

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

Thorpe moved, Clark seconded, THAT WE APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JUNE 11, 2009. Voted unanimously. Flanders moved, Pelczar seconded, THAT WE APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JULY 9, 2009. Voted unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

2881. YERKES SURVEYING CONSULTANTS FOR KRISTEN MONTANA: An appeal for a SPECIAL EXCEPTION (ARTICLE V SECTION D-9 G) to construct a driveway within the protective buffer of a non-designated wetland, Tax Map S11, Lot No.14 & 14A, located at 1 Blueberry Hill Road in the Meredith Neck District.

Frank Yerkes – We received conditional Planning Board approval on May 12, 2009 for this subdivision. We are proposing to construct a common driveway for two lots and about 1000 sq. ft. of this will encroach on the wetland buffer. We originally had proposed the driveway to the left, outside the buffer. Mike Faller looked at the location and his comments were to put it in the location we are proposing. This field is overgrown now. It used to be an orchard. Historically, this has always been the access to the field. There is an existing apron. We don't feel it will impact the neighborhood in any way. Clark – What are the reasons Mr. Faller gave for not liking the conforming placement of the road. (Read Mikes comments into the record.)

From: **Mike Faller**
Sent: Thursday, April 23, 2009 5:24 AM
To: Angela LaBrecque
Subject: RE: Staff Comments

Angela

Montana

I am recommending that we use the existing curb cut. The apron is already in and any drainage that will come down the driveway will drain to the existing roadway cross culvert depicted on the plan. Moving the driveway closer to Meredith Neck road will cause drainage to head down the roadside ditch will cause problems in the future.

Hearing closed at 7:07 PM

2882. GREGORY & NANCY SHANNON: : An appeal for an AREA VARIANCE (ARTICLE V- D-4 B) to construct a garage with a 7.15' side setback and a14.67' side setback, 20' required, Tax Map W03, Lot No. 12, located at 60 Black Brook Road in the Shoreline District.

Carl Johnson - There is a paved driveway that goes down a slope to a flat area in the lot. There is currently an existing garage and a temporary portable shelter. The main dwelling is located to the front. This is a fairly narrow lot. (Pointed out buildable area on the plan to the Board.) The existing garage is non-conforming. It is located 7.15' from the property line to the abutter to the east. There is a portion of the garage that does fall within the conforming section of the lot. The proposal is to take down the existing garage (passed photos of existing garage and the portable storage shed) and replace with a more functional one and slightly larger. The Zoning Ordinance says you can expand a non-conforming structure up to 400 sq. ft. provided you are getting no closer than the existing structure is to the line. We are trying to maintain the limit of the existing encroachment so we are not proposing the new garage be any closer to the lot line than it already is. We are holding that lot line. Because we would like the garage to be 26' x 24', the expansion crosses over the existing setback line to the west, so we are also asking for a variance on that side as well. There will be no increase into the amount of impervious surface. It is within 250' of the lake so we needed to file an application with the State. We were granted approval. We are trying not to deviate too much from the existing conditions on the lot. The lot coverage now is 33% and the proposed would be 33%. We feel there would be no diminishing value of surrounding property. With a new garage, we think the property values would be enhanced. Garages are permitted in this zone. There would be no change in use. There is no way to construct a garage on this property and be conforming. The use is not contrary to the spirit of the Zoning Ordinance because the ordinance allows for the replacement of the existing non-conforming structures, if it can be demonstrated there is no adverse affect to the general public or the abutters. (Submitted elevation sketches to the Board) Glen Worsman – I am not against this project. I am an abutter. I think the project is fine. I question a boundary line on the plan. I am going to have Jeff Green speak for me. Jeff Green – I did some preliminary information on Glen's property. The boundary line in question is the one between Shannon's and the Worsmans, with the distance of 7.15' and 8.2'. There are two pins out at the road. One is an iron pipe and then a rebar was set by another surveying company. After doing the preliminary information, I came up with a different determination. My client wanted to make sure it was at least known for the record. It would put the garage 5.7' at the closest point and 6.44' at the furthest point. I am looking at a different pin that is approximately 3' different from that. Flanders – Are you using the iron Pipe? Green – Yes Clark- Carl, which one do you think is the right one? Johnson - There never is a right answer. Very often there are differences of opinion based on deeds, evidence and existing plans of record. When a line is disputed, the final determination is done by court. When I became involved with the Shannon's, we did some deed research and there was an existing survey by Mr. Yerkes, prepared for the Worsman's, and recorded at the Registry of Deeds. There was nothing at that time and knowing Mr. Yerkes, there was nothing for me to disagree with his line. It was a great situation because we had a plan of record, prepared for the abutter. You tend to use that plan unless you can find a reason not to. So, I used Mr. Yerkes monuments he set. We did map the monuments that Mr. Green says is out there. I spoke to Mr. Worsman and he said, after the plan was done he had reservations about the position of that line. His position is the

