Planning Board will decide the amount of lots. We are only being asked for permission to present to the Planning Board a cluster development. We are not approving the number of lots, just the concept for a cluster development. Hearing closed at 8:50PM

2699: ALAN & JOYCE SWAN: An appeal for a VARIANCE to construct a 20' x 20' storage building within 50' of a non-designated wetland, Tax Map U39, Lot No. 44, located at 16 Cottage Road in the Shoreline District.

Daniel Geiger- I am the wetland scientist that did the work on this property. This property is located off of Leavitt Park Rd. The property sits on the lake. There is an existing residence here that is 26' x 40'. The proposed shed will be 17' from the wetland on the west end and 10' on the north. This is the only location where the shed could be put. There will be no direct impact to the wetlands. There will be no crossing, drilling or dredging. The proposed use would not diminish surrounding property values because the new building will be a wood frame structure of quality construction that will enhance the value of the existing property and not encroach on setbacks to abutting properties. Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest because the 50' buffer zone provides protection to the wetlands and the proposed structure will have no impacts to the wetlands and a minimum impact to the entire upland buffer to the wetland protected on the property. Denial of the variance would result in unnecessary hardship to the owner because many of the neighboring homes have garages or out buildings constructed to store equipment and other items. The wetland buffer setback increasingly limits the amount of useable space on this property and necessary storage room to protect equipment. Granting the variance would do substantial justice because the owners are residing full time in their lake home and a storage facility is required to protect equipment not suitable to store in a modest 26' x 40' one story home with no basement. The use is not contrary to the spirit of the ordinance because the proposed project reflects avoidance of any direct impacts to wetlands and minimal impacts to the upland buffer to the wetlands. The minor encroachment on the buffer zone will not result in a change or effect on the ability for this wetland to perform these

functions. Mack- *Read letter from the Conservation Commission offering no objections to this application.* (See File) Haley – Is this is a one-car garage and does this include overhangs. Geiger – Yes Haley – What is right now on the side of the driveway away from the house? Is that flat? This is all natural vegetation and is a little bit uneven. Hearing closed at 9:50PM

DELIBERATIVE SESSION

2690: KEVIN JOHNSON:

Haley – If I remember correctly, the zoning is close to changing in that neighborhood from residential to commercial. There are other commercial properties two to three doors up. Regardless of the zoning, he is laying it out as a one-man business with one employee. Seems to be right for what that street is doing right now. Mack – I am not sure I agree with the amount of coverage he has. Haley – I am not sure how much professional help he had with this. I think we should limit him to the number of customer units he can have in the yard at any given time. Mack – He should be required to have inside storage, no outside storage. Edney – If you grant the Special Exception, he still has to go through the Planning Board Site Plan Review. Mack - My feeling is, if he wants to keep the other garages to store in, then he needs to store them in there. Edney – The list of criteria for Home Occupation is no outside visual impact. The garages will require some upgrading. Mack – My main concern is nothing outside. I want that part of our approval process.

Hawkins moved, Haley seconded, IN CASE # 2690, KEVIN JOHNSON, I MOVE AN APPEAL FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO EXPAND A NON-CONFORMING STRUCTURE BY MORE THAN 400 SQ. FT., TAX MAP U06, LOT. NO. 6, LOCATED AT 137 MAIN STREET IN THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT BE GRANTED, AS IT MEETS THE CRITERIA, SPIRIT AND INTENT OF THE ORDINANCE WITH THE ADDED PROVISION OF ARTICLE 111, G-4, THE HOME OCCUPATION SHALL BE CARRIED ON ONLY WITHIN THE PRINCIPLE OR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE AND THERE SHALL BE NO OBVIOUS COMMERCIAL INTERRUPTION OF THE RESIDENTIAL APPEARANCE OF THE AREA. Voted 5-0 in favor.

