

From: Elva Pedrego  
Sent: Monday, September 28, 2015 8:50 AM  
To: Celia Turner  
Cc: Chris Poirier  
Subject: FW: amendment to Home Occ Ordinance

Another for the "additional materials" to P & Z.

Thanks,  
E

From: Rita Hall [mailto:allesfine2@aol.com]  
Sent: Saturday, September 26, 2015 11:16 AM  
To: Elva Pedrego  
Subject: amendment to Home Occ Ordinance

Elva  
I was part of the small committee which formulated the Home Occupation Ordinance. It is my understanding that the dual purpose of this ordinance was to allow residents to create income in hard times and to protect the residential nature of the area so zoned.

In light of these two objectives - and especially protecting the primary zoning - no goods for sale or any other goods related to the Home Occupation should be on public display. The "display" should be within the building only visible to clients already inside the premises. Retail was never an intended use - sales should only be secondary to whatever the primary business is. THEREFORE - I am opposed to any display of goods and I remain opposed to any increase in size or usage. Signage, parking, hours - all have been carefully thought out in the original ordinance to protect the residential neighborhood (the primary zoning use).

ALSO - I thought that fence height was restricted to 6' - so how are we now stating that at 7' a permit is required. Would this not be a variance to the 6' restriction?

Never lose sight of the primary purpose of protecting residential home owners and property values.

thank you.  
Rita Hall, chair person of the Northwest Neighborhood Coalition  
(a coalition of neighborhood associations)