

PRESENT: Dever, Chairman; Flanders, Thorpe, Reichlen, Goodheart, Edney, Code Enforcement Officer, Tivnan, Clerk

Thorpe moved, Flanders seconded, THAT WE APPROVE THE MINUTES OF DECEMBER 9, 2010. Voted unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING

2930: GEORGE & CHRISTINE NASSOR JR.: An appeal for a SPECIAL EXCEPTION (ARTICLE V, SECTION D9 G-1a) to allow construction of a driveway across a non-designated wetland and its associated buffer to reach the buildable area of a pre-existing lot of record, Tax Map S26, Lot No. 41, located on Winona Shores Road in the Residential District.

2931: GEORGE & CHRISTINE NASSOR, JR.: An appeal for a SPECIAL EXCEPTION (ARTICLE V, SECTION D9 G-4a) to construct a garage and turning area within 50' of a non-designated wetland with buffer impact of 2,864 sf., Tax Map S26, Lot No. 41, located on Winona Shores Road in the Residential District.

Carl Johnson – The proposal before you this evening is to construct a garage for storage purposes and a turning area within a non-designated wetland and a driveway across a non-designated wetland. This would require two Special Exceptions. The wetland area is a narrow wetland, primarily standing water for most of the year but non-flowing. It comes across a corner of the lot onto the abutting parcel and then comes across the front of the Nassor lot. We have proposed a simple 10' wide driveway crossing with an associated culvert to cross the wetland and get to the buildable area of the lot. We have received approval from the State for the crossing. The Conservation Commission has reviewed this project. They had two separate comments. The Conservation Commission was in favor of the driveway crossing and agrees it meets the meaning of the ordinance. Their other comment dealt with the size of the turning area and the size of the garage. The Conservation Commission felt the garage was larger than necessary as was the turning area. This is a pre-existing non-conforming lot of record. This could be developed for a house and that proposal would have a bigger wetland impact and definitely looking at the same crossings. There would be a significantly greater amount of disturbance. This site is for storage and would not be visited everyday. The remainder of the lot would be undisturbed. There is no proposal for any type of septic system. The Conservation Commission thought a 20' x 20' or a 24' x 26' garage would be better for this site. In addressing the turning area, we tried to make this as small as possible. We are talking 22' to 24' away from the garage. If you had a pick-up truck that would be tight. If you had a situation where you were building this garage and not limited by buffers, you would have a significant larger turning area than what is being proposed. We tried to keep this at a minimum. There is a portion of the garage that is conforming. We chose the area that would have the least impact. In terms of the turning area, I don't see how you would get a much smaller area, especially if you are talking about bringing trailers in,

regardless of the size of the garage. We tried to make the turning area as small as we could and we chose the area that would have the least impact. In terms of the size of the garage I don't believe making this garage smaller is going to have a significant difference in terms of the impacts to the buffers. This is a low grade wetland. I will briefly go over the purpose and intent-criteria.

1. This application does not adversely affect the health, safety or general welfare of the community.
2. It does not contribute to the degradation of the surface or groundwater quality.
3. It does not significantly impair the wetlands ability to treat surface waters, filter pollutants, trap sediments or retain and absorb chemicals and nutrients.
4. It does not affect the ability of the wetlands to provide flood storage
5. A report was filed with the New Hampshire Heritage Bureau — it was determined, while there was a NHB record present in the vicinity, they do not expect that it will impact the proposed project.
6. It provides building envelopes which will not contribute to the degradation of surface/ ground waters and will not result in the production of toxic chemicals or substances
7. We minimized the wetland impact and therefore the buffer impact the aesthetic and recreational values will be maintained
8. The lot will not adversely affect the fish or wildlife habitats or degrade the ecological values as those cited in State Statutes.

Hearing closed at 7:20 PM

2932: KURT W. ELLISON: An appeal for a SPECIAL EXCEPTION (ARTICLE V, SECTION D9 G-1a) to construct a wetland crossing for purposes of access for a sewer line, Tax Map R07, Lot No. 34, located at 57 Collins Brook Road, in the Shoreline District.

