

ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT PUBLIC HEARING AND MEETING
June 11, 2019

A public hearing of the Zoning Board of Adjustment was held on Tuesday, June 11, 2019 at 6:30 PM in the Auditorium, 229 Main Street, at City Hall.

Members in attendance were:

JP Boucher, Chair
Jack Currier, Acting Clerk
Jay Minkarah
Steve Lionel
Efstathia Booras
Nick Kanakis

Carter Falk, Deputy Planning Manager/Zoning

Mr. Boucher explained the Board's procedures, including the points of law required for applicants to address relative to variances and special exceptions. Mr. Boucher explained how testimony will be given by applicants, those speaking in favor or in opposition to each request, as stated in the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) By-laws. Mr. Boucher also explained procedures involving the timing light, as well as the projector in front of the stage for plans to show the audience.

- 1. Michael D. Cimini & Angela T. Cheng-Cimini (Owners) Daniel Muller (Applicant) 4 Fox Street (Sheet 61 Lot 67) requesting special exception from Land Use Code Section 190-119 (A)(4) to expand a non-conforming use by constructing a 8'x12' shed in rear yard. GI Zone, Ward 4.**

Voting on this case:

JP Boucher, Chair
Jack Currier, Acting Clerk
Steve Lionel
Jay Minkarah
Efstathia Booras

Attorney Daniel Muller, Cronin, Bisson & Zalinsky, P.C., Manchester, NH. Atty. Muller said he is representing the owners for this application. He said that last year, the Board granted

a variance for a single-family home to be built on this lot. He said that the owners are looking to construct an 8'x12' shed, a typical shed, to store garden tools, etc. He said that the shed would meet all relevant dimensional criteria.

Atty. Muller said that city staff has determined that this would be an expansion of a non-conforming use. He said that a use by variance is different than an existing nonconforming use, which would be a use that was lawful at the time of construction. He said he didn't necessarily agree with staff, but is proceeding forward nonetheless.

Atty. Muller went over the relevant points of law for the special exception, and stated that the shed will not create any additional traffic, and will be in a fenced-in back yard, and will meet all setbacks.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR:

No one.

SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION OR WITH QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS:

Bill Doherty, 125 Peele Road, Nashua, NH. Mr. Doherty asked why this case wasn't brought to the New Hampshire Supreme Court first.

Mr. Falk said that any land use case must go through any and all municipal actions before going to Court.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR - REBUTTAL:

No one.

SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION OR WITH QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS - REBUTTAL:

No one.

Board members all expressed support for the application, and believe the application was properly advertised as a special exception.

MOTION by Mr. Boucher to approve the special exception as advertised on behalf of the applicant. He stated that the use is listed in the Table of Uses, Section 190-119 (A)(4).

Mr. Boucher stated that the use will not create undue traffic congestion or unduly impair pedestrian safety.

Mr. Boucher stated that the use will not overload public water, drainage, sewer or other municipal systems.

Mr. Boucher said that all special conditions are fulfilled by testimony.

Mr. Boucher stated that the use will not impair the integrity or be out of character with the neighborhood or be detrimental to health, morals or welfare of the residents, as this is solely a shed in the back yard.

SECONDED by Ms. Booras.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY 5-0.

2. Michael H. Armand & Sheila M. Little (Owners) 5 Freshwater Court (Sheet B Lot 3036) requesting variance from Land Use Code Section 190-192 (C) to exceed maximum driveway curb-cut width, 23 feet existing, 24 feet permitted - 32 feet proposed. R9 Zone, Ward 6.

Voting on this case:

JP Boucher, Chair
Jack Currier, Acting Clerk
Steve Lionel
Jay Minkarah
Nick Kanakis

Michael Armand, 5 Freshwater Court, Nashua, NH. Mr. Armand placed a photo of the property on the projector. He said that he's owned the property since 1995. He said that was a cape without a breezeway and garage, so the initial driveway was put in close to the house, and years later, he added the breezeway and two-car garage, so the driveway was extended out wider, but it's not really working, as a driver would have to drive over the curb to get in the garage. He said he wants to pave straight down from the corner of the house to make the garage and driveway more accessible, and he would fix the sidewalk as well, and tie it all in.

