

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

Ken Haley moved, Jack Dever seconded THAT WE APPROVE THE MINUTES
OF JUNE 10, 2004 AS PRESENTED.

PUBLIC HEARING

2617. **PAUL WETMORE, SR.:** An appeal for a VARIANCE to construct a single-family residence with a front setback of 10', 20' required and a rear setback of 10', 40' required, and an appeal for a VARIANCE to allow lot coverage of 40%, maximum allowed is 30%, Tax Map No. U05, Lot No. 48A, located on Water Street in the Residential District. CONTINUED FROM JUNE 10, 2004.

Application was submitted at the prior Zoning Board meeting. Applicant requested a continuance, so that they could provide some additional information and also potentially engage in a transaction of parcels that would significantly reduce the degree of the variance being requested. The original parcel is roughly 60' on one end, 40' on the other and 90' across the back. If you apply the 20' front setback, 40' rear setback and the two 10' side setback, there is virtually no place to build on the lot. They were originally requesting a variance for both the rear, and front, and relief from lot coverage. They have since contacted the abutter, Tom and Marsha Fairbrother, and requested they entertain a discussion of a possible boundary line adjustment. This would result in about a 60% increase of the size of the parcel. What that would allow the Board to do would be to grant relief to only the rear setback. The front is now conforming. The lot coverage now falls under the 30% allowed. So because both of the aspects are less restrictive, the application still stands as a valid application. At the current moment, the Wetmore's do not own the property, so the Zoning Board cannot in fact grant a variance to a lot line that does not exist. With testimony from Carl Johnson and wording in the motion, the applicant is asking for relief on just the 10' rear setback to the parcel. That, in essence, would not allow anyone to proceed, unless this boundary line adjustment took place. If the negotiations do not continue, we would come back to the Board with a different plan, with different relief. The applicant has tried to come to a solution, whereby a very reasonably sized house will be able to be conforming in this zone on three sides. There would be certain restrictions and elements to the boundary line adjustment. This is a bit complicated, but we are proposing less, than what was originally proposed. Haley – For the record, you are

superceding the plan that is in our packet with the drawing that is on the board? Johnson – Yes. Bill – Is this under agreement? Johnson – No, it is under negotiation. I have spoken to Mr. Fairbrother and have made it clear to him that the Zoning Board is not able to grant the boundary line adjustment. He is not agreeing to anything at this point, other than being receptive to negotiations. Mack – All you are asking for is relief from the rear setback? Johnson– Yes. Hearing closed at 7:20PM

2624. **MARTIN AND MONICA RICCIUTI:** An appeal for a SPECIAL EXCEPTION to create an accessory apartment within an existing single family dwelling, Tax Map U06, Lot No. 85, located at 106 Main Street in the Residential District.

Applicant proposes to create an accessory apartment within an existing building that is approximately 1600 sq. ft. under one continuous roof. Within the definition of accessory apartment, it falls under the percentages of the current living space by 2%. There are two separate egresses from the house itself. The accessory apartment will be in the second story, of what they call the barn, which is attached to the garage. Access to the barn is through a stairway in the garage. The bedroom is now moved to the exterior wall, with a porch off the backside for egress #2. The house itself has 5 means of egress. Parking for the accessory apartment will either be in the garage that is attached or in one of the garages down in the back. Mack - Am I looking at the plans correctly? Are you showing a porch and deck being added onto the back end of the accessory apartment? Ricciuti – Yes, In order to get across the garage roof you need to construct that surface. Mack – So the porch and deck are not extending beyond the existing roofline? Ricciuti – No. Dever- Is this a single-family dwelling? Ricciuti – Yes. Hearing closed at 7:30PM

2625. **TOWN OF MEREDITH:** An appeal for a SPECIAL EXCEPTION to construct a 30 space municipal parking lot with parking spaces within the setbacks and an appeal for a SPECIAL EXCEPTION to construct a municipal parking lot with lot coverage in excess of 65% to provide for more parking and safer circulation, Tax Map U07, Lot No. 88, located at Plymouth Street in the Central Business District.

