

PRESENT: Vadney, Chairman; Sorell, Vice-Chairman; Bayard, Secretary; Kahn; Finer; Touhey; Worsman, Selectmen's Rep.; Dever, Alternate; Edgar, Community Development Director; Harvey, Clerk

PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED ZONING AMENDMENT

Vadney – Good evening, welcome to this special meeting of the Meredith Planning Board for a Public Hearing to hear a zoning amendment proposed by the Planning Board covering the subject of "Accessory Apartments". This proposal was driven largely by a petitioned article that has already been voted on by the Planning Board and with substantial discussion with the principle petitioner and others and although we had misgivings to a degree about the original petitioned article, it did have some good points, it had some deficiencies that we felt would make it a little safer for the Town, effectively, that we're proposing covers those deficiencies.

Public Comment: Mike Faller, 319 Meredith Neck Road – Basically, I think you summed it up in your opening remarks. I do support the petition that the Planning Board has drafted up, I was the petitioner of the original petition and I would like to see this go forward, it's been a long time coming and I think overall this will be a good thing for the Town. I think the modifications that were done were prudent and I think it does, which was my intent all along not to jeopardize the Town or open the Town up for any liability, but I think this gives some flexibility to the ordinance that allows some of this "Accessory Apartment" to be blended in and I support this wholeheartedly and I'd like to see this move forward. Thank you. Peter Russell, 3 East Bluff Village – I'm here to support your proposed zoning amendment. I've had discussions with various members of the Board and staff in the past. The Accessory Apartment Ordinance that you allow right now is in the actual main building. A number of people that have talked to me and that I've talked to have talked about the possibility of having an accessory apartment outside of the main building which would be like in an unattached garage or something like that. I actually worked with one client when I first retired and the only thing we could actually do to meet the zoning ordinance at that time would have been to create an addition that was 75' long to go from his house to his garage. He decided not to do that. A number of people are concerned for a number of different reasons, one is in relation to security and a lot of people don't live in their house 7 days/week, they may be there 3 or 4 days and there's no one else around. A lot of our properties in Meredith have long driveways; you can't see the house from the road so the Police can't really patrol it per se without going down that long driveway and this I think would allow some additional security to those people that aren't necessarily living in their homes 7 days/week. As you know, a lot of people actually telecommute and then commute to their job somewhere and it could be anywhere the way it is today where they might actually have to be out of town 1 to 3 days a week and the additional security would help that. The other area that I've heard a lot of people talk about is the idea of having a little bit more of a work force housing issue to allow younger people maybe to live in the accessory apartment that's not connected to the home and also in relation to the security they can also provide some additional help to the homeowner whether it be plowing snow, snow

blowing or mowing the lawn in the summer time and that sort of thing and it gives people an opportunity to have additional people around to help them out. I know being disabled myself there are times I would certainly like to have someone help out as well so I'm in full support of this proposal, I'm glad it has been brought forward and I understand that the petition idea has some flaws in it and I'm glad you corrected those and brought something forward that the public can consider. I think there are a lot of people looking for it and I'd like to thank you very much. Vadney – We've heard many arguments but that's the first time we heard the direct security argument, I think it's an excellent one and I'm glad you brought that forward. I should add by the way the plan for this if the Board approves this tonight, it will go on the ballot with a Planning Board recommends, the petitioned article will be on the ballot regardless of what we do with this, it will be on the ballot with a Planning Board Does Not Recommend Passage. If they both pass, it needs to be clear that the petitioned article rules. This one could get 85% of the vote, the petitioned article could get 51% of the vote but it passes and that is the one that will go into effect so that's the thing that needs to be made clear to the public. We'll be doing some advertising on that. Edgar – I was just going to acknowledge for the record that we've received a letter from Paul Monico from Blueberry Hill Road who likewise expressed his support of the proposal. For similar reasons, he's worried about the security of his property when he's not around as well as the opportunity to provide additional housing in the area so we have that on the record. Barry Van Zandt, 28 Old Follett Road – The question I had is in reference to the second page on Article VII (B) (1). The end of it is the nearest point of the enclosed living space of the principle residential structure shall not exceed 100 feet. I was just wondering where the Board came up with 100 feet and the reasoning behind that. Vadney – The 100 feet was one of the things we felt would be a little broad in the petitioned article, there was no limit at all and we were worried about a piece of land that was in 3-acre zoning and they had 3 or 4 acres and it was a long piece of land, this accessory unit could be put way at the far end possibly requiring long driveways and in effect giving you a subdivision of the property without actually subdividing it and we thought the 100 feet is probably enough so that most people if they have an accessory building or garage or something like that, it's usually within 100 feet and they could put an accessory apartment over it, we wouldn't be getting into the long distances. We were also concerned, for example, some of the properties on the lake where the main house has been built maybe 1,200-1,400 feet away from the lake and the petitioned article could allow accessory buildings to be built way down by the lake and then an apartment put in so we thought the 100 feet was a way to corral them a little bit. Bayard – A minor thing, there was some talk about possibly withdrawing the other amendment, I assume that seems to be out of the question at this point? Vadney – As I understand it, that is going forward and I don't think we could if we wanted to but I certainly don't want the Planning Board in the position of having brought any pressure to bear at all on that. Bayard – I'm not saying that, I'm just saying my only thought was on that last sentence, it would look kind of awkward if a withdrawal did occur. Edgar – We have to finalize the warrant within the next day or so, effectively if we don't have a withdrawal tonight, we run the two proposals with the poison pill the way we had originally planned. Public Hearing closed at 7:11 p.m.

Kahn moved, Bayard seconded, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE THAT WE GO FORWARD AND PUT THIS PROPOSAL ON THE TOWN WARRANT. Voted unanimously.

Vadney - This will go forward to Town Meeting with the recommendation Planning Board Recommends Approval. Edgar – Just to be clear, the only notation on the ballot will be the opinion of the Board relative to the petition, anything else that’s promulgated by the Board is presumed that the Board supports it so there won’t be a specific notation on anything that the Board promulgates.

Meeting adjourned at 7:13 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Lee Harvey
Administrative Asst., Planning & Zoning

The minutes were reviewed and approved at a regular meeting of the Planning Board held on _____.

William Bayard, Secretary