

## PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

DECEMBER 21, 2021

A meeting of the Planning and Economic Development Committee was held Tuesday, December 21, 2021, at 9:24 p.m. in the aldermanic chamber and via Zoom which meeting link can be found on the agenda and on the city's website.

The roll call was taken with 4 members of the Planning and Economic Development Committee present:

Alderman-at-Large David C. Tencza  
Alderman Jan Schmidt  
Alderman Thomas Lopez  
Alderman-at-Large Ben Clemons (via Zoom)

Members not in Attendance: Alderman-at-Large Brandon Laws

Also in Attendance: Alderman Patricia Klee  
Matt Sullivan, Planning Manager  
Tim Cummings, Director of Economic Development

---

### ROLL CALL

### PUBLIC COMMENT

#### Laurie Ortolano

Hi. Yes - Laurie Ortolano, 41. Berkeley Street. I just want to say, you know, the scheduling of these meetings I just think wasn't done correctly. You know to schedule 15 minutes for the first meeting was absurd given the topic and that was without community input. It's over to two hours and 10 minutes later that we're sitting here in an economic development meeting.

I take great offense to the comments made by Alderwoman Klee regarding public behavior. You know, I didn't participate in that behavior and it's not that I condone it but I feel like I've been in a lot of board meetings where I've seen similar behavior from the board members here. I have watched people get on their phone. I have watched President Wilshire wrinkle her face, make faces at me, cut me off. I've watched Attorney Bolton interject out of the rules of order of Robert's Rules. I have watched people use their cell phone. I have watched Alderwomen on Zoom go on social media - you Jan - type in social media comments while you're present as a board member. I've seen it all and I've had to put up with that. I think the call citizens out as children with poor behavior. It doesn't do any good and it's not to the benefit. I mean tonight you chose not to have public comment and I e-mailed President Wilshire to ask her if you were going to do a reading and place this as an item to be acted on would you allow comment. I didn't even get the courtesy of a response.

You have the right to allow no comment and that's fine, but I participated in a Board of Health meeting two weeks ago and a lot has changed in two weeks. I would have challenged some things that these health people said. I've got a letter from the President of Southern New Hampshire who just put his letter out today saying we've come over the hump, we're coming down, and things are improving. I would have read that into the record. Hospitalizations that Dr. Wolf who is my neighbor said we're up 12%. Since December 3<sup>rd</sup>, they're down 5%. We're down around 437, which is what we were on December 3<sup>rd</sup>. The big surge came from November 15 to December 3<sup>rd</sup>. The way this is handled with a one sided view, I have supported the Board of Health. I really have. I've been a big fan of theirs and I understood the difficulty. They no longer have my support for what was said in here tonight. I do my research. So it's just really very disappointing Alderwoman Klee to hear the scolding that goes on because you're the one who says, hey we're the Board. We have to take it anyway it comes, you know. You can do whatever you want to do, but you really don't take it. It offends you but I've been offended so many times in this chamber. I wish you'd consider that. Thank you.

#### Chairman Tencza

Anyone else in the chamber who would like to speak - public comment? Come on up. I apologize. Our timer is not working but I'm still giving folks three minutes and I'll give you a 30 second warning.

#### Bob Keating

Bob Keating, 5 Coburn Woods. I'm Chairing the Universalist Church in Granite State Organizing Project. I just want to make sure that remarks about the inclusionary zoning is appropriate at this point in time?

Chairman Tencza

They are, yes.

Bob Keating

Okay. First off, I appreciate hearing the, you know, the input from the Board and the previous issue. It's a very important one.

So you've all heard me on the previous moment, but just for the record on this I very much in support and is Granite State Organizing Project for the revised ordinance for the inclusionary zoning. I think it will be helpful in terms of a step forward for my remarks that we had hoped in some difference on the income levels, but we're embracing it to this point. As it moves forward, and hopefully, it's a final passage in the future that hope that we can reduce it for a more affordable level.

So thanks again for all the work and for our two gentlemen here, and Tim, and for their efforts, and Sarah Marchant beforehand. I appreciate it and I think this will be one more thing to add to increase the people having less stress in terms of their housing costs. So thank you again.

Chairman Tencza

Thank you Mr. Keating. Anyone else in the chamber? Seeing none. I see online, Reverend Basada.

Kristy Basada

Thank you so much. You have already heard from me today. I feel that I don't need to make all of those comments again, except to express gratitude once more for creating an amendment to inclusionary zoning to make it mandatory. We believe, as I am a representative of the Greater Nashua Interfaith Housing Justice Group as well as Granite State Organizing Project. We all believe that this is an important component for housing justice for Nashua and we just encourage its approval so that we can move forward with this. Thank you so much.

Chairman Tencza

Thank you. Rabbi Spira-Savett.

Alderman Lopez

Mr. Chair, can we remember to use their name and address for the record.

Chairman Tencza

Yes. Thank you Alderman Lopez.

Kristy Basada

Apologies. 2 Nutmeg Drive in Nashua. Kristy Basada. Thank you.

Jonathan Spira-Savett

I'm Jonathan Spira-Savett, 39 Coburn Avenue in Ward 1. Like Bob and Reverend Basada, I echo their comments. I just want to add that really have appreciated that our groups over the past two or three years have been able to work with you, and members of the Committee, leaders of the departments, and the Mayors, and also other citizen groups, and people in the private sector, and really hoping that the adoption and then the implementation of this inclusionary zoning will continue to be the model for how we worked together on the next steps around these things in terms of serving more people and developing more strategies.

Just want to on behalf of all of us let you know that you have partners in the community and maybe partners you didn't realize you had a few years ago who are really ready to roll up our sleeves and collaborate with you. Thank you for the time you're taking this evening.

Chairman Tencza

Robert Lodi would you please state your name and address for the record?

Robert Lodi

My name is Robert Lodi, 12 Bartlett Avenue. I just have a couple slides with some text to help make my point. It just seems like we're having some communication challenges with those on Zoom. But first I want to open and thank you, all the members of Planning and Economic Development, and the broader board - the service to our city and is that last special Board of Aldermen. Your work is challenging in the best of times and these are not the best of time. So I commend you on the work you're doing service to our city.

Just a couple slides I'll put up if I may. Oh it sounds like we're not able to enlist Mr. Poehnert will allow it. But anyway, if that's not okay I'll just speak to it then. I'm speaking here with respect to R-21-203 - the purchase of the property adjacent to Greeley Park. I'm here to urge you to pass this out of Planning and Economic Development and send to the Board with your recommendation. There are a number of facts I'd like to cite for you and then some I think are self-evident to any of us. The Trust for public lands and the return on investment in the New Hampshire Land Study for 2014 show that residential land consumes \$1.12 in services for every dollar and taxes it generates. So when we look at development, it's not the economic panacea that some I've heard from that have spoken to this Board have made. There are genuine costs that come along with that growth.

