

Town of Bedford
Zoning Board of Adjustment Minutes
January 16, 2024

A regular meeting of the Bedford Zoning Board was held on Tuesday, January 16, 2024, at the Town Meeting Room at BCTV, at 10 Meetinghouse Road. Present were John Morin (Chair), Neal Casale (Vice Chair), Sue Thomas (alternate), Dave Gilbert (member), Alex Kellermann (member), Lucia Amaya (Land Use Planner), Kathleen Ports (Conservation Planner). Absent: Bob MacPherson (member).

I. Call to Order and Roll Call

Chair Morin called the meeting to order at 7 pm, introduced the members of the Board, and stated the following:

Rules of Procedure:

We will take a presentation from each applicant this evening. Public input for those in favor and those in opposition will each have their opportunity. I'll ask that there's no debate between parties and that all testimony is directed to the Board. After that application is pretty much done, we'll ask the applicant if they have a summation to end with. All applications will be heard in order of notice. We will go into a non-public input session to deliberate and vote after each of the applications. You can wait for the vote tonight, or you can call the Planning Office after 8:30 tomorrow. I'll ask all folks here that have your cell phone please put it on silent, so it doesn't interrupt the meeting as we go. One other thing I'm going to bring up is that we go till 10:00 pm. We're all volunteers here so if for some reason one application is going very slow and we get to 10:00, we will probably continue it unless we're close to voting. We all have jobs to get to tomorrow, and like I said, we're all volunteers, so we're not getting the big dollars for this.

For rehearings, any party has 30 days to request a rehearing from a decision of the Zoning Board. The Board has 30 days in which to respond to such request, per RSA 677:3, tomorrow being day one. All requests must be in writing and must contain new evidence. Please point out any errors you believe the Board made in its decision. For the criteria for granting a variance, I'm not going to go through the five criteria at this time. We ask each applicant to go through their application and address the five criteria as part of their presentation. For a motion to pass this evening, it must have three affirmative votes. Last thing, anybody who thinks they're going to testify this evening, I'm going to ask you to stand up. I need to swear you in. So, please, if you even think you're going to speak, stand. That way we don't have to stop during the hearing and swear you in at that point. If you don't swear in now, then we might have to bypass you and we don't want to do that. Raise your right hand, please. Do you swear that the testimony you'll give in these hearings tonight is the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth? Thank you.

II. Approval of Minutes: November 21, 2023

MOTION to approve the minutes for the November 21, 2023 meeting was made by Ms. Thomas. Vice Chair Casale duly seconded the motion. Vote was taken – All in Favor - unanimous. Mr. Gilbert abstained. Motion carries.

III. Old Business & Continued Hearings:

Vice Chair Casale said Mr. Chairman, the next agenda item needs to be corrected. It should be 22' by 45' rather than 30' by 45' as it was changed by the applicant. Chair Morin added one other piece needs correction. It's not 7 feet, it's 14.4 feet.

1. **Doemling Living Trust, Nathan and Kristyn Doemling Trustees** – (corrected) Request for a variance from Article III, Section 275-22.A. to construct a 22' x 45' attached barn/garage for an RV and storage space within 14.4 feet of the property line where 25 feet is required at 23 Pulpit Road, Lot 16-38-120, Zoned R&A. *[Tabled from the November 21, 2023 meeting].*

Nathan and Kristyn Doemling Present: Mr. Doemling said I know it seems like a long time ago, but we met with the Board right before the Thanksgiving holiday back on November 21st, and essentially, we revised our plans based on input from this Board and essentially, we're going to do everything that you guys talked about. So when we first talked to you on November 21st, we were talking about a barn of width of 30 feet. We've since reduced that to 22 feet. So thank you, Neil, for the correction. And so we will be 14 feet from the property line instead of seven. So, again, we reduced the size of the structure. The other big addition from the November meeting is we have included architectural drawings. That was something I think we had some hand drawn documents the last time. So we'll go over that.

In terms of the five criteria, I'm not going to go through what was redundant from the November 21st meeting. What I will cover is what changed.

Criteria #1 there was no change. Criteria #2, no change. So down the criteria #5. One of the things, just to remind this Board, is that the property has a very unusual shape in the topography and the wetlands being present on the property as well as the location of the existing house, really limits our options to build this structure, which is why we're planning on requesting the variance to the setback. And then I think section (A)(i) and (A)(ii) were also changed. The garage of this nature is very common with residential units in our area. In fact, there's two other RV garages currently in construction in Bedford of very similar shapes and in styles under construction today. And so we tend to maintain a beautiful property without the clutter of vehicles that won't fit in the garage. So we want to use this garage for not only the RV, but also the lawn equipment and what else?

Mrs. Doemling said well, we're going to use it for all the storage that we currently have in our three-car garage. It doesn't let us get three cars in it, so we're moving it over. So now we can use that for our three-car garage as well as have RV storage.

Mr. Doemling said moving on to the architectural drawing. This is a rendition of what we think the proposed addition would look like, again, abutted directly to the house. Similar architectural shape. It's going to be a barn very much similar to the aesthetic in the Bedford area. And here's another three-dimensional rendition. Don't pay any attention to the color of the siding. We just did that for demonstration purposes to show the old versus the new construction. And then here's the other angle. So these are the three existing garages on the existing house and then we'll have one door for the additional structure as well as a door in the back for access to the backyard. And then just two other final reminders from the meeting on November 21st. Our property sits back from the road by 450 feet, if you remember from this drawing. So the structure is very much obscured by foliage and by trees from the road. So you're really not going to see the structure at all. I think in the last meeting we provided pictures of the trees.

And then the last thing I think is really important. We have approval from all of the abutters including the primary abutter here. And in fact, he sent a letter of approval directly to the Board. So we have no neighbors that have any issue with this property. So we're asking the Board for approval to move forward.

Chair Morin asked are there any questions from the Board?

Vice Chair Casale said yes, just one, Sir, you had mentioned one of the things about having the width originally that you did that you were concerned about being able to maneuver a large vehicle into the garage. But I note that you have a stairway on the right side of the garage as you're looking down.

Ms. Doemling replied that's one of the things that will change. I had him do these drawings. There's going to be changes like that. I think I mentioned that when I turned them in. I said don't pay attention to this stairway because obviously that won't work because the RV goes right there. Mr. Doemling added because the unit won't fit. Vice Chair Casale replied right. OK. Ms. Doemling said the stairway is going to be on the other side. Vice Chair Casale said OK. This stairway is going to be on the other side. Ms. Doemling said I'll figure out where to put it. I asked the same thing. I was like why did you put this stairway there? Mr. Doemling said the plans are there will be a second story on the structure, but of course not a living area. It's just going to be storage only. So this stairway will just access the storage on the second level—Christmas decorations, things like that. Vice Chair Casale replied OK. Thank you and nice job [inaudible] to our requests on cutting it down and providing that architectural rendering. That was very helpful. Thank you. Mr. Doemling said yeah. Our hand drawing wasn't so good. Vice Chair Casale said not as good. It was OK. We didn't request it, but you did it and thank you. Chair Morin said it was the stick figure standing in front. All right. Any other questions from the Board? [There were none]. Chair Morin asked is there anyone from the public who would like to speak on this application? Nobody's rushing, so that's good. All right, any last words before we go into deliberation? Mr. Doemling replied no, I think that's it. Chair Morin said all right. Thank you.

MOTION by Vice Chair Casale to move to nonpublic input for deliberation. Mr. Kellermann duly seconded the motion. Vote taken – all in favor. Unanimous. Motion carries.

1. Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest because:

(1) Whether granting the variance would alter the essential character of the locality:

The Board agrees no.

(2) Whether granting the variance would threaten public health, safety, or welfare:

The Board agrees no.

2. The spirit of the ordinance is observed because:

Vice Chair Casale said so the spirit is regarding overcrowding. His abutters don't mind. There's plenty of room between the homes. He just happens to be near the property line in the way his house is. It just happens to sit in such an area that he can't put it anywhere else.

3. Granting the variance would do substantial justice because:

Board agrees yes. Vice Chair Casale said it would give him the opportunity to do it.

4. The values of the surrounding properties will not be diminished for the following reasons:

The Board agrees there is no evidence to this effect.

5. Literal enforcement of the provisions of the ordinance would result in an unnecessary hardship. Special conditions of the property distinguish it from other properties in the area because:

Chair Morin said definitely if you look at the way the plot plan is and where the house was put and everything else, he's stuck where he can put anything, especially a garage. It would not be great in front of his house. Vice Chair Casale said no, we discussed possibly moving it out back, but that would not be feasible and because of the topography would be probably very expensive to level that out.

(A) Denial of the variance would result in unnecessary hardship because:

(i) No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property because:

Chair Morin said again, it's that teeter totter per se, where it is, it's not affecting the general public, as in overcrowding as you brought up earlier. And it gives him the opportunity to use his land to be able to store his RV in an indoor area. Vice Chair Casale added as well as extra property.

(ii) The proposed use is a reasonable one because:

The Board agrees yes, it is reasonable.

(B) If the criteria in subparagraph (A) above are not established, explain why the property cannot be used in strict conformance with the ordinance and why a variance is therefore necessary to enable a reasonable use of it:

Criteria not applicable, addressed in subparagraph (A).