Kurt Ellison – Our existing non-conforming septic system failed a few months ago and we had a new septic system designed. The lot is under ½ acre and has an intermittent stream going through the property. The stream has to be crossed for the septic line. It goes over a culvert. We believe the use will not visibly alter the appearance of the neighborhood and therefore will not be detrimental to the character or enjoyment. There will be no injurious, noxious or offensive substances used and the improvement to a conforming septic system will be an improvement to public health. I have State approval. I now need this Special Exception. Hearing closed at 7:22 PM

2933: MEGAN GREENSTEIN & SCOTT KNOWLES FOR PETER RUDIS: An appeal for a VARIANCE (ARTICLE SECTION V, SECTION D9 J TABLE 1) to replace a leach bed 42' from a non-designated wetland, 75' required, Tax Map U29, Lot No. 3-8, located at 1 Summerside Drive (Unit 8) in the Shoreline District.

Scott Knowles – The existing leach bed is in failure. We are proposing a new enviro-septic system. Due to other septic systems on the property, wetlands, and wells, it limits the area for placement of the leach bed. The proposed system will be replaced in approximately the same location. The proposed use is consistent with the use of surrounding properties. We feel the new system will increase property values. There is no change of use; therefore, it will not diminish surrounding property values. The new system size is designed to accommodate the proposed use and provide far better waste water treatment than the existing system. To replace the system is in the best interest of the environment; therefore, the public interest. The spirit of the ordinance is to protect wetlands and other water sources. By granting this variance, we feel it meets the spirit and intent of the ordinance. Thorpe- Is the land the building's on owned in common? Knowles- They each own their site. The site is a little bit larger than the actual building. Thorpe – Is the septic and leach bed on the property you own? Knowles –No, it is on common property. Thorpe – Is there any permission required from the condo association? Knowles – When the subdivision was first established, the declaration says all the common land would be used for septic use. Reichlen – Each one of these units has its own septic system? Knowles – Yes. Nancy Marudzinski- I own unit 9. My question is, will the replacement change the hump of the land? Knowles – It is my understanding the leach bed will be higher than what is there now because of the water table. Marudzinski – Will it have one of those upside down J pipes? Knowles – Yes it does. The pipe will be across the street and hidden by a tree. Marudzinsk – So we don't know what the final grading will be? Dever – It's on the plan. It will be less than 3' higher than what is there now. Marudzinski – It is true we own a surrounding perimeter around our homes and we each have our own septic tanks. Jeff (inaudible) – I did the test pits. I can assure you anything they do now will be better than what is there. The system there now is very antiquated. Marudzinski – Is the leach bed going to be totally 3' high, because that pretty much encompasses the whole back yard? Flanders – It looks like this will be a gradual rise so at the tallest point about 3' but as it moves towards the house, it gets less and less. Hearing closed at 7:34 PM

2934: AMES ASSOCIATES ON BEHALF OF PRIMROSE REALTY TRUST FOR ESTATE OF KENNETH W. WOOD: An appeal for a VARIANCE (ARTICLE V, SECTION D-4B) to construct a new single-family dwelling with a front setback of 50', 65' required, Tax Map U19 Lot No. 27, located at 53 Pinnacle Park Road in the Shoreline District.

Nicol Roseberry (Ames Associates) – Passed a letter from an abutter to the Board. The existing residence is about 13' from the shoreline. There is an existing outbuilding and trailer. The proposed plan is to remove these structures and to move the new dwelling back to the States 50' setback; however, we cannot meet the town's 65' setback. If the house were moved back it would violate the rear setbacks and encroach on the required setbacks for the septic system. We meet all side setbacks. We feel this new proposal

will be a benefit by removing those other non-conforming structures. Now no structures will be in that buffer area. In regards to Variance criteria, the new well will be substantially increased which will increase the value of surrounding properties. The existing dwelling is in a state of disrepair. The new structure will be more conforming, a new septic system will be installed and the proposed dwelling will be consistent with the size and style of other homes in the neighborhood; therefore, we do not think this would be contrary to the public interest. Approval of the variance will allow reasonable development of this property that is consistent with other homes in the neighborhood. This structure will be much more aesthetically pleasing than the current one so we believe substantial justice would be done. We believe it meets the spirit of the ordinance because the proposal is a substantial improvement from the existing non-conforming structure. This proposal increases the setback from the lake and it will not detract from the water quality or the privacy of the residents in the area. The small size and irregular shape of the property make it impossible to build a reasonable size home within the building envelope established by the setbacks. The abutter to the north has offered a response saying they have no objection. (Read response to the Board)