Mr. Currier asked about the timeline of construction.

Mr. Armand said that first the house was built in 1995, without a breezeway or garage, and the driveway was built close to the house. He said that the breezeway and garage were put on years later, so the garage extended past the driveway, and that's when the problem came in. He said it would end up being a three-car driveway, but really just wants better accessibility.

Mr. Currier said that there needs to be a hardship in the land to warrant a variance. He asked if there was consideration to cut back on one side of the driveway, and end up with a straight two-car driveway.

Mr. Currier asked how far back does the driveway have to be before it can be widened.

Mr. Falk said that it is an R9 zone, so the front yard setback is 20 feet, therefore, after 20 feet from the front property line, the driveway can get wider.

Mr. Armand said that it looks terrible, and just wants it to be more aesthetically pleasing, and the sidewalk will just keep crumbling away, and can't get in the garage without driving over it. He said the way it is now, it's just not practical.

Mr. Lionel said that a reasonable solution is to just shift the driveway over to the right and get rid of the driveway part in front of the breezeway, and plant some grass there. He said that the extra space on the side wouldn't be needed in front of the breezeway for the driveway. He said that the driveway could meet the ordinance at 24 feet wide, and the variance wouldn't be necessary. He said that one of the points of law, for hardship, is that this would be a reasonably feasible situation if it's reduced down to 24 feet.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR:

No one.

SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION OR WITH QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS:

No one.

Mr. Minkarah agreed in that the owner should just shift the driveway over, and the problem is solved and no variance is needed, and sees nothing unique about this request, and that there is a reasonable alternative.

Mr. Currier said that none of the abutters are here complaining. He said that the only difference is that the breezeway and garage were added. He said he didn't see a hardship with this case.

Mr. Lionel said that there are other ways that this could be done without a variance.

Mr. Kanakis agreed with the other members, and said that they could shift the driveway over just slightly and meet the ordinance.

Mr. Boucher said he is in support of the case, and stated that he knows the street, it's not a busy street, there's no one in opposition, and there is a wider driveway at the end of the cul-de-sac.

MOTION by Mr. Lionel to deny the application on behalf of the owner as advertised. He said that the Board believes that the variance is not needed to enable the applicant's proposed use of the property, there are other reasonable feasible methods for the applicant to pursue that would not require a variance.

Mr. Lionel said that the Board feels that it is not within the spirit and intent of the ordinance.

Mr. Lionel said that the Board has no particular opinion on whether or not it would not negatively impact surrounding property values, or whether or not it is in the public interest.

Mr. Lionel said that substantial justice is served by not supporting the request.

SECONDED by Mr. Minkarah.

MOTION CARRIED 4-1 (Mr. Boucher.)

3. Etchstone Properties, Inc. (Owner) 35 Groton Road (Sheet D Lot 23) requesting special exception from Land Use Code Section 190-115 to work in a 40-foot critical wetland and wetland buffer to construct a private roadway and gravel trail in conjunction with constructing 25 single-family detached dwelling units with associated site improvements. R40 Zone, Ward 5.

Voting on this case:

JP Boucher, Chair
Jack Currier, Acting Clerk
Steve Lionel
Efsthathia Booras
Nick Kanakis

Tom Zajac, Hayner/Swanson, Inc., 3 Congress Street, Nashua, NH.
Mr. Zajac placed some drawings on the bulletin board, and passed out a handout to the Board members.

Mr. Boucher said that this request is just the special exception for the wetland crossing issue, not the construction of the homes.

Mr. Zajac pointed out that the site is about a 25-acre site, in the R40 zone. He said it is abutted by single-family residences and City-owned conservation land. He said that currently, there is a single-family home on the lot, along with several out-buildings, which have since been demolished. He said that access to the site is from a driveway located in the central portion of the site.

Mr. Zajac said that there are three wetland areas identified on the map by the wetland scientist, as shown on the map. He said that two of them are located on the easterly portion of the site. He said that one of them was created as a farm pond. He said on the westerly side of the property is a wetland, it's an isolated forested wetland with no inlet or outlet.

