

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

Ken Haley moved, Jack Dever seconded THAT WE APPROVE THE MINUTES OF AUGUST 12, 2004 AS PRESENTED.

Mack – Case # 2643 David and Teresa McCormick has been postponed till next month. (Hand Raised) You are? McCormick- I am David McCormick. Haley – Do you want to step up? Dever – Was that one of the abutters? Mack – He made it sound like he was the applicant's father. McCormick - No, that is the builder's father. Edney - He's building a lot next to the McCormick's. Mack- Well that wasn't explained. Haley – I think you've been had. I think he definitely said he was the father of the applicant. The three of us heard him. Mack – He implied he was the applicant. Mack- I don't have a problem hearing the case. We have three people who heard him say he was the father of the applicant, because we said that he had to have a letter. I am sorry. Please sit down.

PUBLIC HEARING

2636. NORMAND AND ROBERTA MORIN: (Rep. Carl Johnson) An appeal for a SPECIAL EXCEPTION to fill in a small wet area to create parking within 50' buffer of a non-designated wetland and a SPECIAL EXCEPTION to create off-street parking within designated setbacks, Tax Map No. U06, Lot No. 138, located at 5 Mill Street in the Central Business District.

This property is adjacent to the existing Case & Keg property. These are two separate Map and Lot numbers. Mr. Morin purchased the property. He previously owned just the business. He purchased the property that the Case & Keg is on, as well as the abutting property. We are here for two reasons. Gove Environmental Services supervised Ames Associates in the delineation of the wetlands. There is a drainage situation that occurs on the abutting lot. The town has a drainage easement that crosses that lot, empties into this wetland / drainage complex, goes around the Case & Keg building, into another culvert and catch basin and then across Mill Street. The town is having some difficulty with the way this drainage system flows. Mr. Morin is interested in relocating the access doorway of the Case & Keg to alleviate some of the congestion that occurs with the parking. To relocate the door to the side of the building, we proposed filling a small section of the wetland that is associated with the drainage system and build a retaining wall. This is a separate lot of record that could be developed independently. Mr. Morin is considering merging the two lots. One issue that we have is whether this is a wetland issue or a drainage issue. When you go out and look, it is pretty much a drainage situation. The lots

in this area are all previous filled lots. In order to answer whether we could fill this, I contacted Joslin Degler, from the State of New Hampshire. Joslin did inspect the site, and is in support of what we are proposing and is in agreement that it is primarily a drainage issue and not wetlands. There will be minimum impact. We have analyzed alternatives to this proposal. We would be filling 650 sq. ft. This filling of that portion of the wet area will not impede or distract from the functioning of the wetland drainage system. Mr. Morin would entertain granting the Town whatever easements would be necessary to improve, redirect, and relocate drainage on this property. We are also asking to create off-street parking with designated setbacks. As you know, all the buildings on this road have parking within the front setback. We would have to go before the Planning Board for a Site Plan approval. We are asking this Board for relief of the setback issues regarding the wetland filling, and the setback issues related to parking in the front. Another point that Joslin brought up was that the vegetation that is currently in this wetland is what we call "bamboo." The State does not like to see that. We plan to remove as much of the invasive bamboo that we can, and replant native wildlife. The lot will function better in terms of access and traffic flow within the site. Dever – Are those wetlands jurisdictional? Johnson – Yes. This would require an application to the State for a Dredge and Fill. The Conservation Commission has reviewed this and they are in agreement. Dever – Is he going to combine those lots. Johnson- He would have to as a result of this, because this door is entirely dependent on something functioning on a lot, which is separate. Edney – Some drainage issues have come up before. This is clearly a disconnected drainage situation. Jane Cohen – (MJR Realty) I am directly across the street and I am in support of this. Linda Johnson – This is a non-functioning drain. We are in support of this also. Hearing closed at 7:20PM

2637 ROLAND SYLVESTRE: An appeal for a VARIANCE to construct a 10' x 12' shed with a front setback of 18' 11", 30' required and a side setback of 7' 9", 20' required, Tax Map No. U01, Lot No. 29, located at 15 Anntom Road in the Shoreline District.