Secondarily, Greeley Park is a jewel in the city and I don't have to tell anyone that's been there. But if you go to TripAdvisor, and I had a screenshot of it, TripAdvisor lists Greeley Park is the number two thing to do in Nashua. Number two and TripAdvisor is one of those internet worldwide web welcome mats for the city, right? Visitors coming to the city looking what to do, people who may relocate here, new residents look for what to do, and Greeley Park is at the top of that list of things to do. There is no under estimating the value that being outdoors in nature has for our physical and mental health. What we saw with all of the energy around the mask mandates, the need to be able to be outdoors for both our physical health, socially distance, and particularly the mental health of children who have just taken an absolute beating over the last two years. The more that we can get them outside and playing like kids. So anything we can do as citizens and you as our leaders to help preserve, protect, and defend Greeley Park for another 125 years - and I hope some of you have walked that. You'll see just how integral into the park that piece of property is and it sits some, you know, basically in the crux between land the city already owns and Greeley Park which the city owns by grant from the Greeley family. So it is park parcel to the park. The park is an essential bit both economically and to the physical and mental health of our citizens and I know 125 years from now your descendants looking back would have a measure of pride that you were the Board that took action to protect this vital piece of property. So I'll close my yap at this point. Not easy for me to do and, again, just close with my urgent please to pass this, send it back to the Board with your recommendation, and again thank you for your service to our city.

Chairman Tencza

Thank you Mr. Lodi. John Ferreira name and address for the record please.

John Ferreira

Mr. Ferreira would like to say anything?

Alderman Klee

He's muted.

John Ferreira

Can you hear me?

Chairman Tencza

Yes.

Penny Ferreira

I was on mute for so long I couldn't unmute myself. My name is Penny Ferreira. I'm using my husband's computer. Penny Ferreira at 3 Birchwood. I echo Mr. Lodi's thanks and appreciation. You do not have an easy job and thank you for the opportunity to come to you again and speak about R-21-203. Just by the way, I double mask. So it's very important. It save lives.

Last time I stood up and I held in person. I held up the what I thought was the most current Master Plan for the city and graciously Mr. Sullivan sent me a text and said, I think you had the wrong one. So now I have the right one. So I'd like to share some information with you. Greeley Park and the Bartlett property next to it is a really tough one because you do have a right (inaudible) beneficiary to sell the property. But I also learned from that and also from your Economic Development Manager Tim Cummings that as a citizen, all of us have a right to say our opinion of what we think land should be developed and how it should be developed. I wouldn't be making a cause for this if it wasn't for the fact that any developments has the potential to go forward and with the kids desire to sell that land to a developer whether it is Lloyd Geisinger or anyone else.

So I'm hoping that you heard from all your constituents when you gave us more time. It gave people time to find out about it and express for every ward. Also, the last update was that Ward 3 was not the highest number and people that responded to the change.org that it actually was a combination of all the other Wards. So you're hearing from people in the city as a whole who care about it. But I've now had the current Master Plan, which in the introductory it says, "Maintaining the balance of access and to protect our natural resources". You will find that phrase all throughout this updated version for the plan going forward. Again on page 159, "protect natural resources carefully balancing public access and community use of preservation".

Chairman Tencza

30 seconds Ma'am.

Penny Ferreira

Okay. So I want you to think about the historical value too because you have a house on that property that was also built by a historical builder – Royal Barry Wales - and you talk about increasing bypass. You talk about increasing programs to educate and teach younger people good stewards. Anything that is done on that property is going to affect the quality of Greeley Park and help people enjoy it. I am asking you tonight to please give the Mayor your recommendation to purchase that land because you have a legal right to do that. You have a plan forward to increase the public spaces of the parks that is written throughout your 2021 Master Plan. Thank you very much.

Chairman Tencza

Thank you Miss Ferreira. There's someone here who has not identified themselves with their name was their hand raised? State your name and your address please. You have three minutes. Okay, they put their hand down. Mr. Bourne.

Bob Bourne

Good evening and thank you for the opportunity. Bob Bourne, 28 Carly Street and I, too, talking about the Bartlett Street property R-21-203. We know that the development on that property has hit a snag today by the current developer. While I don't know the reasons for their decision to at this point pull out, I think it's reasonable to assume that they included the factor of the community uprising that is fighting against that, but perhaps more importantly a good business decision based on the cost risk analysis of the development. I see that, for example, we know there's an awfully large amount of ledge in the park area. Imagine what the cost is to remove that.

Initially, the development was caught us all by surprise. I believe that the city had no advance notification, the neighbors had no notification, the abutters had no notification. There was no public disclosure. Using an earlier comment by Director Tim Cummings, he mentioned the need for public private balance. Well in this case, there was no public private balance. Thankfully now with the developers exiting, we have a moment to plan and add balance to help make a city-wide plan for the addition of Greeley Park for the property if the property is developed. The addition of Greeley Park will never be available to us again. Ever again. We can't make that mistake. Please use your good judgment about how we're going to address the 13 plus acres that are abutting your - our beautiful city park. Let's add to the park. We have a little time but not much. Now is the time.

We know that there are a couple of contingency offers. Now is the time to act so this doesn't get away from us so this doesn't surprise us again. We don't know what's behind door number two. We know the community is well organized and will be aggressive in the opposition of any development next to Greeley Park. We know they've hired a law firm to help assist in this process. If you vote to make the recommendation for the city and the city approves the bond...

Chairman Tencza

30 seconds.

Bob Bourne

...we know we won't have to be back here again in months or perhaps even years making similar arguments. The preferred outcome for the community is for this property to be purchased by the city and added to Greeley Park. I would ask you to help the community do just that and vote in favor of that. Thank you and appreciate your time.

Chairman Tencza

Thank you Mr. Bourne. Mr. Richardson. Sorry Mr. Richardson, you're muted. Still nothing I can't hear you. Can't hear you. Sorry, Sir. We'll try Mr. Comeau and then we'll come back to you Sir.

Alex Comeau

Thank you. Alex Comeau, 4 Lewis Street. I spoke briefly to this in the Infrastructure meeting a week or two ago. I think that, at least from my perspective, a lot of the people I've spoken to that initially were against this proposal were against it because of a lot of misinformation that has been going around, particularly on social media and the change.org petition. People were under the impression that some developer was going to come up from Massachusetts and build houses in the middle of softball fields. The fact is that most people if this development went through as planned, the people that use Greeley Park every day, the majority of them would never notice what changed except for the people that walk the very specific walking trail on the west side of Concord Street. The picnic areas to hat shell, the athletic fields, the public gardens, none of that would be affected. The park is not in danger. So people coming on and saying we've gotta save Greeley Park, protect Greeley Park. I use Greeley Park as much as anybody and the fact is, this development doesn't endanger Greeley Park. Parks and Rec has no plans to further develop the western side of Greeley Park. There's no plans of use for the land.

The other thing that, you know, is a hot topic in the city is a lack of housing. So it just doesn't make sense to me to hold up a development deal over a phantom fear of destroying the park that doesn't exist. It's not the city's job to purchase every piece of land that goes up for sale that could potentially be used for something that some neighbors don't like and that's going to happen. In every neighborhood, there's going to be something that comes up that some neighbors might not like. We can't go around as a city and spend millions of dollars buying up every piece of land that goes up for sale because we're afraid of what might go into them. That's all, thank you.

Chairman Tencza

Thank you. Mr. Richardson you're unmuted on our end

Dan Richardson

Can you hear me now?

Chairman Tencza

I can, yes, thank you.

Dan Richardson

Okay, that's great thank you. I think I fixed it on my end too. I don't want to be collaborate but I wanted to mention that those items mentioned by the facts mentioned by Mr. Lodi, and Ms. Ferreira, and Mr. Bourne, I'm fully in support of what they support and that is the preservation of Greeley Park number one. Expansion of Greeley Park where possible because it is virgin land. It is available for a price and there's no way it could ever be possible again. There's no other land available. It's a golden opportunity and (inaudible) extension before. Greeley Park is the number one – well it was

mentioned number two. For me, its number one attractive feature in Nashua and Nashua as we know with the failed branding initiative has been searching for an identity. It is the closest thing we have to an identity. Anybody that ever mentions Nashua, New Hampshire, mentions Greeley Park. So I'll leave you with that. Please approve that and make it possible to purchase this land or at least perhaps the owner would be interested in selling a part of that land but we need the money approved and available for bonding to do so. Thank you very much.

