

Town of Bedford
Zoning Board of Adjustment Minutes
June 21, 2022

A regular meeting of the Bedford Zoning Board was held on Tuesday, June 21, 2022, at the Town Meeting Room at BCTV, at 10 Meetinghouse Road.

Present: John Morin (Chair), Alex Kellermann (regular member), Bob MacPherson (alternate member), Len Green (regular member), Neal Casale (Vice Chair), Dave Gilbert (regular member), Sue Thomas (alternate member), Jillian Harris (Assistant Planning Director).

Absent: None.

Call to Order and Roll Call

Chairman Morin called the meeting to order at 7pm and introduced members of the Board.

Approval of Minutes: May 17, 2022

MOTION by was made by Mr. Gilbert to approve the minutes of the May 17 meeting. Mr. Green duly seconded the motion. Ms. Thomas and Mr. Kellermann abstain from the vote. Roll call vote was taken - ALL IN FAVOR – unanimous. MOTION carries. The minutes are approved.

Rules of Procedure: All applicants will be heard in order of notice. If we need to take a recess, we will by vote. We will go into a non-public input to deliberate and vote after each item. You can wait for the vote tonight or you can call the planning office after 8:30 tomorrow morning and I'm going to ask you please to all silence your cell phones, so we have no interruption during the meeting. For each applicant, we'll have them present their application. There will be public input for those in favor and in opposition of the applications. I'll ask that there be no debate allowed between party. All testimony will come to the Board. And if the applicant would like they can present a summation after all that discussion has happened. For rehearings, any party has 30 days to request a rehearing from a decision of the ZBA. The board has 30 days in which to respond to such requests 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 has made in its decision. Also, for the criteria for granting a variance, I'll not go through the five criteria at this time. We'll ask each applicant to go through their application and address the five criteria as part of their presentation. For a motion to pass, it must have three affirmative votes. At this time, I'll ask anybody who's going to testify here out in the audience to please stand and be sworn in. If you think you're even going to speak a little bit, please stand now so that way we don't have to stop and swear you in later on. Raise your right hand please. Do you swear that the testimony you'll give at these hearings is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? Thank you.

We've got a pretty extensive agenda today. One thing I do want to mention to folks is that if we get to 10:00 o'clock and something hasn't been called, we do not start a new application. We're all volunteers and we have jobs to get to tomorrow, so our limit is 10:00 o'clock for a new application. So just letting

you know. And we've got a whole assortment of things this evening. We'll be starting with two discussion items for the Board. And they are requests for rehearings. Our first one is from Jeffrey Riley.

Item 1. Jeffrey Riley – Request for Rehearing for a variance from Article III, Section 275-21.F(1)(a)[2] to permit a Level II Home Occupation in a detached garage where such use is required to be within the primary residence or attached garage or barn at 6 Lynn Drive, Lot 22-75-02, Zoned R&A.

Before we get into the discussion, I just want to let the Board members know that the folks voting on this can only be the folks that voted on it originally. So, we've got myself, Neil, Bob, Sue and Dave, so we'll be voting parties. But anyone can get into the discussion, of course. So, let's look at that. Everyone should have a copy of the letter from Mr. Riley, and it looks like he had six points that he brought up. Does anyone want to start?

Mr. Casale said I reviewed the six points and in review of them I did not see anything that he brought forward that would be new evidence in support of us granting a rehearing. Nor did I see that the Board made any technical errors.

Chair Morin asked, Anybody else? Ms. Thomas said I agree. Chair Morin said I agree also. I'll get a little more specific on some you know, like number 1. My note here was the applicant was given all the opportunities to give his testimony, so it wasn't like there was interrupted or didn't have a chance to speak to the Board and give everything he had. Number 2, he was trying to per se put some blame on the Zoning Department for not having an overhead picture, but again, it goes back to the applicant to give all the evidence for his case. Mr. Casale said well in that one in the testimony that I read through, I actually had asked for the picture to come up, and she did bring it up. Ms. Thomas said that's what I thought. Mr. Casale said just he didn't present it, but she had it in her computer, so it was actually provided, right? Chair Morin said and then under number 4, there was never a hardship given in the application or during testimony. It was actually questioned very well by the board as in a hardship, and the answer was he didn't understand the question, but we have to go with what we're given for testimony. Mr. Casale said Mr. Chair, if I may, you skipped 3, so I don't know if we're addressing each one? Chair Morin said yeah, if you want to address them, I was just going through the notes I had and the last one I had for myself was number 6. That he was basically saying we're only utilizing the tilted view of the general public, but we take all testimony at hand when we make a decision. We don't just take one person's or one side. We look at the whole thing.

Ms. Thomas said and going back to Neil number three. He had discussed the difference between 650 and 800 square feet, and I think we came down to the fact that it was still detached. Ultimately, he still had, you know, there's a place and it's not great for him in his house, but I remember him saying a few times that he could go with the 650 square feet, but I didn't, personally, didn't view that as a deciding factor of whether we gave him the variance or not. Mr. Casale said right and even if it were, to me, there was all evidence that he was actually growing his business. He wanted to grow the business so he really needed the 800 and he made an inference that basically he didn't have to say the 800, so there was he was going to hide that which of course he should be fully transparent and not have hidden that, so I appreciate that he was transparent about that. And again, it contradicts everything that he said which is he wants to grow the business and supposedly eventually get out of that and go somewhere else when he could afford it.

Chair Morin asked any other comments from the Board? Mr. Casale said there was one other one you did not touch on. The only reason why I say is that since you're addressing them if we skip one, it may be

an issue. And I don't want it to be an issue. Chair Morin said no, hit all the notes that you have. Number 5? Mr. Casale said yes, he mentions this forklift and the fact that the garage—that two-car garage—was not large enough for use of the forklift. But he did not—so he mentioned the electricity. He did not—I don't believe he mentioned the forklift at all in his testimony. He did mention the electricity. We did not get a figure on that. I don't personally, in the little research I did, I don't feel that that's like a huge expense to have. Basically, he would have to change the panel and add outlets and so forth. But the bottom line is, aside from the electricity, he feels that it wasn't big enough. And, again, going back to three, may not be if he's growing the business. Chair Morin said right. Mr. Casale continued, so again, and as far as I'm concerned, in the totality here, there's no errors and no new evidence. Chair Morin said alright. Any other comments on this one? Seeing none, would someone like to make a motion?

MOTION: Mr. Casale moves that the Zoning Board pursuant to RSA 677:3 and the Board's Rules of Procedure, the Board finds that no good reason exists to grant the rehearing request as the applicant has failed to present new evidence, additional legal arguments or evidence of law that was misapprehended or overlooked by the Board in its original decision in regards to the request for a rehearing from the Variance from Article III, Section 275-21.F(1)(a)[2] to permit a Level II Home Occupation within a detached garage where such use is required to be within the primary residence or attached garage or barn at 6 Lynn Drive, Lot 22-75-02, as per our deliberations. Ms. Thomas duly seconded the motion. Roll call vote was taken - ALL IN FAVOR – unanimous. MOTION carries. The rehearing request was denied.

Item 2. Haya Khurshid Alam Revocable Trust - - Request for Rehearing for a variance from Article III, Section 275-21B(2)(d) to allow a 28-unit market-rate elderly housing development to be served by private onsite septic where municipal sewer is required at Route 101, Map 31, Lot 44- 29, Zoned Commercial.

Chair Morin said our second request for a rehearing is from Haya Khurshid Alam Revocable Trust. Would anyone like to start this one? Ms. Thomas asked so this was from last meeting, correct? I was not here. Chair Morin said correct. Let me just go over—so the folks that voted on this was myself, Neil, Len, Dave and Bob. So those will be the voters for this one. Mr. Casale asked do you have that language by the way? Chair Morin said yes. So, we did receive a letter from the attorney for the Trust. And basically, the attorney, it appears, had 10 items, and it would be under number 4. The first three we're basically just statements. Anyone like to start this discussion? Mr. Gilbert said let's see here. Mr. Casale asked, well, would you be OK with a general statement? Chair Morin said sure! Mr. Casale continued versus going through bullet points. Mr. Gilbert said I think my general statement would be that they focused a lot about cost, and I was more focused on the effects of the sewer having on the abutters. That was what I was most concerned about. Also is an overall effect of what's going to happen to the wetlands. What can happen. We don't know. They also came in with no way to—they said it's cost prohibitive—and I don't want to talk too much about costs. But they said cost prohibitive, but they didn't say how much it was going to cost them to do the septic versus what a sewer line would be. So how do you compare that? Also, I just, I don't know. I asked about the leach fields, and I didn't get how they figured it. And it was just—didn't get crisp answers, you know. It was kind of a as you, John, said it was a—it was a term used... Ms. Thomas added conceptual. Mr. Gilbert agreed conceptual. It was conceptual. That stuck with me, because, you know, if you're going to do something, I'm going to do this. And here's what I got. If it's conceptual, it's really not ready for us to make a decision on. That's kind of what I went back to. That's my overall general statement. Chair Morin said and I was pretty straightforward with that from the beginning of the hearing. That conceptual thing is just... Ms. Thomas said, and I wasn't here, but I read through all the minutes, and I read, you know, the whole packet. And that's kind of what I came