Hello Nicol,

After review, we have no objections to the zoning application. Thank you for suggesting and we look forward to the courtesy of being able to enter that property during construction for well machinery to drill our well on our lot near the lot line between the two properties.

Thank you again for forwarding the application and plan.

Nancy Von Kittlitz

Trustee of Windjammer Realty Trust.

Goodheart – I don't see anything on this plan showing the location of the well. Roseberry – You are correct and I apologize. I saw that this afternoon. Pointed to the plan where the well will be. Hearing closed at 7:45 PM.

2935: BOB WOLAK FOR WOLAK REALTY LLC: An appeal for a SPECIAL EXCEPTION (ARTICLE V, SECTION D9 G-4a) to allow parking improvements within the wetland buffer, Tax Map U15, Lot No. 15, located at 55 NH RTE. 25, located in the Central Business District.

2936: BOB WOLAK FOR WOLAK REALTY LLC: An appeal for a SPECIAL EXCEPTION (ARTICLE VIII, DEFINITION-OFF-STREET PARKING) to allow off street parking in the CBD within the side setback, Tax Map U15, Lot No. 15, located at 55 NH RTE. 25, located in the Central Business District.

Steve Smith (Steve Smith and Associates) – This is Dunkin Donuts. We are here for two Special Exceptions. We have been working with the Town of Meredith to make improvements on vehicular movement on site and to the traffic in the road. We have been to the Planning Board and have received conditional approval and the Conservation Commission has no objection to the Special Exceptions we are requesting. There have been other Special Exceptions granted for this site. Pointed to the plan

showing the access point off of Rte. 25. There will be no change to the driveway access. The design of the parking and drive thru are intended to improve site circulation and provide additional storage capacity for the drive thru. We are re-locating the drive thru lane. In order to do this, we need to change the island configuration and move the parking over. The parking is within 2 ½' of the 10' setback. Dever – Have you thought to approach the state about having another exit? Smith – We looked at that but it was a no deal. Hearing closed at 7:55 PM.

2937: BETTY RAYNOR: An appeal for a VARIANCE (ARTICLE V, SECTION D-3) to construct a deck with a rear setback of 15', 40' required, Tax Map U06, Lot No. 32, located at 21 High Street in the Shoreline District.

Chairman, Jack Dever stepped down. Explained applicant has an option to continue to the next meeting date if she would like a full Board. Applicant agreed to go forward.

Betty Raynor- I abut Swasey Park. My backyard faces the Park. There is nothing between my property and the Park. I have neighbors on two sides and both have decks and they are the size of what I am requesting. (Passed pictures to the Board showing neighbors decks and a picture from the back of her property facing the park.). I don't believe my neighbor would be able to see my deck from his property. The deck railing is going to be glass. This will be a very attractive deck. This is my summer family home. There are 14 of us. Two of my children have disabilities and can't go up stairs. I want to make additional space for them. Thorpe – Are you familiar with the laws that we have to follow to grant a variance? Raynor – I am. Thorpe – It requires that there be special conditions of your property that distinguish it from other properties in the area. Could you tell us what that is? Raynor – Mine is very close to the woodlands and I don't know when the park was created. My house is close to the park and there doesn't look like there is any separation. I believe that it is not obstructing anyone's view. Thorpe – I am having difficulty with this application. What section would result in hardship? From your letter I can't tell if it's A or B? Raynor. It seems that those questions were similar. If you could help me? Thorpe – Let me give you a copy and you can look it over. Raynor – I would say A. No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the application. I believe it's a reasonable use of the property. Thorpe – Then are you arguing that the setback should not apply because you are abutting public land? Raynor – I think that it is not abutting any other person or home that it could be a bother to. It doesn't obstruct anything that someone would want to enjoy. Goodheart – How long have you owned this house? Raynor – Three years. Goodheart- Were you aware of the town's rules and regulations regarding setbacks? Raynor - Yes. I thought that because I wasn't abutting someone's house it might be OK. I am more than willing to adapt. I just want them to have open doors and enjoy the canal. David Burgess – I am an abutter. I live at 19 High Street. We own 170' of canal frontage. Behind Betty's home is the property line for the park. We are opposed to this deck for several reasons. The proposed deck will diminish our enjoyment of the park and interfere with our unobstructed view of the park. We believe this will change our property values. This deck will come within 15' of the park. This would cause a noise