monuments that were there when he purchased the property, in his opinion, were the monuments that defined his property line. Mr. Yerkes and I both mapped additional monuments up and down the road. My opinion is agreeing with Mr. Yerkes opinion, based on that line. If there were a plan drawn that showed a different line, there would be two lines until such time there could be a resolution either between the parties or a Judge. This really doesn't affect this because on that particular side we are at the limit of existing encroachment. If the line was to move within two inches of the building, we would still be within the limit of existing encroachment. What gets cumbersome, we are asking for a specific distance to the line, so that would change. If the Board were to word their approval, should they grant it, it should say, the line to be is not to get any closer than the limit of existing encroachment. Green - We agree with this. We just have a concern with the boundry line. Yerkes - I would like to make some brief comments for the record. Our survey was done in 2003 and it was used as the basis for them to do a considerable expansion of their footprint. Some one year latter, when their construction was completed, we did an as-built survey and now some five years latter Mr. Worsman is claiming there is a mistake in the survey. I stand by my survey. I find it interesting this amount of time has passed before this issue has come up. Worsman - For the record, I brought this subject up at the time of the survey. I was not happy with the location of the pins when he did it. He said it didn't make a difference. Yerkes - No I did not. Edney - The reality is, we are using that footprint, and it has no affect. The existing encroachment is what it is. Clark - My comment was only so we could think about wording a motion. Hearing closed 7:30PM.

2883. JEREMY MARTIN DBA LAKES REGION DESIGN GROUP FOR DAMIAN MEOLA: An appeal for a SPECIAL EXCEPTION for expansion of a non-conforming single-family dwelling by more than 400 sq. ft. (ARTICLE IV SECTION 7 C 2), Tax Map S07-7, located at 8 Black Cove Road in the Shoreline District.

Jeremy Martin - We are proposing to go up about 13' to the ridge and make a 24' x 32' bedroom. This will add to the property value. We are converting one bedroom to a new stairway up to the new 2nd floor. Clark - Which bedroom is being sacrificed? Martin - The middle bedroom, which is the largest one. Flanders - What is the height? Martin - From the walkout basement it will be 24'. Clark - Are you saying the middle bedroom is the largest one or the one facing the water? Martin - The middle one is. Thorpe - My understanding is this does not require DES approval on the basis that there is no additional septic loading, and no change in footprint. Edney - Correct. Hearing closed at 7:35PM

2884: HINDS SEPTIC DESIGN SERVICES FOR CHIP DOHERTY & RENE MARTEL: An appeal for a SPECIAL EXCEPTION (ARTICLE V -SECTION D-9, G-2) for the placement of a 12" CMP and associated fill along a manmade drainage ditch line, Tax Map U26, Lot No. 75, located on Douglas Drive in the Meredith Neck District.

