

PRESENT: Dever, Chairman; Pelczar, Vice- Chairman; Flanders, Thorpe, Hampton, Edney, Code Enforcement Officer, Tivnan, Clerk

Thorpe moved, Clark seconded, THAT WE APPROVE THE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 13, 2008 AS PRESENTED. Voted unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

2861: 38 MAIN LLC : An appeal for a USE VARIANCE(ARTICLE V D-7 B) to convert 2nd floor commercial space to a residential apartment, minimum area required 10,000 sq. ft. per unit. This would create (2) residential units within the building. Existing lot is 5,431 sq. ft. Proposal would require 20,000 sq. ft., Tax Map U07, Lot. No. 131, located at 38 Main Street in the Central Business District.

Michelle Ricciuti – The subject is unit four at 38 Main St. It was constructed as a residential apartment originally and has been for over 50 years. Last December, I applied for a temporary permit to sell jewelry out of the space after a tenant had vacated. However, I did not convert the space. I kept the kitchen and bathroom intact. I did use the permit and sold jewelry until Christmas. At the same time, we applied for a permanent permit to convert to retail space. That was granted in 2008. However, I never reopened it as commercial or retail space. It has remained vacant and still is. It is not conducive for retail or office space because of the accessibility. When we were granted the permanent permit, there were lighting issues with the residential tenants next door. I would like to turn it back into its original residential form. That would be the best and proper use of it and is in line with all the other properties on Main St. Dever – You realize the fact that it was a residential unit to begin with means nothing. We are looking at it like it's brand new. Ricciuti– OK Hearing closed at 7:05

2864: THOMAS & SHEILA DIONISIO: An appeal for an AREA VARIANCE (ARTICLE V --D-4 B) to relocate an existing shed with a 55' front setback, 65' required, Tax Map U21, Lot No. 9, located at 179 Pinnacle Park Road in the Shoreline District.

Dionisio – The existing project includes a tool shed that is within 13' of the lake. Part of this project is to relocate the shed behind the proposed structure which is approximately 50' back from the lake. To move behind the 65' line would get me into a very steep part of the grade and not practical. This location is far more conforming and practical. Hearing closed at 7:17 PM

2865: THOMAS & SHEILA DIONISIO : An appeal for an AREA VARIANCE (ARTICLE V- D-4 B) to construct a single-family dwelling with a 25' front setback, 65' required, Tax Map U21, Lot No. 9, located at 179 Pinnacle Park Road in the Shoreline District.

Dionisio - By way of background. The current structure is 110 yrs. old. It has no foundation and has sustained structural damage over the years. It is framed with light

lumber. The second floor is suspended from the ridge pole. The winter 2007 pretty much did it in. In reviewing the project with DES, we explored a number of options, from replacement in kind and various setbacks. We ultimately settled on this project which is more compliant than the existing structure. This is within the spirit of minimizing the impact to the land and slope. The current house is 15.9' from the lake on one corner and 13.2' on the other corner. The new house will be 25' and 25.2'. The proposed house has the same footprint as the existing house. The shape has been changed to optimize placement on the lot. The old house did not meet the side setbacks, the new one does. The lot overage is 26.7% today. It will be 24.7% after. We are removing some hard surfaces within the 50' buffer area. The reduction area moves from 39% to 23.3%. The septic tank is 40' from the lake now and will be relocated to outside the 50' buffer zone. The reason we can't comply with the front set back is because the Pinnacle Park area has a very steep slope. (Pointed to site diagram) Our lot slopes up significantly. We looked at construction deeper into the slope but the size and scale of the retaining wall that would be required made the project financially impractical and DES refused prior to this one, to move it back 35' because it would have increased the lot coverage. This is what we settled on as the best option. We are adding drainage around the house to catch runoff. We believe this project meets the spirit of the ordinance. It is far more complying than the structure we have now. This is why we are asking for the variance. Hearing closed at 7:15 PM

2866: RONALD VEZINA: An appeal for an AREA VARIANCE (ARTICLE V- D-7 B) to convert off-street office space to a residential apartment, minimum area required 10,000 sq. ft. per unit, Tax Map U06, Lot No. 62, located at 4 Water Street in the Central Business District.

Ron Vezina – The reason I am here is to convert off-street office space to a residential apartment. (Passed out packet) I will go through each page.