Chairman Tencza

Thank you Mr. Richardson. I see no one else online who has their hand raised. I see no one in the chamber so we will move on.

COMMUNICATIONS

From: Matthew Sullivan, Planning Manager  
 Re: Referral from Board of Aldermen on Proposed R-21-073, Relative to Authorizing the Purchase of Property Located at 15 Bartlett Avenue (Map 57, Lot 3)  
 From: Matthew Sullivan, Planning Manager  
 Re: Referral from Board of Aldermen on Proposed O-21-073, Relative to Amending the Inclusionary Zoning Supplemental Use Regulations

***There being no objection, Chairman Tencza accepted the communications and placed them on file.***

UNFINISHED BUSINESS – None

NEW BUSINESS – RESOLUTIONS

**R-21-203**

Endorsers: Alderman Patricia Klee  
 Alderman-at-Large Ben Clemons  
 Alderman Richard A. Dowd  
 Alderman Thomas Lopez  
 Alderman Linda Harriott-Gathright  
 Alderman Skip Cleaver

**AUTHORIZING THE PURCHASE OF PROPERTY LOCATED AT 15 BARTLETT AVENUE (MAP 57, LOT 3)**

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN SCHMIDT TO RECOMMEND FINAL PASSAGE, BY ROLL CALL**

ON THE QUESTION

Alderman Klee

Thank you very much for letting me speak today. This is a companion bill to R-21-202 which is actually the bond. I thought it was tabled in the Budget Committee but it wasn't. It was a recommendation to tabling so it will be coming to the Board of Aldermen on the 28th of December with that recommendation and we can talk to that at that time.

But I want to talk to about is the authorization to purchase. That's what this particular one is and I believe all of the Board of Aldermen received an e-mail that I forwarded today from a constituent gave me about Greeley Park a brief history which was submitted by the Friends of Greeley Park to the Board of Aldermen in in 2013. And here it states Joseph Thornton Greeley (1823 to 1881) in his will left to the City of Nashua his farm known as Greeley Park, consisting of "160 acres more or less". He wrote his Will two years before he died.

Greeley's three sons died of Scarlet Fever at an early age. His remaining children, both girls, were both under 18 years of age when he died.

Joseph Thornton Greeley is a direct descendant of Matthew Thornton (on his mother's side), one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence. On his father's side, he is descendant of patriots who fought at Bunker Hill and Lexington. His children and grandchildren are all listed as sons and daughters of the American Revolution.

It was some years before the Greeley farm was turned into a park as per his wishes.

Great thought by the City of Nashua at that time was given to the laying out of the park. Mr. John Cotton, a prominent businessman in the city, donated \$5,000 to the city for the laying out of the west side of the park. This is the west side. The city matched his donation in 1908. On the night it was announced, there was celebration in City Hall. The Board of Aldermen meeting that night went from 7:30 pm until midnight - such was the overwhelming celebrations.

Mr. John Cotton some years later given additional gift to the city, consisting of a resting house (known locally as the Stone House) a fountain, walkway, and fresh spring water drinking fountain. The Stone House is the city's most iconic spot.

After his death in 1912, Mrs. Cotton continued with the beautification of the west side of Greeley Park.

The city employed Mr. B.K. Howard, a landscape architect from the Boston Parks. The Superintendent of the Boston Parks came up to Nashua (as recorded in the City of Nashua Annual Report). At one point during the laying out of the park and left behind him one of his senior foresters - Mr. E.O. Hathaway, engineer, surveyed the farm.

The Superintendent of the Boston Parks was at the time working with the famous firm of Frederick Law Olmstead on Franklin Park. Also at the same time, the Anderson Estate close to Greeley Park on Concord Street had the firm of Frederick Law Olmstead employed to do the landscaping on their property. The firm of Frederick Law Olmstead employed Mr. JP Cotton, an engineer, probably John Cotton and Mr. JP Cotton were related.

Greeley Park has always been considered the gem or crown jewel of the city's park system. When the city had its 75<sup>th</sup> Anniversary, it was hosted at Greeley Park where thousands of its citizens celebrated for one week with parades, children's doll carriage parade, and the like. Many famous people came from all over New Hampshire for the celebration.

Through the years. Greeley Park has been much loved by its citizens but in its past 30 or so years, it has been eaten away bit by bit. Of the 160 acres (more or less) left by Joseph Thornton Greeley, the City of Nashua Assessing Department presently has a record of only 125.14 acres. Presently there's a moratorium against any construction in Greeley without approval from the Board of Aldermen. On the west side of Greeley Park, there is a natural spring running through it.

In 1932, the Nashua Telegraph reported that this spring has medicinal properties whereby local doctors reported that their patients benefited greatly from the drinking of this water. Many local doctors were sending their patients to drink from the spring water. Pilgrims came from afar with jugs to fill the waters from the spring. The Commissioner of the Parks had a list of people from Nashua and Hudson who reported that this spring water had benefited their ailments. Water samples were sent to Concord by the health inspector and the Telegraph reported the sample was excellent. The Annual Report of the City of Nashua for that year included that the health inspector had indeed sent samples to the water to Concord. The archives at Concord have confirmed how many samples were sent. Presently there is a capped well in the area of the spring.

Those of us who walk the west side, see that and truthfully up until I had read this report, I often wondered what that was. So to think that we have this famous spring on there tells me that the west side is as important as any other portion of the city. It's extremely important to me that we consider what a development literally in the armpit of Greeley Park - and I call it the armpit somebody referred to as the elbow and I say no because this is the all of Greeley Park here. There's this piece of property that literally right here and then there's another portion that may or may not be part of Greeley, but it's also part of the city property. It's up on Columbia. There's a tiny little piece of Pennichuck but there's a larger piece of Columbia. That's where believe it or not the water tank for the north end used to live. There are springs in through that area.

There's some homes that are on Bartlett that still have wells. This will affect any development of this property will affect them. They will be blasting. The previous developer - and I say previous developer because he has since pulled out. He is no longer the developer of record. I do believe that there are other people waiting in the wings and I'm not going to comment on that one way or the other. Mr. Geisinger had said that he would step away if the city wanted to buy it. There's been a lot of outcry from the public. I do not know. He sent me a letter today telling me that he was pulling out, did not give a reason, and I did not ask. That is his reason and his reason alone. I believe him to be a very good man, he kept his word.

The problem that I see here is that we need two things. We need a bond and we need the approval to purchase it. Approval to purchase it only takes a majority. The bond takes 10 votes. It is going to be a hard hill to climb. Somebody said did you get permission from the family? Are they interested in it? I don't know. I can't do that. It's not appropriate for me to go and knock on their door but the bottom line is I do believe that we need to show good faith. We need to show that we're ready to pay that mortgage if and when we can purchase it. It's kind of like getting pre-approved.