Deborah Hinds – We have a vacant lot on Douglas Drive. It is just under 4/10th of an acre. Mr. Doherty owns the adjacent lot next to it. We have runoff that comes down the back of the lot from foundation drains that are coming back thru there. There was a manmade ditch that was dug approximately right thru the center of this lot. We would like to culvert the existing ditch line. Pointed to the Board were the septic is and where the proposed new dwelling will be. We are proposing a 24' x 42' two bedroom house. Dever – Bill, does this require DES approval? Edney – It's manmade, no. Hinds - It is not a jurisdictional wetland. Clark – What happens to the water when it gets off the property? Hinds- There is an existing culvert on Douglas Drive. Clark – Is Mike Faller @ Public Works cool with this? Hinds – I have not met with them but I can. Hinds- We are not contributing anymore runoff to it. We are taking the runoff that is there now and just converting it. Edney – The culvert that runs underneath Douglas Drive is a closed system. All they are proposing to do is to take that closed system from the edge of the ROW on that property and pull it back to the rear property line. Greg Sheard – I am an abutter directly across the street. As far as I know, I have never seen any manmade activities or culverts over there. How was it determined the wetlands that are potentially there, are not wetlands? I question the size of the lot. By my calculation it's barely over 1/4 of an acre which makes it a non-conforming lot. Previously any owner who had two lots that were contiguous, the lots were combined and put under one taxable entity. My question goes far beyond the culvert. It goes to what has transpired. All of a sudden a non-conforming lot in this area is buildable. Hinds- I was the one that mapped the wetlands. I am a certified wetland scientist. Sheard- I didn't get a copy of the certification. Dever – All she has to do is provide us with her number. Hinds – The culvert does not exist yet. It is very obvious the ditch is manmade. It is not something that was naturally formed. These are two lots of record. Sheard- I have an issue with how close my well is. I have a concern with the placement of the septic on this property, the house, and the drainage which would go into the clean out pit that is front of my property. Hinds- As far as the drainage, we are not increasing the drainage. Sheard- If I am reading the drawing correctly, the base of this elevated septic field will be equal to the base of the house. I am concerned on whatever is going to drain in there, is going to spill over, and wind up in the clean out pit across from my house. If it is foul or has any safety concerns, I will be opposed to this exception. Hinds – It is a foundation drain that will take on ground water. All the foundation drains from both sides of the street come down the runoff across this property. This will all be sloped and graded so it won't run into the street. Flanders – What about his well? How far away from it are you? Hinds – Unfortunately I don't have it on the plan but 75' from his well would put it right about here (Pointed to plan). I have no problem showing it on the plan. Clark – We are discussing a culvert. It would seem to me whether or not a building permit is granted is a separate question. Is there a building permit on this? Edney – There won't be a building permit on this until it is applied for. Clark – At a point when a building permit is granted, a decision made by the Code Enforcement officer, that could be appealable to this Board if someone feels the permit should not be granted. Is that correct Mr. Chairman? Dever – Correct Clark – We would then at that point be discussing the house. At the present time, we are trying to discuss whether the installation of a culvert meets the

criteria of the Zoning Ordinance. I think we are discussing things outside the matter at hand. Dever – You are correct. I am trying to give everybody an opportunity to speak. Sheard – It's difficult to make a decision on the culvert without looking at the full picture that's being planned for the property. If it was only a culvert for drainage, I probably would not be that concerned. But when the plan comes to me as a proposed building with an elevated septic field that will drain into a pit that is in front of my house, I have concerns. Also, it says on the plan that it is 1 acre. We know it is less than that. If that is an error what else is in error. Dever – The size of lot doesn't come into play. Warren is right. We are here to talk about the culvert and the culvert only. Edney - Those drawings including a septic design and approval by the State of New Hampshire will be reviewed prior to the issuance of a building permit. Hinds – They will have both my septic designer and my wetland scientist license on the plans. Tom Tribuna – I am across the street from this property. All the double lots were combined into one. When you say a manmade dugout, the people between Old Barn and Douglas have been trying to keep that clear. The abutter in the back may have dug that. Sheard – I have tried to find out if this is a brook or stream flowing thru there. The definition in the Zoning Ordinance of a stream or brook says a “body of water having channeled flow and running on either a continuous or seasonally intermittent basis”. So my question is, is this stream, and if it is, how much water will flow in this stream? Is the size of this culvert being proposed adequate enough? Will the culvert be open? If it is closed, is there a potential for an over flow? If it's open, what about additional debris and sediment it will bring? Who cleans out the pit? Who's reasonable for the maintenance of the culvert? Hinds – To answer your questions, no it is not a stream. It is a manmade ditch. We would like to hook into the system so there would be no maintenance at the end of the culverts. We will be working with the town and the road agent to see how they would like things done. Chip Doherty – I am the owner of the property in question. We believe the proposed culvert would be in the best interest of everyone. We want to enhance the property. This is a legal buildable lot. Sheard – Is this an above ground culvert or underground? Hinds – We will lay it right in the ditch line of were it was dug before. So, technically it will be an in ground and covered. Sheard –So you will be bringing fill into the area. How much fill? Dever – We are getting beyond this. Sheard- If this is going to be blasted out and buried with a lot of fill then I object. If it is going to maintain the same terrain, same level, and no fill or blasting, then I would have fewer objections. Hinds – There is no ledge and no blasting. Clark – What happens if the water over flows this? Have you done an analysis of the amount of water so we're sure the culvert capacity won't be exceeded? Hinds- I have not done an analysis but the culvert is going to fill the ditch line that is there now. There is no indication that it has gone over the ditch. Hinds -Don't forget it is going into a closed system. Sheard- It's difficult for me to believe that they want to put a culvert in without adding anymore drainage than what's already coming from that property. Dever – Greg, we go by what the applicants tell us. We can all have doubts. Hinds - Just to clarify one thing. We are not draining any area over there. Dever – The Board understands that. Renate Sheard – She mentioned there is no problem with it over flowing. It is already over flowing right now. Doherty – If there is something that would work better than the culvert, I am open to that. Hearing closed at 8:08 PM.