1. Pictures of the building.
2. Information on the property.
3. Building sketch
4. Tax Map
5. & 6. Current deed
7. Warranty Easement Deed
8. Letter from the town accepting the easement described on the preceding page.
9. Unofficial plot plan of the lot.
10. Drawing of the office/ retail space that it is currently.
11. Proposed residential unit.
12. Appraisers note of the property.
13. Commercial space available in Meredith
14. Section D-7 of the Zoning ordinance (permitted uses in the District)
15. Section D-7 paragraph B (Minimum Standards)

The building is consistent with the neighborhood. The outside will not change. The space we are proposing is a conversion of an office space that has been vacant for 37 out of 70 months. The location is not on a busy street and is set back from the main

foot traffic. It is not the best location for office retail space. Given the amount of office /retail space in town and the location of the unit, it's almost impossible to rent. If we are allowed to convert to residential, I know it would be rentable. I have nine residential units in town and all are full right now. Creating reasonably priced work force rental units is consistent with the district, purpose and the public interest. Dever – I have never been a fan of reducing the density for rental units in small areas. A few years ago, the Planning Board made a proposal to the town to reduce the density and that was denied. The town's people are not in favor of it. We start letting every commercial unit change over to residential then we are in effect trying to rezone the town. That is not our job. Vezina - Is that based on space? Dever – No, the town's people want 10,000 sq. ft per dwelling unit. Flanders – How far away from that is he? Vezina – It is 2.2 acres and the lot has five residential units. Dever – That lot has 2.2 acres? Vezina – Right. The parking easement is part of that. Vezina – I am sorry, it is .22. Flanders – He is close to the 10,000 sq. ft. Dever - For the five residential, he should have 50,000 sq. ft. Hearing closed at 7:30 pm

2867: WILLIAM & LINDA MACKIE: An appeal for an AREA VARIANCE (ARTICLE V-D-4) to expand a non-conforming structure by more than 400 sq. ft., Tax Map R14, Lot No. 12, located at 41 Wicwood Shores in the Shoreline District.

Dave Thorpe and Mike Pelczar stepped down. Dever – You are going to have only three members. Everyone would have to vote yes. Mackie – I want to go forward.

Linda Mackie – I am requesting a variance for a screened porch that was on the original plan we submitted to DES in 2008 and those were rejected. They did approve plans without the porch. We resubmitted the plans and got approval and that is why I am back again. Mike Brower- The house is under construction now. The porch will give it a balanced look. It will add value to the house. We can't go up the hill because of the leach field and the road. There is no foundation. Flanders – Are we just looking at the screen porch? Brower – The rest was approved back in July. Margery Thorpe – They really need a screened porch in the woods. This was part of the original plan. It fits in with the rest of the street. They have given up part of the beach to do this. Hearing closed at 7:40 PM

2868: AMES ASSOCIATES FOR BRUCE PLATTS & FAYE FOSTER: An appeal for a SPECIAL EXCEPTION (ARTICLE V-D-3 A) to convert an existing residential and retail use to professional office space, Tax Map S13, Lot No. 15C, located at 164 NH Route 25 in the Residential District.

Carl Johnson - This property is known as the Toole Hill House. The history of this property is it is a preexisting non-conforming use dating back prior to zoning. There was a residence with a retail business. Frontage is on both Keyser Road and NH Rte 25. There are several entrances to this property. In 2001 this went before the Planning Board and Zoning Board to change the nature of the antique shop to a designer showcase. They received approval. The intent was to have the residence remain a residence and a portion of the barn a place where the designer showcase would be.