So let me talk about the park. This as I said sits right here in the arm of Greeley Park. To remove that property and

anybody who walks the - and I'm sorry that someone felt that, you know, it's only the west side and only the people who walk that park benefit from it. It's not true. Any Sunday you can drive to Greeley Park and you will see Massachusetts plates like crazy. You will hear people who say, well, we're losing \$650,000 in taxes but how much is that going to cost us? The first year those roads will be private. Only the first year. We know we get it all the time we bring these private roads into the city. That's a cost to the city. That's trash pickup, that's road cleaning, and eventually it's also taking care of the roads. So the issue of saying that we're losing these tax dollars is not quite completely accurate.

We need to show that we are willing to purchase this. We are willing to save Greeley Park and I agree to one of the speakers who said that there was misinformation out there. It never came from me. Anybody that heard me speak always heard me say this development is not in Greeley Park. It abuts Greeley Park and only abuts Greeley Park. I'm sorry if misinformation went out there, but they never heard it from me. I think that the removal of these trees, and just to let everybody know there is wetlands there. I don't know if they've done any kind of onsite study, but I have a feeling that there are vernal pools there. It's up in the upper corner of it. It may or may not be affected by it. I'm also going to tell you one other thing and this is not a NIMBY, but any development is going to affect those people there and not because they don't want it in their backyard. You can speak to any of the residents there. Their water pressure is horrendous. I spoke to one gentleman whose two streets away – Elliot. He put in a pump and he still has very low water pressure. It just saddens me that we have people that are on wells that could be affected by this because of the blasting. We have people who have water pressure issues who could be affected by more housing being put in there.

I agree we do need more housing in the city. I just fear that this housing will have a negative impact on the city. It will have a negative impact on the park itself. I think if I remember correctly from the planning committee, this falls within the Master Plan even though as does housing. This falls in keeping with the Master Plan thinking. We need to save the lands. We need to have as much green space as possible. This is not the same thing as going to every neighborhood saying no, no, no, we're not going to do it, we're not going to do it, we're not going to do it. This is different. This truly is, as you heard from Friends of Greeley Park, it is one of the gems. It is the number two on TripAdvisor. I really think that we should look at this. I think we should give it a favorable recommendation to the Board of Aldermen and then I hope on the 28th we can carry it forward.

I just want to add one more thing. It is kind of just a side note. If what happened a short time ago is any indication of what can happen, the neighbors there had their water shut off. Pennichuck shut their water off with less than 24 hour notice. Some people never even got the notice and they were without water. These are families who had no water in their home and it was shut off because of something that needed to get done in that property. I don't know what it was and I assume it was an emergency but this is something that can happen. So we need to really, really keep in mind there are some real issues there and thank you very much for hearing me.

#### Chairman Tencza

Thank you Alderman Klee. Questions from members of the Committee?

#### Alderman Clemons

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I agree with Alderman Klee on this particular issue. I think that a development on this site would be detrimental to not only the park but not really in the best interest of the neighborhood or city as a whole. We have an opportunity. It's not every day that an opportunity comes to expand a park like Greeley Park and to do so in a meaningful way. This presents itself, you know, as a once in a lifetime sort of opportunity. So I think that yeah, it is an investment. It's an investment in the park and what we would be doing is adding this tract of land to Greeley Park so that we can protect it in for the future. That's an investment in our future and all of our city parks are for all of our residents. So I don't prescribe to the NIMBY idea either.

I had a development that was built directly behind my house. There was a few others that happened after that in my neighborhood and we had folks who were against the development and everything but I never went to the Planning Board. I never went to the Zoning Board. I never spoke out in opposition to anything that folks were doing. I was asking to by some of my neighbors because I was on the Board of Aldermen but I didn't do it. The reason being is because the land while it was open or while these projects had an impact on the neighborhood, they weren't of the same type of significance. I mean, certainly personally to me the fact that there's a senior housing now that's three stories tall and, you know, there's 60 people that live back there. That certainly affects me, but it fits with the neighborhood sort of and that's the other thing that we need to consider is the fact that would a project like that fit with the neighborhood. I really don't think that it would.

So rather than letting the opportunity go by, I suggest that this Board should recommend that we pass this legislation to buy the property and hopefully we can move along the other piece, which is the bonding portion of it. At least this sets in

motion the ability to negotiate with the property owner. Now the city can go in and talk to them and see what kind of deal we might be able to work out. Maybe we'll get the whole thing or maybe as former Alderman Richardson said, maybe we'll only get, you know, a portion of it. Maybe we'll work on something so that there's a buffer in the back that it's a compromise, you know, but we can't have these conversations unless we have some piece of legislation that allows us to move forward with that. So this is what this is and I hope that we get the support of the committee tonight. I was happy that it got the support of the Planning Board. So I am hopeful that the committee members will send this forward with a positive recommendation. Thank you.

Chairman Tencza

Thank you, Alderman Clemons.

Alderman Lopez

I want to start by thanking Alderman Klee for her comprehensive and historical presentation. I want to remark that her residents are extremely lucky to have her. I hope you don't mind me sharing this, but I think maybe it was a week ago you were telling me, you had been given exercises to re-inflate your collapsed lung and so to be able to deliver that kind of impassioned exposition is impressive. It reflects - none of it was filibuster. It was all very interesting content. After such a long meeting, I think it's pretty tempting, you know, for legislators such as ourselves to kind of just roll in and maybe have a little bit less of an intensive lobbying effort to the other members of Board. Not in this case. Alderman Klee gives it 110%. She cares passionately about it. Her residents also sat through the last meeting and all of the accompanying mayhem and came forward to make their cases. This is very important to the community. I think they're onto something. I think they know their ward and their neighborhood very well and I think there's an intrinsic wisdom there that the rest of us should be following. I hope the rest of the Board does intend to support this. For me, it's a little bit of an easy sell because I already supported the bond so it's kind of foolish for me to not let anybody do it.

As was pointed out in public comment, it's not the city's responsibility to seize every property. So property that neighbors around it think might be used for something that they don't want, not at all. But we don't have a lot of green space left in Nashua and it is rapidly vanishing. There are a lot of development projects that are underway. We do have an obligation to make sure that they're ethical and consistent with the needs of the community. The same way as the tannery project. We're trying to make sure that they don't create an environmental disaster while also, you know, developing usable land, respecting the rights of the private owners of that property. So the city is not trying to claim this by eminent domain. They're trying to make a fair offer so that the residents have equal playing field to say, what is going on in their neighborhood and I think that is something that as legislators and aldermen, we do have to attend to because they're taxpayers too. They're contributing to our city budget. They're contributing to the resources we have in our AAA bond rating and when they come to us and they say something's about to happen to an asset for the entire city, which also directly affects all of us, they have a right to express that. They have a right to educate us on what that immediate area means to them, how it's used, and the different players in there. I didn't know that there is a Christian School over there or that there may be vernal pools. Apparently the fountain of youth is located there. These are things that you find out from people who know the area and treasure it. These are amenities that you can't build. We just spent years trying to design, develop, and find the perfect place and location for Performing Arts Center. You can't create a forest. Okay, you can like in 30 years and watch patience but you can't add the history to that area retroactively. This is an amazing opportunity.