2885: LRGHEALTHCARE c/o MITCHELL JEAN ESQUIRE: An appeal for a SPECIAL EXCEPTION to amend previously granted 2/12/98 (ARTICLE V D-,G,4,2) construction within a non-designated stream buffer, Tax Map U02-35A, located at 238 Daniel Webster Highway in the Residential District.

2886: LRGHEALTHCARE c/o MITCHELL JEAN ESQUIRE: An appeal for a SPECIAL EXCEPTION to amend previously granted 2/12/98 (ARTICLE V D-3, A) expansion of a Medical Center and parking in a Residential Zone, Tax Map U02-35A, located at 238 Daniel Webster Highway in the Residential District

Steve Smith – Both of these requests were originally granted in February 1998. In your packet is an opening letter with some history of the project. LRGHealthcare filed with the Town of Meredith for redevelopment during the fall of 1997. At that time, the property consisted of three separate lots. Tax Map U02 Lot 35A located in the Central Business District is occupied by a medical facility. Tax U02 Lot 36, located in the Residential District occupied a single family residential house, and Tax U02 Lot 37, located in the Residential District also occupied by a single family dwelling. LRGHealthcare proposed to expand the existing medical office building by constructing an addition to the west side of the existing building and expand parking. This project was proposed to be constructed in two phases. Phase I consisted of the expanded parking area and additional ingress and egress from Lower Ladd Hill Road. Phase II consisted of the expanded office space and improving the existing parking south of the building. Planning Board granted final Site Plan approval January 13, 1998 and the Zoning Board of Adjustment granted two special exceptions February 12, 1998 relative to Section D-9,G.4. As a result of these approvals, the original three lots were merged and are now all under Tax Map U02- Lot 35A. We still have a zone line that goes thru the property. Phase I was constructed and the existing house was removed to provide room to build the additional ingress/egress from Lower Ladd Hill Road. It was later determined that Phase II, expansion of the existing Medical Facility was not a viable option. LRGHealthcare has developed a new plan which proposes to construct a new free standing Medical Office Building south of the existing Medical Office Building requiring the removal of the remaining residential house. Once the new facility has been completed the old Medical Facility would be removed and the existing parking area redeveloped and expanded to encompass the former location of the previous medical building. We do have conditional approval from the Planning Board. One of the conditions is to obtain these two special exceptions. Read into the record:

(1) To promote the health, safety and general welfare of the community

- **The proposed use is an existing use. The new construction will not be any closer than the existing site development to the stream. The new design will capture all the existing and proposed storm water. Redirect the water away from the stream and treat prior to release, at the rate of predevelopment impacts.**

(2.) To prevent the degradation of surface water and ground water quality

- **The current development provides little to no treatment of stormwater in the area of the existing building. The new design will provide treatment of surface water and allow timed release to maintain predevelopment volumes**
 - (3) To preserve the ability of wetlands and areas adjacent to wetlands and streams to provide treatment for water quality purposes, to filter pollutants, trap sediments, or retain and absorb chemicals and nutrients.