Applicant proposes to construct a 30 space municipal parking lot. The property is located on Plymouth Street. Property was purchased approximately two years ago for the purpose of creating a municipal parking lot. There was a public informational meeting. We have tried to address as many of the concerns as possible. There is an *entrance only* on Plymouth Street, with an access and egress onto Route 3. We have

also created a one-way traffic pattern, with an island in between. The parking spaces will be 10' x 20' with 2 handicap spots. Edney – What were the main concerns? Mike – The main concern was the safety to Plymouth Street. They did not want people cutting through and going down Plymouth Street in both directions. Site distance was a concern. Davis – My big concern is the traffic on Plymouth Street. Unless there is a police officer there 24 hrs. a day, you know people are going to cut through to avoid the traffic light. My main concern is that this will cause more traffic on Plymouth Street. Faller– Meredith is growing. We need more parking. The goal was to get cars off the road, so they don't have to go down to Mr. Davis's house. There may be people who will cut through. We can't stop that. Dever – Any thought to not having an entrance on Plymouth Street? Faller – Yes, I met with the Planning Board and their feeling was to allow people to get off of Plymouth Street as they enter off of Main Street. This was explored thoroughly. Hearing closed at 7:40PM

2626. **CHARLES AND PATRICIA COLLINS:** An appeal for a SPECIAL EXCEPTION to construct a 28' x 60' two-family dwelling, Tax Map S13, Lot No. 22, located at 40 Old Center Harbor Road in the Forestry/Rural District.

Jan Joslin recused herself from this application.

Applicant is reapplying for a special exception to construct a two-family dwelling that was approved by the Zoning Board on June 12, 2003. Applicant did not realize that the decision lapsed after one year. A letter from Pam Bliss was read into the record. Mrs. Bliss had no problem with this special exception as long as there are no changes from the last approval. Haley – So what you asked for in June of 2003, is exactly what you are asking for tonight? Collins – Yes, It is about 400 ' off the road, not 200'. Hearing closed at 7:45PM

2627. **EQUIVISE, LLC:** An appeal for a SPECIAL EXCEPTION to create a 59-Lot cluster subdivision, Tax Map S20, Lot No. 3, located on Parade Road in the Forestry/ Rural District.

Applicant proposes to construct a 59-lot single-family residential development on 207.4 acres, which would provide an overall lot size per total development of 3.5 acres. The plan shows the 50% Green or Open Areas and the perimeter setback requirement. The property is located on Parade Road. The proposed subdivision is being developed with the intent of providing an alternate way between the Class VI highway known

as Wadleigh Rd. and Parade Road, in order to ensure future street access. We have conditional approval from the Planning Board.

Crestwood Drive is the drive that will go through the center of the development. The 50' right of way for Crestwood Drive will be dedicated to the Town to replace Wadleigh Road. Two 50' non-developed areas will buffer the 50' right of way. All residents frontage will be on cul-de-sacs. There will be no driveways off Crestwood Drive. The total open space exceeds the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. All lots will have individual wells and septic systems except lots 29 –38. Those lots will have individual wells but will have a common septic system on lot #34. We feel we have met or exceeded the criteria for a special exception. Haley – Is there a possibility of an egress onto Route 3 in the future? Wood –If at some point in the future Wadleigh Road right of way was to be developed, then that would be the other point of access. The plan now is to build a cul-de-sac at the end of that right of way. Wadleigh Road connects to Route 3 near the Great Escape. Kerry Chase of Meredith spoke in favor of this application. Hearing closed at 7:50PM

2628. **EQUIVISE, LLC:** An appeal for a SPECIAL EXCEPTION to cross a wetland for the purpose of constructing an access road (Crestwood Drive) in the Crestwood Estates subdivision and an appeal for a SPECIAL EXCEPTION for any proposed development within the protective wetland buffer areas in that subdivision, Tax Map No. S20, Lot No. 3, located on Parade Road in the Forestry/Rural District.

Applicant proposes the crossing of a non-designated wetland and the encroachment of wetland buffers. The first impact to the wetlands is located off Parade Road at the entrance to the development. The property has three points of frontage on Parade Road. The entrance we have chosen has the least impact to the wetlands. You cannot get to the property without crossing wetlands. The other potential wetland crossing is about two-thirds of the way across the property. There is a retention pond north of Crestview Drive where there is an overflow from that pond that will cross a wetland area. The other impacts are two wetland buffers. On Ashwood Circle there is a buffer area that is impacted by part of the cul-de-sac. On Dogwood Circle there are two wetland buffers that are impacted and another one on Crestview Drive. We have spent a lot of time reviewing the property to find the areas that will have the least impact for wetlands. In the declaration, there is a special section that says, "There will not be any impacts from construction of houses, driveways, or yards." There is also language that says, "The declaration cannot be amended without the approval of the Planning Board." Mack – What you are saying is, there is a buildable area on every lot that is not