MOTION Vice Chair Casale moves that the Zoning Board approve the request for a variance from Article III, Section 275-22.A. to construct a 22' x 45' attached barn/garage for an RV and storage space within 14.4 feet of the property line where 25 feet is required at 23 Pulpit Road, Lot 16-38-120, Zoned R&A, per our deliberations. The motion is supported by the following findings of facts:

- 1. The variance request satisfies all five criteria for granting relief from the Zoning Ordinance.**
- 2. The Board includes all facts found in the meeting minutes for this application and incorporates all meeting minutes into this decision.**

Ms. Thomas duly seconded the motion. Vote taken. All in Favor - Unanimous. Motion carries. The application is APPROVED.

MOTION by Mr. Gilbert to go back into public input. Ms. Thomas duly seconded the motion. Vote – All in Favor - Unanimous. Motion carried.

Chair Morin said you're all set. Thank you.

PUBLIC NOTICE: Before I go any further, I just want to make the announcement in case anyone's here for that item, but New Business Item #3, 90 West River Road, LLC was postponed by the applicant to the February meeting.

IV. New Business

- 1. Senior Living of Bedford – Request for a variance from Article III. Section 275-23.C(1) to expand a non-conforming use, where expansion of a non-conforming use is not allowed, to construct additional parking at 24 Old Bedford Road, Lot 10-50-03, Zoned R&A. [At the request of the applicant, this application was postponed from the December 19, 2023 meeting.]**

Mr. Tom Burns presented: Good evening. My name is Tom Burns. I'm a senior project manager with TF Moran. I'm here tonight on behalf of the applicant, Senior Living of Bedford, and I'm here this evening to request a variance from Article 275-23 Section C (1), and that is based on a proposal to expand the existing parking area at the Bowman Place Assisted Living facility. Just a little bit of the history of the site. In 2018, the applicant received approval to construct 105-unit assisted living facility at 24 Old Bedford Road, which is located in the R&A Zone. That same year, a zoning amendment was passed that removed this use specifically from the list of those that are permitted in the zone. So as a result, the facility is now a legal non-conforming use as its parking. The

current parking on the site right now includes 82 spaces that are used by residents, visitors and staff to the site. However, it was found that due to the large number of residents that are there that still drive their own car, as well as the high frequency of family and friends that visit the residents that are living there, there's a need for additional parking on the site. There's been concerns with people parking on the site driveway coming up to the building and trying to locate parking wherever they can on the site. And so to address that, we're proposing to construct 21 additional spaces on the site. As you'll see on the plan on the screen, what we did was we located seven additional spaces at the top of the driveway in an area that had been previously altered as part of the original development. So it's basically extending the row of parking that exists now and adding those seven spaces. And then there would be 14 additional spaces that would be up in the northwest corner in the back parking area, again, in an area that had previously been altered by the development. The intent of doing that is to place those spaces where we don't have to remove screening, where we can try to maintain the buffer so that there's no impact to the abutters for it. But it allows us to kind of in-fill some areas where we've got room to add parking and hopefully alleviate some of that safety concern of people parking on the driveway and having to drive around trying to find spaces in there. Because parking is an accessory to the use itself, we need to request a variance from this Board to allow us to continue forward with the process of a site plan application and approval to add that parking on the site. To that end, I can go through the five criteria as part of our application.

1. Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest because:

(1) Whether granting the variance would alter the essential character of the locality:

The expansion of the existing parking area as proposed does not alter the character of the site or the surrounding neighborhood. This additional parking would be located in areas that were previously altered as part of the original 2018 development to minimize site changes and maintain vegetated screening and buffers from the abutting properties.

(2) Whether granting the variance would threaten public health, safety or welfare:

Granting this variance to allow for the additional parking requested would not threaten public health, safety or welfare. On the contrary, allowing for the additional parking proposed would address an existing demand that has created a potential safety issue wherein residents and visitors have been parking in non-designated areas along the sloping site driveway. The granting of the variance would specifically provide for improved health, safety and welfare.

2. The spirit of the ordinance is observed because:

The existing overall use of the site, the Bowman Place assisted living facility would remain unchanged with the addition of the proposed parking. The intent of the expansion would be to support the existing operations, the residents, their families and other visitors with no expansion of the overall use proposed. The spirit of the ordinance would be observed in that the expansion of the parking would address existing health, safety and welfare concerns resulting from residents and visitors having to park in non-designated areas along the driveway.

3. Granting the variance would do substantial justice because:

With the current demand on the available parking, residents and visitors have been parking along the site driveway and have been struggling to find open parking spaces, at times. Granting the variance would allow the expansion of the existing parking area to alleviate this congestion and address related safety concerns while not adversely affecting the site nor the surrounding properties.

4. The values of the surrounding properties will not be diminished for the following reasons:

The proposed parking would be located in areas previously developed as part of the original construction. The spaces would be located adjacent to existing parking areas and in locations that would remain screened from abutting properties and meet all buffer requirements. Coupled with the limited scope of the proposed work, there would be no negative impact on the surrounding properties.

5. Literal enforcement of the provisions of the ordinance would result in an unnecessary hardship. Special conditions of the property distinguish it from other properties in the area because:

As denial of the request for a variance to expand the parking for the use would contradict the general purpose of the ordinance. The variance would allow for additional parking to alleviate this congestion that has created a safety concern for the residents, family and other visitors who have had to park in non-designated areas along the driveway. Literal enforcement of the ordinance to deny the expansion of the parking could create a continued hardship on the overall use, the assisted living facility, by continuing to create a safety and welfare concern for these residents and their visitors.

(A) Denial of the variance would result in unnecessary hardship because

(i) No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property because:

The purpose of the ordinance is to promote the health, safety and general welfare of the residents of Bedford. The requested variance is to allow for the expansion only of parking associated with the non-conforming use, the assisted living facility, in the underlying zone—specifically to address health, safety and welfare concerns of residents and visitors to the facility. There's no proposed expansion of the use and the additional parking would provide for improved driver and pedestrian safety while having no negative impact on the surrounding properties or the public in general. As such, there'd be no fair or substantial reason for strict application of the ordinance in this request.

(ii) The proposed use is a reasonable one because:

As the parking specifically addresses health, safety and general welfare concerns for residents and visitors of Bowman Place by alleviating existing parking congestion on the site with no negative

impact to the surrounding properties or the general public. With that said, I'm happy to answer any of the Board's questions.

- (B) If the criteria in subparagraph (A) above are not established, explain why the property cannot be used in strict conformance with the ordinance and why a variance is therefore necessary to enable a reasonable use of it:**

Criteria not applicable, addressed in subparagraph (A).

Chair Morin asked does anyone from the Board have any questions?

Mr. Kellermann said I have just one question. You had said it was previously altered. You would be paving now, I assume, right? Mr. Burns replied yes. Mr. Kellermann asked is it grass now? What does it look like? I don't think we have a good picture. We have an overhead, but... Mr. Burns replied yeah. The areas that are there now—this is on the lower area coming up the driveway here. That's a grass area along there. And then the tree line that you see on the plan, that's the existing tree line, so we wouldn't be altering that. So that's a grassed area with drainage going through. There's some storm water management going through there now. There's a drainage swale. So what we would do is we would intercept that drainage with a closed pipe that would run underneath that parking area in place of the swale. And then up in the northwest corner there, this is that paved area. Right now there's a hatched area for fire turnaround. So we would maintain that area, that circulation route, for the fire truck access and then what we'd do is build the parking right off of that. So again, that's an area that's grassed right now. And then that's the tree line that comes around it. So the idea would be that way we're not taking down any of the screening, the tree lines at all, so that we maintain those. Mr. Kellermann replied OK. Thank you.

Vice Chair Casale said Mr. Burns, following along with that question, I'm not sure if you've been there recently, the spot in the lower corner currently there's some plow equipment there. So where the current pavement is, are you going beyond the current pavement? Mr. Burns asked in this area here? Vice Chair Casale said no, the lower corner. The lower corner in back. Mr. Burns asked up in here? Vice Chair Casale replied correct. So you're going beyond the edge of the pavement that currently exists. Mr. Burns replied yes, it'd be adding parking off the back of that edge of pavement. Vice Chair Casale said OK. Is there anyone from the facility here or are you it? Could you join him please because these questions will probably be for you?

Mr. Eldon Munson, project developer for Bowman Place: My name is Eldon Munson, and I was the project developer for Bowman Place. Vice Chair Casale asked did you have any other projects anywhere else? Mr. Munson replied at the current time, no. Vice Chair Casale asked this is the only one that the company owns? Mr. Munson replied it's a one off. Yes, Sir. Vice Chair Casale replied OK, Twenty spaces off seems unusual for me. Usually when these are planned, they go by certain guidelines. Can you tell me how we came to be 20 spaces off? Mr. Munson replied surely. We went by code that was developed and we thought that our residents would not be as capable and still driving. And we've had, I would say, approximately a dozen residents keep their cars and continue to drive, which increases the demand for the spaces. And then we've had an inordinate number of families who come every day and visit their loved ones. Sons and daughters, typically. And they come regularly. And they occupy additional spaces. So I'd say between 25 and 35 cars more than we expected. It was surprising to me because I have experience with other

communities, and this is the first time I've encountered where the parking simply wasn't enough. Vice Chair Casale said OK, so you haven't had to ask for more parking for these other communities? Mr. Munson answered they have not. No Sir. Vice Chair Casale said OK. There's never been any discussion of any kind of expansion? I know you specifically stated in this application that there's been no discussion at least proposed right now. There was no discussion of expansion in conjunction with this parking at all? Mr. Munson replied no, Sir.