- **The proposed design maintains the existing tree cover next to the stream, does not impact any wetland, provides treatment, traps sediments and retains and absorbs chemicals and nutrients by capturing storm water, treating and releasing under a controlled environment**
 - (4) To prevent the destruction of or significant changes to natural wetlands which provide flood storage

- **Proposed redevelopment will not impact the existing wetland and will increase the flood storage by redirecting existing and proposed storm water, treating and releasing at pre-development rates**
 - (5.) To prevent the destruction of habitats for rare, unique, threatened or endangered species of flora and fauna.

- **The proposed redevelopment will continue to maintain the undisturbed area which exist today surrounding the stream bed while improving treatment of storm water**
 - (6.) To prevent the development of structures and land uses in wetlands and areas adjacent to wetland and streams which will contribute to the degradation of surface and or ground water quality by means including but not limited to wastewater, toxic substances, excessive nutrients release, accelerated runoff, erosion and sedimentation

- **The project as proposed will improve the quality of the adjacent stream by reducing nutrient release, accelerated runoff, erosion and sedimentation.**
 - (7.) To preserve and enhance the aesthetic and recreational values associated with wetlands

- **Storm water management tools being applied to the redevelopment of this site will preserve and enhance the adjacent stream**
 - (8.) To protect fish and wildlife habitat, maintain ecological balances, and enhance the ecological values such as those cited in RSA 483A-1B.

- **The non-designated stream in question has been over taxed from upstream development over the years. The proposed redevelopment plan will continue to maintain the existing buffer and reduce the overall amount of storm water runoff impact to the stream as a result of the proposed drainage. All parking lot runoff will be captured and redirected to a treatment facility and released at pre-development rates. There will be no adverse impact**

on this stream and its water quality.

We then have the general requirements for a special exception. I can read these into the record if you would like. Dever – Does anyone objects if these are not read into the record. Board voted unanimously to have them not read. Smith – I put them in writing so they are on record. In your packet are the written criteria for meeting the special exception for the expansion of the Medical Clinic and parking. One thing unique about this site is it is already being used medically. We have a corner lot and it fronts mostly on the Daniel Webster Highway which is the Central Business Zone. From the last special exception, we planted a whole bunch of trees to protect the two closest residential abutters. The abutters have indicated the trees have provided a great buffer. (Presented Architectural renderings of the building to the Board.) Hearing closed at 8:30 PM.

DELIBERATION

2881. YERKES SURVEYING CONSULTANTS FOR KRISTEN MONTANA:

Clark – I can understand the desire to use the existing curb cut. But it seems to me, it would be practical to move the driveway further to the west and thus give more protection to the wetland. Mr. Edney, could you please comment. Edney – The reason they want to preserve that curb cut is it already exists, the drainage systems exist and what affectively is going to be a driveway, is an old orchard road. So, not only are you minimizing the disturbance within that area, you also minimize construction activities and the potential for changing drainage at the street.

Thorpe moved, Flanders seconded, IN CASE # 2881, YERKES SURVEYING CONSULTANTS FOR KRISTEN MONTANA, I MOVE THE APPEAL FOR THE SPECIAL EXCEPTION (ARTICLE V SECTION D-9 G) TO CONSTRUCT A DRIVEWAY WITHIN THE PROTECTIVE BUFFER OF A NON-DESIGNATED WETLAND, TAX MAP S11, LOT NO.14 & 14A, LOCATED AT 1 BLUEBERRY HILL ROAD IN THE MEREDITH NECK DISTRICT BE GRANTED, AS IT MEETS THE CRITERIA FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION. Voted 5-0 in favor.

2882. GREGORY & NANCY SHANNON:

Clark moved, Pelczar seconded, IN CASE # 2882, GREGORY & NANCY SHANNON, I MOVE THE APPEAL FOR AN AREA VARIANCE (ARTICLE V- D-4 B) TO CONSTRUCT A GARAGE WITHIN THE EXISTING LIMITS OF ENCROACHMENT ON THE SHORT SIDE AND A 14.67' ON THE OTHER SIDE SETBACK, 20' REQUIRED, TAX MAP W03, LOT NO. 12, LOCATED AT 60 BLACK BROOK ROAD IN THE SHORELINE DISTRICT BE GRANTED, AS IT MEETS THE CRITERIA FOR A VARIANCE. Voted 5-0 in favor.

2883. JEREMY MARTIN DBA LAKES REGION DESIGN GROUP FOR DAMIAN MEOLA:

Clark – I see no problems with this. He is maintaining the existing footprint. It is a reasonable use of the property.