Hawkins moved, Haley seconded, IN CASE # 2690, KEVIN JOHNSON, I MOVE AN APPEAL FOR A VARIANCE TO EXPAND A NON-CONFORMING LOT WITH 51% LOT COVERAGE, 30% ALLOWED, TAX MAP U06, LOT. NO. 6, LOCATED AT 137 MAIN STREET IN THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT BE GRANTED, AS IT MEETS THE FIVE CRITERIA FOR A VARIANCE WITH THE ADDED PROVISION OF ARTICLE 111, G-4, THE HOME OCCUPATION SHALL BE CARRIED ON ONLY WITHIN THE PRINCIPLE OR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE AND THERE SHALL BE NO OBVIOUS COMMERCIAL

INTERRUPTION OF THE RESIDENTIAL APPEARANCE OF THE AREA. Voted 5-0 in favor.

2695: RICHARD P. LACOSS FOR RICHARD P. LACOSS LIVING TRUST:

Haley moved, Joslin seconded, IN CASE # 2695, RICHARD P. LACOSS FOR RICHARD P. LACOSS LIVING TRUST, I MOVE AN APPEAL FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO CONSTRUCT A GARAGE WITHIN THE 50' PROTECTIVE BUFFER OF A NON-DESIGNATED WETLAND, TAX MAP U25, LOT NO. 20, LOCATED AT 19 CUMMINGS COVE ROAD IN THE MEREDITH NECK DISTRICT BE GRANTED, AS THE CURRENT GARAGE HAS BEEN PLACED IN THE BEST POSITION IN RELATION TO THE HOUSE AND THE ROAD, DOING THE LEAST AMOUNT OF CHANGE TO THE LAND IT IS SITTING ON, SURROUNDED BY THE SPINDLE POINT TRUST LAND AND MEETS THE SPIRIT AND INTENT OF THE ORDINANCE. Voted 5-0 in favor.

2696: AMES ASSOCIATES FOR SANDRA M. HALEY:

Hawkins moved, Joslin seconded, IN CASE # 2696, AMES ASSOCIATES FOR SANDRA M. HALEY, I MOVE AN APPEAL FOR A VARIANCE TO CONSTRUCT A LEACHBED 22' FROM A NON-DESIGNATED WETLAND, 75' REQUIRED, TAX MAP S25, LOT NO. 18, LOCATED ON ROBIN WAY IN THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT BE GRANTED, AS IT MEETS THE CRITERIA FOR A VARIANCE AND UNDER THESE CIRCUMSTANCES IS THE VERY BEST THAT CAN BE DONE. Voted 5-0 in favor.

Hawkins moved, Joslin seconded, IN CASE # 2696, AMES ASSOCIATES FOR SANDRA M. HALEY, I MOVE AN APPEAL FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO CONSTRUCT A DRIVEWAY CROSSING WITHIN THE 50' PROTECTIVE BUFFER OF A NON-DESIGNATED WETLAND, TAX MAP S25, LOT NO. 18, LOCATED ON ROBIN WAY IN THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT BE GRANTED, AS IT MEETS THE CRITERIA FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION. Voted 5-0 in favor.

Hawkins moved, Joslin seconded, IN CASE # 2696, AMES ASSOCIATES FOR SANDRA M. HALEY, I MOVE AN APPEAL FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO CONSTRUCT A SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING 4' FROM A NON-DESIGNATED WETLAND, 50' REQUIRED, TAX MAP S25, LOT NO. 18, LOCATED ON ROBIN WAY IN THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT BE GRANTED, AS IT MEETS THE CRITERIA FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION. Voted 5-0 in favor.

2697: KURT B. GUNDLACH:

Joslin – Isn't 50' pretty big? Mack - We granted a special exception based on the house and the location of the driveway on that property three years ago. Now he wants to change it and go 17' closer to the wetlands than what we approved only

three years ago. I am against it. We even had them change the turn around so that it was in front of the house and further away from the wetlands.