Vice Chair Casale said OK. Any attempts at ameliorating the current parking problem by putting up signs or stanchions or anything else? Mr. Munson replied no. It's pretty open, first come, first served. All the space that's available for parking currently is designated for parking spaces. There's not a lot of asphalt anywhere where people could park and overflow. They end up in the driveway. Vice Chair Casale said right. And I've spoken to a few people that actually visit there quite often. Some of them are parking there not because they cannot find spaces, but because of laziness. So how much of this is due to laziness and how much of it is due to actual that the lot is full? Because I've been there quite a few times in the past few weeks, and I have not seen the lot to capacity. And the reason I ask is because this points to a need.

Mr. Burns said Eldon is there obviously more frequently than I am. But in the times that I've been up there when I walked the site when we were evaluating places to put the parking, I couldn't find a parking space when I came up. And that was during like on midday. When I'm coming up in the afternoons and I'm looking for space to park, to be able to walk the site when we had coordination meetings there. There was an apparent issue when I went to the site. I can't speak to whether that's every single day, but it's certainly the number of times I've been there it was like that. Mr. Munson added taking off on Tom's response, it's not every single day that we have 25 to 30 or more extra people, mostly visitors. But just as a guess, it's a couple days a week. But it varies and particularly for special events, Mother's Day, Christmas dinner, things like that. We definitely have an over-utilized problem. Vice Chair Casale replied OK. Thank you.

Chair Morin said I didn't have any questions, but I did want to comment. I had been up there a few times during the weekdays, and I've got to say when I went through the parking lots there were very few open spots there. It was pretty full, and I was surprised how full it was. Vice Chair Casale asked when did you go? Chair Morin replied during the middle of the week. I just happened to be in that area, so I took a ride up and I was like, wow, it is busy up here. I have to say. Vice Chair Casale said I've been there on the weekends. Do you find the weekends are usually the problem? Mr. Munson replied I don't spend a lot of time on the weekends, but I don't think so because we have somewhat fewer staff on weekends other than events. Chair Morin said OK. Are there any other questions from the Board? Seeing none, is there anyone from the public who would like to speak on this application? Sir, please state your name, your address and...

Mr. Chris Kumaroo of 25 Galloway Lane, Bedford: Hi. My name is Chris Kumaroo. I live at 25 Galloway Lane. We're an abutter. Obviously, during the construction of this, it was a complete nightmare listening to it for years, but right there in that northwest corner area just as an awareness, I'm not objecting to expanding your parking. But right in that area where we do quite a bit of hiking, there's a bobcat family of four or five that are right there, if you haven't seen them already. So just be aware of that. We also have two very healthy herds of deer. We have bears come through

there all the time. Let's just be aware of that before we start putting more impervious surfaces out there. OK, just a bit of awareness.

Chair Morin asked is there anybody else who would like to speak to this one? Seeing none, anything else from you guys here? [There were no further questions or comments].

MOTION by Mr. Gilbert to move to nonpublic input for deliberation. Vice Chair Casale duly seconded the motion. Vote taken – All in Favor. Unanimous. Motion carries.

1. Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest because:

(1) Whether granting the variance would alter the essential character of the locality:

The Board agrees no. Chair Morin said I don't see it doing that. Just some grass areas and that's it.

(2) Whether granting the variance would threaten public health, safety, or welfare:

Mr. Gilbert said I think it does exactly the opposite. The Board agrees.

2. The spirit of the ordinance is observed because:

Mr. Gilbert said I would say yes, in my opinion, because I've been up there a number of times and I've seen people parking in the driveway on the way up. It's steep. It's narrow. It's dangerous to do that. Of course with the weather like now... But I will give you guys this. I drove by there on the way here. Your driveway is impeccably done. It's beautiful. But it's a danger. It's serious. If people park down there, it's an accident waiting to happen. Vice Chair Casale asked were there spaces, though, when you went? Because I had heard the people—unfortunately where they're talking about people parking, it's the closest to the front entrance and there are the fewest spaces by the front entrance are closest to where they're talking about where people are parking. Plus you have a number of handicapped parking spots right in the front—probably like ten or more. Mr. Gilbert said that's where they need to be. Vice Chair Casale said right, but people are parking there because it's easier than walking way down the driveway down to where they want to put all the extra parking. That's my understanding.

Mr. Gilbert said when I was there, there were people who parked on the driveway. I went through and around, and it was pretty full. As they were saying, you're going to have special events. You're going to have holidays. It's kind of the same concept with the Library parking lot extension here. You're not going to have it full every day. But for events like you have something here, Town Hall, Craftworkers, Library. You need the overflow in case. This is it. There's nowhere else to go.

Chair Morin said I think they've chosen two good spots where we're not altering the wood line. They're taking some grass right on the edges, but that's limiting it as much as they can, which is helpful.

3. Granting the variance would do substantial justice because:

Chair Morin said of course it's going to give them the opportunity to have 21 more parking spaces for folks that are there. Of course, it will help that.

4. The values of the surrounding properties will not be diminished for the following reasons:

The Board agrees there's no evidence to this effect.

5. Literal enforcement of the provisions of the ordinance would result in an unnecessary hardship. Special conditions of the property distinguish it from other properties in the area because:

Chair Morin said well it is the only place like this in the area for them. Ms. Thomas said, and I think they found two good places to put additional parking. Chair Morin said right.

(A) Denial of the variance would result in unnecessary hardship because:

(i) No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property because:

Chair Morin said again, they're utilizing the most efficient space, not altering any of the wood line digging more into the area. They're using what they have. That pretty much maxes them out for those types of things. I think that works.

(ii) The proposed use is a reasonable one because:

Chair Morin said it is reasonable to get some more parking there.

(B) If the criteria in subparagraph (A) above are not established, explain why the property cannot be used in strict conformance with the ordinance and why a variance is therefore necessary to enable a reasonable use of it:

Criteria not applicable, addressed in subparagraph (A).

MOTION Mr. Gilbert moves that the Board grant the variance from Article III., Section 275-23.C(1) to expand a non-conforming use to construct additional parking, where expansion of a non-conforming use is not allowed. The motion is supported by the following findings of facts:

- 1. The variance request satisfies all five criteria for granting relief from the Zoning Ordinance.**
- 2. The Board includes all facts found in the meeting minutes for this application and incorporates all meeting minutes into this decision.**

Ms. Thomas duly seconded the motion. Vote taken. All in Favor - Unanimous. Motion carries. The application is APPROVED.

MOTION by Vice Chair Casale to go back into public input. Ms. Thomas duly seconded the motion. Vote – all in favor. Unanimous. Motion carried.

Chair Morin said you're all set. Thank you.

- 2. Order of St. Benedict of NH** – Request for a variance from Article IV, Section 275-27A. to permanently fill 12,122 square feet and temporarily fill 587 square feet of wetland for the construction of a Track and Field Athletic Complex at the corner of Rundlett Hill Road and Worthley Road, Lot 42-62-01, Zoned GR. *[At the request of the applicant, this application was postponed from the December 19, 2023 meeting.]*

Ms. Ports said excuse me, Mr. Chair. I believe we need to swear in both individuals. Chair Morin said do you swear the testimony you're going to give at this hearing is the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth? Go ahead.

Mr. Nick Golon of TFMoran presented: Good evening. My name is Nick Golon. I'm a licensed engineer and principal with TFMoran. I'm joined this evening by Mr. Ari Pollack, our attorney for the evening. Also in the audience, Mr. Bill Furlong, who's the CFO with St. Anselm College, Christopher Danforth, who is our certified wetland scientist, as well as Jonathan Woodcock, who is our director of physical plant for college and he can be asked specific questions in relationship to the activities on the campus. So hopefully we have all the right people here this evening to answer any questions you may have.

Relative to the application that is before you this evening for Saint Anselm's College, this is a variance from Article IV Section 275-27A in relationship to wetlands impacts. We've got our graphic up here on the screen, which is a supplement to the application before you. We will be endeavoring this evening to provide some additional details as to the application to show that the proposal as currently designed is the least impactful relative to wetlands. Also noting that for any wetland impact, we also have a permit with the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services that is required. That application had been submitted. We've received a request for more information. We have compiled our response and expect to respond to that in the next day or two. So we feel confident that we've been able to address any of those concerns, but felt that it was important to point out that there is obviously a parallel approval process that's required by the State, which very much dovetails on the nature of our conversations this evening.

So relative just to the plan, when we get it sited overall, north is up the page here. The existing site is primarily a former agricultural field. I believe they were growing corn out here at one point. To the southwest, there is an existing wetland. This is identified as Wetland 6, which I'm highlighting with my mouse here, which also represents one of our areas of impact. This is denoted as an emergent wet meadow with a classification of PEM1/BF. We'll get the technical stuff out of the way, and then we'll get into more of the criteria if you don't mind.

Relative to the other impact that's associated with this project, that is Wetlands 1 and 2. This wetland is located in really the northeast quadrant. It has a classification of PFO1/04E, which is forested. I'll note again, Chris Danforth, our wetland scientist, is here. So if he needs to expand on

any of these components, I'm sure he'll be happy to. The nature of our impacts is twofold, one of which is to repair existing drainage infrastructure, specifically the impact in that northeast quadrant is to repair an earthen berm that was intended to direct storm water from a wet basin to the northeast into this lower segment where it would then provide additional treatment with an [inaudible] basin before discharging along its anticipated flow course. As part of our work on this project, it was noted as part of our survey that things weren't quite as they should be. So that wetlands permit is very much distinct from the siting of the field. That is just a drainage infrastructure improvement in some repair of an eroded channel. The date in which that took place, we don't know for sure, but it will ensure that it works in accordance with the AOT permit that it received.