And finally, I'd like to point out that in Ward 4 we missed the boat on that very early in my aldermanic term because an adjacent piece of private property was developed further and in turned it essentially a parking lot and didn't even trigger anybody's radar because there weren't residents right in that area saying, wait a minute, you're about to build the parking lot about eight feet from a trail. Now that's the park people know. Like Greeley Park used to be virgin land. It used to be very unspoiled. It has been developed by Public Works. There's a soccer field in the middle of it. There's baseball fields. Those are amenities that neighborhood children, and local organizations, and the city enjoys. But it's not a deep woods trail. It's not the environmental and conservation experience and that's something that we owe it to future generations of Nashuans to preserve for them so they have that experience and have that ability to do it. Because many of us had the opportunities. I mean I had too much of an opportunity growing up in a log cabin in the middle of nowhere to understand nature. Inner city kids don't and if we make it too far away from their backyard, they don't get that opportunity. So I appreciate the advocacy that I've seen here tonight. I appreciate the cause and the argument. I plan to support this and I look forward to supporting it again at the Board of Aldermen. Thank you.

Chairman Tencza

Thank you

Alderman Schmidt

Thank you. What's the zoning there do you know and how it's zoned?

Alderman Klee

The zoning is it R41?

Matt Sullivan, Planning Manager

It's RA.

Alderman Schmidt

What is that imply?

Matt Sullivan, Planning Manager

The minimum lot size is 7,500 square feet.

Alderman Schmidt

So it's not protected because of the water that's there. T here's no wetlands associated with it. Thank you.

Matt Sullivan, Planning Manager

Matt Sullivan, Planning Manager. My understanding is that there has been a field delineation of wetlands. However, we have not seen that form of wetlands delineation. I believe there's a small pocket of wetland area on the site that does constrain the site's development.

Alderman Schmidt

The piece of property they're looking at only has one entrance, is that correct?

Matt Sullivan, Planning Manager

The proposed configuration included only one entrance with the development that was at least floated to the neighborhood. That was not submitted to the city but that did include one entrance only.

Alderman Schmidt

And the road that it dumps out on is all residential homes with how much - are they zoned A as well?

Matt Sullivan, Planning Manager

They are comparably zoned. The parcels adjacent to the proposal are a mix of lot sizes from .3 acres all the way up to 1.8 acres in size I would say in the general vicinity.

Alderman Schmidt

As far as traffic goes if they were to build it as they've designed it, that traffic dumping out on that street do you think the street would need to be upgraded or widened?

Matt Sullivan, Planning Manager

It's very difficult to say based on the number of units. They would have to go through an exercise with the Engineering Department to determine whether or not a full traffic study is needed or whether basic traffic treatment could treat...

Alderman Schmidt

So at this point what we're really looking at is it's an idea. It hasn't gone through planning, it hasn't gone through zoning, none of this none has been put forward at all yet?

Matt Sullivan, Planning Manager

That is correct.

Alderman Schmidt

Thank you. For a lot of reasons, I don't like the housing there but for a lot of reasons, I don't like the \$2 million price tag. Hearing from Ward 1, people don't like it. They think it's, you know, not in my backyard and it's perfectly understandable. In Ward 1 we have access to the central park of this city. That's the one people use there and I can't get any buy in from the people in in Ward 1. They think Greeley Park is that part on Concord Street that is just for picnics, and movies, and such. They never have gone up in there. They don't understand why it can't be purchased by the people in the neighborhood to give to the city. We know that there is a lot of opportunity for grants and such for things just like this. As a matter of fact, there have been two very big ones recently in New Hampshire. So I really have a hard time voting for this. That's it.

Chairman Tencza

Thank you. Anything further?

Alderman Klee

Thank you very much. I completely respect that and I do see how oftentimes one ward or one neighborhood says I don't get the enjoyment of that so why should I have to pay for it. So let's get down to dollars and cents - \$2.5 million conservatively based on what Dave Fredette had explained to us would be about \$650,000 that it will cost the city beyond the \$2.5 million. So we're looking at like about \$3.1 - \$3.2 million is what we're looking at in total. So let's put that all on the table. It's more than the \$2.5. But the bottom line is that this is something that can never be gotten back and while I do respect that you may have some people within your ward that have never gone there, there are some people in Ward 3 that have never been able to make it because they don't drive so they don't make it to Mine Falls but they do use Greeley.

So you say okay, so it's only Ward 3 but it's not only Ward 3. This is very historic, specialized land. To remove the trees, to create blasting is going to have a negative effect. I am not an arborist. I am not this, but my common sense tells me exactly what will happen. We will lose a good portion of Greeley Park in there. The bottom line is if we can purchase this land, if we can parcel it together, I refer to the word as "annex" and I think it was Attorney Bolton says, I don't know what you're talking about annex. So let me put it to you this way. Let's attach it. Let's attach it to Greeley Park. Let's kind of complete that circle. Take the Columbia Ave. area, take the part of Greeley that goes around, add this right into it.

As you heard when I read, Greeley Park at one point was 160 plus acres. We've lost land because of erosion. We've lost land because of encroachment. People that are moving through it slowly kind of move in, and move in, and move in. Sadly, we need to stop this. We need to stop the shrinkage of Greeley Park and we need to look at it as a city. I don't think, in my opinion, \$3.2 million over 20 years is a lot to ask for saving this park. We vote all the time in this body here not just because our wards tell us to do it. The performing arts center is a perfect example of it. We voted because it was the right thing to do. Some people said nope, we're going to vote for it because my ward told me not to so therefore I didn't. We all did what we felt was the right thing to do for the greater good and for the whole and this is what I'm asking. I'm asking people to look at the whole, look at the benefit of it. This is not a in my backyard. I have never once taken it that way. I brought up some of those issues because those are real issues. You will be affecting the property values of those homes and then what happens? Then what happens to the city? People want to save you're gonna lose \$650,000 but that was based on 43 homes. Truthfully, I don't think 43 homes are going to go in there - maybe 30 homes will go in there.

If it gets developed, there is an in and out issue. Unless they purchase the property next to it, they could have a bigger one. This is literally at the corner of Wellington and Bartlett. You're affecting both areas. Anybody who sits there at four o'clock on a on a weekday, you're going to see all those cars back up going to the school where parents are picking up their children. It used to be in the morning people were dropping off the children. The residents that live there deal with that anyways. To add more traffic to it, I don't think it would be as a significant traffic as many people have been saying that it will be but it's still adding additional traffic. Traffic that those roads, traffic that those residents can't deal with.

Already the residents are dealing with people from that school that are blocking their driveways and so on. Trust me, I talked to them. They're very nice but parents don't listen. They're anxious. They just got out of work. They want to pick up their children or they're late for work and they have to drop off their children. They get frustrated, they get aggravated, and the neighbors have to live with it. School was there. Schools been there for a long time. These properties aren't. They're not there now. This is the last chance we have to save that land. The last chance we have to save that forestry. So, again, it's in your hands and hopefully it makes it (inaudible) so I'll leave it at that. Thank you.

Chairman Tencza

Thank you. Anything further?

Alderman Schmidt

I'm having a hard time equating this with the performing arts center. The performing arts center the design for me in Ward 1 - you know I go to shows maybe once a year, but that's not why I voted for that. I voted for that because it would essentially lower taxes for people. It would actually do that. That income and what that brings around it will lower taxes for the residents. I don't see Greeley Park addition doing that for us and I can certainly understand why Ward 1 would say, this is really an expensive thing for us that we will never see anything from. It's going to remain wooded. It will only be used by what 30 people over, you know, a month. People don't go through the woods. They are down by the road where there's picnic tables. I know the neighborhood uses it but I don't think a lot of people in the rest of the city use it.

