



---

**ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT**

**Draft Minutes**

**April 26th, 2022 - 7:00 pm @ Community Development Department**

**Physical Location:** 3 North Lowell Road (Community Development Department) Live  
**Broadcast:** WCTV Channel 20 – Local Cable TV  
**Live Stream:** <http://www.wctv21.com/>

**Attendance:**

**Chairman Betty Dunn- present**  
**Vice Chair Nick Shea-present**  
**Pam Skinner, Secretary- present**  
**Neelima Gogumalla, regular member- present**  
**Michelle Stith, regular member- present**

**Staff:**

**Alex Mello, Community Development Director**  
**Julie Suech, Planning Technician**  
**Anitra Lincicum, minute taker**

**Zoning Board Alternate Members Interviews:**

Chairman Dunn introduced one potential Zoning Board alternate, Ms. Ruth Ellen Post.

Ms. Post addressed the Board. Ms. Post provided a letter to the Board earlier today. Ms. Post has served on the Planning Board and she is also a retired attorney and professor of legal studies. Ms. Post stated she has been active in the service club and an organization that provides pro-bono legal advising. Ms. Post looks forwards to working with this Board if given the opportunity.

Chairman Dunn asked if Ms. Post has even attended a Zoning Board meeting; she has both in person and watching the meetings at home/online. Chairman Dunn asked Ms. Post if she was willing to attend a ZBA training session in the next year. Ms. Post said that she would and may have in the past as a

35 Planning Board member. Vice Chair Shea asked if the ZBA meetings would suit her schedule. Ms. Post  
36 said that they would. In response to Mr. Shea, Ms. Post stated that she is a US citizen.

37  
38 Chairman Dunn stated that the Board would like to go forward with the interviews of the other applicants  
39 and then make a decision about all the applicants. The Board agreed to start the discussion in non-public  
40 at the end of the meeting if time allows and proceed with the applications.

41  
42 Chairman Dunn reviewed the variance process to the public.

43  
44 **Call to Order**

45  
46 **Public Hearing**

47 **Case # 10-2022** Parcel 24-F-6  
48 **Applicant – Benchmark LLC**  
49 **Owner – Edward and Renee Hahn**  
50 **Location – 6 Johnny Hill Rd**  
51 **Zoning District – Rural District**

52  
53 Variance Relief is requested from **Section(s) 702, and Appendix A-1** to construct a single- family dwelling on an  
54 approximately 7.26-acre lot that does not have the required 175-feet of frontage on a Town Class V Road. The lot  
55 does have 240-feet of frontage on a discontinued Road.

56  
57 Ms. Skinner read the case into the record along with the letter of authorization.

58  
59 The Board is in agreement to waive the reading of the list of abutters.

60  
61 Mr. Joseph Maynard of Benchmark LLC addressed the Board. Mr. Maynard stated that there is currently no access  
62 for the applicant to the parcel from a road. Mr. Maynard stated that the road was discontinued as a town Class V  
63 road in 1962. In 1999, Edward N. Herbert Associates did a plan for the area. Plan D 27411 and Plan D-34587  
64 discussed Johnny Hill road on those plans as well. Mr. Maynard mentioned Sheerer vs. Raymond; this was a court  
65 case that decided that an easement over private property can be granted to access a town owned road. Mr. Maynard  
66 stated that this is a 7-acre parcel. There is a dredge and fill permit, special permit request for the driveway in the  
67 WWPD and a special permit for construction on a town road. Mr. Maynard stated that even if a road is  
68 discontinued, an applicant does have a right to access the road the parcel is on.

69  
70 Mr. Maynard reviewed the 5 criteria contained in the public packet. Mr. Maynard explained that the lot is a lot of  
71 record and is on a discontinued road and it does not meet the frontage requirements on a town road. Mr. Maynard  
72 stated that there is one home proposed on this 7-acre property and the test pits are good for both septic and well  
73 water.

74  
75 Ms. Gogumalla asked if it was only one home on the property. Mr. Maynard stated that there would be only one  
76 home. Ms. Stith asked how long the road would be. Mr. Maynard stated that it would be about 1,000 feet and there  
77 are culverts in the area.

78  
79 Chairman Dunn stated that discontinued town roads have quite a history in New Hampshire and it is not a simple  
80 matter.

81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130

Correspondence via email:

The Conservation Commission would like to request a joint site walk and they would like more information about the location of the road and house.