This is a seasonal summer home. We only have a crawl space for storage. We do not have a full basement. We need storage space for lawn equipment etc. I do not feel it will be out of character with the neighborhood. Most of the houses were built in the 1950's, and most have sheds already. Haley – Is the shed there now? Sylvestre – Yes. Haley -Was there a building formally or just a parking space? Sylvestre – Just a parking space. Hearing closed at 7:25PM

2638. **JOSEPH AND LINDA DICESARE:** An appeal for a VARIANCE to replace an existing single-family residence with a new residence with a 15' side setback, 20' required and a rear setback of 4' 7", 40' required, Tax Map No. U01, Lot No. 13, located at 8 Anntom Road, in the Shoreline District.

We would like to tear down the existing house and replace it with a new house. We want to put the house in the exact same spot. That would be 15' on the side, and 20' in the rear. It will be a little wider but will be within code on one side and front. It will be a stick built home on a full foundation. Haley – What is there now? Is it a trailer? Dicesare – No, there is a house. Dever – Is this on town sewer? Dicesare – Yes Morelli- Is this two-stories with a basement? Dicesare - Yes Morelli – What is the sq. footage? Haley – Do you have a copy of your building permit? There is a figure on it. Dicesare – For the new construction, the sq. ft. will be 1728 sq. ft. Mack – What is the existing? Dicesare Existing is 672 sq. ft. Morelli – Will there be plumbing in the basement? Dicesare- No, upstairs only. Hearing closed at 7:35PM

2639. **RONALD AND MARCELLE ABEAR:** An appeal for a SPECIAL EXCEPTION to create an accessory apartment within an existing single Family dwelling, Tax Map R31, Lot No. 3, located at 39 Higgins Road in the Forestry/Conservation District.

I live at 39 Higgins Road and we own the property. This is a large piece of property. We want to have a smaller apartment within the house. We are proposing a 1600 sq. ft. accessory apartment. The existing building is connected and is 7,770 sq. ft. in what is known as the carriage shed. We would like to take 1600 sq. ft. on the second floor, which is over the garage space and convert that into our living quarters. We are proposing two-bedrooms, a dining room, living room, kitchen, utility and 2 baths. Moyer – Is that the carriage shed? Abear - That is the barn; this is the carriage shed. Moyer –Is that the one that is adjacent to the house? Abear – Yes. Mack –You are saying that the total sq. ft. of all the existing dwellings are 7770 sq. ft.? Abear – That is one floor in this building. If you multiply the number of floors that exist in these buildings, the sq. ft. comes out to around 23,000 sq. ft. Mack – I guess he's within the percentage. Hearing closed at 7:40PM

2640. **ALBERT AND DONNA DUCHARME:** An appeal for a SPECIAL EXCEPTION to create an accessory apartment within an existing single family dwelling, Tax Map R25, Lot No. 3, located at 45 Roxbury Road in the Forestry/Conservation District.

The sq. ft. of the apartment is 673 sq. ft. Total sq. ft. of the house is

approximately 4,550 sq. ft. The accessory apartment is not an accessory structure. It has one bedroom. I, the owner, occupy the premises. Means of egress: The apartment has 1 exit directly outside, 1 oversized window which can accommodate the size of an adult directly to ground level, and another exit to the laundry area of the house. The upstairs area has 3 exits. The principle residence has 4 exits directly to the outside. The parking area is oversized and can accommodate many more cars than necessary. The septic system was originally designed for a 4-5-bedroom house. No exterior changes have been made to the outside of the house. This apartment occupies ground level and basement, with one bedroom, small kitchen, bathroom and dining area

Dever – When you add this bedroom, how many will you have? Ducharme Four

Dever – You said the septic design was for a four- five bedroom system, but we do not see that indicated anywhere on that copy of the design. Ducharme – I think I included a copy of the original design. When I put the house in originally, 14 or 15 yrs ago, an oversized system was put in. Dever – You should have a plan that indicates how many bedrooms the system is designed for. This is a copy of a leach field with a 1000 gal. septic tank. A 1000 gal. septic tank is not designed for a 4-5 bedroom system. Do you have any plans that show the State approval number and the indication of the designer that it was for a 4-5-bedroom design? Ducharme – No, unless I can look it up through Frank Keegan. I don't know if he is still around. Dever – What year was that done? Ducharme – 1989 I think. Dever – There should be a copy in the town office. We would need to see the septic design. Hearing closed at 7:47PM.