going to require any impact to wetland buffers. Wood - That is how it is designed. I cannot tell you that no one will come before you for a special exception. Mack- No, but I am just asking the question. Is there a buildable area on every lot that meets the setbacks from all the buffers? Wood – Yes. Haley – Carrying that one step further, are there covenants that go with these lots? Wood – Yes. Edney - This final version is far less of an impact then the original plan. Hearing closed at 8:02PM

2629. **HANSON FAMILY TRUST:** An appeal for a VARIANCE to construct a deck with a 35' front setback, 40' required, Tax Map U26, Lot No. 61, located at 148 Cummings Cove Road in the Shoreline District.

Applicant is asking for a 5' variance that would bring the deck to 16'. The neighbors to the east and west are currently 32' and 33'. Adding this additional 5' will bring us back further than the neighbors currently are. Having a 16' deck will make it wide enough so that a car may be parked underneath. Hearing closed at 8:06PM

2630. **CARL JOHNSON OF ASSOCIATED SURVEYORS FOR R.B. KREMER AND P.A. MICHALAK:** An appeal for a VARIANCE to construct a 14' x 22' garage with a 21.6' front setback, 30' required, Tax Map U39, Lot No. 1-32, located at 10 Beach Club Lane in the Shoreline District.

This property is located in the Sands of Brookhurst on Beach Club Lane. The existing dwelling is located on an 1100 sq. ft. lot. The dwelling is located very close to the rear of the property line leaving some room in the front. It is also located to one of the sidelines. After the purchase, it was discovered that the driveway was over the property line. That was rectified by tearing out a portion of the patio, clothesline and a portion of the driveway. The applicant is proposing to make a couple small additions to the dwelling. One of the additions is a one-car garage. In order to accommodate the garage and preserve the primary entrance of the structure, there would have to be a small encroachment to the front setback. Many of the lots that are in Sands of Brookhurst have previously existing non-conforming structures or have been allowed to construct dwelling, garages and other structures by benefit of a variance. Most of the lot sizes are 10,000 sq. ft. Minimum lot size permitted by the zone is 40,000 sq. ft. The architect has tried to incorporate elements of the existing house by a slight change in the roofline so it is in concert with the proposed garage expansion. The total encroachment being asked for is 79 sq. ft. The rest of the proposed expansion falls within the existing limits of encroachment or within the existing permitted zoning overlap. In order to accommodate the entrance, there will be a new driveway. The

old driveway will be discontinued. This is a relatively minor expansion. It will meet or exceed all the other restrictions of the zoning ordinance with regard to height and lot coverage. The setback to the road is characteristic to other houses or garages in the neighborhood. Edney – Is this a proposal to redevelop this entire property? Johnson – To redevelop? Edney - Renovate, rebuild. Johnson – Yes. Mrs. Walmsley - In regards to the driveway, I think the pavement should be ripped up. This house is rented 2/3 of the summer and this will allow for more parking. Also, by looking at the drawing, it looks like this is a two-story home. It is a one-story house now. Johnson – I cannot say that the pavement will be removed. I do know that the town will not allow access to two driveways. There is a loft in the house now and these drawing do make the roofline look more dramatic than it is. Mr. Walmsley – The distance from the front line to the back line is 100'. According to my scale, this represents approximately 5' to 6' from the line to the house. They are asking for a 21.6' variance, so there is approximately 73% of the distance from the front to the back as a structure line. The elevation of the roof will have an impact to the value of my property. I will be losing a certain degree of view to the lake area. William Melville, 7 Beach Club Lane, said he was not noticed as an abutter. *Records show that a notice was mailed.* Melville - If the driveway is taken out, they will then have to take out large trees and rocks. I want the Board to know that there is an abandoned propane tank on that property. This house has a septic for three bedrooms. To my count, there are five bedrooms in that house now, and with an addition, there will be another bedroom. Mack - Excuse me sir, but we are talking about a variance for him to construct a garage within the setbacks. As far as adding bedrooms, all of that is Bill Edney's responsibility when they come to get a building permit, they have a septic system to support whatever they are building. If you don't think they have a system that can support what is there now, I suggest you contact Bill Edney, and file a complaint and he can investigate. Hearing closed at 8:35PM

2631. **AMES ASSOCIATES FOR DONALD AND MARY BOOTH:** An appeal for a VARIANCE to construct a leachbed 54' from a seasonal runoff, 75' required, Tax Map U26, Lot No. 60 located at 144 Cummings Cove Road in the Shoreline District.