away with. There was no—it was an idea more than a plan. And we could—and like somebody made the comment, if we granted the variance, granted it has to go before the Planning Board, I understand that. But we grant variances on very specific things. You know, so many feet, and this just seemed kind of open-ended that ultimately it could be very different than what we think we're granting a variance for. Mr. Gilbert agreed, right, and in the original meeting, Mr. Yandow said that this is preliminary. Right here in the Minutes it's like... Mr. Green said they brought up the issue of the cost of extending, but they had no facts, as has been said, to justify what the cost was for one versus the other. I don't know how you can come to a conclusion that one is going to be more expensive. And I don't think you can just pull it out of thin air. Obviously, it's more expensive, unless you actually have the dollar and cents facts saying if we did the sewer extension, it would cost X. And if we did the septic, it would cost Y. Then we have something to compare. And it's their argument. It wasn't our argument. It was their argument that the cost was prohibitive. Give us facts. They didn't do that. Which goes back to this is a concept, not a plan. Mr. Casale said you know, that said, that's something you would expect more from a homeowner not doing their homework. Not from professionals who should have come much more prepared, I feel, for a presentation. Because if you are making that argument, boy, it's cost prohibitive. Well, how is it? And I think you were correct in honing in on that that, you know, how can we compare? We don't know. And that's a big, that's really the centerpiece of their argument.

Mr. Gilbert said another thing I'm looking at here is they weren't able to determine a soil profile from the fill debris. So, if you can't get a soil profile, how are you going to do septic? How do you know what it's going to be? Mr. MacPherson said That was my question as well. I mean, wouldn't you have an expert scientist to look at this and give an opinion too? Chair Morin said well, and I think one of their presenters was the person who designed it. But again, his report had flaws to it, as in number one it's conceptual. So, we don't know if it is exactly going to go where they're trying to say it's going to go. Yeah, they did test pits, but how about if it moves? We don't know about that type of thing. We don't know what that's going to do to the neighbors in the back or the wetlands, or those types of things. Mr. Green said yes. Chair Morin continued so, that was, yeah, and you know, it's funny because I watch a lot of the Planning Board meetings or whatever it might be, and a lot of times developers will go to the Planning Board with a conceptual thought and see what their thoughts are before they even come to us. Because normally they'll have, by the time they come to us, they'll have a set plan on what they're going to do. You know, some of the aesthetics might change, but they have a set plan. OK, this is going to be here. This is going to be here. The Planning Board might adjust them a little bit for what it looks like on the outside or what they use for materials or that type of thing. But we need to know specifics. If we don't know specifics, how do we make a decision? Mr. Casale said, and I guess this is the least expensive way for them to do stuff, right, versus you know, they took a gamble. Like, well, let's see first if this will fly before we spend any more money, perhaps. Chair Morin asked any other discussion on this?

Mr. Gilbert said well, we did take into consideration the abutters. Chair Morin agreed, we did. Mr. Gilbert continued, and they talked about the topography and how it slopes down to their neighborhood or to where they are abutting and all the things that would happen or have happened with groundwater contamination from failed septic systems, say at the Weathervane, prior to Murphy's being there. So, there's a little bit of history there of what's going to happen. Also, they talked about how are you going to remove sewage? Do you have a plan for that? You know, you have to go get a truck and bring it in and pump it out. They didn't have a plan for that. So, it's really nebulous in my mind about what the potential problems would be down the road of not having a good plan to deal with those issues, because they will come up. Mr. MacPherson said and for the abutters, I mean his question is, is justice being done by the abutters? I'm not convinced of that. I think that it is not a good situation for the abutters. Chair Morin said OK, anything else? Mr. Casale said my only concern on the other side is that

maybe we could have been a little clearer on some items, and so do we opt to do a rehearing, which is a little bit safer versus deny the rehearing? Just my thought. Chair Morin said well, we can look at OK so, if we deny it, then they still have another step to go. And I'm not an attorney. I don't know the process out there, but if the Court finds that we messed up, they'll send it back to us anyway. Mr. Green asked does it go to the Court, or does it go to that new Hearing Board? Chair Morin said I thought it went to the Sup, well. Mr. Green said because they set up an alternate because the Courts can tie things up 2-3 years. I thought that's what that. Chair Morin said let's ask Jillian. Ms. Harris said they can appeal the Superior Court, and I believe the Housing Board could decide if they have jurisdiction. Mr. Green said yeah, because I thought the Housing Board was set up because Superior Court, no matter even if the law says hearing within 90 days, it still goes out 2-3 years. Ms. Harris continued it's my understanding that they would make the decision if they have jurisdiction or not. Mr. Green said oh, so they make the jurisdiction on that. OK. Mr. Casale said Jillian, a question concerning the defense of that, if it were to get that far. Does the Town incur any additional cost for that or are our attorneys on a monthly stipend and it really doesn't matter? So, it's, you know, it's somewhat easy to say well, this is the way we're going to do it. And you can take it to Superior Court if you'd like. But I believe that there's a cost incurred if that's done. Ms. Harris said I believe there's an additional cost, yes. Mr. Gilbert said there is. Mr. Casale said OK, thank you. That's all I have to say about that. Chair Morin said yeah, anything else? Anybody? All right. With that said, would someone like throw a motion on the table?

MOTION: Mr. Green moves that the request for rehearing of the denial of a variance to allow a 28-unit market rate elderly housing development to be served by private, on-site septic where municipal sewer is required, be denied per our discussion. Mr. Gilbert duly seconds the motion. Roll call vote was taken - ALL IN FAVOR – vote is 4 to 1. MOTION carries. The rehearing request is denied.

Chair Morin votes yes.

Mr. Gilbert votes yes.

Mr. Green votes yes.

Mr. MacPherson votes yes.

Mr. Casale votes no.

New Business:

Item 3. Michael Franzino – Request for a variance from Article III, Section 275-22.A & Table 1 in order to construct an addition 14.5 feet from the front property line where 35 feet is required at 115 Bedford Center Road, Lot 20-45, Zoned R&A.

Chair Morin said come right up to the desk and introduce yourself and go ahead, sir.

Mr. Mike Franzino testifies: Hi. I'm Mike Franzino. Two years ago, I came here and applied for this, and I was approved. But we didn't move forward with it due to finding the right contractor and supply chain issues. We still plan to go through it. This is 19 pages long. So, I respect you guys' time. So, I'm curious to what level do you want to walk through it? Chair Morin said if you just want to go through the five criteria. If you can just do that. If you want to go through those criteria for us and. Mr. Franzino continued,

Granting the variance would not be contrary to public interest:

Because the house is non-conforming, and we are looking to improve the current property and its value while maintaining the same style. With demolishing a barn section of the house. We pretty much

renovated 2/3 of the house and we got to the last part and it's so crooked and so old that we can't build on it so we're renovating—we're demolishing that part and rebuilding it. We plan to match the same character of the house and the neighborhood. We went in front of Historic District twice. Once for the original approval and then last month just to extend the variance. I missed the cut off on this one, so I have to reapply for this variance. And we hope that our—we don't think there will be any public health implications. And we hope our neighbors would appreciate the renovation.

The spirit of the ordinance is observed because:

We believe the proposed changes will only enhance the property, and the new structure will certainly be safer than existing barn/garage. The height overall for the cupola will be minimal and not diminish any of the neighborhood views. It was a detail added to make the addition seem more like a barn and from the historic community.

Granting the variance would do substantial justice because:

The property was built in 1840s before the zoning ordinance, and it is non-conforming. It would allow us to improve the property, make it safer, and more usable and practical for our family. To comply with the zoning laws, the house would need to be moved back. The house will need to be moved since the 35-foot setback would not align with the current house.

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

We will be demolishing a non-conforming garage in poor condition with a new structurally sound and aesthetically pleasing addition. We intend for this property to increase the value of our home and therefore the surrounding neighbors.

Denial of the Variance Would Result in an Unnecessary Hardship:

The entire house is non-conforming. The new footprint will be fairly similar to the old one. Placing the addition in conformance with the 35-foot setback would create a disjointed addition. They weren't in line with the current house, and it would potentially create setback issues in the rear of the house. We'd like to maintain the yard, garden, and fruit trees as green space for our family to enjoy. The house was built in 1840s before zoning ordinance and is non-conforming, and other sections of the existing structure remain closer to the road than this addition. Complying with the zoning ordinance would require demolishing or moving the entire house and rebuilding elsewhere on the property.

The proposed use is reasonable one because:

Our intention is to improve the property while maintaining the character of the house and the neighborhood using a very similar footprint with a more structurally-sound addition built to code, which will provide much more practical, useful and safe space for our family.