Speaking to the second area of wetland impact, again in the southwest quadrant, this is specific to the field. I'll go through quickly what these different elements are of this athletic complex. This is not just a synthetic sports field, but a true athletic complex to allow Saint Anselm's College to compete and host events at the collegiate level. Centrally located—I think this is a fairly well distinguished element. This is the synthetic sports field. The area that surrounds it is our track. Working our way northwest is the area of the bleachers. The area directly behind that at ground level would be your concessions and then the area directly above that is your press box. Working further west through the plaza area, you have your locker rooms that would be for our athletes. Working left to right around our track area, you can see there is a storage building strategically located to provide storage for the necessary elements associated with the project. And then working to the south, we have our long jump and our triple jump. So these are again elements associated with the athletic complex that are necessary elements in order for Saint Anselm's to compete at that collegiate level.

Now working our way to the right, this was probably an area in which our original application was perhaps a little deficient. It was called out that this was an area of sport, but not with any specifics. We've supplemented that here with a color graphic to be a little bit more clear as to what's out here. This is the shot-put event area that's evaluated in the blue. You have the javelin throw. So this is the runway that would be associated with it, and we've seen this on TV as far as the javelin throw that does require a longer and larger area. And then last but not least is the discus and hammer throw area located here. All of these elements have specific guidelines from the NCAA as well as just good practice engineering. Derck and Edson is our project architect and landscape architect and the individuals responsible for these design elements to make sure these are consistent with all of those regulations. So when we think about a little bit about some of those hardship elements, we can't just say, alright, we're going to make this track a little bit smaller. We're going to make this field a little bit smaller. We're going to make the discus and hammer throw a little bit smaller. In order for their athletes to compete at this level they are a mandated size. So from an overall standpoint, I just want to get it sited so that we knew what these various elements were throughout the overall project area.

Speaking to some of the elements that have changed through the course of this... yes, Sir?

Vice Chair Casale said Mr. Golon, sorry to interrupt. When this extra area, aside from that dark gray box, which I assume is pavement... Mr. Golon asked this area here? Yes. Vice Chair Casale asked the rest of that in the coned area is all grass? Mr. Golon replied that's correct. Vice Chair Casale said OK, thank you.

Mr. Golon continued the specifics have more to do with its grading to make sure that when you throw the hammer or the discus so far, it doesn't go rolling a little bit extra. Vice Chair Casale replied OK. And the same with that brown cone to the right? Mr. Golon replied that's correct.

I'd be remiss if I didn't mention some of the improvements that were made to the plan at the request of your Conservation Commission. We did have the opportunity to meet with them twice. Although we weren't able to secure a recommendation, I think they provided some great insights and improvements to the plan overall. One of which was the ability to reduce the amount of clearing associated with the project, which is in specific relationship to Wetland 3, which is one of the higher functioning wetlands on the site. Where we would eliminate in excess of 1,200 square feet of tree clearing, which was certainly an added benefit. One of the other things that I think was a general concern by them were impacts to wildlife and how we could best minimize those with the design of our project. There is an existing irrigation pond that's located at the east side of the site which is located right here. It will be replaced just due to the nature of it. It's Time for replacement. One of the things we're able to incorporate is really New Hampshire Fish and Game improved wildlife friendly fencing in that area. It may sound silly, but the reality is they lift that bottom cord, so the smaller critters have the opportunity to continue to pass through that area and also provides a larger gauge to the fence itself, which also promotes wildlife travel.

The third item, which I think makes a lot of sense and shoot, I wish we thought of it first, was the proposed use of wildlife seed mix on these graded slopes. So those areas are really these steeper slopes that transition from the built environment that is the Sports Complex, as we work our way easterly towards the existing tree line and the wetlands beyond. The seed mix is something that is certainly favored by New Hampshire Fish and Game. It includes wildflowers that support pollinators throughout the summer months and provides habitat for birds and other wildlife throughout the year. Now I make mention of this because wildlife was one of the functional characteristics of our wetlands. So in that there may have been a concern that an element of that wildlife is lost with the impact of that wetland is then recaptured through other site elements. So there is no net loss to the functions and values of that wetland. Taking a step towards the application itself, if we feel comfortable with just the narration of the site itself, we may mention that this variance is in regard to wetland impacts, 1) to accommodate the existing stormwater infrastructure repairs, but also to construct the proposed athletic complex at Saint Anselm's College.

We discussed the various elements, but I think it's important again to reiterate that the components of the athletic complex as well as the siting of those components are driven by athletic venue design best practices and the standards of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, also known as the NCAA. These must be adhered to for Saint Anselm College to compete and hold sanctioned events at the collegiate level. As currently designed, there are no upland areas available that would otherwise be used to reduce wetland impacts as well as meet the NCAA regulations without impacts and displacement of existing campus infrastructure utilized by the college's other athletic venues.

1. Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest because:
(1) Whether granting the variance would alter the essential character of the locality:

This really starts to tie us into the discussion of altering the essential character of the locality and making sure that granting the variance would not be averse to that element. The wetland impacts, again, to repair the existing stormwater infrastructure and to site the athletic complex in the athletic core of the Saint Anselm College campus is consistent not only with the character of the locality and also the college's master plan. Within this given area of campus currently resides Grappone Stadium, Thomas F. Sullivan Ice Arena, Melucci Fields, which are for the soccer, Hawks softball field, tennis courts, basketball courts, as well as a variety of other outdoor fields to accommodate practices. The fact that we have a centralized parking lot directly to our north that allows us to utilize that versus expand our impervious footprint, is not only consistent with the ordinance itself to keep your impervious surface to a minimum value that reduces sediment runoff associated with projects—you're not sanding, you're not salting additional parking lots. We have one centralized area that allows us really to reuse that. So again, this is purposeful in that it provides the benefit of existing centralized parking that lessens the impervious footprint by co-locating these similar uses to reduce the need for additional parking.

This location also has readily available utility locations as far as connecting to the services that are required for this use that prevents the need for long utility extensions that would otherwise compromise activities throughout the campus and disrupt activities. So the wetland impacts have specified that these don't alter the essential character of the locality.

(2) Whether granting the variance would threaten public health, safety or welfare:

In evaluating this criteria, we're very much drawn to the functional characteristics of these wetlands. The ordinance states very clearly that the intent is to preserve those functional characteristics. Whenever we have this type of project, one of the first things we do is the wetland scientist goes out there and performs a functional evaluation of those wetlands, ends up being basically our guide book to how various elements are located throughout the property, what impacts certain wetlands may be advisable versus others to make sure the project as laid out is the least impactful. And looking at those wetlands, Wetland Area 1-2, which was up here in that northeast corner, the supported wildlife habitat and groundwater discharge. So again in that these are impacts that are associated with repair of a stormwater practice, those functions would be restored. The intent for that area is to control the site runoff from the property, which will only be improved by this modification. Wildlife functions would not be altered through this repair, and then that the area would be stabilized and no impediment to wildlife movement or otherwise would be created. So looking at that northeast quadrant, there is no impact to functions and values of the wetland with that proposed work.

Relative to Wetland Impact Area 6, and I believe everybody had a photo of these areas. So we've got a little bit of that flavor for what we're looking at when we had our site walk with the Conservation Commission. That took us a little while to find it, because it does very much blend in with its surroundings. It is located directly next to an irrigation pond. So again, this is a man-made element, and the reality is they've been plowing those fields for hundreds of years, 130 years relative to the agricultural use. So looking at the specific habitat or the specific values of that, the

only thing that was identified was wildlife habitat. We've minimized the impact to that area with the grading and orientation of the field. The guidelines for a sports complex such as this typically require north-south and that's in part because of solar glare. You want to make sure you're keeping your athletes safe. They're not staring into the sun. Working with Derck and Edson as the project architect and designer of this field, they felt that there could be a slight rotation to the field without it imperiling any of the athletes who are using it, and it allowed us to significantly reduce wetland impacts. So that's why you see this orientation at this angle. The 90° north/south would be much preferred, similar to what you see with the throwing events. The reality is, although there's some wildlife impact there, it is not rare and endangered species habitat. We filed originally with Natural Heritage Bureau to confirm that was not an issue. We have subsequently refiled with them just to make sure, given the concerns that were raised by one of our abutters as well as the Conservation Commission, and it came back with the same results—there are no impacts to rare and endangered wildlife in that given area.

We feel we've mitigated those concerns relative to the functional characteristics of that wetland with the incorporation of that wildlife seed mix, which is easily double the area of that wetland that's being impacted.

2. The spirit of the ordinance is observed because:

In relationship to the spirit of the ordinance, the use is allowable in the underlying zoning district and the wetland impacts have been avoided and minimized, consistent with the requirements of an NH DES Wetlands Bureau, such as the location results in the least impactful layout to wetlands. And again, just looking back at one of the primary purposes of the ordinance is to protect those functions and values of the wetlands, which the site as designed will do.