Matt Charbonneau, 8 Bennington Road, wrote a letter. Their lot directly abuts the lot application. The letter stated that the lot has been for sale for 10+ years and has not been purchased. Mr. Charbonneau stated that the Hahn family has no intention of residing on the property. Mr. Charbonneau stated that this was never a Class V road; it was a Class VI road. Mr. Charbonneau stated that Benchmark LLC and the Hahn family would need to secure access with no less than 4 residential lots. Mr. Charbonneau also stated that there are vernal pools in the area. Mr. Charbonneau stated that this lot could potentially be used for Conservation land.

Ms. Stith read a second letter into the record. The Hamid family also wrote a letter to the Board asking about the access point to the property. The letter stated that the owners understood there was no access to the site when it was purchased.

Ms. Wendy Williams read a letter on behalf of Mr. Bruce Chang. The letter stated that the image shown shows that there is no easy access to the lot. The letter stated that based on a Conservation map in 2007, there is no longer a right of way access along Johnny Hill Road. Mr. Chang stated that there is a stream in the area and is significant. Mr. Chang disagrees with the applicant that the construction of a home will increase property values. The letter and map were submitted as Exhibit A.

There was a letter from James Saulnier from the Windham Fire Department. Mr. Saulnier would like to know if the applicant will be improving the road to gain access to the site.

Chairman Dunn invited public input at this time.

Mr. Paul Odette, 1 Burnham Road addressed the Board. Mr. Odette stated that he had his land surveyed in spring of 2019. There are property stakes on his property and the stakes for the discontinued road are actually on their property. Johnny Hill Road was considered privately owned land and absorbed into the property the letter was submitted as Exhibit B.

Mr. Dan Guttman, 20 Heritage Hill Road addressed the Board. Mr. Guttman stated that he reached out to the town manager Dave Sullivan to discuss the discontinued road. Mr. Sullivan stated that the town has no interest in the lot line being removed. The lot line should have been removed at that time according to Mr. Guttman. Mr. Guttman stated that the development of Bennington and Burnham has impacted Heritage Hill Road. Construction on the hill will impact the households downhill according to Mr. Guttman. Mr. Guttman stated that these properties should have gone to conservation and Mr. Guttman stated that the owner knew there was no access when they purchased the property.

Ms. Wendy Williams, 28 Bear Hill Road and Historic Commission Chair addressed the Board. Ms. Williams stated that the GIS map has many errors and the lots are deeded to the center of the road and the road is considered a Class VI road according to Ms. Williams and is subject to gates and bars. Ms. Williams stated that the road has a physical gate and bar on the property. Ms. Williams stated that it has not been maintained for over 5 years and she believes it is a Class VI road. Ms. Williams stated that there is a double wall in the area. There is also evidence of pot ash circles as well as a barn foundation. Ms. Williams stated that there is a beaver pond in the area. Ms. Williams stated that she would like the Historic Commission to attend the site walk as well. Ms. Williams stated that much of the lot appears to be wetland, similar to her own house lot and it would likely be difficult to build on. Ms. Williams stated that her map shows Johnny Hill Road as discontinued. Ms. Williams stated that the map

131 submitted as part of Exhibit A shows where Johnny Hill Road was given to the property owners. Ms. Williams  
132 would like to see the Board consult town counsel.

133  
134 Mr. Maynard addressed the Board for rebuttal. Mr. Maynard stated that he does not list the road as Class V  
135 anywhere in his paperwork. Mr. Maynard stated that gates and bars is not part of his discussion and this is not one  
136 of these situations because it is listed as a discontinued road. Yet, Mr. Maynard stated that a property owner has  
137 the right to access his or her parcel of land. Mr. Maynard stated that he is aware he has to deal with the state of  
138 New Hampshire in regards to the wetlands and talk to the Conservation Commission. Yet, right now, he is here to  
139 build on a lot that does not have frontage on a Class V road. Mr. Maynard stated that there will also be an  
140 archeological assessment of property in some cases as well. Mr. Maynard stated that he will also be doing a  
141 drainage study.

142  
143 Mr. Mello stated that part of the discussion might be to discuss if it is a paper street or a discontinued street. Mr.  
144 Maynard stated that there is an implied easement which also allows people to construct a driveway from end to end  
145 for access to their lot.

146  
147 Chairman Dunn suggested that the Board meet with town counsel and schedule a site walk. The Board discussed  
148 getting the legal question answered first.

149  
150 **A motion was made by Ms. Gogumalla to continue Case #10-2022 to May 10<sup>th</sup> and the Board asked staff to**  
151 **get the written opinion of town counsel regarding this situation and to give further information provided**  
152 **sufficient information becomes available. If information is not available by this time, the Board will notify**  
153 **the public as needed if May 10<sup>th</sup> will not be the date of continuance. Seconded by Ms. Stith. Vote 5-0. Motion**  
154 **passes.**

155  
156 Mr. Odette addressed the Board and asked if abutters would be noticed. Chairman Dunn stated that they would not  
157 be noticed again and they can assume it will be continued to May 10<sup>th</sup>.