Since the existing house is not conforming, aside from demolishing the entire existing property and building an entirely new home elsewhere on the property we would be unable to renovate the property. Given the current state of the existing garage/barn, we have been advised that a complete demolition and rebuild is our only option for this section of the house. That's it. I think, an important part to look at—let me see if I can zoom in on this for a second. When you're looking at the current house, which is the slash line that goes all around here, now that's what is existing and then that would be knocked down and the part would be to remain and the new proposed section is not as far back, not as far to the left, and it doesn't stick as close—it's not as close to the road as the existing structure. And it's not really that much of a square footage change between what's existing. The numbers are in here somewhere.

Chair Morin said OK, any questions from the board? Mr. Kellerman said just have one question on here. You said that you were proposing to replace the existing driveway with a new one running parallel. Where would that fall on this? Mr. Franzino said so it shows it going down here and it runs by—right now our driver comes, literally you pull onto the house, and you can get one car in on both sides. So new section would go along the side here. And then it would come out somewhere along this side. We've got to work with the town for the curb cut. But we wouldn't have a short driveway so close to the road. Chair Morin asked any other questions? Mr. Gilbert said I wanted to ask you about—you said you were talking with the Historic District. Did they approve it or are you still in the process? Mr. Franzino said yeah, so two years ago they approved it and the Zoning Board approved it. And then I think it was last month or the month before, they approved another two-year extension. But I did a reverse. I should have come here first. So, since the two years was up, I have to apply fresh for the Zoning Board. Or just ask for an extension. Mr. Gilbert said OK. Chair Morin asked any other questions? Mr. MacPherson asked have you heard from the abutters as far as traffic or being so close to your property? Mr. Franzino said so it's the Town Hall behind me and the Stevens Building. And then across the street is a commercial building. And then straight across is wetlands, and behind me is wetlands. I really don't have neighbors per se in that area. And the one neighbor that's one further down as you go towards Harvest Market, as you go down that way, they're aware of this and they never had any issues with it. Our goal actually is to have a longer driveway due to the increase in traffic with all the commercial buildings going in that area. I bought that house about 2004. So, I've lived there for, what, 18 years now? Mr. MacPherson asked so no issues from? Mr. Franzino said no. Of all four meetings, including this one, nobody has complained, or nobody stopped by and said anything. Chair Morin said OK. Anything else? I'll open it up to the public. Is there anyone out there who wants to speak to this application? No one is jumping to a microphone, OK. All right, any last words before we deliberate. Mr. Franzino said no, I think our friend—we appreciate it. Chair Morin said just to remind everybody, so it looks like we've got a full board so our regular members will be voting tonight. Which will be myself, Neil, Len, Dave and our brand-new member Alex, who's a full member. So that will be the voting 5 for this evening. OK, alright so I'll take a motion to go into nonpublic input for deliberation.

MOTION Mr. Casale moves to go into nonpublic input for deliberation. Mr. Green duly seconds the motion. Roll call vote taken – ALL IN FAVOR – unanimous. Motion carries.

Chair Morin continued alright, let's go through the 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:

Board agrees there is no evidence of this. Chair Morin said it's a Commercial area almost now. Mr. Gilbert said yes, he really doesn't have a residential abutter.

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

Consensus of the Board is no evidence. Chair Morin said we're not dealing with the driveway piece, but that will be a lot safer for him trying to get out of there instead of having barely enough room for a car and trying to back up at the same time. Mr. Green added and if he had people over, they could be on the driveway, not out on the street. It could be a safety plus, I think.

2. The spirit of the ordinance is observed because:

Chair Morin said I see it being observed, like he said the existing house by this plan is showing 10 and a half feet away from the road. At least now it's going back further. So, it's giving more of a buffer than what it had. Is it non-conforming? Yes, but they're doing better than where it was. Mr. Casale agrees.

3. Granting the variance would do substantial justice because:

Mr. Gilbert said I think it would. Chair Morin agreed and said it would give him the opportunity to take down an old barn and put up an addition—replace it with something.

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

Chair Morin said it's mostly all commercial or town property around them. I don't think he could do that.

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, as he said, he's kind-of the only commercial property, so it is very distinct when it comes to neighbors. So, it is definitely a unique property.

(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:

Mr. Casale said it's already non-conforming as it is. It's not adding to it. Chair Morin said it might have been conforming back in the day when it was built—when the horse buggy was going by. Mr. Green said well you wanted the horse and buggy near the road. Chair Morin said exactly.

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

Mr. Casale said it is. Chair Morin agreed saying I think it's very reasonable for what he's looking to do.

(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 Zoning Board of Adjustment approve the request for a variance from Article III, Section 275-22.A & Table 1 in order to construct an addition 14.5 feet from the front property line where 35 feet is required at 115 Bedford Center Road, Lot 20-45, Zoned R&A as per our deliberations. Mr. Green duly seconded the motion. Roll call vote taken – all in favor. Motion carried 5-0.

MOTION: Mr. Casale moves the ZBA go back into public input. Mr. Gilbert duly seconds the motion. Roll call vote taken – all in favor. Motion Carried 5-0.

Chair Morin said you're all set, sir. Thank you. Mr. Franzino said thank you guys. I appreciate it. Chair Morin said our next 2 items on the agenda are for Daniel O'Rourke.

Item 4. Daniel O'Rourke - Request for a variance from Article III, Section 275-21.J and Table 2, Table of Uses, to permit a detached accessory dwelling unit where it is not allowed in the GR zone, at 390 Boynton Street, Lot 44-22, Zoned GR.

Item 5. Daniel O'Rourke - Request for a variance from Article III, Section 275-21.J(2) to permit a 1,630 sq. ft. detached accessory dwelling unit where such use is limited to not more than 1,000 square feet at 390 Boynton Street, Lot 44-22, Zoned GR.

Mr. Daniel O'Rourke testifies: Good evening. Daniel O'Rourke, 390 Boynton, St, Bedford. Thank you. So, the property is located—is a one-point acre lot in in a general residential zone. The existing home was constructed in 1932, and the detached structure was constructed in around the 1950s. And it's functioned as a commercial facility since its construction. It's been across from Charlie Boynton Street Market, right next to Table Talk Pies, Playtime Pools, Bedford Pool and Patio, and the Consignment Shop now. It started out as a statuary and a woodworking business. And also, my stained-glass shop, which I started with my Aunt Alice and my grandmother in 1984. So, if it pleases the Board, I'd like to talk about both the two agenda items, both three and four together if that's if that's OK. Chair Morin said that's fine. Mr. O'Rourke said Item 3 is about being detached, and also Item 4 is about being more than 1000 square feet, so those are the two parts that are non-conforming. In the summary that I've given you—presented to the board—I made a slight miscalculation. I put down it's 2,500. The existing home is 2,500 square feet. Therefore, what I did was I looked it up on the Vision Appraisal form and in Vision Appraisal, it says that was the net – 2,502 was my living area, but the gross area was 5,830. So according to the, for a detached building, it says it shall not have a gross floor area greater than 50% of the gross floor area of a single-family dwelling or greater than 1000 square feet, whichever is less. That's for the R&A, which it's not. It's general residential, but just I wanted to use that. I cited that in my agenda Item 4, so I just wanted to correct that. So, what it means is that I've got the 5800—is the gross area. Fifty percent of that is 2,900, so the shop is 1,630. So, the building is 4 times larger than the shop. The primary building is four times as large as the shop. So, it's clear the shop or the place I want to make the accessory dwelling unit is clearly incidental to the main house. So, and according to the Vision Appraisal, it's four times the size of the workshop. So, and I know we can't use that because it's not R&A, but if it was R&A, it would be a calculation that I think it would be OK for it to, though, but it's 1,000 square feet, and that's what we that's what I'm here asking for, is that that be amended. I also have included a lot of photographs. And in my Portfolio, and you could see where the shop is. It's tucked over here on the side, so that's where I want wanted—that building has been there since the 50s, and I wanted to have the accessory dwelling unit right there.

Granting the Variance Would Not Be Contrary to the Public Interest.

Because the neighborhood is zoned general residential. I'd like to switch the use of the building from home operated business to accessory dwelling unit. This would not alter the essential character of the locality and will fit better into the neighborhood.

Granting the Variance Would not Threaten Public Health, Safety or Welfare.

There's a U-shaped driveway with plenty of turn around room, so no cars need to back out on Boynton St. There's ample parking that was used for a stained-glass business. You can see, obviously, right, the U-shaped driveway. That's Boynton Street. That's the Consignment Shop. That's the old Charlie's Boynton

Street Market. So, you have 101 is busy, but I've got plenty of turn around room. Matter of fact, some people use the driveway to turn around in it and there's no issues with that.

The Spirit of the Ordinance Will Be Observed.

Because the exterior footprint has not changed in over 70 years. It has a beautiful space with a front room, and it is wide open with 10 windows. The open concept will make a relaxed and enjoyable living quarters. It's far enough from the main house and is set back from the neighbors with privacy and quiet with 1.2 acres and over 90 feet from the road is within the spirit of the neighborhood.

Granting the Variance Would Do Substantial Justice.

