Pla. Rd. File

ANTRIM PLANNING BOARD

Antrim, New Hampshire

Minutes of Meeting of Antrim Planning Board

January 24, 1980

As prescribed by RSA 31:63a. and b., a public hearing on a petition for amendment to the Antrim Zoning Ordinance was held January 24, 1980, at 7:30 p.m., in the Little Town Hall. As required, notice of the meeting had appeared in the Hillsboro Messenger and Peterborough Transcript on January 2,3,16, 17,23, and 24, starting at least 14 days before the date of the meeting. Copies of the notice had been posted on two public bulletin boards in the Town. The notice repeated the amendments as proposed by the petition, which were essentially to permit multi-family housing in the Route 202 Business District.

Attending for the Planning Board were Gordon Allen, Emery Doane, Harvey Goodwin, Katherine Wasserloos, and James Dennison, who chaired the meeting and acted as Secretary, protem. Town Counsel Henderson was also present.

Francis Chapman, Peterborough realtor, Robert Kargman, Boston developer, and Richard Brimley, architect, represented the petitioners. The three proposed zoning changes, as presented on the petition signed by 25 Antrim voters, were designed to make possible the construction of subsidized elderly housing as specified by federal and state funding agencies.

Five members of Antrim's "public" attended. No one of them represented the signers of the petition. The meeting was called to order at 7:40 p.m. The purpose was threefold:

1) to afford the developers the opportunity to explain their program to the Board and to the citizenry; 2) to permit the residents of the Town to express their opinion on the proposed amendments and on the subsequent plans of the developer; 3) to assist the Planning Board in deciding whether the Board's approval or disapproval of the amendments would appear on the ballot along with the petition, all as specified in RSA 31:63b, for vote of the Town on March 11, 1980.

Because the promoters of the zoning change have used an obsolete copy of Antrim's Zoning Ordinance, the petition's references to sections of the ordinance were incorrect:

1. The paragraph to be added in Article V A. Section 1 should be a.(6), not 1(f);

2. The change to Article IV E should not be an addition to paragraph 2, but should be a new paragraph 3;

3. The proper paragraph to be amended on "lot sizes and areas" is Article V, A. Section 1 paragraph (h).

The public hearing was adjourned at 9:40 p.m.