158  
159 **[Case #11-2022](#) Parcel 21-V-230A**  
160 **Applicant – Benchmark LLC**  
161 **Owner – Arthur Breslin**  
162 **Location – 28 Fish Rd**  
163 **Zoning District – Residential District A / WPOD**

164  
165 Variance Relief is requested from **Section(s) 405.2, 405.3, 702, and Appendix A-1**  
166 to raze the existing structure and construct a new single-family dwelling on a pre-existing, non-  
167 conforming lot. To allow the dwelling to be placed 8-feet from the front lot line, 9-feet from the North Eastern side  
168 yard, 2-feet from the South Western side yard, and 9-feet from the rear yard lot lines. Where the setback  
169 requirements are 50-feet for front yard, and 30-feet for side and rear yards. To allow a lot size of approximately  
170 4,571 sq. ft., where a minimum lot size of 50,000 sq. ft., is required. To allow approximately 63-feet of frontage on  
171 a private road, where 175-feet of frontage on a Town Class V Road is required. To allow the coverage of 25.4 %,  
172 where a maximum of 20% is required in Residential District A, Cobbett's Pond and the Canobie Lake Watershed  
173 Protection Districts.

174  
175 Ms. Skinner read the case into the record along with the letter of authorization. The Board agreed to waive the  
176 reading of the list of abutters as it was part of the record.

177  
178 Mr. Joseph Maynard of Benchmark LLC addressed the Board. Mr. Maynard stated that the current coverage of the  
179 property is 25.4% and the proposed coverage is 24.2%. Mr. Maynard stated that the reduction in coverage would  
180 be considered in the drainage improvement but they will also be adding additional drainage measures.

181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230

Ms. Gogumalla asked if this was listed as year-round. Mr. Maynard that it is currently listed as seasonal.

Mr. Maynard read the 5 criteria contained in the public packet. The proposal meets the WPOD for this area. This is a residential building and is allowed in this zone. Mr. Maynard explained that this is an odd shape and does not currently have any land improvements. Mr. Maynard stated that the variance is necessary because it does not leave room for any improvements without a variance. Mr. Maynard stated that the existing house it about 24 feet tall and the proposed house would be about 30 feet tall.

Chairman Dunn asked about the elevation of the road. Mr. Maynard submitted a picture of the view of the property and this was labelled Exhibit A by the Chair.

Ms. Skinner read the letter from the Conservation Commission. This Board would like a joint site walk with the Zoning Board of Adjustment.

Ms. Stith asked about the current footprint. The current layout is 1100 square feet. Mr. Maynard stated that the applicant is looking for a one-story garage. Mr. Maynard and Chairman Dunn asked why the Conservation Commission may want a site walk; Mr. Maynard stated that the Conservation Commission has often had concerns about when small is too small and they would like to see the lot.

Chairman Dunn invited public comment at this time.

Mr. Roy Dennehy addressed the Board. Mr. Dennehy resides at 5 Willow Road. Mr. Dennehy is here to support the applicant. Mr. Dennehy stated that the area is about 80% “summer people” and they have been there for decades. Mr. Dennehy stated that there is a close family knit organization in the area and they very much enjoy the summer in the area. Mr. Dennehy stated that the lot abutting this property is also in support of the project.

Mr. Shawn Harrington, 2 Fish Road addressed the Board. Mr. Harrington stated that he is also in support of the project and he understand the concern around the setbacks but there is no impact whatsoever and he does think it will improve the lot.

Mr. John Carroll, 13 Fish Road. Mr. Carroll stated that this is a win/win situation because any time you do an improvement on the septic, it is helpful to the pond.

Mr. Arthur Breslin, 28 Fish Road addressed the Board. Mr. Breslin as the applicant stated thy have strived to make a lot of improvements on the septic and the well. Mr. Breslin stated that there are comparable lots on the lake that have been approved over the last few years.

Mr. Maynard addressed the Board once again. There is no way to make the lot or the land any larger and he does believe this is an improvement. Ms. Stith asked about how homeowners are trained to maintain the geogrid. Mr. Maynard stated that sprinklers are often used on the geo-grid systems to help them remain with grass. Vice Chair Shea asked if Mr. Maynard knew why the Conservation Commission requested a site walk. Chairman Dunn stated that she would like to see a site walk.