Applicant proposes to construct a leachbed 54' from a seasonal runoff. The leachbed is no longer operating correctly. We have discovered that probably the failure was not from use, but because of lack of use. The fact that I am not 75' from the on site well and not 75' from the seasonal runoff, I cannot do a repair. This leachbed needs to be replaced. We

have done everything possible to correct the problem. This will be a better system, not a larger system. There will be no change in bedrooms or use. A letter from Mr. Davies was read into the record. Mr. Davies said that the leachbed replacement of the same size and type may be inappropriate. He requested that the appropriate test be performed, and final septic system type and design be approved by a state licensed engineer and the Town of Meredith before any construction permit and variance is considered or granted. Ames –We have a septic approval from 1968 for a two-bedroom house. We do maintain the setback we need from the collection systems. Any future installation of culverts, I think the WBCC should investigate. They are indeed honoring the setbacks they need to from neighbors leachfields. Mr. Davies mentions sloping ledge. There is no ledge. I don't know if his term of ledge meant bedrock or just a terminology for slope. We are doing a better type of system and I feel as though I have done appropriate testing. I am not a professional engineer. I am a designer. Haley - The bottom line is that the Colony Club is worried about their beach. Ames – Yes. Haley- But if you didn't do something, they have more to worry about than if you did this. Ames – Correct. Haley - The bottom line is that this is an improvement. Ames – Yes, Mr. Booth allowed Mr. Hanson, his neighbor, to build a leachfield too close to his line. They realize that they all have septic issues with too many buildings, too many wells and too many septic systems. Edney – In my opinion, this is as good as it is going to get. Hanson- I believe that the Booth's have gone above and beyond using all the latest technology. I am also a member of the WBCC. Hearing closed at 8:50PM.

DELIBERATIVE SESSION

2 617. PAUL WETMORE, SR.:

Hawkins moved, Dever seconded, IN CASE # 2617, PAUL WETMORE SR., I MOVE THE APPEAL FOR A VARIANCE TO CONSTRUCT A SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE WITH A REAR SETBACK OF 10', 40' REQUIRED, BE APPROVED AS IT IS A VERY SMALL LOT AND THEY ARE DOING THE BEST THEY CAN TO MEET THE REQUIREMENTS. ALL THE OTHER VARIANCES THAT WERE ADVERTISED AND ORIGINALLY APPLIED FOR HAVE BEEN VOLUNTARILY REMOVED BY THE APPLICANT. Voted 5-0 in favor.

2624. MARTIN AND MONICA RICCIUTI:

Mack – He meets all the requirements for an accessory apartment.

Dever moved, Joslin seconded, IN CASE # 2624, MARTIN AND MONICA RICCIUTI, AN APPEAL FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO CREATE AN ACCESSORY APARTMENT WITHIN AN EXISTING SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING, I MOVE WE APPROVE AS IT MEETS THE REQUIREMENTS OF A SPECIAL EXCEPTION. Voted 5-0 in favor.

2625. TOWN OF MEREDITH:

Haley – There has been material in the paper about concerns of citizens on Plymouth Street. This is a case where residential has been over shadowed by the creep of a growing town. We have also had the cry that there is no parking in Meredith. Although we may have options on a big parking lot to come with a Church that may move someday, it is not happening now. This is a case where you would have to say this is for the public good.

Haley moved, Joslin seconded, IN CASE # 2625, TOWN OF MEREDITH, REQUESTING AN APPEAL FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO CONSTRUCT A 30 SPACE MUNICIPAL PARKING LOT WITH PARKING SPACES WITHIN THE SETBACKS AND AN APPEAL FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO CONSTRUCT A MUNICIPAL PARKING LOT WITH LOT COVERAGE IN EXCESS OF 65% TO PROVIDE FOR MORE PARKING AND SAFER CIRCULATION, LOCATED AT LOT #88 ON PLYMOUTH STREET IN THE CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT, I MOVE THAT BOTH SPECIAL EXCEPTIONS BE GRANTED AS THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE PARKING LOT IS FOR THE OVERALL PUBLIC GOOD. Voted 5-0 in favor.