Because it's not been used as a thriving glass shop in a while. It could provide a place for my mother who's 82, my three children, 29, 28, 25, my wife's three children, 36, 33, 32 to live if needed. I also just retired from the Manchester Fire Department with 35 years of service, and I had major heart surgery last October. So, I've had to cut back on my activity so I'm not able to use that building as a stained-glass business anymore. And it's mostly just been used for storage. So that building is going to remain idle, and I've had to heat it and keep the place just as is right now, and this would be a good use for the building. So, I want to be able to take care of my family or such.

Values of Surrounding Properties Would Not be Diminished.

Because I'll be adding value to the property at 390 Boynton St. I'll be doing major renovations to the inside of the building, although the building will appear to remain unchanged from the outside with the exception of a few windows and a door. The inside will get a total makeover including a new septic, which has been approved by the State and the Town. It will appear the same from Boynton St. Or look even less. We used to have five cars parked there when I was married to my first wife. We had three children who were all driving. So, we used to have five cars parked in that driveway. So, you could kind of see the area that the cars could park right in front of my stained-glass shop.

Literal Enforcement of the Provision of the Ordinance Would Result in Unnecessary Hardship.

Because it would then be an unused existing building. The building does have special conditions of property that distinguishes from other properties in the area because it was one of the first houses built on Boynton St. Originally it was part of a larger parcel that was set back from the road of 90 feet. As the buildings crept into the Pines, so that this type, this style of building. This was there before zoning, so you could kind of see that—then that's where the nature of the general residential was. The houses that were built later were more onto the street and were more of ½ acre or less type of configuration. We just sold this last part of the parcel in the rear in 2002 and that's ¾ of an acre and their friend is 1.2 acres.

Denial of the Variance Would Result in an Unnecessary Hardship.

Because it will be a hobby shop that would not be used. It would be a building that would have to be maintained and kept mainly for storage, which is a waste of an existing structure. The general public would better serve the application would be used as accessory dwelling unit. In this housing and rental market, I feel many friends are finding difficult accommodations to live.

The Proposed Use is Reasonable.

The proposed uses as accessory dwelling unit is a reasonable one because the footprint of the building is 1,627 square feet, where 1,000 is allowed. The building has existed at the location for 70 years and probably more foot traffic in the past than is proposed. The building is unattached were attached is required. The building was built before this was considered. There's no connection with the interior

stairway because the building is 18 feet from the garage and 14 feet from the heated room, which makes a 33-foot quarter impractical. So, you can kind of see the space that's right here. I have the photographs. Later on, we can flip through it, but there there's a garage right there and there's the space. And this right over here will be where the leach field is. I have a design for that leach field, and the leach field is going to go right there. So, I'm going to need some room to get it. That's where the septic truck is going to have to go through to empty out the septic system that's going to be there. Jillian, do I click on this? Or do you click on that? Ms. Harris said you can, or I can. Mr. O'Rourke said All right. And I do right down there. OK.

So, this is a picture of my shop that was taken. This is actually in the Town Hall in Bedford. So, this is the stained-glass shop. This is how it looks right now with the fence right there and the chimney and a pickup truck in 1988. So, someone came over and wanted to, it cost \$300 to be in a picture. I used to have a permit for my sign. The sign used to be out on the street, and that's how it looks. And I want it to look the same way that it does right there. So, this is a picture in the 50s of that's the shop over here and that's my Aunt Alice and Uncle Joe's house. That's the garage that's still there, and this, kind of interesting, Route 101 in Bedford. So, this was before 114/101 cut through. So, I guess 101 went right down--that's why Boynton Street is so wide. Route 101 went right down Boynton St., probably across where Sully's was over the Queen City Bridge up Candia Road. And that's how you went to the beach. Before my time.

And this is, which I have with me, I do have my Uncle Joe's Ledger and stuff. He was French Canadian, so some of these are in French. I have his Ledger and stuff I've included in the packet on there so. And that's when he sold statuary from Donati. And that's some of his statuary that he would sell in the front yard. And this is when I, as a matter of fact, I went to the Planning Board, and I got permission from the town and there was someone from the Union Leader in the audience and they came over and they took a picture, and they wrote an article with me and my Aunt Alice. And that's me 22 years old or something like that, in in my workshop.

So right now, I have two electric bills. I have one that's Galway Glass and I have one that's the house, and I haven't figured out what I'm going to do because I have my pool filter hooked up to the electric on the shop so whoever is there, I'm going to have to have this Galway Glass. I'm going to have to have electric included, so whatever. If it's one of my kids, I'll have to figure it out. But that just shows that I have two poles actually. One line to the shop, and one line comes into the house. It's funny you were just talking about septic approval. Tim Hersey came over. He's a great guy. I'd went through Sarette Septic, and it cost me \$1,400 to get this septic design drawn up. It's been approved by the Town of Bedford and approved by the State. I know what it costs. If I get approved, then it's going to cost me \$14,000 to get it done. So that's going to be the cost. But I know right there that's going to be a cost that I'm going to incur for having this stained-glass shop ahh having an accessory dwelling unit. You know what I mean? So, if someone tells you they don't know what it's going to cost, I think that's a little sketchy. I know what it's going to cost me right away, and that's part of my type of thing. I know what kind of refrigerator I'm going to get. I know what kind of stove I'm going to get. You know what I'm saying? If I'm gonna have granite countertops or going to have Formica, you know what I'm saying? Anyway, I think you guys know too. So, anyway, so that's my plan of the ... and this is the stuff that the conceptual drawings.

That's the front of my shop, and I kind of like it to stay the same just because that's a glass window right there. It's an 8-foot slider, and it's just it's beautiful. It lets in a lot of light, and it was great for showing off stained glass. And you can see that from the other thing. And that's going to be a new layout, which

is still to be determined. And that's kind of a conceptual drawing of the new layout. The only thing I didn't like about it because the refrigerator is going right here in front of the chimney. Right now, I've got a wood stove and a gas back up in there like a gas heater and I don't like blocking out that chimney in case I don't know what's going to happen with gas and oil situation. So, I might have to do some kind of solid fuels in there, and I don't know, so putting a refrigerator in front of a chimney, it might not be a great idea and you put the cabinet in front of it and always take the cabinet down. You don't know what's going to happen 20 years from now with fuel, so anyway. So, and that's different side views of the of the shop. Chair Morin said we do have all the pictures of this. Mr. O'Rourke said oh you do? Chair Morin said it's part of our packet. Mr. O'Rourke said OK, do you want you have any—I mean, so there's another picture of the front of the building, and that's why making a corridor from that, that unheated. It just wouldn't be practical sense to make a, although I don't think I'm allowed to have a detached corridor anyway in general, residential. And to make it more conforming, maybe I could put green shutters on the front of it to make it more—some vinyl green shutters? That's what my house has is the same white vinyl shutters, white vinyl shutters that the house has. And that's the flooring which I'd like to keep. And that's the front room. You know they talk about living area with the front room, I mean that front room—I could use the rest of the shop as storage and just make that front room an accessory dwelling unit. And to do that I would have to chop up that front room and make bedrooms out of it. And I would lose the character of that whole building by doing it, and just and keep like storage in the back of it. This way I've got a picture which I didn't put in there like that. But you know, this is kind of like the type of kitchen that I want to put on the one side of it. So, you're going to be able to have the kitchen and you can look out and put a TV over there in the corner and look out into the window there. So, when the packet of, like I said, include the photos of conceptual drawing, accepted plans, memorabilia and to give the board a little better insight on the property.

I appreciate your time and your variable consideration in this matter, and I hope that I've done an adequate job presenting this in front of you. Thank you. Chair Morin said thank you. Any questions from the board? Mr. Green said I just like seeing the old pictures. The article with your great aunt, and for many years my father represented Denardi and Sons as their attorney. So, seeing one of the old bills brought back a lot of memories.

Mr. Casale said sir, it's kind of up in the air whether this accessory unit would be used for family members. You had mention friends. If you don't do that, will you rent it? Because you did make mention of rental market. I don't know if that was to emphasize that there's nowhere for your family and friends to go, which I debate. But or if you meant that you would use this as a rental unit. Mr. O'Rourke said yeah, I could. I could use it as a rental unit. So, absolutely. I've got 4 bedrooms in the house. We're only using one right now. The kids could always move into their bedroom, you know, and not move into the shop over there. Thing is after taking a second mortgage out to finance this, and I wanted to see how far I'm going to be able to go if I need a second revenue stream or not. So, that's the kind of thing right now that I'm trying to figure out with that. Mr. Casale said OK. And you'll agree. If you have 1,000 square foot accessory unit, it's going to be harder to rent a space like that than it is a 1,650. Mr. O'Rourke said yeah, but I don't know what I would do with the back part of the shop. Would I just screw the doors closed and not make that... you know what I mean? The storage unit that's the only thing about it. It's like it's all part of that building, you know. Mr. Casale asked and why are you heating it right now if it's only being used for storage? You stated you're heating it. Mr. O'Rourke said one part I'm heating. The front part is heated. Those back rooms are not being heated. Mr. Casale asked right, why are you heating the front part? Mr. O'Rourke said because I have water in there, I've got a septic system that's been in there since the 80s. It still works, but it's not good enough to... It's not up to code right now. It's pre-2009. Mr. Casale said OK. Right. You just can't shut the water off and drain the pipes? Mr. O'Rourke

said I've tried that, and I've broken all the diverters in the sink and the toilet. Mr. Casale said OK. Alright, thank you.