One more thing. There have been plots of land that we have lost to developers. Really great pieces of property. Recently, there was one I believe it's in Ward 9. It had been a camp of some kind. Beautiful piece of property. It had everything. It was in the middle of an area where they could really use it and I had people who called me and said, can't you save this? Looking into it, there weren't enough people who said can't you save this? Even people in the neighborhood didn't speak up. We could have used the \$3 million for that and it would have really enhanced Ward 9. It would have saved a piece of property that was historic. It had been a camp for a century and it seems wrong to pick one over the other just because maybe a few more people are vocal about it. Picking and choosing like this, it just seems wrong to me.

Alderman Klee

Thank you, Mr. Chair. I respect everything that you said there. I also say that I don't think we're picking and choosing. The fact that we lost that opportunity to purchase that land, or to save that land, or do anything like that, that is no reason to punish another property that comes up. But I do respect and I do understand exactly what you're saying. I think it is a shame that we lost that property. I think it is a shame that we did not take more into consideration. I don't think that is the same thing as Greeley Park. Greeley Park is quite historical. The entire area within that area is quite historic. The Historic District goes almost up to that area. The reason it doesn't go up to that area is because at one point those homes were all part of one property. They were subdivided. In 1955, I believe, the Barker home was built. In 1958, the one next to it. In 1999, the one next to that. This at one point was very big property and it was slowly - I believe it was the Barker family or descendants of the Barker family at one point that it owned those properties and slowly started cutting them off.

The problem that I see here is that this is just a slippery slope. Once this gets developed, what stops the next two homes next to it from getting developed and putting in more homes, to putting in right up against Greeley Park is all those homes literally go right up against Greeley Park. When you say only 30 people and they're all from that area, I disagree with you on that. As I said, I see - and it's not just the picnic area - I see families from Massachusetts and license plates from Massachusetts every single Sunday oftentimes on Saturday. Yes they're picnicking and yes they're hiking. We walk through there and I'm a resident of Ward 3. This is not quite in my backyard. I'm a little bit over a few streets. We walk through there all the time. We meet people all over not just from Ward 3, not just my constituents. I've talked to people from Ward 1. I've talked to people from Ward 7. I've talked to all kinds of people who enjoy it and if you do walk the current trails that are there, you will see the barbed wire fence. You will be able to see the Barker home. All that woods from that fence, we can already see the Barker home already from that fence, you will now see homes. You will have cars that will be putting exhausts into the park because they will about the park. They will hurt the park.

I'm sorry. We did buy property that did about Mine Falls because we saved it because we did not want to hurt Mine Falls. I say saved Greeley Park. This is not in Greeley Park so anybody who says differently they're wrong. This is in the armpit of the park. This literally abuts it on like two and a half sides. Anything that's done to it from the blasting will affect the wildlife there. If there are vernal pools there, there is a small wetland area. If there are vernal pools there, it's going to affect them. There are bear in there. There are fox in there. There are, I'm sorry, normal critters that we see all the time - the squirrels, the chipmunks, the birds, etc., and so on, but we see coyote in there. This will go away. The west side is

like this tiny little beautiful park with different types of – be it small, different types of paths for walking for biking. I see children playing in there. I see all types of things on a regular basis and I'm there a lot. The idea that I could walk through down that path and all I would see is homes will take away the significance and the beauty of this thing that we call a gem and it is a gem.

The other side of Greeley Park has been developed. They put in a soccer field, and a pickleball court, and horseshoes, and baseball fields, and a music venue, and so on. There aren't trees there. The trees that are there on the other end of the park and there are no paths through there. It is so thick with brush but there are paths on the other side and it's beautiful. I just, you know, the fact that Ward 9 lost their park – and as Alderman Clemons talked about an area behind him - every time we lose any kind of green space, it breaks my heart. This is going to be a loss of beautiful green space that will have a ripple effect. It doesn't always happen that day. It happens years afterwards. By that point by the time we realize the mistake that we made, we cannot undo it. So I really besieged everybody to think about this and to think about the importance of it. It will cost the city \$650,000 above the asking price. I shouldn't say the asking price - over the \$2.5 million that I'm asking for us to Bond. I think it's important. I think it's important to show to that family that we are serious and that we want to save our park and that's really what it comes down to. It's saving our park. So while I respect you, I respect everybody in Ward 1 that you have spoken to and so on. It's a crying shame if we let it go. I think I've said enough. Thank you.

#### Alderman Clemons

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to state also that, you know, I mentioned investments in the future and I often do that because I believe that the city has to make investments. Most investments that the city makes are not going to have a positive return. That's the nature of a city. There are on occasion some investments that we make that will have a positive return and one of those, and I agree with Alderman Schmidt, was the performing arts center and that's because it's an active ongoing event center that will attract people to the city center and will, you know, produce economic activity and things like that for a long time to come after it's built.

But the most things that we do, don't do that. Most investments that we make are ones where we have to continually put money into up keeping them. Parks are one of those things. Green spaces tend to be one of those things, although in some cases green spaces are we have volunteer groups like in Mine Falls that go out and they maintain the trails and do cleanups and things like that. So, you know, there are ways to mitigate these costs. Will there be potentially lost tax revenue? Yes, there will be potentially lost tax revenue. There might be unforeseen revenue, I guess, (inaudible) doesn't get developed. But, you know, these things have to be laid out in their totality and they have to be looked at in a greater aspect of what do we want to see for the future of the city. While I lament as well the loss of the green space which is Camp Doucette I believe down in Ward 9, we can't dwell on the past. We have to move forward and look towards the future. We have an opportunity here. It's in our lap. I think we should move forward with this. It's got a favorable recommendation from the Planning Board and, you know, like I said, this starts the conversation.

#### Chairman Tencza

Thank you, Alderman Clemons.

#### Alderman Lopez

Yeah well, as we're discussing the performing arts center and as the person who accidentally introduced that into this, it's my understanding that it itself will not lower taxes. Its function as an economic anchor will bring in revenue that will increase the overall value of the properties around it. That's a benefit to the city. A lot of that benefit specifically in terms of property value is tied up in a TIF so it's going to serve that neighborhood very well and those regional businesses and allows us the opportunity to add secondary amenities.

I think Greeley Park as has already been mentioned being on TripAdvisor is a huge amenity for Nashua and a huge economic anchor where people come to Greeley Park and if they're going for a hike for the day, they're going for a picnic, maybe they stop at the supermarket to shop for it, maybe they go have a drink after whatever they were doing in Greeley Park. I know it's a huge economic anchor for half of the nonprofits in the city because they're all doing 5K's through it. So it's a well-used space and having that kind of green space does have value. Strictly speaking trying to render it down to just its tax value, again, I think it's a disservice to the taxpayers who actually sit right in that area and understand its value. They deserve a voice too. So again, I appreciate the advocacy and the lobbying that's being done by a very responsible Alderman who saw the needs, and saw the values, and is championing that cause because without her, we would be missing all of this and we would be lamenting the loss of that property.

Finally, I would just want to point out that the petition that precipitated the performing arts center landing on the ballot, and actually I think Alderman Clemons essentially said that, but the petitions in supporting the performing arts center aren't as big as the change.org one. There is a lot of public support for this not just Greeley Park. I think we should bear that in mind too.

Chairman Tencza

Thank you, Alderman Lopez. So the motion is for final passage of R-21-203. It has to be done by roll call. Just for the record, I will be abstaining from this vote due to a professional conflict. So I'll call the roll. I'm going to abstain.