3. Granting the variance would do substantial justice because:

Relative to substantial justice, the guiding factor for substantial justice is that any loss to an individual that's not outweighed by a gain to the general public is an injustice. Allowing minimal impacts to low functioning man-made wetlands to allow the siting of the college's athletic complex in an appropriate location consistent with the college's master plan and the guiding principles of the Bedford Master Plan, would do substantial justice and result in no apparent gain to the community by denial of this request. I've mentioned the location and why it's important. It's co-located directly adjacent to parking, so I won't overlap on that element. But I think it's also important to point out the consistency with the Bedford Master Plan. Two of those elements really do talk to stormwater management, reducing your impervious surfaces, making sure you are siting uses where appropriate to connect to existing utility infrastructure. This does check both those boxes. It's also noteworthy that the area of the proposed athletic complex is located outside of the town of Bedford's Conservation land sector, and its preservation sector. Those areas which place emphasis on protecting established high value resources. So the Town has really done some of our due diligence for us in that relative to this specific area of Town, the functional characteristics are the importance in preserving all of these wetlands is to a lesser fact than some of the other areas of Town. And just to reiterate that under the specific design of the proposed site, the gain to the public would not outweigh the harm to the applicant, as the reality is that the public is protected equally in either case. The project will provide controls to safeguard against potential impacts to

resources, including appropriate stormwater management facilities, and that even the orientation and location of the bleachers, the locker rooms, the areas that would have more impervious surfaces that potentially could be sanded or salted are located as far away from those wetlands as possible. And also located far away from residential abutters that are beyond that existing tree line. So again that was part of the siting element that Derck and Edson followed.

4. The values of the surrounding properties will not be diminished for the following reasons:

Relative to the criteria that the values of the surrounding properties will not be diminished, there is no factual evidence that impacts to low functioning manmade wetlands to accommodate allowable use would have a material effect on the value of surrounding properties.

5. Literal enforcement of the provisions of the ordinance would result in an unnecessary hardship. Special conditions of the property distinguish it from other properties in the area because:

(A) Denial of the variance would result in unnecessary hardship because

(i) No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property because:

When we look at the unnecessary hardship clause, it's our belief that in this specific case, full application of the ordinance is not necessary to promote a valid public purpose as the overriding criterion to protect the public health, safety and welfare which the proposed wetland impact does not impair. We draw that conclusion specifically in relation to how the ordinance is written. We're talking about functional characteristics of these wetlands, to make sure that they are preserved. The functional assessment provided by a certified wetland scientist shows that very fact.

(ii) The proposed use is a reasonable one because:

Relative to this use being a reasonable one, siting the athletic complex in the athletic core of the campus is a reasonable use. Again, the components of this athletic complex, as well as the siting of those components, are driven by the Athletic Venue Design Practices and the standards of the NCAA. In order for them to use this field as intended to compete at the collegiate level, it must be designed as shown. We have worked at different rotations. It was something that was specifically requested by the Conservation Commission. Any modification, whether it be mirroring the field from this location, rotating it 60° to the east or otherwise, puts our impervious surfaces and the vast majority of our development closer to the higher functioning wetlands that are associated with this project. It also moves the field from an existing agricultural field, the old corn field, into the existing tree line that is protecting those wetlands. All wetlands have value, but all wetlands are not created with equal value. We followed the playbook provided by our certified wetland scientist to ensure that the wetlands that we are impacting are the least functioning and this project as a whole is the least impact to the wetlands. So I think I've droned on for a while. But I wanted to make sure that we at least provided a lot of the baseline information. That's really important when evaluating a permit such as this, because it is a relationship into that wetland.

There is a use that's going to be reviewed by the Planning Board, but relative to what we're before you this evening, it is solely for the impact to that wetland. Thank you.

- (B) If the criteria in subparagraph (A) above are not established, explain why the property cannot be used in strict conformance with the ordinance and why a variance is therefore necessary to enable a reasonable use of it:**

Criteria not applicable, addressed in subparagraph (A).

Chair Morin said by the way the agenda is set up and the way it's put there, we're talking about a temporary fill of 587, then a permanent fill of 12,000 plus square feet. Can you go over both of those wetland areas and tell me specifically what's happening at which and why?

Mr. Dolon replied OK, alright. We'll start in the northeast quadrant. The manner in which the stormwater conveyance system is currently designed: there is a wet detention pond located to the northeast which is intended to drain through this channel and then into a stormwater management area below. In this area, we are requesting the permanent impact of 108 square feet of wetland. What we'll be doing there is rebuilding an eroded berm. So when it happened, I can't say with certainty, but to ensure that the stormwater management systems are working appropriately, we do require 108 square feet of wetlands impact at this location, and nine square feet of temporary impact.

As we move to the southwest quadrant, we'll zoom out. At this location, we have 12,122 square feet of impact with the remaining 569 some odd square feet of temporary impact associated with our set of erosion controls. The Wetlands Bureau is very precise in how you show your wetland impacts. If the shovel is touching it, it's permanent impact. If there's going to be a temporary impact, either for a staging area, say you're using temporary swamp mats or otherwise, that be more of a temporary impact. In that same vein, our sediment and erosion controls that would be placed at the perimeter would also generate that same element. It would be a temporary impact. In this case, we're calling for a double row of silt sock, basically a 12-inch fiber roll that has an appropriate compost media to trap sediments as it's passing through it. So there's no ill effects on the adjacent wetland.

Chair Morin said of course, specifically, the larger spot is because that's where the stadium track and things are going to be. So, what specifically are the... I don't have the words for it. What type of wetlands was that that big area? Mr. Golon replied sure. Emergent wet meadow would be the appropriate classification. When we think about emergent wet meadows, they have value, yes. They're certainly more valuable than a drainage ditch. When we look at the functional characteristics that Chris was able to identify for us and what we saw in the field and what we had the opportunity to see with the Conservation Commission. This is your... it could be a bird habitat. You could have butterflies, those types of elements, but otherwise, it's a former cornfield. I don't mean to belittle or downgrade the quality or value of the wetland, but when we look at that in comparison to Wetland Areas 1-2 or 3, 4 and 5 that are located further east that are forested and providing a higher level of value, it rates very low.

Chair Morin said I can see you out of the corner of my eye, but you have to wait until we get to Public input, OK? Number six area. So that's what he's talking about is the wet meadow area, the cornfield area. Why don't you step to the mic? Give your name and address, please.

Mr. Chris Lemay of 103 Worthley Road, Bedford: Chris Lemay, 103 Worthley Road. I abut the southeast corner. That red section, isn't that the pond that's to the left of Clarks Farm? Is that that spot? Mr. Golon replied so, Mr. Chairman, and in regards to the question, that is not the irrigation pond. The irrigation pond is located southeast of that location of that wetland. Mr. Lemay said because I'm having a hard time understanding where the house is in that plot of land. Where that pond is, and where the other retention ponds are versus that map.

Chair Morin asked do you have a larger picture of the property? Mr. Dolon replied I thought that might be of value for tonight's proceedings, so we went ahead and did an overlay. Also, because just from a campus wide perspective. The question of why is it located here versus somewhere else on campus? The reality is between steep topography, other wetlands, electrical rights-of-way and just the reality that we would have to build a whole new two- or three-hundred-person parking lot somewhere else that's going to create deforestation and is not consistent with the outlook of your Master Plan and ordinances, that this area makes the most sense. So let me dial us in here a little bit as far as location. So this here, Mr. Chairman, is the irrigation pond itself. The wetland is located directly adjacent to it and if need be, our wetland scientist can provide some further documentation as far as issue.

Chair Morin said that was good that you were able to pinpoint with this big picture. That helps. I was going to ask earlier about a bigger picture just to see where the house was but that helps a lot. Mr. Golon said and we got a little tunnel vision there. We'll take a step back to make sure that we can understand it.

Ms. Ports said I think Nick pointed out previously and I had been on the Conservation Commission site walk, it's virtually indistinguishable from the field that it's in. So you would not notice that there's a wetland there. You would see the pond very clearly.

Chair Morin said that's all I had. So let's go around.

Mr. Kellermann said going to the Conservation Commission, their recommendation, which I take it, reading between the lines you don't feel that's within the purview of the wetland impact here. Mr. Golon replied that is a fair statement, Sir. I didn't speak to it directly. I know you have the Minutes within your packages. There was some discussion of PFAS relative to the sports field. We're here for a variance in relationship to fill wetlands, not necessarily to speak to the merits of that, although we would acknowledge that if that is a concern, we provided a potential condition that shows how testing could be done or otherwise something that could carry over probably to a more appropriate venue, which would be the Planning Board for their deliberation.

Chair Morin said I agree with what he just said. We're here for wetlands. We're not here for the merits of artificial turf, the stadium, whatever it might be. We're looking at two areas of wetlands that are going to be filled. What goes on that property afterwards would be up to the Planning Board to decide what's there and how it's there and what is there. I think we're pretty specific to

what we're dealing with when it comes to the two areas and yeah, I don't think the other items that were brought up during that meeting were our purview, even though people kept saying it was part of our purview. But it isn't.

Mr. Gilbert said what I'm gathering from that, because I was going to ask the same question, is that we should not put any kind of condition on this.

Chair Morin said that's up to the Board. Personally. I don't think so.

Mr. Gilbert said I tend to agree because I believe this is more of a Planning Board issue than a Zoning Board issue.

Chair Morin said and I don't want to get into the Planning Board's job. I don't like them getting into our world.

Mr. Gilbert said OK. I just wanted that to clarify. I do have a general question because it's been a while since I've looked at it. But does Saint Anselm also own the parcel with the house and the buildings there?