Mr. Zajac said that the proposal is a 25-unit single-family detached residential development, on property known as Terrell farm. He said it will be developed in a cluster-style development, in accordance with the City's Conservation Subdivision ordinance, the units would be on a single common lot, and will be under a condominium ownership, and the open

space will be protected and maintained by the condominium ownership. He said that access to the site will be provided via a new private roadway off of Groton Road, and 22 units will be proposed in the central portion of the site, with 3 units proposed on the northeast portion of the site, with access to them will be via a shared driveway, which will be crossed by a small stream, and that is the crux of the application tonight.

Mr. Zajac said that the plan shows the impact areas to the wetland and the wetland buffer, one is 1,226 sq.ft, and the associated buffer impact would be 7,996 sq.ft, a portion of that buffer impact also includes a walking trail that was added to the plan. He said that the crossing is a narrow location of the existing stream, and they will be constructing a narrow driveway as allowed by the Fire Department. He said that they will also have guardrails and steeper slopes to minimize the impacts to the wetland and buffer area. He said that the site will be served by onsite private septic, water by Pennichuck Water Works, and onsite propane, underground electric.

Mr. Zajac said that the use is covered in the Land Use Code Section 190-115, as a special exception. He said that the use meets the special nine conditions, and those have been recommended for approval by the Conservation Commission as well. He said that the use will not create undue traffic congestion, or unduly impair pedestrian safety, as there will be safe access for emergency vehicles and residents. He indicated that the use will not overload public water, sewer, drainage, or other municipal systems. He said that the use will not impair the integrity or be out of character with the neighborhood or be detrimental to the health, morals or welfare of residents. He said that all special regulations have been and will be fulfilled, and submitted a handout showing how they have been met.

Mr. Currier asked if there will be individual septic systems, or one system for the whole site.

Mr. Zajac said that they will have individual septic systems, with individual propane for each house.

Mr. Currier asked if the site meets all the criteria for a conservation subdivision.

Mr. Zajac agreed, it meets all dimensional criteria, and this will be going to the Planning Board.

Mr. Minkarah asked about the Conservation Commission approval letter.

Mr. Boucher said it was just approved on June 4th, and has the approval letter with five stipulations of approval.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR:

No one.

SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION OR WITH QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS:

Peter Erickson, 4 Woodbury Drive, Nashua, NH. Mr. Erickson said he abuts the property on the left side. He said that the pond there on the left has no outlet, and the pond floods every spring, and is concerned that new homes will affect the drainage, as yards will all drain into that area, and will flood his property. He said he questions Hayner/Swanson's research that said it's pretty dry, and the pond now is pretty full. He said that roof water, yards that will get graded, road water has no place to go except for his yard, which has flooded in the past, and wants assurances that the pond has an outlet structure built into it so the water level comes up to a certain height and drains out.

Patricia Terrell Holt, 18 Groton Road, Nashua, NH. Ms. Holt said that she has concerns about the wetlands, as there are some endangered species that are in the wetland, and they have to be careful of them. She said that the water will be going somewhere else with the development, and the neighbors on the west side will be affected by that.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR - REBUTTAL:

Mr. Zajac said that Mr. Erickson mentioned wetland flow into the pond, and said that as part of their Planning Board application, with the DES Alteration of Terrain, they are required to submit a detailed storm water management report, in which many storm water issues are addressed, and they have to prove that they are not making the storm water situation any worse. He said that the majority of the development all drains into itself and into the roadway, where it will be piped out to the rear part of the

property, where there will be a big storm water management basin that will store water. He said that the storm water will be managed properly onsite.

Mr. Zajac said as far as the endangered species, there are two vernal pools located on site, and they will not be impacted. He said that the New Hampshire Fish & Game will be notified for the Alteration of Terrain, and the New Hampshire Wetlands Bureau. He said that they are working with Pennichuck Water to extend the water line from Hadley Drive, so there will be no impact to abutting lots.

Mr. Currier asked about the added runoff from this project, being piped up to that area, and none of it is going to the flagged wetland near the abutting property owner to the west.

Mr. Zajac agreed, they will be lessening the overall drainage area that is getting to that pond.

Mr. Boucher said that the application is also being reviewed at the State level too.

SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION OR WITH QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS:

Mr. Erickson said that the pond is almost at flood stage now, it's high. He said that in the springtime, the water goes into his yard, as there is no outlet, so any water that runs off the roof, yards, driveways will go down there.

Mr. Currier said that the Engineer's testimony was that the amount of water that currently flows into that wetland will be lessened as it will be piped up.

Mr. Erickson said that his back yard is at a lower point, and said that water will go into his yard.

Mr. Currier said that the testimony from the applicant was that that wetland area sees a lot of water from the surrounding areas, and that more runoff will be diverted post-development. He said that with this information, the Engineer is certifying that runoff going into that pond is mitigated post-development, not exacerbated post-development.

Mr. Boucher read the letter that Mr. Erickson wrote into the record.

Mr. Minkarah said that it appears that the impact for encroaching into the wetland and wetland buffer appears to be minimal, it's an intermittent stream, and a culvert will be provided, and this was also supported by the Conservation Commission. He said that overall, the impact is minimal and it is reasonable to grant the special exception. He said he can't say whether this development will impact Woodbury Drive, but there is no impact to that wetland closest to Woodbury, and didn't feel that the impact there is material to the application.

Mr. Currier agreed, we are here for the proposed wetland regrading and culvert for the three houses in the upper right corner of the lot. He said that the nine special wetland criteria are met as well. He said that he has support for the application.

Mr. Boucher agreed. He said he understands the abutters concern, and strongly suggests that the abutter go to the Planning Board to raise his concerns. He said that he is supportive of the application.

MOTION by Mr. Currier to approve the special exception as advertised on behalf of the applicant. He stated that the use is listed in the Table of Uses, Section 190-115.

Mr. Currier stated that per testimony, the use will not create undue traffic congestion or unduly impair pedestrian safety.

Mr. Currier stated that the use will not overload public water, drainage, sewer or other municipal systems.

Mr. Currier said that all special conditions are fulfilled by testimony.

Mr. Currier stated that the use will not impair the integrity or be out of character with the neighborhood or be detrimental to health, morals or welfare of the residents.

Mr. Currier said that for a special condition, the Conservation Commission approval letter from June 4, 2019, with five stipulations is tied to this approval.

SECONDED by Mr. Lionel.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY 5-0.

4. Theodore Prineas & Mukti Patel-Prineas (Owners) Michael Petrovik (Applicant) 9 Reservoir Street (Sheet 65 Lot 64) requesting variance from Land Use Code Section 190-16 to encroach 2 feet into the 10 foot required side yard setback to construct an 8'x21' deck. RA Zone, Ward 3.

Voting on this case:

JP Boucher, Chair
Jack Currier, Acting Clerk
Steve Lionel
Jay Minkarah
Efstathia Booras

Michael Petrovik, Callen + Petrovik Architects, 51 Railroad Street, Keene, NH. Mr. Petrovik said that the project is currently under construction, and decided that they'd like to increase the size of the deck, which led to the variance application to encroach two feet into the side yard setback. He said that there are garages on the property line, and feel that this shouldn't deter from the character of the neighborhood. He said that due to the neighbor's garage and the jog in the property line, the deck is pushed into the setback. He said that they believe they meet the points of law, and this should not deter from the neighborhood.

Mr. Minkarah asked if the lot line was at some point adjusted to accommodate the garage.

Mr. Petrovik said perhaps the garage was built where they wanted it to go, and the property lines were adjusted, he said he's not sure.

Mr. Lionel asked about a stairway going up to the third floor.

Mr. Petrovik said that it is a demolition ladder to load the dumpster, there is no outdoor stairway up to the third floor. He said that it is a temporary construction chute.

Mr. Currier said it's hard to tell from the street if the proposed deck would be very disruptive, as it's closer to that cutout, and asked what he thought of the cutout for the abutting

property being closer, and would this two-foot incursion create a unique or problematic situation for the abutter, or the one on the back.

Mr. Petrovik said that the jog is the neighbor's garage on the property line, so the deck is looking at the side of the garage.

Mr. Minkarah asked what exactly is being added to the house.