A viva voce roll call was taken which resulted as follows:

Yea:	Alderman Lopez, Alderman Clemons	2
Nay:	Alderman Schmidt	1
Abstained:	Alderman Tencza	1

**MOTION CARRIED AND RECOMMENDED FOR FINAL PASSAGE**

NEW BUSINESS – ORDINANCES

**O-21-073**

- Endorsers: Mayor Jim Donchess
- Alderman-at-Large Shoshanna Kelly
- Alderman Patricia Klee
- Alderman Thomas Lopez
- Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.
- Alderman Richard A. Dowd
- Alderman Linda Harriott-Gathright
- Alderman-at-Large Ben Clemons
- Alderman Elizabeth Lu
- Alderman-at-Large Lori Wilshire

**AMENDING THE INCLUSIONARY ZONING SUPPLEMENTAL USE REGULATIONS**

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN LOPEZ TO RECOMMEND FINAL PASSAGE, BY ROLL CALL**

ON THE QUESTION

Chairman Tencza

We've heard about this a number of times. We heard about it earlier tonight. Is there anyone on the Committee who has additional questions for Mr. Sullivan or Mr. Cummings?

Alderman Clemons

Thank you. I did have one question. So some folks in the public had the question about why the income level, I believe, was at 80% instead of 60%. I don't know if you could go over that and maybe also what we might be able to do and get that threshold down a little bit in the future even if it's in separate legislation.

Matt Sullivan, Planning Manager

I'd be happy to address that. Matt Sullivan, Planning Department Manager. Yes, Alderman Clemons there are a few factors that sort of weigh on the ordinance as its drafted and before you this evening. First of which is really the work that was done as part of the housing study back in 2020, which identified the particular need not only in one and two bedroom units but also in what we've referred to as sort of colloquially as the missing middle housing. That really is the 80% to 100% of area median income need. We did review other income needs within that study, but those are identified as the highest priority need and so when we went into the exercise of doing a feasibility analysis, we focused our revenue neutral element on that income level. So we did not specifically model for the 60% income levels.

I've been fortunate to have a lot of conversations with some of the folks that have spoken this evening. I think we want this ordinance to be an active one in that we come back in a year or two years and do sort of an audit of how we've progressed, do some data analysis of how many units have actually been created, and potentially analyzed at that time whether or not there is a need to add a 60% component in addition to those 80 and 100% elements that are included within the ordinance today. So we certainly don't want to discount the fact that there is a need at those income levels and below as certainly one member of the public spoke to, but we have not modeled that in detail and we believe that what we've put forward as a revenue neutral mandatory IZ policy is best accounted for through that 80 and 100% AMI as presented. Hopefully that answers your question.

Alderman Clemons

Yes, it does and so I appreciate that and I appreciate the fact too that your department and the city staff is looking at this as a living document. Too often in the past we've had, you know, the answer was well that's just the zoning laws. I understand that they're a pain and they you know, you want to have consistency and things like that when it comes to zoning and they're things that you don't want to touch that often. I think when it comes to adjusting to the needs of our population in regards to their income, I think that that's something that I'm glad that you're willing to look at and hopefully in the future, you know, a year from now maybe or so we can look at what we could do at a different threshold. Rather than kicking away or just lowering it to 60, maybe we can add a component to this. So I look forward to working with you on that. Thank you.

Chairman Tencza

Other questions by members of the committee? I have one question. So it was brought up before just tracking. Is it something that will be tracked the number of affordable units that come online as a result of this and where will it be tracked?

Matt Sullivan, Planning Manager

Great question. So this effort that we're undertaking this evening to actually install or repeal and replace the existing inclusionary zoning is really just part one of two of our efforts. The second part is actually working with the Planning Board to actually implement policies and standards that govern how we actually manage these within development projects that are submit to the city. What's included therein is how we're going to monitor and report those units back to not only the Board of Aldermen to track how we're doing, but also to the Community Development Department who's sort of monitoring this program overall. So our intent at this time is to work with the Planning Board through the months of January, March, or April on developing those policies and standards. As part of that, we will include specific monitoring guidelines as far as how we report back on how we're doing. I fully expect that based on the aldermanic involvement and the housing work that's been done that that will include at least an annual report to this group. So I hope I hope that that answers the question, but we certainly will be reporting back on how we're progressing particularly with this being such sort of an innovative policy within the State of New Hampshire and, again, recognizing that we may have a need to tweak it as we actually work with developers to implement it.

Chairman Tencza

Thank you. So I just have two other comments to make in support of it. I think it was impressive that you've had several public meetings on this come to this Committee, come to the Board. It's impressive that the developers have not voiced any significant opposition to this. So it must be a policy that you folks worked with them on this to make sure that it was a good balance. So I appreciate that.

I also just wanted to say thank you to the folks who have been consistently coming here - Reverend Basada is still online; Rabbi Spira-Savett is still online; Mr. Keating. I think they will also kind of keep us honest and accountable going forward. I'm sure there'll be interested in whatever opportunities there are to kind of fill in that gap for less than 80% of AMI. They'll be thinking of creative ways for us to do that. So thank you for bringing this to us.

Any further questions or comments? All right, seeing none I will call the roll.

A viva voce roll call was taken which resulted as follows:

Yea:	Alderman Schmidt, Alderman Lopez, Alderman Clemons, Alderman Tencza	4
Nay:		0

**MOTION CARRIED**

TABLED IN COMMITTEE - None

GENERAL DISCUSSION - None

PUBLIC COMMENT

Tim Cummings, Economic Development Director

Tim Cummings, Director of Economic Development. I just wanted to put a plug out there that this is going to come up on December 28th for final passage. I want to just make sure that this body knows that that's going to be the last meeting before session expires. It's really imperative that we have a quorum for that meeting so we can move this legislation on. I just hope that everyone is aware and cognizant of that detail. It's something that I've been internally ruminating on and I just wanted to make sure folks were aware of that observation. Thank you.

Chairman Tencza

Thank you. I'm sure there will be a headcount done before that meeting. Any the other public comment?

Laurie Ortolano

Laurie Ortolano, 41, Berkeley Street. I just wanted to share a little bit of information from the mask mandate meeting that you had. I think one of the problems with how you conduct your business is that you're only willing to take your information from one source and even our Board of Health consists of healthcare providers and doctors that only look at medicine from one perspective. You could have doctors up there that would share a different opinion. You could have a nurse on that board that would share a different opinion and it's interesting because there seemed to be four or five people at the beginning of the meeting that were not keen on that mandate and by the end having listened to your "experts", they had all changed their mind. But they didn't allow the nurses that were, you know, in the crowd, or on Zoom, or any of the other people to share any perspective at all. It's been a while since people have been able to have a voice on this. It's two or three weeks since the Board of Health meeting allowed community input, then they shut it down, and then we come out here to an emergency hearing, and it shut down.

I received the letter today from a friend written by the CEO of Southern and he wrote: "As we approach the end of 2021, I wish to give my most heartfelt thanks to all and each of you for all your hard work and dedication to our organization, blah, blah. He says we're anticipating COVID numbers are peaking now and will soon begin to decrease. We're also pleased to announce that we are having success and retention and recruitment of staff. It was a priority when I began at the end of September and we are now beginning to see positive results." This concept that you know this is going to blow up again isn't reflected in this letter at all. They're not seeing it. When I told you that I looked at the numbers on December 3<sup>rd</sup>, it was 433 hospitalizations. It went up to 462 on December 8th and right now as of December 21<sup>st</sup>, its 437 and we do seem to be riding a wave over it. I really would encourage everyone not to go downtown, don't go to restaurants, bars, clubs, and casinos. We shouldn't even be going into them and they should be closed. If what the Board of Health is telling us that the death of one child is significant and, you know, another hospitalization is a problem, then close those places where there's a lot of close contact. Instead of having the doctors sit at the table and say, well, it's their choice if they want to go and put themselves at that risk, I don't know how you can say that when in the second breath you're saying it's overtaxing the hospitals and they can't handle it. I'm a proponent of choice.