Mr. Dolon replied so as part of this application, there's also going to be a lot line adjustment that's being proposed with the Clark Farm that's located directly to our south. So as you would assume in that they've agreed to a lot line adjustment, they are well acknowledged the intent of what's being built directly adjacent to them. But yeah, so when you drive down Worthley Road and you look directly to the right, that's the existing Clark Farm and outbuilding. So as part of that lot line adjustment, it's really twofold. There's a portion that we're acquiring to accommodate the sports field, so that the existing infrastructure of the college wouldn't be unduly impacted, i.e. the parking lot. And in return, they are receiving a portion of land of equal size directly to their east. Ms. Thomas said oh, I see. Mr. Gilbert said it's a land swap. I get it. That's where I was going. Thank you. [There were no further questions or comments from the Board.]

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Mr. Roger Blanchette of 105 Worthley Road, Bedford: Good evening. My name is Roger Blanchette. I live at 105 Worthley Road. I'm an abutter just to the east. My concerns or my questions here are focused on stormwater. Stormwater management requires an effective design. It also requires maintenance over time. So I'm interested in understanding what the plan is to maintain the stormwater maintenance system and also want to understand as residents and abutters downhill from this thing, what is our recourse if the stormwater management becomes ineffective?

Mr. Dolan said I'm happy to answer. Excellent questions. So maybe 15-20 years ago when we did a project like this, it would go through site specific now called Alteration of Terrain. They did not have specific requirements at the state level, the Department Environmental Services. They didn't have requirements to maintain your stormwater infrastructure. They do now. So it's part of any Alteration of Terrain permit, which this will require. There will be an operation and maintenance manual for all of the stormwater management items. Those are then evaluated either on a biannual or annual basis, depending on the nature of their use. The applicant is required to

keep files of all of their maintenance practices. It's actually a service TFMoran provides to various clients to make sure that their storm water management systems continue to work as intended. Relative to the design, I'll speak to the merits of our professional engineers that we know how to follow the rules and make sure that we design an appropriate stormwater management system. And relative to the maintenance, which is equally if not more important, is that the college will be mandated by the State to maintain those practices and show records that they continue to do so.

Chair Morin said and let me ask just to be more specific, because I'm not going to worry about Section 6... But where you're doing the fix in the northern section, so you're saying you could be one or two years. For that specific area, what would that be considered? Every year? Every other year? Mr. Dolon replied that would be a biannual inspection in the spring and then again in the fall. So kind of follows the seasons. As we finish up with winter, snow has been removed, any sediment or otherwise it's been displaced or salt, it gives you the opportunity to go in there, clean out your catch basins, check the functionality or [inaudible]. If there's sediment that's been displaced to those locations, it's removed. As much as I'm sure it's not fantastic for the owners, that's one more onerous thing to do. It's an important step. It's an important step for us professional engineers to make sure things are working the way they're supposed to. Chair Morin said very good. Thank you.

Attorney John Bisson of Cronin, Bisson and Zalinski, PC: Good evening, folks. My name is John Bisson. I'm an attorney with Cronin, Bisson and Zalinski, and I'm here representing James and Patricia Alger, who own property in Goffstown, but are directed abutters. They own 110, 120 and 130 Violet Street or Avenue. I'm not sure which. The first issue: they are in Goffstown. As you can see, the oval is pointed sort of directly at their property. I assume that there's been consideration of whether there's any regional impact as a result of this, and the Board is satisfied that there is no need to notify Goffstown or if so, Goffstown has been properly notified. The Alger family has owned that property since the 1880s, and until Mr. Alger became the current owner, he was a proud graduate of Saint A's, surprisingly. When he became owner of that abutting property, he had a somewhat troubled history with his alma mater, and the only reason that's appropriate is because there is a history of representations made by the college at application stage that have not been fulfilled. For example, when the football stadium went in, there was a promise for some storm drains that did not go in. And but for Mr. Alger's involvement, that would not have been addressed. So there is a history of coming to the Board, making promises that were not fulfilled. And even here tonight, we're hearing that as a result of this application, the college found something that is in failure. We don't know how long it's been in failure. They haven't told us when or how they found it, what the consequences are of that. Nobody's perfect. I'm not suggesting that a school of this size should be monitoring every piece of their property all of the time. However, to be here in front of you without that data, I think that's really relevant for you to have as you make this decision.

So what we can say is, and I guess I would ask you to consider a slightly broader or more involved consideration of why you're here. They are here for a variance, and I did hear the discussion regarding PFAS and PFOAs, and that it's somehow beyond your consideration tonight. But they are here for a variance and one of the first conditions of a variance is that the request must not be contrary to the public interest and that public interest condition requires a consideration of the threat to public health, safety and welfare. I would suggest—you can reject me if you disagree—

that whether or not we are heightening the risk of PFAS in Bedford's water supply is exactly the kind of threat to public health, safety and welfare that is within this Board's purview. So if you will indulge me a little bit—what this application is bringing before you, what it will undoubtedly do, is increase noise in the area, increase traffic in the area, increase impervious surfaces in the area, increase the risk of PFAS contamination in the area. And what does that mean? We have heard shedding PFAS. Well, Bedford has, as you all likely know, a PFAS Committee. And I just want to quote from their September 5th, 2023 meeting: The committee discussed requesting the Bedford delegation submit legislation that would further protect Bedford property owners now that Saint-Gobain is closing. The Committee agreed that it is important that Saint-Gobain be held accountable for current and future contamination, including as new federal PFAS standards are put into place. It was determined that Chairman Carter would send a letter urging all state representatives to work together to submit legislation that protects the health of Bedford residents, their property rights, and shelters them from undue costs of remediation from Saint-Gobain, potentially abandoning future responsibility for past actions.

I'm not suggesting that this college is Saint-Gobain and that it will abandon things in the future. However, those risks highlighted by a Bedford Committee are important to this community. We heard from the applicant that there is this sort of gloss that the State of New Hampshire has approved this. There's a permit. And that somehow should be compelling.

Chair Morin said excuse me. Did you just say that he said that they approved the permit? Atty. Cronin replied well, the dredge and fill permit. Chair Morin said he didn't say that.

Atty. Cronin said I'm sorry. Then thank you for correcting me. But the permit that was submitted is basically self-certifying. And one of the questions that they have to address is whether they did an alternative analysis while considering whether these wetlands should be filled. The application that they submitted essentially proposed two things. That, and turning that same field perpendicular to the way that it is on your plan. Those were the only two alternatives that were represented to have been considered where tonight that they looked at the rest of the campus that they've explored other opportunities in the area. That was not part of the permit that was submitted, and I think that's—I didn't mean to misquote anybody—I'm just saying that one of the things that they're supposed to show is that they've explored alternatives before coming to ask to fill these wetlands. And they also have to show in that permit that they will properly maintain whatever they propose. And again, the history I think is a little bit problematic for them. If you, and I assume you have, the Conservation Commission minutes of that meeting. I think it's a bit off to say that the PFAS analysis was just a minor consideration. It came up. It was discussed, and if you look at page fifteen of those Minutes, Mr. Golan essentially concedes, and I can quote it specifically—that there is no way to test. So putting them to a standard of testing is unfair.

Chair Morin said let me ask you this. So we're here to do a variance for two—one temporary fill issue and one permanent fill issue. We don't approve the stadium. We approve a filling of an area, but we have nothing to do with approving a stadium, even if there's going to be a stadium, per se. OK, right? Because isn't there another thing after us called the Planning Board that deals with what's going to be on that property?

Atty. Cronin replied the Planning Board is not asked to vary the terms of your ordinance. You are.

Chair Morin clarified for the dredge and fill. Mr. Cronin continued of the wetlands that potentially will be contaminated, maybe, maybe not, by the use that's proposed—not the use as a stadium. Chair Morin replied well, we don't even know what the... well, the proposed use is there. Atty. Cronin said I think you do know what it's going to be used for. Your Conservation Commission, and the Minutes are in front of you, discussed it at length. They asked why can't we do grass? So it's not a secret.

Chair Morin said I watched both meetings, so I know what was said there, Sir. But my thing is we're not going into that piece, OK. We will discuss it during our deliberation, what we want to do about that piece, if we want to go into it.

Atty. Cronin said well then, if I may, I'll just simply conclude, and you can ignore my commentary if that's appropriate. So, Mr. Golan was asked at the end of his presentation: Is there a concern with the chemical? He said... Is there a concern with a chemical potentially leeching off of this material when it's exposed to rain? Could it potentially get into storm water and then go down and have a detrimental impact? I think really Kathleen Bemis has, as I have reached out to Alteration of Terrain. There is no answer to that right now. If this Commission is not comfortable offering a recommendation, that is your choice. Then we can try and fulfill those conditions to the best of our ability, whether it's at Planning Board or Zoning Board level, we will seek to do so. Those are Mr. Golan's words. You can reject the conversation, but if you go to the statutory right criteria for a variance, what's missing here tonight must not be contrary to the public interest. Will it threaten public health, safety or welfare? They cannot say, based on how they plan to construct the improvements that are on this plan that are in front of you, that it will not do that. Their engineer has conceded. There is no way to make that promise.

Will it be consistent with the spirit of the ordinance? As we know, those two criteria are taken together, so you fail one, you fail the other. It must result in substantial justice being done. That standard is, you must show that any loss suffered by the general public would be so minimal that it is outweighed by the gain to the applicant. Conversely, a denial must result in a gain to the general public that outweighs any loss to the applicant.

