

To: The Planning Board  
From: Barbara Marty

### Comments on the proposed Amendment D

Most people glaze over in the voting booth when they get to zoning changes because of the technical language and unfamiliar terms. This amendment changes just a few words in the ordinance but makes a huge difference in almost every zone in Warner, which makes it essential that the language of the summary be transparent to the average voter.

For clarity the summary should read:

**This amendments will allow an additional stand-alone house on the same lot as a single family house in zones R-1, R-2, R-3, B-1, OC-1 and OR.**

From Merriam Webster dictionary.

**Accessory:**

:an object or device that is not essential in itself but adds to the beauty, convenience, or effectiveness of something else

**Apartment:**

: a room or set of rooms fitted especially with housekeeping facilities and usually leased as a dwelling

**Stand alone:**

: intended, designed, or able to be used or to function alone or separately : not connected to or requiring connection to something else in order to be used or to function

**House:**

: a building that serves as living quarters for one or a few families

I am firmly against this amendment as it seems a backdoor to allow the already controversial 'tiny houses' into Warner by calling them accessory apartments and burying that fact in technical language. Although the amendment may be technically legal, it seems to go beyond the intent of the accessory dwelling law. I ask that the Planning Board **NOT RECOMMEND** the amendment.