That never got off the ground. The proposal is for a special exception to create office space within the building. We are asking to convert the building into eight professional office spaces. (Presented site plan to the Board) that showed increase parking and screening of some of the elements of the site plan that may have some affect on the abutters. One major element of this application is one entrance off of Rte. 25 will be discontinued and the entrance or exit which is at the northerly end of the parking also. The entrance off of Keyser Road will remain but not to be used by members of the public or employees of the site. It is there primarily to gain access to the back of the building for fire and emergency purposes. The Planning Board did agree that that was a good idea. There will be no signage there. There are 27 proposed parking spaces. We believe we have complied with site plan review regulations by not creating a situation where we are building more parking than what we need. We are not asking for any relief in regards to lot coverage. What we are proposing is well within the character of the neighborhood. One of the advantages to office space is that the traffic is limited and very little activity on the weekends. The applicants have proposed to restrict certain types of professional offices. Those would include hairdressers, physicians, dentists, and veterinarian clinics. This is being self imposed. Ames Associates and Cerrutti Construction are anticipating having office space in the building. There will be no exterior changes to the building and limited changes to the configuration and little grading to the parking lot. The dumpster will be screened with additional planting to help screen the abutting property. The house that has an impacted view of this property is Mr. Fletcher. Mr. Fletcher is here and has said that he is generally in favor of this project. The beauty of the proposal is that it's a minimum impact use of the property. We believe we have met the criteria for a special exception. Wayne Fletcher – I live next door and I am grateful that this is happening to this building. I just asked these gentlemen to put a barrier in between the dumpster. I hope they get this. Hearing closed at 8:05 PM

2869: DAVID & NANCY SMITH: An appeal for an AREA VARIANCE (ARTICLE V-D-3B) to convert the upstairs of a garage to an accessory apartment, minimum area required 10,000 sq. ft. per unit, Tax Map U06, Lot No. 30, located at 10 Waukewan Ave. in the Residential District.

Mike Pelzcar stepped down.

Dever – You only have four members. Do you wish to go ahead?

David Smith – Yes. I live at 9 Waukewan Ave. I am an abutter and I am speaking for the applicants, my parents. We began this project four years ago. From the beginning we knew we would be seeking to get an apartment. We started with an old garage. We currently have a two-unit building on the lot. My grandmother currently resides upstairs in the second unit. We approached members at the town to discuss what we needed to do to accomplish this. We built the garage two years ago with the upstairs unfinished. We would now like to finish it off. My sister has recently moved back home and is living upstairs. My grandmother is in Florida for the winter. With my sister home with her children, the in-law apartment would be a great addition for my grandmother. Two

houses down we have a four-unit building, the next unit on the same side has an apartment attached to it and the unit I have is zoned for multi-family also. This would not change the character of the neighborhood. Parking was brought up when we first started this project. Currently in our driveway alone we have the ability to park 4-6 vehicles and that does not include the two-bay garage that we now have. There will be no change in the existing structure there now. Hearing closed at 8:10 PM.

DELIBERATION

2861: 38 MAIN LLC:

Dever – On this one, it didn't work as a residence so let's change it over to commercial and now it doesn't work as commercial, so let's change it back to residential. That certainly violates the spirit and intent of the ordinance. What's the good to the public if we keep changing things around. That's how I feel. Thorpe – So this is a 5431 sq. lot with two residential units. Dever – Correct. She should have 20,000 sq. ft. Thorpe – Have we been approving these on a regular basis and we are now getting more aware or have these been few and far between. Dever – I don't recall how many there have been but I don't believe there has been a whole raft of them. Like I said, there was a proposal made to reduce the density and maybe it got shot down because there was too much put in at one time but this was part of it. You do have the spirit and intent of the ordinance and it is to have 10,000 sq. ft. per dwelling unit. I don't like to see a lot of housing jammed in on small lots. Hampton – My thought is that we are always in need of work force housing. Dever – Work force housing is a new buzz word. We have no rent control, so there is nothing that says the rental price is going to be what someone can afford. In the paper now, there are a lot of rental spaces in Meredith now. Flanders – We have three cases that are looking for the same thing. Pelczar – We have passed a few of them. If we look at them separately, I heard parking brought up. When you get on Main Street with that tight corner, where is that person going to park. I don't think we can consider parking but it's still a thought. I am at the other end with being in business and trying to keep things a float and work. The congestion is a concern for me. The 10,000 sq. ft. doesn't bother me. If they can provide a lower rent and someone can move in, have a job, and eat, that's how I look at it. Dever – Like I said. We don't have rent control. Flanders – I think we can look at parking. What more parking does a residential use require then an approved commercial use? Dever – The difference is residential is going to need parking all the time. Where do they park in the winter time? They can't park in the street or the public lots. There is a tenant at the building that parks his car there all day and in the winter there are two. I do understand where you are coming from Brian. Dever – Let's go through the criteria first.