Chair Morin said I can see the use. But it's well over the size of what the town lets happen. That's the problem. There are ways to block it or redo the inside where it doesn't change the outside appearance or anything like that. I just have a problem with the size. That's my biggest thing. You know we try to help property owners, as much as we can. But the town did come up with ordinances for a certain reason. And they've increased the size of accessory apartments. It used to be smaller. Now it's up to 1,000, but to go 50% more. I have a hard time with. Personally, that's my thought anyway. I don't have any questions for you, I just want to let you know where I was coming from. Any further questions from the Board?

Let me open it up to the public. Public, any questions? No. Nothing from the public. OK, anything else? Mr. O'Rourke said I've talked to my neighbors. Of the 10 neighbors that I've have, I've talked with six out of the 10. And for the other four neighbors, some of them, I think, are rental properties, so they're not available. They're not available to talk with, but I have no problems with any of the six out of the 10 neighbors that I've had, and those are the ones that live all in the back. Chair Morin said and if there would have been a problem with them, they'd be sitting here now. Mr. O'Rourke said you know, when the letter came out—the certified letter came out—I went around that Saturday. It came out on a Friday. I went around that Saturday to make sure that they got it and that they understood what it was about. And I explained it to them.

Chair Morin said alright. No further questions? No last statements before we go into deliberation? Mr. O'Rourke said thank you.

MOTION by was made by Mr. Green to go into non-public input for deliberation. Mr. Gilbert duly seconded the motion. Roll call vote was taken – ALL IN FAVOR - unanimous. Motion carries.

Chair Morin continued alright. Let's go through the criteria. We will take these separately. So, our first is for the detached accessory dwelling to be in the GR zone. That's what we're dealing with first.

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 I don't think it's going to change that at all. Board agrees.

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

Chair Morin said again, there's nothing there.

2. The spirit of the ordinance is observed because:

Well, the spirit—they are allowed detached now. There was a new thing that happened last year. Mr. Gilbert said this year, March. Chair Morin said oh, was it this year? I can't keep up with it. Felt like last year. Mr. Gilbert said yeah, well, it's been a while. Chair Morin said so, it is out there. It's supposed to be the Planning Board, but due to the fact of the zoning of where it's at, that's why it's here. Where it is—I don't have an issue with the spirit of the ordinance—because of the location and what's around it and that type of thing. I don't think it's going to change anything. If it would have

been a new building, that would have been different. Ms. Thomas said different story. Mr. Gilbert said whole different story. Chair Morin asked any other comments on that? Mr. Kellermann said I think it's also a larger lot than you may typically see in the GR zone. Chair Morin said right. Well, especially in the Pines area. That's a huge lot compared to—and we've had a lot of people come in for those lots just to do little things and it's everything nonconforming almost there.

3. Granting the variance would do substantial justice because:

Board agrees it would give him the opportunity to use the building.

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

Board agrees there's no evidence of this.

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 he did bring up the point of and looking at the map, it is definitely a different sized property compared to the other residential properties in the area. There are businesses, but the businesses are bigger, but the residences in that surrounding area look a lot smaller than his. Mr. Green said less frontage. Chair Morin said yeah, less everything.

(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:

Mr. Casale said like you said, it's already there. It's not like it's a new building. Chair Morin said right.

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

Board agrees this 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: Mr. Casale moves that the Zoning Board grant the request for a variance from Article III, Section 275-21.J and Table 2, Table of Uses, to permit a detached accessory dwelling unit where it is not allowed in the GR zone, at 390 Boynton Street, Lot 44-22, Zoned GR, as per our deliberations. Mr. Gilbert duly seconded the motion. Roll call vote taken – ALL IN FAVOR - unanimous. Motion carries 5-0. The variance is approved.

Chair Morin said so we'll go on to the next item which is for the size of the dwelling to be 1,630 square feet where it's not to be more than 1,000.

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, I don't think that piece will change. It's the same. Board agrees.

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

Board agrees no.

2. The spirit of the ordinance is observed because:

Chair Morin said that's where I have the issue. Mr. Gilbert said to me, it comes down to the building has been there for 70 years. So, it's kind of grandfathered in my mind. But, again, you're talking 1,600 versus 1,000 square feet. What takes precedent? Grandfathered? Or ... Chair Morin said the building is a business. That's what it was been approved for in those types of things. Now it's a whole different use. Mr. Gilbert said right. You can't really say tear down 600 square feet. You can't say that. Do we put a restriction on it? I don't know the answer to that question. Mr. Casale said that's the hard part. Chair Morin said my thinking, anyway, it's not a tear down, it's just a wall to where the square footage meets the requirement. Then what they utilize the rest of the building for is up to the owner. Mr. Casale asked is that correct? It's been thrown out there, but I don't know that that's totally correct. I thought that it would have to be cut down. Ms. Harris said it's an option. There's no requirement that it would need to be cut down. You need to make a decision if you're going to let them use the full 1,600 square feet. Mr. Gilbert stated for a residence—residential use. Ms. Harris clarified for the accessory dwelling unit. Mr. Gilbert said I'm just speculating; you could say you've got your 1,000 square feet for residential and then the other can't be used for that. You can use it for something else. Chair Morin said right. They could put a wall up and make a storage. Mr. Gilbert said make it a garage. Whatever. But not housing. Chair Morin said that's my thought. Mr. Kellermann said I'm also concerned with the size of it. But, again, the building is there already. I'm not sure if putting a wall up there if there would be an issue with needing to have another access point. If that would block that back access point. Mr. Green said it seems in these lots, we're always granting variances because they're so tiny. This is the converse. The building is there. He wants to expand it because it's so large, it just seems almost counter intuitive to what we normally do in this area.

3. Granting the variance would do substantial justice because:

Mr. Casale said I disagree with this. The use of it for family members and he even mentioned friends as potential. Chair Morin said the thing is, it doesn't really matter who it's for. Once it's an accessory, it can be anybody. Mr. Casale said right, but his reasoning, when you're using that as a reason, then that's the only reason we have. So, whether it's this or the hardship, what is the hardship? What is the substantial justice? So, when you're balancing the needs of the Town versus his needs, where are we at. So, his needs are potential. He's already stated that, yeah if I don't use it, I'm going to rent it out. So, now, as far as I'm concerned, the scale is going the other way. So, yes, it can be used for anything, but when you're using that as an argument—if he came in here and said to you, I just want to rent this out. Would you not place that at a lower level than if we knew that grandma needed a place to live? Because we've had people come in that have said, I need this for my grandmother. She's handicapped. I take care of her, etc. Whole different story when you're using it for rental property. Because now it's, well do you use it for the rental property, or do we protect what's stated in the ordinance? Chair Morin said well, the interesting part with that is we've never dealt with detached before. We've had a few that have come in, and I think the Board, at whatever time it was,

said no. Normally we deal with attached, which is part of the house that has to have direct access to the house. So, it's a little different when it comes to that type of situation. It's hard. It's one of those hard situations. Mr. Gilbert asked so what's your determination? I think it provides substantial justice if we follow the rules of the square footage. Mr. Casale said right, but he's asking for more. Mr. Gilbert said I understand. That's up to us to decide what we would allow. Mr. Casale said if he's acceptable to that ahead of a vote. Mr. Gilbert said correct, could be. It provides substantial justice, maybe, right? Chair Morin said you've got to remember; we've already approved the building to be an accessory dwelling. Ms. Thomas said the dwelling is approved. Now, it's just - will we let him have it be bigger than 1,000 feet. Chair Morin said the only piece that we're dealing with is the size. Mr. Gilbert said square footage. Mr. Casale said but it is separate, though. Even though we have. We get to the hardship; I'm going to say what's the hardship? Because I struggle with this. I had no problem with the first one. I do have a problem with this. And you had mentioned it too. I have a problem with the size, as do I, because what's the hardship. There is no hardship. Nobody really needs it. He may have it for the future for rental. Then, again, you're balancing. What's the needs of the Town, and why this ordinance was proposed versus well he can make some extra cash. Sixteen hundred square feet is a second home as far as I'm concerned. That's not a small house. Having lived in a 1,600 square foot. Mr. Gilbert said 1,000 square feet is... Mr. Casale said yeah. I've been in a 1,700 square foot home in Merrimack. It was a big house. That's a big house. So, really, you're looking at a second house on this property.

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

Board agrees there's no evidence of this.

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 asked is it different from other properties in the area? Yes. But we're looking at the square footage of this building, though. Mr. Green said there's commercial that's bigger. But this is more residential. And most of the lots for residential are much smaller. Chair Morin said right. Mr. Green said it's a conundrum.

(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 that's the hard piece. The scales of justice. Mr. Casale said right. So, I guess I'll just repeat again. I don't see the hardship here. These are wants, not needs. If you refer to the planning notes, on Page 2, it states "the applicant acknowledges that he could limit the size of the detached ADU." Which he can. Again, this isn't a need. So, therefore, how do you prove a hardship? Balancing the needs of why the ordinance was put into place, versus yeah, I want a bigger place just in case. I could rent it and make some good cash.