Mack - I would like to be put on record, the fact that they did isolate it, so that there is an” entrance only “on Plymouth Street. Hopefully, this will keep people from cutting through the parking lot.

2626. CHARLES AND PATRICIA COLLINS:

Jan Joslin did not vote on this case.

Dever moved, Haley seconded, I MOVE THAT IN CASE #2626, AN APPEAL FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO CONSTRUCT A 28' X 60'

TWO-FAMILY DWELLING BE APPROVED, AS IT MEETS ALL THE REQUIREMENTS FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION. Voted 4-0 in favor.

2627. **EQUIVISE, LLC:**

2628. **EQUIVISE, LLC:**

Mack – Case # 2627 and # 2628 will be discussed together and voted on separately if no one has a problem with this. Mack – I think everyone has done a pretty good job with the layout. I think they are encroaching as little as possible. The only thing I would like to make sure, even though it says it in the covenant and restrictions that there is a buildable area on each lot, and none of them require setbacks to build on. We get tired of them coming back all the time. Dever - And there is nothing we can do to enforce them after it is approved. Haley - Pat, you have the north entrance. Is there any provision in here that I am missing that would allow emergency vehicles in and out, if the main entrance were blocked. Pat – We have talked with the Fire Dept. and the Police Dept. and Wadleigh Road is accessible. Haley – So you are saying there is another way? Pat – Yes, in case of trouble.

Haley moved, Hawkins seconded, IN CASE #2627, EQUIVISE, LLC, REQUESTING A SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO CREATE A 59-LOT CLUSTER SUBDIVISION, TAX MAP S20, LOT NO. 3, LOCATED OFF ROUTE 106, KNOWN AS PARADE ROAD, I MOVE THAT WE GRANT THE SPECIAL EXCEPTION BECAUSE IT MEETS ALL OF THE MAJOR CRITERIA FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION AND SHOULD BE A CREDIT TO THE COMMUNITY. Voted 5-in favor.

Haley moved, Hawkins seconded, IN CASE # 2628, EQUIVISE, LLC. REQUESTING AN APPEAL FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO CROSS A WETLAND FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONSTRUCTING AN ACCESS ROAD (CRESTWOOD DRIVE) IN THE CRESTWOOD ESTATES SUBDIVISION AND AN APPEAL FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION FOR ANY PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE PROTECTIVE WETLAND BUFFER AREAS IN THAT SUBDIVISION, TAX MAP NO. S20, LOT NO. 3, LOCATED OFF ROUTE 106, KNOWN AS PARADE ROAD. I BELIEVE THE PROPONENT LISTED THREE AREAS FOR CROSSING WETLANDS, THE MAIN ONE BEING THE ONE TO GET INTO THE SUBDIVISION, JUST OFF ROUTE 106. IN THAT THEY HAVE APPEARED TO MINIMIZE ALL WETLAND EXPOSURES NEEDED FOR EGRESS ACROSS WETLANDS, I WOULD MOVE THAT WE GRANT THE SPECIAL EXCEPTION ONLY AS DEFINED IN THE

APPLICATION AND DRAWINGS SUBMITTED TONIGHT AND NO FURTHER RELIEF BE GRANTED TO OUR WETLANDS ORDINANCE FOR INDIVIDUAL LOT DEVELOPMENT. Voted 5-0 in favor

2629. HANSON FAMILY TRUST:

Mack – I don't have a problem with this. Dever – If you look at the new requirements, one is whether the variance is necessary to enable the applicant's proposed use, given the special conditions of the property. That is a tough one to meet there because they are all the same. The other factor is whether the benefit sought by the applicant can be achieved by some other method reasonably feasible for the applicant to pursue, other than an area variance. Another thing to look at is, strict adherence to the ordinance is not going to serve any useful purpose in this. We can grant a variance for that reason.

Dever moved, Haley seconded I MOVE THE APPEAL FOR A VARIANCE TO CONSTRUCT A DECK WITH A 35' FRONT SETBACK, 40' REQUIRED, BE GRANTED AS STRICT ADHERENCE TO THE ORDINANCE IS GOING TO SERVE NO USEFUL PURPOSE. THEY ARE FURTHER BACK THAN THE REST OF THE HOUSES. Voted 5-0 in favor.