1. No diminution in value of surrounding properties would be suffered.

Hampton - Probably not

2. Granting of this variance will not be contrary to the public interest.

Dever – Looking at the ordinance, this is what the public voted on. This would be going against what people voted on. Flanders – This has been a somewhat recent vote by the town on this rule so we kind of Pelczar – I think we are stuck on this if we go by what Jack is telling us with the 10,000 sq. ft. The zoning board is here to help the people. They put stuff in this for us to say yes. Jack is saying the town voted for this so we have to keep it but I am sitting here and you hear a special exception and it allows us some loop holes. If we take this out, are we doing our job as a zoning board? I don't know. This is a tough one. Dever – What you are saying is that we should grant variances all the time? Pelczar – What are we using as a reason? Dever – It violates the spirit and intent of the ordinance. The spirit and intent of the ordinance is the 10,000 sq. ft. per dwelling unit. I agree you look at each one individual but this one just flat out does not meet it. Anything we have done before on a lot does not count. Flanders – When was this property changed over to commercial? Dever – A year ago. Thorpe – If you look at item (5) it would clearly be contrary to the spirit of the ordinance. There is no question on item (5) Dever – It has to meet all (5) to grant a variance. Thorpe – If three out of the five of us agree on item (5) it would not fly.

3. Since:

- a. the following special conditions of the property make an area variance necessary in order to allow the development as designed;

Dever – The property is already there. Thorpe – This doesn't even apply.

- b. the same benefit cannot be achieved by some other reasonably feasible method that would not impose an undue financial burden.

Dever – Financial burden according to the applicant is that she tried to run it residential and it didn't work, changed it to commercial and now it doesn't work commercial so change it back to residential. Flanders – We are not asking them to spend money to do something different.

4. Granting this variance substantial justice would be done.

Thorpe – No Flanders - I agree with the points, I'm just a little hesitant.

5. The use contemplated by petitioner as a result of obtaining this variance would not be contrary to the spirit of the ordinance.

Dever – As we have discussed it would be contrary to the spirit of the ordinance as it does not meet the 10,000 sq. ft.

Thorpe moved, Hampton seconded, IN CASE # 2861: 38 MAIN LLC: I MOVE THE

APPEAL FOR AN AREA VARIANCE (ARTICLE V- D-7 B) TO CONVERT 2ND FLOOR COMMERCIAL SPACE TO A RESIDENTIAL APARTMENT, MINIMUM AREA REQUIRED 10,000 SQ. FT. PER UNIT. THIS WOULD CREATE (2) RESIDENTIAL UNITS WITHIN THE BUILDING. EXISTING LOT IS 5,431 SQ. FT. PROPOSAL WOULD REQUIRE 20,000 SQ. FT., TAX MAP U07, LOT. NO. 131, LOCATED AT 38 MAIN STREET IN THE CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT BE DENIED, AS IT DOES NOT MEET THE FIVE CRITERIA REQUIRED FOR AN AREA VARIANCE. Voted 4-1 in favor.

2864: THOMAS & SHEILA DIONISIO:

Dever-They are meeting the side set back. Flanders –They have no garage.

1. No diminution in value of surrounding properties would be suffered.– No Board agreed.

Granting of this variance will not be contrary to the public interest -. Board agreed it would not be contrary.

2. Since: a. the following special conditions of the property make an area variance necessary in order to allow the development as designed; Board agreed.
 - b. the same benefit cannot be achieved by some other reasonably feasible method that would not impose an undue financial burden. Dever – We went over this on case #2865.
3. Granting this variance substantial justice would be done. Board agreed.
4. The use contemplated by petitioner as a result of obtaining this variance would not be contrary to the spirit of the ordinance. Board agreed it would not.

Hampton moved, Thorpe seconded, IN CASE #2865: THOMAS & SHEILA DIONISIO, I MOVE THE APPEAL FOR AN AREA VARIANCE (ARTICLE V --D-4 B) TO RELOCATE AN EXISTING SHED WITH A 55' FRONT SETBACK, 65' REQUIRED, TAX MAP U21, LOT NO. 9, LOCATED AT 179 PINNACLE PARK ROAD IN THE SHORELINE DISTRICT BE GRANTED, AS IT MEETS THE FIVE CRITERIA FOR AN AREA VARIANCE. Voted 5-0 in favor.