factor for our back yard. The owners of 21 High St. already have a very large deck on their home with rooms off the same floor that they are proposing for this new deck. . We have concerns about the gradual conversion of the zoned single family home at 21 High St into a two unit property. They have converted their garage into a complete multi-story apartment with a kitchen, bath, bedrooms, etc. For about a year and a half, this unit was used by their contractor from Rhode Island as his weekend apartment; it was used by him and his friends for weeks at a time during the summer and winter; he left his Rhode Island registered Jeep Cherokee continuously there for over a year. The proposed deck is off this apartment unit and this will make this a step closer to converting this unit into a separate property. I'm also concerned about the kinds of construction that has happened at 21High Street. They did obtain a permit to construct the deck; they subsequently added a stairway off the deck to the ground. This stairway protrudes off the side of the home and is certainly within 10' from the property line and I don't think there was a permit. They have built a retaining wall, graded the property, and is now used as an outdoor patio. This is within 10' of our property and there was no permit for this. Recently they built a roofed structure about 15 ' high, 12'long and 5' wide within one foot of our property line to store wood which we were concerned about it falling over. We complained about this and Code Enforcement required them to remove this structure. They have left construction debris adjacent to our property for over a year which I believe is in violation of town code. We are opposed to this for a variety of reasons .First and foremost, this is in the shoreline district which does have distinct setbacks regulations. We think to have this deck 15' from the park will interfere with public enjoyment of the park and diminish our property values. Raynor- I am here tonight asking for a deck on the back. I would be more than happy to have Bill Edney go over to their property and take photographs from the deck to show that the proposed deck would not be visible. On the other issues Bill can take them up with me and I will address each one of them. I live overseas sometimes and I like to have a friend live in my house and I feel I have the right to do that. The car was for my use. I don't believe my request for a deck will be visible from the condominium next to me. Hearing closed at 8:15 PM

DELIBERATION

2930: GEORGE & CHRISTINE NASSOR JR.:

Dever - Have any of you visited that property? Thorpe – I have twice. It's not appropriate for us to determine the size of the garage. What is the right size?

Flanders moved, Thorpe seconded, IN CASE # 2930, GEORGE & CHRISTINE NASSOR JR. I MOVE THE APPEAL FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION (ARTICLE V, SECTION D9 G-1A) TO ALLOW CONSTRUCTION OF A DRIVEWAY ACROSS A NON-DESIGNATED WETLAND AND ITS ASSOCIATED BUFFER TO REACH THE BUILDABLE AREA OF A PRE-EXISTING LOT OF RECORD, TAX MAP S26, LOT NO. 41, LOCATED ON WINONA SHORES ROAD IN THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT BE

GRANTED, AS IT MEETS THE CRITERIA FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION. Voted 5-0 in favor.

2931: GEORGE & CHRISTINE NASSOR, JR.:

Thorpe moved, Reichlen seconded, IN CASE #2931, GEORGE & CHRISTINE NASSOR, JR, I MOVE THE APPEAL FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION (ARTICLE V, SECTION D9 G-4A) TO CONSTRUCT A GARAGE AND TURNING AREA WITHIN 50' OF A NON-DESIGNATED WETLAND WITH BUFFER IMPACT OF 2,864 SF., TAX MAP S26, LOT NO. 41, LOCATED ON WINONA SHORES ROAD IN THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT BE GRANTED, AS IT MEETS THE CRITERIA FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION. Voted 5-0 in favor

2932: KURT W. ELLISON:

Thorpe – This is the only reasonable solution.