2630. CARL JOHNSON OF ASSOCIATED SURVEYORS FOR R.B. KREMER AND P.A. MICHALAK:

Mack – A lot of issues have been brought up, but we do not control those issues. Haley – It is hard. Since the mid 80's, we have probably walked up and down every street in Brookhurst. Everybody has been adding something on postage stamps. In every neighborhood there is one house that appears to be a problem to all others, but unfortunately, we can't look at that. Mack - Bill Edney and I have discussed this and he is going to set up an appointment with the builder to voice all of the concerns and see if there is anything the town can do. We as a Board can't do anything. Haley- I would like a condition added that the existing driveway be torn up and returned to grass or mulch. Joslin- I don't think that's fair to make them pull the driveway up. They are going to stop the access to it from the road. Mack – I think where Ken is going, is that we are granting a variance to build a garage encroaching on setbacks, yet they have a driveway now that is encroaching on setbacks. So now we are saying that you can build the garage closer and still park cars over on the side of the house. It becomes a storage area. There is still access to it. Dever – However, there is nothing in the ordinance that says you can't have a driveway in the setback. They are not going over the lot coverage. Joslin-

They will have to interrupt it off the street. Edney - The only point I would like to make is, when you look at the plan you see a proposed addition. Without the addition, the garage fits. The way I view that is if there is an alternative available to you, where you don't need to ask for relief, you should explore that. We have an architect working on plans. There are going to be some major renovations. Dever - I don't disagree with you, but any renovations that they are proposing fall within the expandable area. We are approving the garage, not the renovation plans. Joslin - If they did not put up the addition, they would not need a variance. Dever - However, if you look at the new standards, you cannot reduce what they are asking for. You have to look at the application as it's put before you. You can't deny it because you could reduce it. There has to be another reason. Johnson - Could I call a point of order Mr. Chairman? Mack- yes. Johnson- I feel a little uncomfortable when an issue comes up that is not brought to my attention to respond adequately during the session where I can respond. I do have a response. I do not think this is fair. I would like a chance to respond. Mack - What does everybody feel? The Board agreed. Johnson - The primary entrance is where the proposed addition is. If you were to shove the garage back, you would have to walk through the back of the garage and pass the car to get into the house. That is why it is proposed the way it is.

Haley moved, Dever seconded, IN WHAT THEY ARE ASKING AS FAR AS THE GARAGE AND THE ADDITION ON THE FRONT, I MOVE THAT IN CASE #2630, CARL JOHNSON FOR R.B. KREMER AND P.A. MICHALAK, ASKING FOR AN APPEAL FOR A VARIANCE TO CONSTRUCT A 14' X 22 ' GARAGE WITH A 21. 6' FRONT SETBACK, 30' REQUIRED, LOCATED AT LOT NO. 1-32, 10 BEACH CLUB LANE BE APPROVED, AS IT IS COMMENSURATE WITH WHAT HAS BEEN GOING ON THAT STREET AND OTHER STREETS OF THE BROOKHURST COLONY. Voted 5-0 in favor.

2631. AMES ASSOCIATES FOR DONALD AND MARY BOOTH:

Dever - I don't give any credibility to the letter from the engineer requesting that we have the plan be approved by a state licensed engineer. Normally, a licensed engineer would do a major commercial project, but not for a septic system like this. Mack - I agree with Jack. Ames Associates is a licensed designer and has been doing this for more years than he cares to admit. Mack - I think this is the only solution to the problem. He is doing the best he can, for what he has to work with.

Hawkins moved, Dever seconded IN CASE #2631, AMES ASSOCIATES FOR DONALD AND MARY BOOTH, I MOVE THE APPEAL FOR A VARIANCE TO CONSTRUCT A LEACHBED 54' FROM A SEASONAL RUNOFF, 75' REQUIRED, BE APPROVED AS IT MEETS THE CRITERIA FOR THE VARIANCE AND IS A VAST IMPROVEMENT OVER WHAT IS THERE NOW AND CERTAINLY IS THE BEST THEY CAN DO UNDER THE CIRCUMSTANCE. Voted 5-0 in favor.

Meeting adjourned at 9:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Christine Tivnan
Planning/Zoning Clerk

Approved by the Meredith Zoning Board on _____, 2004.

John Mack, Chairman