Mr. Petrovik said that there is an addition on the southeast corner to expand the kitchen, which does not encroach on any of the setbacks. He said that the entire house is being renovated, all three floors have been gutted.

Mr. Minkarah stated that given that the whole house is being renovated, asked if there was any attempt to come up with an alternative that could provide the deck and meet the setback.

Mr. Petrovik said that it is very tight in there, and there is that existing garage, and in order to have a south-facing deck, with light into the house, the idea was to take advantage of the south-facing exposure.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR:

No one.

SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION OR WITH QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS:

Mr. Boucher read a letter of concern from Marie Coleman, 46 Stark Street, Nashua, NH. She indicated that the construction has been going on for a long time, and they had received an approval for an in-law apartment. She stated that she doesn't want to see all the construction and to have this project dragged out, and did not want to see any more variances here.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR - REBUTTAL:

Mr. Petrovik said that the owner is doing the work himself, so it's taking longer, and had to leave the area for six months. He said it is being renovated and rehabbed as a single-family home, without the in-law apartment, and is actively under construction.

SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION OR WITH QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS - REBUTTAL:

None.

Mr. Currier said he was concerned about how close it is to the neighbor's yard, but there is an unusual special condition with the lot-line cutout, and the garage there.

Mr. Lionel said that given that it is only a small corner of the proposed deck that encroaches into the setback, and the position of the neighbor's garage, he didn't see any problems with it. He said that it is also being renovated as a single-family home.

Mr. Falk said that if the in-law unit is removed, and there is a building permit for solely a single-family use, they would have to re-apply for the in-law unit.

Mr. Minkarah said that he had some concerns, but understands why the deck is proposed with the layout of the house. He said that the property line jog is a special condition, and the garage on the abutting property, as well as an out-building on the property to the right, neither of those meet the setback as well, and there are a number of other out-buildings and garages in the neighborhood that also don't meet the setback, so it is generally in keeping with the character of the neighborhood, and the impact will be minimal, and having a deck on the south side of the lot makes sense, and the deck is narrow, it's only 8 feet wide, so it's not an overly sized deck, so the size is reasonable, and the use is reasonable.

Mr. Boucher said that he supports the request for all the reasons stated.

MOTION by Mr. Lionel to approve the application on behalf of the owner as advertised. He said that the Board believes that the variance is needed to enable the applicant's proposed use of the property, given the special conditions of the property, considering the jog in the property line and the minimal encroachment for the corner of the deck, and the benefit sought by the applicant cannot be achieved by some other method reasonably feasible other than the area variance.

Mr. Lionel said that the Board feels that it is within the spirit and intent of the ordinance.

Mr. Lionel said that it would not adversely impact surrounding property values, and once the construction is completed, it should improve the property values.

Mr. Lionel said that the request is within the public interest, and substantial justice is served.

SECONDED by Ms. Booras.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY 5-0.

5. Marc R. & Sarah Angotti (Owner) 122 Peele Road (Sheet B Lot 1552) requesting special exception from Land Use Code Section 190-15, Table 15-1 (#3) to construct an attached accessory (in-law) dwelling unit. R18 Zone, Ward 8.

Voting on this case:

JP Boucher, Chair
Jack Currier, Acting Clerk
Steve Lionel
Jay Minkarah
Nick Kanakis

Liam Leary, Chestnut Hill Renovations, 282 Main Dunstable Road, Nashua, NH. Mr. Leary said that they wish to add space for the owner's father, who recently moved into the house. He said that the plan is to build a two-car garage, and to close off the existing two-car garage. He said that they designed it to follow the accessory dwelling unit rules, and the living space is at 748 square feet, and there will be no separate entrance in the front, it is connected to the house.

Mr. Currier said it looks like a wise proposal to close off the existing garage, as a house with two two-car garages would look like a two-family house.

Mr. Leary said that was the plan from the beginning, to close off the existing garage. He said that the owners want to use that space for living area. He said he would have no problem if it's a stipulation that the existing garage be walled off.

Mr. Currier asked about the breezeway between the house and addition, and questioned whether or not it makes it look like a two-family.