Reichlen moved, Thorpe seconded, IN CASE # 2932, KURT W. ELLISON, I MOVE THE APPEAL FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION (ARTICLE V, SECTION D9 G-1A) TO CONSTRUCT A WETLAND CROSSING FOR PURPOSES OF ACCESS FOR A SEWER LINE, TAX MAP R07, LOT NO. 34, LOCATED AT 57 COLLINS BROOK ROAD IN THE SHORELINE DISTRICT, BE GRANTED, AS IT MEETS THE CRITERIA FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION. Voted 5-0 in favor.

2933: MEGAN GREENSTEIN & SCOTT KNOWLES FOR PETER RUDIS:

Thorpe – Short of putting in a system for everybody, I don't know what else they could do. Dever - Let's go down the criteria list.

1. Granting the variance would not diminish the values of surrounding properties. The Board agreed it would not.
2. Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest: The Board felt it would not be contrary to the public interest.
3. Granting the variance would do substantial justice: The Board agreed it would.
4. Granting the variance would observe the spirit of the ordinance: Yes
5. Literal enforcement of the provisions of the ordinance would result in an unnecessary hardship. To show unnecessary hardship, you must provide facts that establish either (A) or (B) below:
 - A. Owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area:

- 1. No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property;

B. Owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area:

- 1. The property cannot be reasonably used in strict conformance with the ordinance,
and
- 2. A variance is therefore necessary to enable a reasonable use of it.

The Board agreed the applicant met (B) of criteria #5.

Thorpe moved, Flanders seconded, IN CASE # 2933, MEGAN GREENSTEIN & SCOTT KNOWLES FOR PETER RUDIS, I MOVE THE APPEAL FOR A VARIANCE (ARTICLE SECTION V, SECTION D9 J TABLE 1) TO REPLACE A LEACH BED 42' FROM A NON-DESIGNATED WETLAND, 75' REQUIRED, TAX MAP U29, LOT NO. 3-8, LOCATED AT 1 SUMMERSIDE DRIVE (UNIT 8) IN THE SHORELINE DISTRICT BE GRANTED, AS IT MEETS THE CRITERIA FOR VARIANCE. Voted 5-0 in favor.

2934: AMES ASSOCIATES ON BEHALF OF PRIMROSE REALTY TRUST FOR ESTATE OF KENNETH W. WOOD:

Dever –Did anyone visit this property? (Some members had) Thorpe – I am amazed at how squeezed in some of these areas are over there. I think they have done a pretty good job with meeting the 50' setback and both side setbacks and rear setbacks. Flanders – This is a pretty average size house and they have met almost all of our setbacks.

- 1. Granting the variance would not diminish the values of surrounding properties. The Board agreed it would not.
- 2. Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest: The Board felt it would not be contrary to the public interest.
- 3. Granting the variance would do substantial justice: The Board agreed it would.
- 4. Granting the variance would observe the spirit of the ordinance: Yes
- 5. Literal enforcement of the provisions of the ordinance would result in an unnecessary hardship. To show unnecessary hardship, you must provide facts that establish either (A) or (B) below:

A. Owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area:

- 2. No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that

provision to the property;

B. Owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area:

- 3. The property cannot be reasonably used in strict conformance with the ordinance,
- and
- 4. A variance is therefore necessary to enable a reasonable use of it.

The Board agreed the applicant met (B) of criteria #5.

Flanders moved, Reichlen seconded, IN CASE #2934, AMES ASSOCIATES ON BEHALF OF PRIMROSE REALTY TRUST FOR ESTATE OF KENNETH W. WOOD, I MOVE THE APPEAL FOR A VARIANCE (ARTICLE V, SECTION D-4B) TO CONSTRUCT A NEW SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING WITH A FRONT SETBACK OF 50', 65' REQUIRED, TAX MAP U19, LOT NO. 27, LOCATED AT 53 PINNACLE PARK ROAD IN THE SHORELINE DISTRICT BE GRANTED, AS IT MEETS THE CRITERIA FOR A VARIANCE. Voted 5-0 in favor.