Clark moved, Thorpe seconded, IN CASE # 2883, JEREMY MARTIN DBA LAKES REGION DESIGN GROUP FOR DAMIAN MEOLA , I MOVE THE APPEAL FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION FOR EXPANSION OF A NON-CONFORMING SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING BY MORE THAN 400 SQ. FT. (ARTICLE IV SECTION 7 C 2), TAX MAP S07-7, LOCATED AT 8 BLACK COVE ROAD IN THE SHORELINE DISTRICT BE GRANTED, AS IT MEETS THE CRITERIA FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION. Voted 5-0 in favor.

2884: HINDS SEPTIC DESIGN SERVICES FOR CHIP DOHERTY & RENE MARTEL:

Thorpe - This one I have a problem with. The presenter could not give us any factual information about the flows thru that ditch when it's seasonal, normal, dry season, wet season etc. She had no idea what the flows are. As soon as you put a culvert in, you are going to limit the amount of flow thru that ditch. I don't think we have been presented with enough information to make a wise decision. Dever – I agree with you Dave. Normally we ask for an assessment of down stream impacts on things of this nature. This is a touchy area. The lots are small and it is a wet area. I think we should continue this until we are provided with specific information on the calculations on flows and down stream impact. Clark- Is it better to continue this date specific? Dever – I would rather we continue this until we get the information and then we can do the re-notification process. Edney – This will take awhile. Clark – I was thinking the area could overflow and water could rush down there and dig out the culvert. But the people who are putting it in are the ones that want it, so if it happens, it will just put it back to the way it was before. I am also worried if it does overflow; it won't follow the old path and cause problems. My other concern was what if the capacity of the culvert is exceeded but that was put to rest by one of the people that were speaking against it. I don't have a problem continuing this until we get more information.

Clark moved, Flanders seconded, IN CASE # 2884. HINDS SEPTIC DESIGN SERVICES FOR CHIP DOHERTY & RENE MARTEL, I MOVE THE APPEAL FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION (ARTICLE V -SECTION D-9, G-2) FOR THE PLACEMENT OF A 12" CMP AND ASSOCIATED FILL ALONG A MANMADE DRAINAGE DITCH LINE, TAX MAP U26, LOT NO. 75, LOCATED ON DOUGLAS DRIVE IN THE MEREDITH NECK DISTRICT BE CONTINUED UNTIL INFORMATION ON FLOWAGE RATES, POSSIBILITY OF FAILURE OF THE CULVERT, DOWNSTREAM IMPACTS AND ALSO HAVE PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR WEIGHT IN ON THIS AND PROVIDE COMMENTS. Voted 4-1 in favor.

2885: LRGHEALTHCARE c/o MITCHELL JEAN ESQUIRE:

Pelczar – I don't have a problem with this one.

Pelczar moved, Clark seconded, IN CASE # 2885, LRGHEALTHCARE c/o MITCHELL JEAN ESQUIRE, I MOVE THE APPEAL FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO AMEND PREVIOUSLY GRANTED 2/12/98 (ARTICLE V D-,G,4,2) CONSTRUCTION WITHIN A NON-DESIGNATED STREAM BUFFER, TAX MAP U02-35A, LOCATED AT 238 DANIEL WEBSTER HIGHWAY IN THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT BE GRANTED, AS IT MEETS THE CRITERIA FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION. Voted 5-0 in favor.

2886: LRGHEALTHCARE c/o MITCHELL JEAN ESQUIRE:

Clark moved, Flanders seconded, IN CASE # 2886, LRGHEALTHCARE c/o MITCHELL JEAN ESQUIRE, I MOVE THE APPEAL FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO AMEND PREVIOUSLY GRANTED 2/12/98 (ARTICLE V D-3, A) EXPANSION OF A MEDICAL CENTER AND PARKING IN A RESIDENTIAL ZONE, TAX MAP U02-35A, LOCATED AT 238 DANIEL WEBSTER HIGHWAY IN THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT BE GRANTED, AS IT MEETS THE CRITERIA FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION. Voted 5-0 in favor.

Meeting adjourned at 9:00 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Christine Tivnan
Planning/Zoning Clerk

Approved by the Meredith Zoning Board on _____, 2009.

Jack Dever, Chairman