Chairman Tencza

30 seconds.

Laurie Ortolano

Like I said, I've been a proponent of the Board of Health but tonight was - I can't support that organization anymore. I think they're too one sided. They weren't objective. I was very disappointed in Stephanie Wolf and the pediatrician for sensationalizing the death of a child. He had no data on that and, you know, we know nothing about that to make a determination. I think the one member who stayed true to their position. Have a good night and have a good holiday.

Alex Comeau

Yes, thank you. Alex Comeau, 4 Lewis Street. I don't want to rehash everything that I said earlier regarding the Bartlett Avenue property. I would just like to add to that. I had conversations with a lot of people during the election season about issues that were important to them in Ward 6 and a number of those were a couple of really busy streets that we have that don't have sidewalks. I had a nice conversation also with the Division of Public Works about the sidewalk project. We had a conversation about how there's a lot of things that we really like to do that aren't possible because we don't have the money. So it's really disappointing to hear that kids that walk to Fairgrounds Middle School and Fairgrounds Elementary School on Lund Road don't have a sidewalk to walk to school on because we don't have the money but we can find \$2.5 million to buy an unused piece of wooded area because some people are afraid that it's going to affect their view. So that's very upsetting. When it's something that is at the end of somebody's street, we can find \$2.5 million dollars to do it but when its kids that have to walk in the street after a snowstorm to get to school, we don't have to funding to do that. So that's all. Thank you.

Chairman Tencza

Thank you. Anyone further for public comment? Okay I'm not seeing anyone online. No one else in the chamber.

REMARKS BY THE ALDERMENAldermen Lopez

I'd like to thank everybody who showed up for the Vigil tonight – the longest night vigil to recognize people that we've lost over the past year that have been unsheltered or been staying outside.

I think tonight's inclusionary zoning board is at least a favorable recommendation and the ability to advance it is something tangible, which means a lot to providers who've been working with people for years trying to help them navigate the issues that are systemic in accessing housing, and accessing employment, transportation that generally a lot of people will not consider important for matters of principle - like how it effects their taxes, or whether "these people" have somehow incurred the wrath of a higher power and deserve what they're getting. The excuses have varied year, after year, after year and the indifference to people who are suffering right in front of us hasn't really waned. So it was encouraging to see the turnout today. Everybody was socially distanced. Everyone was wearing masks and there was a lot of commitment, I think, to trying to uphold principles of thinking for others and trying to find ways that nonprofits, and community members, and the city can work together to address this.

Earlier it was referred to the city, the city is looking for rebranding. I think we should dare to rebrand. I think we could be a city of kindness. I think we could be a city that looks at its people as resources instead of obstacles to whatever development of amenity or whatever is in their way. So I was encouraged by tonight's participation and I appreciate the support from the public. I even had some members of the public donating some hand warmers which are far short of being enough for somebody who's sleeping outside, but there'll be warmer with them than without. So I appreciate that.

Chairman Tencza

Thank you. If Alderman Clemons and Alderman Schmidt don't mind, Ms. Ferreira did have her hand up and I just missed her during the public comment. So go back to her if she would like to make a comment.

Penny Ferreira

Sorry, can you hear me now?

Chairman Tencza

We can yes. Okay.

Penny Ferreira

I just want to thank everyone that voted in support of the R-21-203. I'm just so grateful - more than you know. One of the things that I didn't get to send you my three minutes because I'm a very long winded, detailed person and I apologize. Reading through the Master Plan, it talked about climate change. We didn't even talk about what that's going to do when the trees are cut down. One of the goals in the Master Plan is to commit to climate change.

Also, we know there's a lot of ledge on that property and there's a 20% increase according to the Master Plan of significant rainfall in Nashua and they don't expect that to go down. So my concern has always been if you had the developer to go in and cut down those trees and it's on ledge, then you're gonna have a flooding problem. Both of those streets run downhill from that property and there's a significant slope on that property as well. So I'm just asking everyone who is involved in the aldermen vote for the bond to keep that into consideration. This is not a Ward 3, again, issue. This is so much more than just in my backyard and I look forward to seeing this property become annexed, and that armpit being brought in, and then working with the Boy Scouts and groups to create more biking trails and walking trails. I'm a huge animal advocate and I can tell you, I have hundreds of friends in Nashua, literally, that walk through the current trails in in Greeley right now with their animals. That's going to bring in revenue if we market it as an animal haven for walking trails. So thank you again. I appreciate all of you. You've had a long night, if again, not an easy job and I don't want your job but I appreciate you. Thank you so much.

Chairman Tencza

Thank you.

Alderman Schmidt

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to take a moment to thank the people who wrote to us. The people who took their time to write reasons and interesting letters about the mask mandate. When science is used, when discussions about issues that you have with masks, all of that matters to us. What mattered just a bit more was what we're watching as far as the numbers. I said 19 people died yesterday. Someone has corrected me that was 25. This is not the time to believe that your freedom to go maskless beats everybody else's freedom to be safe. Thank you very much for writing, it was really important to hear from you and I'm very sorry that I could not vote for the purchase of the property at the park. If I had my way, I'd buy up all the land that we could and save it for the future. I don't have it my way and I'm not sure the city has the funds to do this. Thank you.

Chairman Tencza

Thank you, Alderman Schmidt.

Alderman Clemons

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So I, too, want to thank everybody that reached out over the past week or so, regarding the mask mandate. I believe I responded to every single email. So I just wanted to make sure that of the hundreds of emails we got, I responded to all of them and I did try to do that.

The other thing is you I agree with Alderman elect Comeau in a way. I wish we could actually do the sidewalks and Greeley Park because despite the fact that I voted against the mask mandate, I am still sort of a liberal Democrat and I don't mind spending people's tax money. So if we could find a way to do the sidewalks and Greeley Park, I would be happy to do it. But of course, we don't have an unlimited budget. We're not the federal government. We do have to live within our means. So I understand that there are choices that have to be made but we get pretty creative here in Nashua and I think and I'm hoping that when you come on board Alderman Comeau I hope you see that it doesn't always have to be one or the other and that there are ways to work together to find solutions. So I look forward to working with you on that. Ward 6 is my home as well so hopefully we can work together.

Lastly, I just wanted to for all the people who celebrate, I want to wish everyone a Merry Christmas and we will see you all next week before New Year's.

Chairman Tencza

Thank you very much. Okay. Well I think we've taken care of all the business we need to take care of tonight so Alderman Schmidt would you like to make a motion to adjourn by roll call?

POSSIBLE NON-PUBLIC SESSION - None

ADJOURNMENT

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN SCHMIDT TO ADJOURN, BY ROLL CALL**

A viva voce roll call was taken which resulted as follows:

Yea: Alderman Schmidt, Alderman Lopez, Alderman Clemons, Alderman Tencza 4

Nay: 0

**MOTION CARRIED**

The meeting was declared closed at 10:54 p.m.

Alderman-at-Large David C. Tencza  
Acting Committee Clerk