2641. TOR & SUSAN BRUNVAND FOR SCOTT CARPENTER: (Rep. Joanne Coppinger-Dolan Associates) An appeal for a SPECIAL EXCEPTION to construct off-street parking within designated setbacks, Tax Map U10, Lot No. 27, located on Daniel Webster Highway and Plymouth Street in the Central Business District.

The existing building is between Plymouth Street and Rte. 3. This building is already outside the setbacks. The building currently is used for apartments on the Plymouth Street side, and that will not be changing. The part that will be a change of use is the boat storage that is accessed from both Plymouth Street and Rte 3. The change would be from boat storage to a catering business. Phase I of the business would be a catering business and Phase II will be a take-out type restaurant from Rte. 3. The Special Exception is for parking on the Rte. 3 side and parking outside the front setback on the Plymouth Street side. A driveway permit from NHDOT is needed and we are using some of their ROW for the driveway. We have verbal approval from NHDOT, but no written approval yet. We have met on-site. Dever – Has this been to the Planning Board? Coppinger – Yes, they are taking a site-walk on September 14th and we are on the agenda for the 28th. Dever- Have they approved this plan? Coppinger – No, there is no conditional approval yet. Dever – She should not be here. They

should not be here until they get Site Plan approval. Edney – This is not a use issue. Dever – It still has to go back to the Planning Board for re-approval of the site plan. The ordinance requires that it have Planning Board approval prior to coming to ZBA. Edney – That would be a use thing. I separated this out. Dever – As it reads “As to all uses subject to Site Plan Review” This is a use, subject to Site Plan Review. Correct? She is changing the use, it is a permitted use, but it is subject to Site Plan Review. Edney-I read this as not a change of use (Can't Hear) Mack – How does the Board feel? Mack - I don't hear anything. Bill, you made the determination to separate this? You felt they didn't have to go through the Site Plan approval first? Edney – Yes, I separated the change of use (Can't hear---boat storage-----) Dever – I understand that Bill, but the way this reads, “As to all uses subject to Site Plan Review”. So, if it is subject to Site Plan Approval, it has to go to the Planning Board first. It reads “ As to all uses subject to Site Plan Review by the Planning Board, pursuant to RSA 674:13 and the Meredith Site Plan Review Regulations, that written approval by the Planning Board of the applicant's site plans must be on file with the Board of Adjustment”. Edney – Right. This is a parking and setback issue. That's why I separated them. Mack –It's still a Site Plan. I see what Jack is saying. Hawkins- If it requires Site Plan Review, then do it that way anyway. Mack – All those in favor of continuing this meeting? Voted unanimously. Hearing closed at 7:55PM

2642. ASSOCIATED SURVEYORS FOR CONRAD REALTY TRUST: (Rep. Carl Johnson for Michael Sousa) An appeal for a SPECIAL EXCEPTION to construct a driveway and utility crossing through a non-designated wetland and an appeal for a SPECIAL EXCEPTION to construct a duplex, parking area, and driveway within 50' of a non-designated wetland, Tax Map U15A, Lot No. 7, located on NH Route 25 in the Residential District.

We were here previously for a request to construct (2) two-family dwellings on this property, located on NH Rt. 25, diagonally across from Inter-Lakes High School. Based on discussions at that meeting and input from the Conservation Commission, the Board voted to deny the request for the Special Exception based on the provision that a least impacting alternative be analyzed. Although I believe we met that requirement, we have reapplied and have taken out one duplex. This application is for one duplex. The provision that you have to always cross the narrowest part of a wetland can be relieved if you demonstrate from a practical standpoint and safety that you are providing a reasonable access. Gove Environmental Services delineated the wetlands. We did look to access the driveway from the lot above. That would require an easement. That was not possible. Where we are proposing the driveway requires a minimal amount of filling of the wetland in the front of the property. We have tried to locate the duplex unit in a manner that is maximizing the amount of build able area without making it difficult to get to. Duplex in a residential zone is a permitted use. If we were to come before the Board for a

single-family dwelling for this lot, you would see a plan no different than this. We have reduced what was originally requested, in terms of the disturbed area, by about half. This is a tough site. The majority of the site is remaining undisturbed. The duplex being proposed is 28' x 60', 2 stories. I believe that I have entertained to the best of my ability the requirements to meet the Special Exception. Jeanne Clark – Will there be a garage, and if so, where will they be located? Johnson – The design is for the garages to be underneath the units. Dever – That doesn't mean that at a later date they can't come in and get a permit for a garage if they can meet setbacks and/ or impact to the wetlands. Clark- How tall is the building? Johnson- I don't have that, but they are within the limits required by the zoning ordinance. Clark-Let me ask it this way. Will I see it from my house? Johnson – I doubt it. Clark – I think Carl has done a great job. Hearing closed 8:00PM

2643. **DAVID AND TERESA McCORMACK:** An appeal for a VARIANCE to locate a shed with a side setback of 5', 20' required, Tax Map No. R06, Lot No.15, located at 14 Serenity Lane in the Residential District.