What we heard in front of the Conservation Commission is that this location is for the convenience of the school. We heard it tonight. It's so that they can compete at the NCAA level. That's their justification for this application, before you tonight. So that they can compete at the NCAA level. Is that an appropriate consideration for this Board? They must show you their burden. It must not diminish the value of surrounding properties. That is their burden. I would, by example, say, if you go to Merrimack and look around the property, because of PFAS, those properties have diminished in value.

There is a hysteria, perhaps, in New Hampshire, around PFAS now, but if any one of you live next to this property and put a sign up that said these quotes from what has been presented to the Conservation Commission, that there is no way to test about the safety of what we're going to do on this field. It would impact the value of your property. Significantly, though, you don't have to rely on me. It's their burden to come in with evidence and show that if they do this, it will not diminish the value of surrounding properties. Thank you.

Atty. Ari Pollack said I don't know if you're looking for a reply. I know all of that's directed to the Board. First let me say that I agree with all of your comments in response to the objections. It strikes me that most of the comments are aimed at turning this variance exercise into the Planning Board's site plan review. That's down the road from where we are now. We're asking for a variance that would allow a site plan application to be considered complete by that Board so that we could have that conversation.

I'll try to pick up the points in order and I'll be brief. A question about regional impact, Planning Board. A question about prior representations not being fulfilled, enforcement, and a discussion that we already had about stormwater practices being differently regulated and differently monitored by the State, by municipalities, by other groups than they were even 15 or 20 years ago.

There was question raised about how the need for a repair for the smaller impact area was discovered, came about. It was diligence for this application and field work done for this application, and I believe Mr. Golan testified to that earlier tonight.

There was a comment that we have to avoid and minimize impacts to the wetlands. That's certainly the criteria that is chief among the concerns the DES Wetlands Bureau will use to review our submitted and pending wetlands application. We had a detailed conversation with the Conservation Commission about that very point. We're limited in the way we can rotate the track. Rotating it in one direction deals with glare issues. Rotating it in another direction deals with impacts to an opposite wetland that has higher functions and values which we're trying to avoid. Taking this complex, picking it up and putting it somewhere else on the college's holdings, which would simply ignore the shared use that comes with co-locating around the existing athletic facilities, chief among them the availability of the parking area. It would just ignore the reality that that stuff is already there.

There was a discussion that somehow there's a justification, or that we haven't justified why this is appropriate. Let me put it in this context if it helps. We're asking to impact a wetland so that we can pursue an accessory use to an allowed principal use. Educational facilities are allowed in this District and Town. An athletic track is certainly an accessory use to that principal use, and it just won't fit without some relief and that was the avoid and minimize exercise that we conducted. Value impacts were discussed. The value impacts to the extent that this abutting property is going to receive an impact, it's already got it. There are existing facilities for the college that are closer than the one that we're proposing. If there's an impact to be had, they're having it. It's not relative to this particular impact and it's certainly not relative to the question in front of this Board, which is can we fill an area of wetlands? Yes, there is that small pocket of 100 square feet. But the lion's share of the impact we're asking for is completely on the opposite end of the plan from where the abutter's properties are located.

Their last item, if I've gotten them all captured, is the concern over PFAS. No one is discounting the concern for that chemical and its potential for harm. We're just saying that we don't think it's relevant to the wetlands exercise. We fully anticipate questions about it at the Planning Board and we fully anticipate having to answer those questions to that Board's satisfaction. I just don't think has anything to do with the exercise in front of this Board right now. Which is, can we fill an area

to have a site that's large enough to accommodate an accessory use to a principal use? It's really that simple.

We did supply some information relating to the manufacturing and testing of these field materials because we wanted you to understand that we're taking it seriously. We're doing our research; we're prepared for that discussion wherever it comes up. But we anticipate it will come up more fully with the Planning Board. I'll stop there.

Chair Morin said I have a question for you. If State DES doesn't approve the permits, what happens? Atty. Pollack replied the State has to approve impacts to a jurisdictional wetland and we would need to redesign the project to avoid those wetland impacts or in some way materially change what we're asking so that we could reapply. Chair Morin said right, so if you don't get approval, no project. No project until it gets approved. No matter what we do. Atty. Pollack said that is correct. We need both. Chair Morin said OK, thank you. Is there anyone else who would like to speak this evening? Go ahead, Sir.

Mr. Chris Lemay of 103 Worthley Road, Bedford: Chris Lemay 103 Worthley Road. The land, I've lived there for 24 years. My wife grew up there. She's been there 52 years. It's been in my wife's family over 100 years. We live in the bottom, right-hand corner of that blue map. So thank you for illustrating exactly a bigger scale of what the map looks like, but that bottom, right...we get so much rainwater and runoff water from that field year-round. It doesn't matter if it's a drought or not, there's so much water that runs on that whole area. And then to the right, that's 4th, 3rd, 2nd, 1st Street. There's been a lot of conversation over the years about houses, basements being flooded out. People can't get their septic designs done up. There's not any kind of sewage or septic systems down along that whole road, and I just feel like this conversation is really talked about the top right-hand corner and shoving water that way. But when I see a synthetic field, and synthetic fields are designed to drain pretty quickly, there's been no discussion about how that water is going to flow to the middle or to the bottom right-hand corner of that map, and how it's going to affect about 60-70 houses all the way down that hill, down Worthley Road. It's all about going to the top right-hand corner and that system's been failed. That's been discussed. I don't feel like there's been adequate discussion of how everything else is going to drain properly. So all the impacts of the neighbors to the right of this field is going to be in a positive light. There's been no discussion of that. So that's all I have to say. Thank you.

Mr. Golon said Mr. Chairman, should it please the Board, I can give a little bit of an explanation on our post development evaluation. So as mentioned, obviously we have an Alteration of Terrain permit associated with this project. We have to evaluate our peak rates of runoff for particular storm events both for the Town as well as for the State, such that we can have no increases in that peak rate of runoff at any of our receptors. I'm going to switch back to our more focused plan so we can see the contours a little bit more clearly. The reality is three quarters of this area drains really to the east, if not more so. Portions of that are discharged to the east, as was mentioned by the abutter. Other portions more so to the north to that existing drainage infrastructure. One element I didn't speak to is the drainage design associated with the field and something we will certainly deal with the Planning Board, but I'd be remiss if I don't mention it here. There are some components that tie to functional characteristics of wetlands there, namely recharge, that the northeast corner of the field here that is a fill section, so it provides us the opportunity to include

under drains throughout that area. They can also store stormwater versus directly discharging it. So what we're creating here, essentially, is an under-drained sports field. The area of cut which is more or less, we'll say the left side of the field, in that area, there's under drains that are picking up the groundwater and then transporting it to appropriate stormwater management facilities, which consequently are located to the northeast. So that that area of runoff would no longer be draining directly to the east. It's going to go to our stormwater management facility. One of things that's great, it's a synthetic sports field. So how do those operate? You have a membrane layer. It drains through. There's usually a sand layer below that. And then you have your naturally occurring materials. So that you don't have freeze/thaw cycles that would negatively impact your field, you provide under drains, much like you would in your roadway system to make sure that that stormwater that drains through the field doesn't directly sheet off. It's captured in the under drain and then directed to the stormwater management facilities. One of the things we see with site plans a lot of time, you get cheap flow off certain areas. Mother Nature likes to do what she wants sometimes, and you can't always control that. But with this type of system with an under drain, it drains through the field into the under drain and then directly through a closed pipe network directly to our stormwater management facilities. So I'd provide that as explanation relative to how the stormwater management system would work for this field, and I think they provide a perceived benefit to some of our neighbors elsewhere.

Chair Morin said thank you. Is there anybody else that would like to speak this evening?

Mr. Tim Hepworth of 106 Worthley Road, Bedford: Tim Hepworth, 106 Worthley Road. I guess this is kind of for the Zoning Board. We talked about that you're making just a decision on the wetlands today. Why are we differentiating between the zoning and the planning? So if we approve the wetlands and then Planning basically kiboshes, are we still going to allow St. A's to go fill that in for no reason? So why wouldn't we align those two decisions together to actually see...? I mean, don't you want to see what the full plan is before you say, yeah, let's go do this work on the land. So, is there a reason? Is the zoning—and this is me having no understanding—is the zoning approval required before we get into the planning stages? Is that a requirement?

Chair Morin replied I'll let our town employee help us out. Ms. Ports said I can explain, and the attorneys can probably, but yes, this is a variance from our zoning ordinance. So, the project has to meet all the zoning requirements and only the Zoning Board can grant that relief. The Planning Board can't grant relief from the zoning ordinance.

Mr. Hepworth said I'm with you there, but why wouldn't we want to see the full plan? With wetlands, we should have had a count on how many times wetlands was said tonight. It's obviously been the focus, and probably purposely so. But why don't we want to see the full plan before we make this approval? Because from the package that was presented, it was very focused. Again, you've got a scope of work. That's what you go for. But the fact that the first question was where the hell are we on the map? Right? Why wasn't that in the original plan? And it could have been easily put there, right? They had a top-level picture. They could have just put a track on it. So, why don't we want to see the full plan before we make the approval? Why can't that be presented from Saint A's type of perspective? Right? It's got to be there already, right? I would assume that it's more mature than just an image on a screen at this point, right? So, why? Why don't we want to require that rigor from Saint A's, from our approval perspective? Because we can.