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

Chair Morin said it is the size of the existing building, but it's still over 50 percent bigger than what's allowed. That's the hard piece.

(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).

Mr. Gilbert said let me just ask a question to double check. The existing square footage of a detached unit is no more than 1,000 square feet for residential? Ms. Harris replied correct. Mr. Gilbert said thank you.

MOTION: Chair Morin moves that the Zoning Board deny the request for a variance from Article III, Section 275-21.J(2) to permit a 1,630 sq. ft. detached accessory dwelling unit where such use is limited to not more than 1,000 square feet at 390 Boynton Street, Lot 44-22, Zoned GR, per our deliberations. Mr. Casale duly seconds the motion.

Mr. Green asked should he be asked if he'd be willing to reduce it from 1,600 to 1,000? Because that would then comply. Chair Morin said well then, we wouldn't need the variance. Mr. Green said that's true.

Roll call vote taken – ALL IN FAVOR – unanimous. The variance is denied.

MOTION: Mr. Casale moves the Zoning Board of Adjustment go back into public input. Mr. Gilbert duly seconds the motion. Roll call vote was taken – ALL IN FAVOR. Motion carries.

Chair Morin said sir, your first is approved. Your second was denied. Mr. O'Rourke said okay. Thank you.

Item 6 and Item 7. 209 Route 101, LLC and Millennium Running – have been postponed to the July 16, 2022, meeting at the request of the applicant.

Item 8. 276 Route 101A, LLC – Request for a variance from Article III, Section 275-21, Table 2, Table of Uses, to allow 8,000 sq. ft. within an existing warehouse building to be converted to a light manufacturing use at 276 Route 101, Map 27, Lot 29, Zoned Commercial.

Chair Morin said please introduce yourself and go ahead, sir.

Mr. George Chadwick testifies: Sure, my name is George Chadwick. I'm with Better Design Consultants. Also with me tonight is Gino Bernard. He's in the audience. He's the owner of the property. Tonight, we're requesting a variance from Article III, Section 275-21 Table 2. And that's to allow 8,000 square feet of an existing 17,780 square foot building to be converted to light manufacturing, maintaining 9,780 square feet as warehouse space. The parcel is 5 acres in size. As you can see in the aerial photo, it has a great deal of frontage along Route 101 but is very narrow in depth. The parcel is zoned commercial. The existing building was built in 1962 and was the former home of Grenon Trading. Grenon Trading basically was a wholesale retail florist company. The building has been vacant since 19, excuse me, 2016. I believe it is 2016. The 8,000 square feet that is to be converted to light manufacturing is intended to be used by Global Safety. A company that retrofits vehicles to be used by law enforcement and security companies. In your packet, there's actually photos of Global Safety and our client's building down in Hudson. They will be relocated to this location. So, I guess I'll go through the criteria.

Granting the Variance Would not be Contrary to Public Interest.

The interior fit up of the building would not alter the character of the neighborhood, and the additional garage doors on the North End of the structure will not affect the abutter the view of the building. The change in use will not threaten the public health, safety, or welfare. The main benefit to the community will allow the vacant structure, since 2016, to be utilized by a business that will not add a large amount of traffic to Route 101, where a true commercial use would. A much larger use would generate much, much more traffic.

The Spirit of the Ordinance is Observed.

Because the purpose of the ordinance is to group like uses and areas of the town with roadway infrastructure and utility services to accommodate that use. So, in this instance, the site is adequate in size. And the use is on septic and well, thus not overloading municipal services. The only site change is interior to the structure and there will be no increase in stormwater to the adjacent parcels. The light manufacturing use is a light traffic generator, thus not affecting traffic on Route 101 as much as a more intense commercial use would. The project will not create excessive demand on municipal services such as fire, police, and schools.

Granting the Variance Would Do Substantial Justice.

It will allow a vacant building since 2016 to be used as intended. There would be a greater benefit to the owner, which cannot be outweighed by the loss to the public.

Values of Surrounding Properties Would Not be Diminished.

The use change from a wholesale retail florist to light manufacturing, being Global Safety, will generate less traffic and safety concerns on Route 101. There will be no major exterior changes to this site that will affect the abutters' line of sight or view. By allowing the structure to be used, it will prevent loitering and theft on the property. Fairly recently, the property has been broken into and they stole all the copper out of the structure.

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. One, the structure is vacant. The long and narrow parcel prevents large commercial uses to be constructed. And the high traffic volume on Route 101 creates a higher safety issue for a more intense commercial type of use.

Denial of the Variance Would Result in an Unnecessary Hardship. No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purpose of the ordinance provisions and the specific application of that provision to the property because:

The purpose of the commercial zone is to provide a rationally planned location for uses that need vehicular access and public utilities and services. The size and shape of the parcel prevents a large commercial type use to be constructed that can financially afford traffic mitigations to the site and provide a safe left turn from Route 101 for the higher traffic generated. Plus, the light manufacturing use is a good alternative that would not affect the health, safety and welfare of the area.

The Proposed Use is a Reasonable One.

The light manufacturing use meets the dimensional regulations and is a great use as an alternative to the commercial parcel with. Let me start again. I apologize. Light manufacturing use meets the dimensional regulations and is a great use for a commercial parcel with shape, non-ability of municipal services, and traffic issues. So, to summarize, on the aerial photo that you have in front of you, the existing structure is located in the southern portion of the site. It exists with its parking, septic system,

and well. With this use change, there will be no need for any exterior improvements to the parcel. And we know we do have to go to the Planning Board if we make it past the Zoning Board. With that, I guess I'm here to answer any questions Board may have.

Chair Morin said before I have a question for you, I have one for Jillian. I'm looking through the ordinance and I can't find--what's the definition for light manufacturing. Ms. Harris said let me pull that out for you. Mr. Casale said I was going to ask, why are you defining it as light manufacturing? What are you exactly doing in there that causes that to trigger? Mr. Chadwick replied, sure, let me explain that. The reason we're defining it as light manufacturing because Becky had defined it that way and told us we have to come to the Zoning Board. What are we doing? Global Technologies is a company that takes vehicles and retrofits them for public safety vehicles—public and private safety vehicles. They take the vehicle in. They install the gun rack. They install the lights on the top. They install the computer keyboard tray that the computer goes on. Things of that sort. Put decals on the vehicles. So, Becky thought that was sort of a light manufacturing versus a heavy manufacturing where you'd actually make things. Chair Morin said and the only reason I asked the question is because when we grant a variance now whatever we grant it to... so say that company decides not to move there. But it's granted light manufacturing. Well, without knowing what that definition is, makes it a little interesting. Ms. Harris said so, it is not defined in our ordinance, and we would therefore look to the dictionary as another source. Merriam Webster defines light industrial as the production of small goods that will be sold to the people who use them rather than another manufacturer. Chair Morin said OK. Mr. Gilbert said it's a solid interpretation because you're actually retrofitting a vehicle, right, basically? Mr. Chadwick said right. Yeah, it definitely isn't a heavy manufacturing where you'd be producing goods. Two other companies that may be put together for public consumption or public use. Mr. Gilbert asked just to be particularly safe and secure on this. So, basically, it looks like you're going to be receiving parts from other vendors and then just retrofitting vehicles with them. You're not doing any manufacturing at all. Mr. Chadwick said that is correct. Mr. Gilbert said OK. Good, thank you.

Mr. Kellermann asked are you testing the vehicles, the alarms, the sirens, those types of things? Mr. Chadwick said I'm going to have to ask my client that question. Chair Morin requested the property owner move up to the microphone or come right up and sit down to speak.

Mr. Gino Bernard testifies: Yes, they do. They test the flash, and they test the stuff that they're installing on the car, but that's more like 10 seconds. When they work, they shut it off and they move on. Mr. Casale asked and that's during business hours. Normal business hours. Mr. Bernard said yes. Chair Morin said that would be a Planning Board issue to deal with anyway. Mr. Casale said yes, but that to me ameliorates his concern, which is about neighbors. Chair Morin said right. Mr. MacPherson asked are there neighbors there other than? Mr. Casale said well across the street, but there's a lot of trees. Chair Morin said there's just a lot of trees and hill and. Mr. Bernard said yeah, that's full of trees and stuff.