Applicant presented pictures to the Board. The property was bought in 1999 and at that time some boundary pins were missing. Given the facts we had at the time, I built the shed and placed it on what I thought was my lot. Skipping a head a few years the abutting lot was sold. Because of the boundary situation there was a survey. That is when we found that my shed was on their property. I spoke with the Code Enforcement Officer and told him that I was going to relocate the shed. Because of the topography and width of my lot, this is the only place I could find to place the shed. It is partially on my driveway. I have no idea what Tessier (abutter & builder) thoughts are. I did speak to him the other day and he said he had no problem with me leaving it there if I would pay to have the lot surveyed. I told him that I was not required to do that as part of the building permit process. I am asking that I be allowed to leave the shed where it is, with a 5' side setback. I have moved this shed once. It took me a whole day to do so. Dever – If this Board said that you had to move that shed to meet the setbacks, what would it cost you? McCormack – I would need to get a crane and I was told it would be around \$2500. If this were not approved, I would have to dismantle it. Moyer-Could you place it on the other side of the driveway? McCormack – The other side of the driveway is the front lawn. In keeping with the décor, I did not think it would be appropriate. Haley – Do you know where the other party's house is going to be in relation to the shed? McCormack – I do. Haley- Setback is at least 20' from you and them? McCormack - Yes. Haley – Anywhere near the shed? McCormack – No. Haley - It seem to be out of the way. I am looking at what is the big objection to this. McCormack – I really don't know. He has indicated to me if I pay certain items that he has had to pay for to get this done, he wouldn't fight me on the shed. He did mention that it makes his lot look smaller. The house he is building is very

large for the size of the lot. Haley - If money were not the object, which it isn't a criteria, could you put it on the other side of the house. McCormack - I didn't purposely make a misrepresentation, but there is a porch on that side. It would then be on the abutter's property. Haley – Next time put everything on your plan. Edney – I support the difficulties of this property. McCormack – I do have a letter from Craig Wiggin (an abutter). Mack – Letters were read into the record from Craig Wiggin and Michael Browher, both in favor of this application. Dever- The reason we are asking some of these questions is because of a Supreme Court decision. The Supreme Court decision was in your favor by the way. Hearing closed at 8:20PM

2644. **JOHN M. COLEMAN:** An appeal for a VARIANCE to replace an existing single-family residence with a new residence with a 42' front setback, 65' required, Tax Map No. U31, Lot No. 16, located at 15 Tommys Cove Road in the Shoreline District.

We have owned this property for almost 25 years. There were originally 2 lots. The two lots were combined into one. We would like to retire here. However, we have out grown our camp. It is about 800 sq. ft. We would like to take down the old camp and replace it with a new single-family home. I am asking for a 42' variance from the corner of the existing camp to the nearest high water mark. At 42' we are much further back than all of our neighbors except for one. I believe I meet the 5 requirements for granting a variance. 1. There are no problems with abutters. 2. Abutters have upgraded their homes, so this will compliment them. 3. Not close to a public road. We are on a ROW. 4. The over all site will be improved. We hope to remove a cesspool and the outhouse. 5. This will help us to get off the road. 6. Would be improving the lot. Without a variance, I would be forced to put the house at the extreme western end of my property line, which is the best area for recreation. My lot is one of the most invisible from the water. I have a lot of trees. Moyer – The current house and shed will be coming down? Coleman – Yes. Hearing closed at 8:42PM

2645. **JOHN AND RUTH LINK:** (Rep. Robert Harlow) An appeal for a VARIANCE to modify two (2) non-conforming lot sizes by decreasing Lot 7 by 3,299 sq. ft. and transferring 3,299 sq. ft. to lot 8K-1, 40,000 sq. ft required for both lots, Tax Map No. U35, Lot No. 7 located at 17 Tall Pines Way in the Shoreline District.