2865: THOMAS & SHEILA DIONISIO:

Thorpe – It appears they are making a bad situation better. They will now meet the side setbacks. It appears to me to be a well designed project. Dever – Let's go down the criteria.

1. No diminution in value of surrounding properties would be suffered. Thorpe – No Board agreed.
2. Granting of this variance will not be contrary to the public interest. Thorpe - It would not be contrary.
3. Since: a. the following special conditions of the property make an area variance necessary in order to allow the development as designed; Thorpe -Yes
 - b. the same benefit cannot be achieved by some other reasonably feasible method that would not impose an undue financial burden. Dever – Normally what we do when we come to this section we would ask the person if they have gone and got quotes but you take a look at this property and it would be very expensive and the State would not allow it.
4. . Granting this variance substantial justice would be done. Thorpe – Yes
5. The use contemplated by petitioner as a result of obtaining this variance would not be contrary to the spirit of the ordinance. Dever – This certainly would not be contrary to the spirit of the ordinance.

Flanders moved, Thorpe seconded, IN CASE # 2865, I MOVE THE APPEAL FOR AN AREA VARIANCE (ARTICLE V- D-4 B) TO CONSTRUCT A SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING WITH A 25' FRONT SETBACK, 65' REQUIRED, TAX MAP U21, LOT NO. 9, LOCATED AT 179 PINNACLE PARK ROAD IN THE SHORELINE DISTRICT BE GRANTED, AS IT MEETS THE FIVE CRITERIA FOR AN AREA VARIANCE. Voted 5-0 in favor.

2866: RONALD VEZINA:

Thorpe – This is the same as 38 Main only more aggravated. There are 5 residential units there now. This would add a sixth. The same arguments would apply here. The property is off Main Street and the commercial opportunities are less. Dever – It is what it is. Flanders – There are commercial businesses on Water Street.

1. No diminution in value of surrounding properties would be suffered. Dever – We can't say that.
2. Granting of this variance will not be contrary to the public interest. – Dever – Same argument as 38 Main St.

3. Since: a. the following special conditions of the property make an area variance necessary in order to allow the development as designed; - Dever – There are no special conditions except that it is a small lot. It doesn't meet the requirements.
4. b. the same benefit cannot be achieved by some other reasonably feasible method that would not impose an undue financial burden. Thorpe - I don't think this applies. It is not a development.
5. Granting this variance substantial justice would be done. Flanders – Justice to whom?
6. The use contemplated by petitioner as a result of obtaining this variance would not be contrary to the spirit of the ordinance. Thorpe- This would be.

Thorpe moved, Hampton seconded, IN CASE # 2866, I MOVE THE APPEAL FOR AN AREA VARIANCE (ARTICLE V- D-7 B) TO CONVERT OFF-STREET OFFICE SPACE TO A RESIDENTIAL APARTMENT, MINIMUM AREA REQUIRED 10,000 SQ. FT. PER UNIT, TAX MAP U06, LOT NO. 62, LOCATED AT 4 WATER STREET IN THE CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT BE DENIED, AS IT FAILS TO MEET THE FIVE CRITERIA FOR AN AREA VARIANCE. Voted 4-1 in favor. Pelczar voted against.

2867: WILLIAM & LINDA MACKIE:

Flanders – I don't have any particular problem with this. Dever – It is a very small lot. The septic is behind the house so you no other place to go. Flanders – My only question, are they entitled to have a screened porch?

1. No diminution in value of surrounding properties would be suffered. Flanders - No
2. Granting of this variance will not be contrary to the public interest. Flanders - No
3. Since: a. the following special conditions of the property make an area variance necessary in order to allow the development as designed; Dever – It is small and steep. Those are special conditions.
- b. the same benefit cannot be achieved by some other reasonably feasible method that would not impose an undue financial burden. Flanders – Don't think this applies as there is no other option.

4. Granting this variance substantial justice would be done. Hampton - Yes
5. The use contemplated by petitioner as a result of obtaining this variance would be contrary to the spirit of the ordinance. Flanders -No

Hampton moved, Flanders seconded, IN CASE # 2567, WILLIAM & LINDA MACKIE, I MOVE THE APPEAL FOR AN AREA VARIANCE (ARTICLE V-D-4) TO EXPAND A NON-CONFORMING STRUCTURE BY MORE THAN 400 SQ. FT., TAX MAP R14, LOT NO. 12, LOCATED AT 41 WICWOOD SHORES IN THE SHORELINE DISTRICT BE GRANTED, AS IT MEETS THE CRITERIA FOR AN AREA VARIANCE. Voted 3-0 in favor.