2935: BOB WOLAK FOR WOLAK REALTY LLC.:

Dever – This is a tight lot. Thorpe – The traffic pattern is terrible.

Thorpe moved, Flanders seconded, IN CASE #2935, BOB WOLAK FOR WOLAK REALTY LLC., I MOVE THE APPEAL FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION (ARTICLE V, SECTION D9 G-4A) TO ALLOW PARKING IMPROVEMENTS WITHIN THE WETLAND BUFFER, TAX MAP U15, LOT NO. 15, LOCATED AT 55 NH RTE. 25, LOCATED IN THE CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT BE GRANTED, AS IT MEETS THE CRITERIA FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION. Voted 5-0 in favor.

2936: BOB WOLAK FOR WOLAK REALTY LLC.:

Thorpe moved, Goodheart seconded, IN CASE #2936, BOB WOLAK FOR WOLAK REALTY LLC., I MOVE THE APPEAL FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION (ARTICLE VIII, DEFINITION-OFF-STREET PARKING) TO ALLOW OFF STREET PARKING IN THE CBD WITHIN THE SIDE SETBACK, TAX MAP U15, LOT NO. 15, LOCATED AT 55 NH RTE. 25, LOCATED IN THE CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT BE GRANTED, AS IT MEETS THE CRITERIA FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION.

2937: BETTY RAYNOR:

Flanders – I'm having a hard time with them making their case. Thorpe – I find it hard to apply under section 5(b) of the application where it says that there are special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties. I believe the property can be reasonably used. Flanders –The special circumstances were for the people occupying the building not the property itself. They have a very useable deck for that floor now.

Goodheart – Everyone would love to have as many decks as possible but it is rather close to the public park that is used by more than just one or two abutting land owners. . Thorpe – Let’s go down through the criteria.

1. Granting the variance would not diminish the values of surrounding properties. The Board disagreed. They felt it would diminish values.
2. Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest: The Board felt it would be contrary to the public interest.
7
3. Granting the variance would do substantial justice: Thorpe – Not to the community. Flanders – They have a deck on that floor already. The Board agreed it would not do substantial justice.
4. Granting the variance would observe the spirit of the ordinance: No
5. Literal enforcement of the provisions of the ordinance would result in an unnecessary hardship. To show unnecessary hardship, you must provide facts that establish either (A) or (B) below:

A. Owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area:

No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property;

The Board all agreed that a fair and substantial relationship does exist between the general public and the ordinance. See 5 (A) above.

Reichlen – Should the first motion be in the affirmative? Thorpe – Warren seems to think it should be. Thorpe – Jack, do you feel we should have the motion in the affirmative or the negative? Dever – It should first be in the affirmative.

Reichlen moved, Flanders seconded ,IN CASE #2937, BETTY RAYNOR, I MOVE THE APPEAL FOR A VARIANCE (ARTICLE V, SECTION D-3) TO CONSTRUCT A DECK WITH A REAR SETBACK OF 15’, 40’ REQUIRED, TAX MAP U06, LOT NO. 32, LOCATED AT 21 HIGH STREET IN THE SHORELINE DISTRICT BE GRANTED, AS IT MEETS THE CRITERIA. Voted 3-1 opposed.

Dever – Now make a motion to deny.

Flanders moved, Reichlen seconded ,IN CASE # 2937, BETTY RAYNOR, I MOVE THE APPEAL FOR A VARIANCE (ARTICLE V, SECTION D-3) TO CONSTRUCT A DECK WITH A REAR SETBACK OF 15’, 40’ REQUIRED, TAX MAP U06, LOT NO. 32, LOCATED AT 21 HIGH STREET IN THE SHORELINE DISTRICT BE DENIED, AS IT DOES NOT MEET THE CRITERIA FOR A VARIANCE. Voted – 4-0 in favor.

Dever – Remember there is a 30 day appeal period on these applications.

Meeting adjourned at 9:00 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Christine Tivnan
Planning/Zoning Clerk

Approved by the Meredith Zoning Board on February 10, 2011

Jack Dever - Chairman