This property is a small pie shape lot that is sandwiched between Jack Armstrong, the Links and mine. The Link family has allowed us to park my automobile there. I would like to increase the length of my driveway. My lot now is only 8,380 sq. ft.; by adding this 3299 sq. ft. it would bring my lot up to 11,679 sq. ft. The Link lot is presently at 38,332 sq. ft. This would bring his lot size down to 35,033 sq. ft. Haley – When looking at your proposed

boundary adjustment, are the buildings I see the Armstrong's? Harlow – Yes. Haley – Are they accessed from his driveway? Harlow – Yes. Link - If we do reduce our property from 38,000 to 35,000, 40,000 sq. ft. being the minimum, does that make it more difficult in the future? Mack – You are still below the minimum lot size. Edney – You are non-conforming now and still would be. Hearing closed at 8:48PM

DELIBERATIVE SESSION

2636: NORMAND AND ROBERTA MORIN:

Haley – Is this two lots? Edney - This is a voluntary merger. Dever – According to the ordinance, they do not need to come for Site Plan Review for Special Exception for filling the wetlands, but they do have to come for the parking, because that is subject to Site Plan Review. We did this so that the Zoning Board would not play Planning Board. If you have a site plan, it needs to be approved by the Planning Board before it comes to the Zoning Board. Edney – My interpretation was that we were not deciding on a use, but deciding on an application of parking within a setback. The reason I interpreted that way was because we are not as a Board trying to play Planning Board. All that parking in the setback requires a Special Exception. The configuration may change, because they will need DOT approval not only for the driveway access, but also for the use. Dever – That is why we don't want to be put in that position. When it comes here for a Special Exception, we want to know for sure what it is going to look like.

Dever moved, Hawkins seconded, IN CASE # 2636, NORMAND AND ROBERTA MORIN, I MOVE TO GRANT AN APPEAL FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO FILL IN A SMALL WET AREA TO CREATE PARKING WITHIN 50' BUFFER OF A NON-DESIGNATED WETLAND. Voted 5-0 in favor.

Dever moved, Hawkins seconded, IN CASE # 2636 I MOVE THAT A SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO CREATE OFF-STREET PARKING WITHIN DESIGNATED SETBACKS BE CONTINUED UNTIL SITE PLAN APPROVAL. Voted 5-0 in favor.

2637. ROLAND SYLVESTRE:

Dever – Bill, if this variance were granted, would he be subject to the penalty for building a shed without a building permit? Edney – Yes.

Hawkins moved, Haley seconded, IN CASE # 2637 ROLAND SYLVESTRE, I MOVE THE APPEAL FOR A VARIANCE TO CONSTRUCT A 10' X 12' SHED WITH A FRONT SETBACK OF 18' 11", 30' REQUIRED AND A SIDE

SETBACK OF 7' 9", 20' REQUIRED, BE APPROVED, AS IT APPEARS TO BE THE ONLY REASONABLE LOCATION FOR THE STRUCTURE AND IT DOES MEET THE CRITERIA FOR A VARIANCE. Voted 5-0 in favor.

2638. JOSEPH AND LINDA DICESARE:

Haley moved, Dever seconded, IN CASE # 2638, JOSEPH AND LINDA DICESARE, I MOVE TO GRANT AN APPEAL FOR A VARIANCE TO REPLACE AN EXISTING SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE WITH A NEW RESIDENCE WITH A 15' SIDE SETBACK, 20' REQUIRED AND A REAR SETBACK OF 4' 7", 40' REQUIRED, DUE TO THE RESTRICTION OF THE SMALL LOTS IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD, THIS WOULD MEET THE CRITERIA OF THE FIVE CONDITIONS FOR A VARIANCE, AS PER THE PLANS DONE BY GORAL ASSOCIATES, DATED 6/14/99 AND REVISED FOR THIS MEETING. Voted 5-0 in favor

2639. RONALD AND MARCELLE ABEAR:

Dever moved, Moyer seconded, IN CASE # 2639, RONALD AND MARCELLE ABEAR, I MOVE TO GRANT AN APPEAL FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO CREATE AN ACCESSORY APARTMENT WITHIN AN EXISTING SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING, TAX MAP R31, LOT NO. 3, LOCATED AT 39 HIGGINS ROAD, AS IT MEETS ALL REQUIREMENTS FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION. Voted 5-0 in favor.

