

Special Meeting, May 7. - Hearing on ZB-L

Meeting was convened at approx 7:20 p.m. by HRY. Planning Board members present were Wade Jambonis and Frank Goodwin. Attendance varied between 25 & 35. The chairman of the Board of Selectmen was able to attend for most of the evening.

Discussion began, where it left off at the first mtg, with Article 4. the procedure being the same.

The matter of the answers to the questions asked at the previous hearing was brought up. Mr. Goodwin replied the information was not yet available but would be presented at a later meeting.

Questions were asked about loss of record at time of acceptance of proposed ordinance. It was stated that this was amended under 1.4.5.1 & 2. Question was asked does a road or any other equivalent intervening restricted land or water body <sup>or course</sup> serve to obstruct contiguity. Opinion was that it would.

Genl Prop Syst.

4.3.3: Facilities having less than 2500 sq ft etc  
was questioned re. offering food. - (see 4.3.4  
Comm. & Dist. use)

Filling grading etc.

What about a farm pond, a water hole  
for fire fighting. This TI needs rewriting  
similar to 5.6.2

There <sup>were</sup> comments from developers suggesting that lots of record should be "grandfathered." They questioned seriously the decision for acre-sized lots due to hardship on ~~those~~ anyone who had tracts of land which they may later to break up into lots. Another speaker defended the large lots and the intent of the proposed ordinance. He further questioned the wisdom of the 100ft frontage on water citing the greater likelihood of pollution.

#### Resource Protection District.

Who will police it. Asked Mr. Starr <sup>for</sup> comment - he did not feel prepared to do so at this time. Will be answered  
Question raised: is not the main reason for resource protection ~~district~~ to protect "water".

It was explained that it included other things as stated in 4.2.1.1.

It was brought to the Board's attention that Mr. Alexander, who had monopolized the hearing was not a resident of Waterloo and it, therefore, required an affirmative vote of the residents present to permit him to speak. The vote was taken and was unanimously in favor; the same applied to Ron Ward.