Chair Morin said actually, the per say full plan has been out for months, starting with the Conservation Commission, where they went to. And I'm pretty sure some of these different pictures were shown and stuff like that, showing what their ultimate idea is. But everybody only has their little piece of the puzzle. Conservation deals with their piece of the puzzle. We deal with our piece of the puzzle, and then the Planning Board deals with the rest of the puzzle. They deal with a lot more items than we do.

Mr. Hepworth said sure. And I guess, at least from the planning perspective, as an abutter, I wasn't notified because I guess there's no variance required or whatever it may be. So this has been the only interaction that I've had as far as this is what, besides the news from WMR that just had a screen grab two or three years ago, this is the first time I've heard the project is moving forward.

Ms. Ports said the Conservation Commission is making a recommendation. They're not making a decision. So, the abutters, in that case, are not notified. When this goes to the Planning Board, you will be notified by certified mail, again, as an abutter to the property.

Mr. Hepworth asked that this is happening or that it's going through the approval process?

Ms. Ports replied when the site plan goes to the Planning Board for their review, yes, you will be notified at that time.

Mr. Hepworth said OK, alright. Yeah, I guess I just felt we probably or Saint A's is probably further down the line, and that the package could have been a little more comprehensive as to what is actually happening.

Ms. Ports replied there is a full submittal with the Planning Board, but that material information is likely available. I'm not quite sure what you're looking for that you didn't get. But we do try to sort through it all and give this Board the most relevant information for what their decision is.

Mr. Hepworth said yeah, and I guess more information as far as like—and again, this is obviously not for the zoning—for like what are we looking at for traffic increases? The fact of the fence that's designed obviously is not meant to keep people out from the Worthley side, right? I think it was only 42 inches. What's the expectation? And that is obviously based off of what we discussed here tonight is all planning has nothing to do. But again what does that comprehensive plan look like? It was kind of, so if it's out there, it's out there. But again, the package was presented related to the wetlands, obviously was very focused.

Ms. Ports replied that's true. And when you get that notification, all that material is available. You can come down to the office and review it. It's also posted online. And if you have questions, you can make an appointment with staff, and we'll go through it with you and answer questions. That's why we're here.

Ms. Thomas said Kathleen, as a way of explaining: it can't go to Planning until all the zoning variances are dealt with. So, it has to come here, otherwise it won't get on Planning's agenda until

we do this. So this is one or two or three in the step. Planning and Zoning can't work in concert. They have to wait for us, because if we say no, they have to go back to the drawing board, basically.

[There were no further comments or questions from the public]. Chair Morin asked gentlemen, any last items for us? Mr. Golon said no, thank you. We appreciate your time.

MOTION by Vice Chair Casale to move to nonpublic input for deliberation. Mr. Kellermann duly seconded the motion. Vote taken – all in favor. Unanimous. Motion carries.

1. Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest because:

(1) Whether granting the variance would alter the essential character of the locality:

Chair Morin said again, we're talking about just filling in that one section, the big section, and then that small repair up at the top. I don't see it changing. Right now it's a big field. Ms. Thomas said and it's still going to be a big field. Chair Morin added and it's still going to be a big field after it's changed, but I don't see anything there. Mr. Kellermann said yes, when I saw it on this map here, it looks like there's a big impact. When you look at the pictures of what the actual topography is, it's actually not that substantial.

(2) Whether granting the variance would threaten public health, safety, or welfare:

Chair Morin said again, I don't see either of these two fills, temporary or permanent, is going to change or affect any of those. Vice Chair Casale said they're making an effort to ameliorate the issues with filling in that one section of wetlands. I think that they were pretty clear as far as their reference in that regard. Particularly, mentioning the addition of the plantings along the side and the fencing that the Fish and Game recommended, and the fact that it's really a low quality [air quotes] wetlands—I was trying to come up for a better name for it—depression that sometimes fills with water. So I think that they've, as far as I'm concerned, stated their case that they have ameliorated any concerns in that regard.

2. The spirit of the ordinance is observed because:

3. Granting the variance would do substantial justice because:

Chair Morin said again, it gives them the use of that area, for whatever that purpose might be, with minimal change to it. As they talked about the different types of wetlands and how this was one of the minimal types and then you still have the State permitting where they have to submit all this stuff to the State and no matter what we say, if the State says no, it's no. Then they have to start from scratch.

Vice Chair Casale said on a larger level, there really is no, knowing this campus, there's no better place to put this. It makes perfect sense to be here. It appears that they've done the best that they could to mitigate as much harm as possible to the wetlands on that level. And in this area, in the sports complex area, this is really the only place to put it. And again, I think as far as the campus at large, this area is the only place to put it.

Mr. Kellermann said I think, when you're talking about a field of this size and the amount of parking that is typically required for something like this, the amount of paving and the fact that they can use an existing lot. Chair Morin said it's all done already. That part of the project is done. Mr. Kellermann said yes, that's important. Mr. Gilbert said it's the least disruptive.

4. The values of the surrounding properties will not be diminished for the following reasons:

Chair Morin said again, I don't see this small area of fill going to diminish the surrounding properties. As stated by the applicant, even in that small area of 108 square feet where they're repairing some stuff, with changes in how things are done, this will be managed, and maintenance will have to be done. These things will be kept an eye on to make sure they're working properly.

Vice Chair Casale said I think it's important to note to differentiate that we're not talking about the end result, which is the stadium and perhaps noise issues and perhaps the PFAS issues. We're only looking at filling this wetland area and does that affect the value of surrounding homes. I agree with you that I don't believe filling in that area affects the value of the surrounding homes. The other issues, which I'm not stating are not important, are not within our jurisdiction.

5. Literal enforcement of the provisions of the ordinance would result in an unnecessary hardship. Special conditions of the property distinguish it from other properties in the area because:

Chair Morin said well, the biggest thing is, they brought up this, again, it's owned by the college. The college can utilize this zoned area for this type of use. And again, we're looking at specifically the fill in that large area and then a fix in a different area. So, I don't see this as an issue.

Vice Chair Casale said yes, I don't think this is a—I forget what the exact comment was—but this is not a luxury for the college. Stadiums like this are—and I'm not saying that it is the case here, but in some cases is—a matter of survival for colleges. They did mention it enabling the college to be able to recruit athletes that perhaps they wouldn't be able to get that might go to other colleges. Chair Morin added and host events. Vice Chair Casale said oh, absolutely, and the money that that brings. Just having gone through the process where our son is an athlete, it's just schools are spending money on sports and as a parent I like to see the money go more towards academics. But all the colleges are spending money on sports. In order to survive, it just seems like you have to compete in the sports realm. Again, I'm not saying that Saint A's needs it, but I think it's important.

(A) Denial of the variance would result in unnecessary hardship because:

(i) No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property because:

Ms. Thomas said without the variance, they really can't use that piece of land. That's the hardship. Chair Morin said right, because you've got to deal with those issues and again from a scientific perspective, it's a minimal issue when it comes

to the fill of that larger area, I'll say. Vice Chair Casale said they're doing things to offset that as well, which has been well documented.

(ii) The proposed use is a reasonable one because:

Chair Morin said I think it's reasonable to fix a few items on the property so it can be utilized for other purposes.

(B) If the criteria in subparagraph (A) above are not established, explain why the property cannot be used in strict conformance with the ordinance and why a variance is therefore necessary to enable a reasonable use of it:

Criteria not applicable, addressed in subparagraph (A).

MOTION: Vice Chair Casale moves that the Zoning Board grants the request for a variance from Article IV, Section 275-27A. to permanently fill 12,122 sq. ft. and temporarily fill 587 sq. ft. of wetlands for the construction of a Track and Field Athletic Complex. The motion is supported by the following findings of facts:

- 1. The variance request satisfies all five criteria for granting relief from the Zoning Ordinance.**
- 2. The Board includes all facts found in the meeting minutes for this application and incorporates all meeting minutes into this decision.**

Ms. Thomas seconded the motion.

Chair Morin suggested the addition of the wildlife habitat condition shown on the paperwork.

AMENDED MOTION Vice Chair Casale moves that the Zoning Board grants the request for a variance from Article IV, Section 275-27A. to permanently fill 12,122 sq. ft. and temporarily fill 587 sq. ft. of wetlands for the construction of a Track and Field Athletic Complex, with the following condition:

- 1. The site plans will incorporate the wildlife habitat improvements reflected on the color map stamped Received by the Planning Department on December 7th, 2023 and presented to the Conservation Commission at its December 12th, 2023 meeting.**

The motion is supported by the following findings of facts:

- 3. The variance request satisfies all five criteria for granting relief from the Zoning Ordinance.**
- 4. The Board includes all facts found in the meeting minutes for this application and incorporates all meeting minutes into this decision.**

Ms. Thomas duly seconded the motion. Vote taken. Unanimous. Motion carries.

The application is Approved.

MOTION by Ms. Thomas to go back into public input. Mr. Gilbert duly seconded the motion. Vote – all in favor. Unanimous. Motion carried.

Chair Morin said you're all set. Thank you, gentlemen.

Ms. Ports said just a reminder that our next Housing Forum is March 20th. I apologize, I don't have the time, but it is at the Bedford Public Library in the McAllister Room.

V. Adjournment:

MOTION: Ms. Thomas moves to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Gilbert seconded the motion. Vote – all in favor. Unanimous. Motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 8:50 pm.

The next meeting will take place on February 20, 2024.

Respectfully submitted,
Sue Forcier