2868: AMES ASSOCIATES FOR BRUCE PLATTS & FAYE FOSTER:

Dever – This is a special exception that requires an approved site plan, which they have with the condition that they have the special exception. Thorpe – Looking at the three criteria for a special exception:

- a. That the use will not be detrimental to the character or enjoyment of the neighborhood by reason of undue variation from the kind and adverse violation of the character or appearance of the neighborhood. Thorpe- I don't believe it would be detrimental
- b. That the use will not be injurious, noxious or offensive and thus detrimental to the neighborhood. Thorpe – The use would not.
- c. That the use will not be contrary to the public health, safety or welfare – Thorpe – I think it would not. It appears to meet the three criteria for a special exception. Dever- I think it's an excellent use for the building. Flanders – It will look a lot nicer than most of the buildings on Rte. 25.

Flanders moved, Thorpe seconded, IN CASE # 2868: AMES ASSOCIATES FOR BRUCE PLATTS & FAYE FOSTER, I MOVE THE APPEAL FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION (ARTICLE V-D-3 A) TO CONVERT AN EXISTING RESIDENTIAL AND RETAIL USE TO PROFESSIONAL OFFICE SPACE, TAX MAP S13, LOT NO. 15C, LOCATED AT 164 NH ROUTE 25 IN THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT BE GRANTED, AS IT MEETS THE THREE CRITERIA FOR GRANTING A SPECIAL EXCEPTION. Voted 5-0 in favor.

2869: DAVID & NANCY SMITH:

Thorpe – I have concerns on what seems to be crowding in the driveway but not enough for me to vote against it. In general I think it is fine. Flanders – This falls into the category of the other two. In general, I personally think the 10,000 sq. ft. is too high but it's been voted on. Dever – Anybody that has been denied can put forward a warrant article at town meeting. Flanders – I would say this is different then the others if we can put a restriction that it be used by family and not a rental property. Dever – That is why I asked the question because that has been done in the past. They don't seem to be in

favor of that but we can put conditions on the approval. Flanders – I think they would be more in favor of that than a denial. They do have a need and I think the ordinances needs to be revisited in the future. Dever – We are not talking a commercial property. This is a residential property that is surrounded by town property that is never going to be developed. Flanders – I do think that outside of a family situation that parking would be an issue. Dever:

1. No diminution in value of surrounding properties would be suffered. Board agreed no. There are a number of apartments in the area.
2. Granting of this variance will not be contrary to the public interest. Board agreed no.
3. Since: a. the following special conditions of the property make an area variance necessary in order to allow the development as designed; Dever- That's obvious that it is.
4. b. the same benefit cannot be achieved by some other reasonable feasible method that would not impose an undue financial burden. Dever – A financial burden does not come into play on this one.
5. Granting this variance substantial justice would be done. Flanders - It would be.
6. The use contemplated by petitioner as a result of obtaining this variance would not be contrary to the spirit of the ordinance. Flanders – If we don't approve this with a condition it would be inconsistent with the other two. Dever – I agree with you.

Flanders moved, Hampton seconded, IN CASE #2869: DAVID & NANCY SMITH, I MOVE THE APPEAL FOR AN AREA VARIANCE (ARTICLE V-D-3B) TO CONVERT THE UPSTAIRS OF A GARAGE TO AN ACCESSORY APARTMENT, MINIMUM AREA REQUIRED 10,000 SQ. FT. PER UNIT, TAX MAP U06, LOT NO. 30, LOCATED AT 10 WAUKEWAN AVE. IN THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT BE GRANTED WITH THE CONDITION THAT IT ONLY BE USED BY FAMILY AND NOT TO BE USED AS A RENTAL APARTMENT. Voted 4-0 in favor.

Dever – You understand if the zoning should change and the density is lowered, then that condition would not apply. You can come back to this board and ask that the condition be lifted.

Meeting adjourned at 9:00 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Christine Tivnan
Planning/Zoning Clerk

Approved by the Meredith Zoning Board on _____, 2009.

Jack Dever, Chairman