Mr. Casale asked why are you moving from Hudson? Mr. Bernard said because I need the building in Hudson for my own business. Mr. Casale said OK. Mr. Bernard said I'm in five buildings right now. Mr. Casale said OK, and nobody from Global is here? The gentlemen that walked in is not from Global? [public] said no, I'm the neighbor. Mr. Casale said oh, OK, alright. So as far as you know, this was not initiated by Global because they are growing? And there's a reason why I'm asking that. Mr. Bernard said no, actually they have more space over there. Mr. Casale said oh, they do. OK, all right, thank you. Storage of vehicles—so I'm quasi familiar with this kind of business. There aren't many of them. There's one in Marlboro. There's one in Plymouth, and then there's some smaller ones. But the locations

Marlboro, Plymouth--there's really nothing up here, so they could generate a lot of business. Where are the cruisers and these vehicles being stored because they're dropped off and they're left there? Mr. Bernard said yes, they come with new car, that's all new cars, usually. They drop like 5-6. They put them inside the building. They do their thing, and they ship them out. Mr. Casale said OK, what about when departments come to them. Because I've seen this happen, and I'm talking about Massachusetts, and these are larger facilities. But again, you're probably the only game in Town here, and it would be right in Bedford, NH. I think it's going to generate more business than maybe they think. And where are those cars going? It's not just going to be four or five cruisers in there.

Again, departments are going to do what's convenient for them, which is I'm going to dump it off. And however long they need, it's like an auto body shop or an auto repair. Sometimes you drop them off, particularly auto body. It's going to be there for a bit until these are retrofitted and then picked up at their convenience. So, where's the excess storage of these vehicles going?

Mr. Bernard replied well, I don't need any parking from the other side. The parking is big there like you could fit I don't know how many cars, but a lot. Mr. Casale said OK. Mr. Chadwick said yeah, let me answer that. So, I would assume that any vehicles that need to be stored will be stored in the existing parking lot that's there. The use for the project, the light manufacturing use, and the remaining warehouse use requires 12 parking spaces to meet code. Out there today there are 43. So, I think there's plenty of room out there to store whatever vehicles that would happen to be dropped off. Mr. Casale said OK, it's not necessarily that. For 10 years but then you end up because some cars are like in accidents, and they are farmed out. They're taken care of by this business that retrofits and then the car goes to an auto body. So, they're taking care of everything. My concern is not necessarily you don't have the space, but it becomes a wasteland of police cruisers. My question about Hudson is, do they have cars outside now? If I were to go there right now are there cruisers parked outside? Mr. Bernard said yeah, they're probably 2 or 3 right now. Mr. Casale asked That's it? Mr. Bernard replied, yes. Mr. Casale said OK, alright, thank you. Chair Morin said and just going off of what Neil was saying, they only set up new cars? Mr. Bernard said usually it's all new car, yes. Chair Morin asked but does the equipment is all the equipment that they put on it, new cars? Or are there times that old cars are brought in, they take the equipment off and reutilize that equipment. Mr. Bernard said no, I haven't seen that. I mean, it's not my business, but every time I see there's a truck unloading like two or three car or the dealer around like in Hudson, McMulken goes and drops a new car there with a temporary plate. Brand new. Chair Morin said and the only reason I'm asking that is because we have to look at public health, safety and welfare. So, depending if there's an old vehicle sitting around or whatever spilling or whatever is going on. We just have to look at those things. That's why we asked some of these questions. Any other questions from the Board?

Mr. MacPherson asked How many employees will be there? Mr. Bernard said I think right now they have 7 or 8 employees. Mr. MacPherson asked do you expect more in the future? Mr. Bernard replied no, they have over there in my other building in Hudson 16,000 square feet. They are going into 7,500 square feet, so they are not planning on growing more. Mr. MacPherson replied they're only going to have seven or eight employees? Mr. Bernard say yes.

Chair Morin asked anything else? Let me open it up to the public. Is there anyone from the public that would like to speak, sir? You came in after we got started, right? I just need to swear you in. If you just raise your right hand. I have to swear you in. Do you swear that the testimony you're going to give in this hearing is the truth, the whole truth nothing but the truth? Go ahead, sir. Just state your name and address.

Mr. Dicky Desai testifies: My name is Dicky Desai. I'm the owner of Hillbrook Motel. We've been there almost—I think this is our 27th year at the place. I'm the longest serving owner of the property and I'm proud to be in Bedford serving the community of Bedford for 27 years, and my previous ownership was about 24 years. So, there's only two major ownerships. I just got the notice last week. Didn't have time to meet the people who are, or we would have had some conversation to find out more information. But I do come from manufacturing. I spent 12 years of my life making car parts as a tier 1 supplier for working for Freudenberg-NOK here in Manchester. If you open the hood of Saturn, that's my design on the valve cover. Just so you know I have an in-depth knowledge. I'm happy what's been proposed as a conversion, what I call a glorified garage. It's not a light manufacturing or a light industrial. There is a difference between industrial manufacturing. I think we're using this gray area that is not well defined. The definition was read from Webster Dictionary, was related to industrial, not manufacturing. I think this is an auto body shop in a very simple term. If town of Bedford wants an auto body shop on 101, then I have no problem with that whatsoever. My only concerns are few. One is being an industrial light or heavy, they're going to have parts supplied in big trucks turning into the spot and all hours of the day. It's a problem on 101. I'm also an innkeeper, so I actually live on the property. So, I'm the only person who sees that traffic goes up and down 24/7. This last winter I had to call Bedford Police at least two times that I remember that trucks can't make up the 101 going westbound because of the icy condition and backed out the traffic all the way past Wallace. And it was such a dangerous situation that people were running off the road and coming into my property—at least three. One UPS truck almost flipped because they could not stop. So that is one concern. I think town can figure it out and safety department. Another thing is noise when they are loading and unloading. I'm a motel. I've been there for over 55 years serving this community. My guests, when they are sleeping, even today, next door in a veterinarian clinic, 4:00 o'clock in the morning the waste disposal truck comes and drops such a big noise that I started getting calls to the front desk saying if the building fell apart, or is that an earthquake, is that big noise.

So, being in manufacturing, I don't know how if town can put some kind of restriction as to when they deliver the parts rather than six in the morning at 10 at night or 7 in the evening when the traffic is at peak up and down 101? Chair Morin said I can explain a little bit for you. Our job is to decide if they get the opportunity to use the building. Then what will happen is it's going to go to the Planning Board. They get into the nuts and bolts of hours, the look of the place, how it's set up, how it works. That's where all those specific items are done. Mr. Desai said yes, alright, so as I don't have a big experience in this, I just wrote down some quick notes. And you can just ignore it if you think that doesn't pertain to you. Chair Morin said we never ignore it. Mr. Desai said I mean move forward if I need to bring it and thank you for that. My concern is loading, unloading all those kind of noisy traffic at odd hours of the day, noise level, light manufacturing. Are they going to have presses to press those metal body parts or something that I don't know what equipment? So, I think what we need to know is what equipment is being used and what level of decibel noise they're going to generate, because that's another concern for me and my property. Because if my guest starts complaining about the noise, I might shut the door and move out of the area or close the business.

Waste disposal is another thing, because this kind of thing do generate some waste that is not conducive to the water, being a well that I survive on. There is no city water. If my well is contaminated for oil or leftover vehicle or anything that comes out of that vehicle as a garage, then we have a problem because Bedford, as we all know, has a very limited water quality left as the time passed. Sirens—I think that's another noise level that I'm also very concerned about. Because if they have sirens, if they can show that they can mitigate that noise by putting some kind of a noise insulation equipment over it that

doesn't generate that noise emanating at all hours a day, because we're not going to be able to control how many times on what time of the day they test their equipment. I think they probably need some freedom to do the work that they're doing.

One of the things that also concerned me that I think Chairman brought it up is the expansion. They are going from 8,000 to 18,000 or 18,000 to 75,000 square feet? That means they are running out of space and they're going to expand. Is that the reason? I don't know. Board says actually, it's the opposite. Mr. Desai continued oh it's the opposite? So here, if we are giving permission for 8,000, building is almost 18,000 or something. What is to say is that a stipulation that they're not going to now go from 8,000 to 18,000 and become an industrial place. So, I do like the idea that is not a retail space, so 500 cars in and out. I think the owner has a right to use the place the best they know how and pay their expenses. As a neighbor—and I want to be a good neighbor of them—my concerns noise, contamination and traffic. That's all. Chair Morin said thank you. Mr. Desai replied thank you. Chair Morin said appreciate it. Alright, any other questions from the Board?

Mr. Kellermann said I just have a question for Jillian. If we were to grant this variance for the 8,000 square feet, that it would be limited to the 8,000 square feet for the light manufacturing, and they would have to come back to expand it to the 17,000? Ms. Harris said correct. Chair Morin asked any other questions from the Board? Any last items from yourself before we deliberate? Mr. Chadwick said no, I think I'm all set I mean I did hear the abutter's concerns, and I'm sure we'll address all those at the Planning Board level. There is, between the existing parking lot and his business, approximately 1,000 feet or so of woodlands and trees. You can see it on the aerial photo. So, as far as noise, we work during normal business hours. So, any noise generated would be during normal business hours. We will work with the Planning Board if they want to limit the hours of operation and when parts can be dropped off. I truly believe this is a use that takes parts that are made somewhere else, and we assemble them. That there is no auto body type of work. We're not fixing cars. We're not mechanically changing cars at all. It's truly taking parts, very simple parts, and assembling them to the vehicle. With that, I'm here to answer any other questions you may have.