Joslin moved, Hawkins seconded, IN CASE # 2697, KURT B. GUNDLACH, I MOVE AN APPEAL FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO CONSTRUCT A 12' X 50' GARAGE WITHIN THE 75' PROTECTIVE BUFFER OF A NON-DESIGNATED BROOK, TAX MAP S25, LOT NO. 33, LOCATED AT 144 WAUKEWAN STREET IN THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT BE DENIED, AS IT DOES NOT MEET THE SPIRIT AND INTENT OF THE ORDINANCE AND THERE ARE ALTERNATIVES WHERE THE STRUCTURE DOES NOT NEED TO BE SO CLOSE TO A NON-DESIGNATED BROOK. Voted 3-2 in favor.

2698: ASSOCIATED SURVEYORS FOR ALBERT & DONNA DUCHARME:

Mack – We had a lengthy discussion tonight. A lot of the arguments are not germane to our decision. We created this process by not making developers do complete engineer drawings and to get all the approvals before they come to get a variance or special exception from the Board, so there is only half the information for the concerned citizen. But I am all for it. Haley – How much of this is the standard thing of, we got ours, now everybody else go away. The ordinance was voted on at Town Meeting. How did Mr. Johnson go wrong on what he presented? Mack – He did not. I think the traffic is a non-issue. It is 200 acres out there, with 10 acre zoning. That is a 20-lot standard subdivision. Lets say you lose a couple because of wetlands; you still have 18. They are only going to have 14. The traffic impact is minimal. Edney – At the end of the day, they have to go before the Planning Board and the amount of lots may change. Haley – Where am I missing that they kept saying three things under one request. I only see two requests for a special exception. Mack – One request is a crossing of a non-designated wetland and one within 50' of a non-designated wetland. The second one is the cluster subdivision. We as a Board have required this because we want to see the overall picture before making our decisions.

Haley moved, Hommel seconded, IN CASE # 2698, ASSOCIATED SURVEYORS FOR ALBERT & DONNA DUCHARME, I MOVE AN APPEAL FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO CONSTRUCT A ROADWAY AND COMMON DRIVEWAY CROSSING OF A NON-DESIGNATED WETLAND AND WITHIN 50' OF A NON-DESIGNATED WETLAND IN A FORESTRY/CONSERVATION DISTRICT, TAX MAP R 30, LOT NO. 3 & 4, LOCATED ON NEW ROAD BE GRANTED, AS IT MEETS THE CRITERIA FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION. Voted 5-0 in favor.

Haley moved, Joslin seconded, IN CASE # 2698, ASSOCIATED SURVEYORS FOR ALBERT & DONNA DUCHARME, I MOVE AN APPEAL FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO CREATE A CLUSTER SUBDIVISION IN A FORESTRY/CONSERVATION DISTRICT, TAX MAP R 30, LOT NO. 3 & 4,

LOCATED ON NEW ROAD BE GRANTED, AS IT MEETS ALL THE CRITERIA PUT FORTH FOR A CLUSTER DESIGNATION. Voted 5-0 in favor.

2699: ALAN & JOYCE SWAN:

Haley moved, Hommel seconded, IN CASE # 2699, I MOVE AN APPEAL FOR A VARIANCE TO CONSTRUCT A 20' X 20' STORAGE BUILDING WITHIN 50' OF A NON-DESIGNATED WETLAND, TAX MAP U39, LOT NO. 44, LOCATED AT 16 COTTAGE ROAD IN THE SHORELINE DISTRICT BE GRANTED, AS IT MEETS ALL FIVE CRITERIA FOR A VARIANCE AND IS IN THE BEST LOCATION AS FAR AS THE LOT IS CONCERNED. Voted 5-0 in favor.

Meeting adjourned at 10:15 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Christine Tivnan
Planning/Zoning Clerk

Approved by the Meredith Zoning Board on _____, 2005.

John Mack, Chairman