2640. ALBERT AND DONNA DUCHARME:

Hawkins moved, Dever seconded, IN CASE # 2640, ALBERT AND DONNA DUCHARME, I MOVE AN APPEAL FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO CREATE AN ACCESSORY APARTMENT WITHIN AN EXISTING SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING, BE APPROVED, AS IT MEETS THE CRITERIA FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION WITH AN ADDED CONDITION THAT THE SIZE OF THE EXISTING SEPTIC SYSTEM BE PROVEN TO BE LARGE ENOUGH TO SUPPORT THIS EXTRA BEDROOM. Voted 5-0 in favor.

2641.TOR & SUSAN BRUNVAND FOR SCOTT CARPENTER:

Dever moved, Haley seconded, IN CASE # 2641,TOR AND SUSAN BRUNVAND FOR SCOTT CARPENTER, I MOVE AN APPEAL FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO CONSTRUCT OFF-STREET PARKING WITHIN DESIGNATED SETBACKS, BE CONTINUED UNTIL SITE PLAN APPROVAL. Voted 5-0 in favor.

2642. ASSOCIATED SURVEYORS FOR CONRAD REALTY TRUST:

Dever moved, Haley moved, IN CASE # 2642, ASSOCIATED SURVEYORS FOR CONRAD REALTY TRUST, I MOVE TO GRANT AN APPEAL FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO CONSTRUCT A DRIVEWAY AND UTILITY CROSSING THROUGH A NON-DESIGNATED WETLAND AND AN APPEAL FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO CONSTRUCT A DUPLEX, PARKING AREA, AND DRIVEWAY WITHIN 50' OF A NON-DESIGNATED WETLAND, TAX MAP U15A, LOT NO. 7, LOCATED ON NH ROUTE 25 IN THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT IN THE TOWN OF MEREDITH. Voted 4-1 in favor.

2643. DAVID AND TERESA McCORMACK:

Haley- With the layout of his property, I think this is probably the best place. The builder, depending upon when he bought the property, did not quarrel about the shed at all. Edney – The reality is, you have a builder that is building a speck house, and then will be gone. Moyer – There were no objections to it tonight were there? Mack – No. Edney – The rest of the neighborhood has no problem with this. Dever – This is a steep area. Mack – This is a difficult area. Where else are you going to put it, except on his front lawn? Talk about a detriment to the neighborhood.

Haley moved, Dever seconded, IN CASE # 2643, DAVID AND TERESA MCCORMACK, I MOVE TO GRANT AN APPEAL FOR A VARIANCE TO LOCATE A SHED WITH A SIDE SETBACK OF 5', 20' REQUIRED, TAX MAP NO. R06, LOT NO. 15, LOCATED AT 14 SERENITY LANE IN THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT, AS THERE IS NO BETTER LOCATION ON THE MCCORMACK LOT TO SITUATE THIS SIZE SHED. Voted 5-0 in favor.

2644. JOHN M. COLEMAN:

Haley moved, Dever seconded, IN CASE # 2644, JOHN M. COLEMAN, I MOVE TO GRANT AN APPEAL FOR A VARIANCE TO REPLACE AN EXISTING SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE WITH A NEW RESIDENCE WITH A 42' FRONT SETBACK, 65' REQUIRED, BECAUSE IT MEETS ALL THE FIVE CRITERIA AND IS THE MINIMUM REQUEST TO BE ABLE TO FIT A YEAR ROUND DWELLING. Voted 5-0 in favor.

2645. JOHN AND RUTH LINK:

Dever moved, Haley seconded, IN CASE # 2645, JOHN AND RUTH LINK, I MOVE TO GRANT AN APPEAL FOR A VARIANCE TO MODIFY TWO (2)

MEREDITH ZONING BOARD

SEPTEMBER 9, 2004

NON-CONFORMING LOT SIZES BY DECREASING LOT 7 BY 3,299 SQ. FT. AND TRANSFERRING 3,299 SQ. FT. TO LOT 8K-1, 40,000 SQ. FT. REQUIRED FOR BOTH LOTS. THE STRICT INTERPRETATION OF THE ORDINANCE IN THIS CASE WOULD SERVE NO USEFUL PURPOSE. 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