Mr. Leary said that the addition was originally going to be pushed further to the left, on a slight tilt, with no real connection, and told the owners that it had to be connected to the house, so the plans were revised to have the connection, and there is a gas line that runs right along the side of the proposed breezeway, so keeping it short allows the opportunity to bring electrical and plumbing right through there, without any major trenching.

Mr. Currier mentioned the proposed deck on the left hand side, starts to also make it look potentially like a two-family.

Mrs. Angotti said that her father wants to park his boat under the deck, so it's a covered area to tuck the boat into.

Mr. Boucher read the nine special conditions for an in-law apartment.

Mr. Leary said that they would meet all of them.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR:

Bill Doherty, 125 Peele Road, Nashua, NH. Mr. Doherty said that more people should be doing this for their parents or elderly with in-law apartments, to take care of family members. He mentioned that Lille Road, in the back, is much higher in elevation, but in the winter, there is an excessive amount of water runoff on the left side of their property, and goes across the street, and DPW has had to spend a lot of time and effort dealing with the ice in the street from the excessive runoff. He said that speeding cars in this area can also be a problem.

SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION OR WITH QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS:

Arthur Pavlidis, 124 Peele Road, Nashua, NH. Mr. Pavlidis said that Peele Road and the surrounding streets are all single-family houses, it's a very desirable neighborhood. He said he is concerned that this proposal could change the character of the neighborhood adversely, and set a precedent for other properties to have rentals, and harm the character of the neighborhood.

Mr. Currier mentioned that the State of New Hampshire has recently amended the criteria for accessory dwelling units. He

said that in turn, the City had to also amend the ordinance to comply with some of the State criteria, and in doing so, that is what our laws are.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR - REBUTTAL:

Mr. Leary said that for the water runoff, it will all be taken care of with the construction, and all the water runoff may not all come from this lot.

Mr. Falk said that all storm water and runoff has to be contained on the lot, and they cannot make the situation any worse than it is, that is part of the permit process.

Mr. Leary said that they could build the garage, breezeway, and the living space without the kitchen with just a building permit. He said that they are following the ordinance and the rules.

SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION OR WITH QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS - REBUTTAL:

Mr. Doherty said he is ok with the use, but it shouldn't be a separate rental unit, and they should meet all the criteria for approval.

Mr. Minkarah said that they meet the criteria for the accessory unit, it meets the square footage requirement, and any additional runoff must not go offsite. He said that they could build the garage addition as proposed without the kitchen just through the building permit process. He said that private covenants were mentioned, but that is not the purview of this Board to enforce, and will support the request.

Mr. Lionel agreed with Mr. Minkarah, and is in support. He said that there have been a couple applications that the Board has seen that were rental arrangements, but most are for family members like this one, and the State law and the City ordinance is the way it is, and the Board has to abide by them.

Mr. Currier said that he is in support of the application.

Mr. Boucher said he is in support also.

MOTION by Mr. Lionel to approve the special exception as advertised on behalf of the applicant. He stated that the use

is listed in the Table of Uses, Section 190-15, Table 15-1 (#3).

Mr. Lionel stated that the use will not create undue traffic congestion or unduly impair pedestrian safety.

Mr. Lionel stated that the use will not overload public water, drainage, sewer or other municipal systems, based upon the requirement that no additional offsite drainage occur.

Mr. Lionel said that all special conditions are fulfilled by testimony.

Mr. Lionel stated that the use will not impair the integrity or be out of character with the neighborhood or be detrimental to health, morals or welfare of the residents.

SECONDED by Mr. Minkarah.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY 5-0.

MISCELLANEOUS:

REHEARING REQUESTS:

None.

MINUTES:

5-14-19:

MOTION by Mr. Boucher to approve the Minutes as presented, waive the reading, and place the Minutes in the file.

SECONDED by Mr. Currier.

MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY 5-0.

REGIONAL IMPACT:

The Board did not find any cases of Regional Impact.

ADJOURNMENT:

Mr. Boucher called the meeting closed at 8:32 p.m.

Zoning Board of Adjustment

June 11, 2019

Page 18

Submitted by: Mr. Currier, Acting Clerk, for Mrs. MacKay,
Clerk.

CF - Taped Hearing