Mr. Green asked when you say normal business hours, what does that mean? Mr. MacPherson said that was my question. Mr. Green continued, is it 7 to 7? Nine to 5? Mr. Chadwick replied, it's 8 to 5. Chair Morin said but, again, that's not our purview. Mr. Green said no, but when they use that term, I like to know what they're talking about. Chair Morin said alright, with that, why don't we go into deliberation?

MOTION Mr. Gilbert moves to go into nonpublic input for deliberation. Mr. Kellermann duly seconds the motion. Roll call vote taken – ALL IN FAVOR – unanimous. Motion carries.

Chair Morin continued alright.

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 I don't think it's changing anything. Might just put a few doors on the end of the building, but it's still going to be the same. Mr. Green added that was the wholesale flower? Chair Morin replied wholesale, right—so it was mostly a warehouse with some sales. Mr. Green added traffic coming in and out. Chair Morin said right.

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

Mr. Gilbert said I don't think so. Mr. Green said the only thing is what the abutter brought up. Would it affect his water, his septic and his water supply? So that's health safety. Ms. Thomas said well, that would be if he's dealing with oil and changing oil and all that stuff, but just a car pulling in and putting equipment on it. I don't see. Mr. Kellermann said yeah, right, and for public health, the I think the deliveries, from the sounds of it, it doesn't appear like they're heavy in volume. It seems like it's a. Mr. Gilbert said right, this is as they said, it's light manufacturing and you're putting things on a car. They can't be that big. They can't be bigger than a car. So, you're not going to have gigantic 18-wheeler trucks there, I would think. I could be wrong. Ms. Thomas said well, they have to get the cars there that's the only thing. Mr. Gilbert continued, they have to get the cars there and 8,000 square feet goes pretty quick when you got cars in there and stuff to put on them.

Mr. Casale said yeah, let me clarify though, because you would because what's been said about new cars. It's not just new cars. It's departments dropping off vehicles that also need to be fixed. Mr. Gilbert said but they're not going to fix them there. Mr. Casale said they are going to. They're not going to touch the engine, but they are going to do things. Mr. Gilbert asked like replace a door or something? Mr. Casale said no, so, if they have equipment, they put in equipment. Sometimes that equipment fails. So, they're wiring up sirens, lights—all that stuff fails sometimes. And so, departments are bringing back cars all the time to have them fixed. Whether under warranty or what have you. So, it's not just new cars that are going in. So, there's more traffic than what it sounds. Mr. Gilbert said OK, but it's not giant volume like you're not bringing a giant generator in there or something. You're gonna bring something to put on the car. Can't be bigger than a car. Mr. Casale said yes, agree. Mr. Gilbert said but yeah, you're right. I agree with you. It could be a used or a renovated car versus a brand new one. Mr. Casale said right.

Mr. Green asked if they're doing this for police vehicles, would they be replacing, say, door frames with bulletproof door panels as opposed to regular? Mr. Casale said that can be part of it. Mr. Green continued, and that could be quite heavy. Mr. Casale said I don't think it's big business, not around here—New York City it would be. But it's possible. The majority of it is you're fixing a push bar to the front. You're throwing lights on. You're throwing a siren on. My big concern that was brought up by Alex, you know, the siren. There's no way you can mitigate that. You can't blast it inside of the building because it's just too loud. OSHA would have a big problem with that. It has to be done outside, and they do have to test them. So, you'll wire it. You test it. Or you're bringing in a car that's already been in there and you're testing it. So that's done outside. There's no way you can mitigate that. So, if you're a neighbor, you are going to hear that rue, rue, rue—not for long periods of time. They're going to turn it on to make sure it works, but that's a potential issue. I don't think it's a big issue, but I don't live there. Mr. Green said but that's a Planning Board issue rather than our issue? Chair Morin said I think the Planning Board regulates that stuff a lot more than we do as in noise and like Planning Board gets into dumpster hours and stuff like that. If someone complains about the 4:00 o'clock dumpster thing or something, that's where the Planning Board will look at and say, well you can't do it from this time to this time and that's the arrangements you have to make with whatever company you're using. Mr. Casale said but I mention it because although that's more in their purview, one could argue that it is part of the 'does it alter the essential character?' Right now, I live in a nice quiet neighborhood. I would not want to hear a siren blasting every once in a while. That to me alters the essential character of the neighborhood. So that's my only argument. I don't think it's a deal breaker, but it is a potential issue. Mr. Gilbert said well, if you look at the road there and the neighborhood to the north or all those homes over on that road, there's a business South. There's a business North, and there's nothing behind it on the other side. So, I don't see—I agree

with you there's going to be noise—but those homes are fairly far away with trees. Mr. Casale said agree, yeah, I don't think it's huge.

Mr. Gilbert said no, and also if you look at this picture, I'll go by this. It's all we got is there's stuff on pallets. So that would be the biggest thing I'd see unless there's other stuff I don't know about. Mr. Casale said right, which would indicate tractor trailers having to go in there. And I don't even know if there's a dock here or not. We're in nonpublic so we can't answer but. Ms. Thomas said right. I think there was. Mr. Gilbert said It's hard to say if it was a dock. Ms. Thomas said I think there was on the side of it, there were docks. Mr. Casale said you know, and I can see. Ms. Thomas said it was a warehouse. I mean, it was a florist warehouse. But I think there were docks on the side of it. Mr. Gilbert said right here. Chair Morin said see, it all depends how they set up the building. On where they set it up in that type of thing. Mr. Gilbert said let's see. They got parking right next to it. See that in the area right there. It's not very big. Getting a semi in there wouldn't really work. I guess. I don't know.

2. The spirit of the ordinance is observed because:

Chair Morin said I can understand why they look for certain types of businesses to be in certain areas. Looking at that space in that area, it's all commercial from the bottom of the hill to all the way to Hannaford's or even further. So, it's heavily commercial and yes, there is some residential on the other side of 101 off a separate road. It's not directly on 101. I don't have an issue with that—this type of business anyway. Mr. Casale said aside from the sirens, is pretty benign. Chair Morin said yeah.

3. Granting the variance would do substantial justice because:

Chair Morin said it's going to give the owner an opportunity to use a building that's vacant. It's pretty wide open looking at the pictures. So, it gives them the opportunity to separate it however they need to do and be able to utilize the property. Mr. Green said well then, we're looking at an eyesore, for a while, you know? Chair Morin said right. Well, this was here three years ago, four years ago, as a restaurant. A bakery type restaurant as part of the building and then whatever else. It's changed some ownership and use, but at least it will clean up the area hopefully. Mr. Green said yes.

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

Board agrees they haven't heard anything on that.

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:**

Chair Morin said no I think this is one that actually will help the public and help the business. The property owner itself, too, as in, it'll clean up a vacant area. I'm sure the Planning Board will do their magic with it—whatever they need to do to get it suitable. Mr. Casale said yeah, and I would add the purpose is to keep out more of the heavy manufacturing, the stuff that's going to bother neighbors. And I don't see that happening. The sirens are going to be an issue. It's not going to be a lot but for what they want to do, this is pretty mellow.

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

Board agrees it appears very 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: Mr. Gilbert moves that the Zoning Board of Adjustment approve the request for a variance from Article III, Section 275-21, Table 2, Table of Uses, to allow 8,000 sq. ft. within an existing warehouse building to be converted to a light manufacturing use at 276 Route 101, Map 27, Lot 29, Zoned Commercial, per our deliberations. Mr. Green duly seconds the motion. Roll call vote taken – ALL IN FAVOR – unanimous. The variance is approved.

MOTION: Mr. Casale moves the Zoning Board of Adjustment go back into public input. Mr. Kellermann duly seconds the motion. Roll call vote was taken – ALL IN FAVOR - unanimous. Motion carries, 5-0.

Chair Morin said you're all set. Thank you. Mr. Chadwick said appreciate the Board's time. Thank you very much.

Election of Officers: Chair Morin said alright, now we have to go back to number 2, Election of Officers. Who wants to take over as chair? Mr. Gilbert said nobody. Do we have any motions?

MOTION: Mr. Gilbert moves the ZBA re-up John and Neal as Chair and Vice Chair. Ms. Thomas seconds the motion.

Mr. Gilbert asked, do you want to? Mr. Casale said that's fine. Just don't ever not show up. [laughter] That's easy. No heavy lifting. Mr. Gilbert said I was going to do it separately. Mr. Casale asked does it have to be done separately? Ms. Harris said you can do it together. Mr. Gilbert said OK, well then do your package deal. Chair Morin said alright, so there's a motion on the floor. Do we have a second? Ms. Thomas said I seconded it. Chair Morin asked any further discussion?

Roll call vote was taken. Chair Morin abstains from the vote – ALL IN FAVOR – unanimous. Motion carries.

Chair Morin said alright, so we've got that done. Jillian, anything else? Ms. Harris said nothing further. Chair Morin said oh, perfect, so one last motion please.

MOTION: Mr. Gilbert moves to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Thomas duly seconded the motion. Roll

call vote was taken – ALL IN FAVOR - unanimous. Motion carries 5-0.

Meeting was adjourned at 9:00 pm.

The next meeting will take place on July 16, 2022.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Forcier