**A motion was made by Ms. Gogumalla for Case #11-2022 to schedule a joint site walk with the Conservation Commission. Seconded by Ms. Stith. Vote 4-1. Vice Chair opposed. Motion passes.**

**A motion was made by Ms. Gogumalla. to continue Case #11-2022to a date certain on the May 10<sup>th</sup> site walk at 6pm and the hearing at the ZBA meeting to follow. Seconded by M. Stith. Vote 5-0. Motion passes.**

231 **Case #57-2021: Parcel(s) 18-L-300 (continued from February 22, 2022)**

232 **Applicant – The Dubai Group, Karl Dubai**

233 **Owner – Angle Wood Pond Realty Trust, Inc.**

234 **Location – 1-3 Sharma Way (aka 55 Range Road)**

235 **Zoning District – Professional, Business and Technology, Residential A & WPOD**

236

237 Variance relief is requested from Section(s) 603.1.1 & 614.2 to permit 100 two-bedroom townhomes, arranged in  
238 fourplexes, where this particular type and configuration of residential use is not allowed in the PBT, RDA &  
239 WPOD zones.

240

241 Attorney Morgan Hollis, 39 East Pearl Street, Nashua, NH addressed the Board. Attorney Hollis would like to put  
242 100 2-bedroom condominiums on the site. These are uses that are not permitted in the PBT zone. Attorney Hollis  
243 stated that they had submitted a supplemental memorandum previously when it was decided by the Board to  
244 continue to review the material. The March meeting date was continued as that was not a full Board. Attorney  
245 Hollis stated that comparable properties were also provided as requested at prior meetings. There have also been  
246 materials provided regarding the projected enrollment projections. Attorney Hollis stated that he does have a  
247 consultation from an independent consultant regarding why development has not occurred.

248

249 Attorney Hollis reviewed the concept of spot zoning. Attorney Hollis stated that relief from the zoning is a  
250 variance, it is not spot zoning. Attorney Hollis stated that a vote to try and change the zoning of the area would  
251 actually be an example of spot zoning. Attorney Hollis stated that they did invite an independent consultant to  
252 review the data regarding school enrollment.

253

254 Mr. Mark Fougere wrote a letter as an independent consultant. The letter was submitted as evidence and read into  
255 the record. 100 2-bedroom condominium units. Mr. Fougere estimated that there may be approximately 19  
256 students residing in the proposed complex; the findings were submitted to the Windham ZBA. Students would  
257 likely be spread throughout the grade levels and the addition to the student population would be negligible  
258 according to Mr. Fougere. According to Attorney Hollis based on the findings in the letter, families are not  
259 attracted to these types of developments. Attorney Hollis stated that they did meet with the Windham Economic  
260 Development Committee. Attorney Hollis discussed making use of a clubhouse for communal office space.  
261 Attorney Hollis stated that there are some condos with one bedroom and professional offices. There is more  
262 commercial activity in nature under the new plan according to Attorney Hollis.

263

264 Mr. Karl Dubai of the Dubai Group addressed the Board and is representing the applicant as well. Mr. Dubai  
265 stated that there is a home occupation permit available in Windham. The units in this proposal are 4 units per  
266 building. The floor plans talk about the square footage. Mr. Dubai stated that these town houses are for a different  
267 types of market and they are designed for office space and for adults. Mr. Dubai stated that the layout of the  
268 structures has convertible office spaces for buyers that would like certain things. Mr. Dubai stated that Vice Chair  
269 Mason from the Planning Board was part of the discussion where it was asked why it might not be possible to  
270 integrate some of these units where the office is downstairs and the living space is upstairs so that the uses are  
271 integrated into the property. The colored area on the plan is where the changes were made according to Mr. Dubai.  
272 Each of the 4 buildings has one-bedroom luxury flats with garages on one side.

273

274 Attorney Hollis submitted a packet labeled “Proposed Mix Uses in Residential Condominium Project” which  
275 explained the change in use and the reduction in the number of bedrooms. Mr. Dubai stated that the floor plans are  
276 for the 2-bedroom condos, not the ones with the office in the front, there is no floor plan for this. Attorney Hollis  
277 stated there is no floor plan for the condos with office space. There is 100 total units but there is now a difference

278 in the number of bedrooms. Mr. Dubay stated that 31 townhouses were approved as part of Residence A line and  
279 the front of the lot is PBT. There is now 28 units above the red line. The Board discussed that the residences  
280 cannot be in the PBT and the PBT cannot be in the residential so the variances are not usage variances.  
281

282 Chairman Dunn stated that the applicant does appear to have no layout plan for these commercial units. Further,  
283 there is the home occupancy variance that is not a typical use in the PBT. Chairman Dunn also stated that none of  
284 this information was available to the Board prior to his evening.  
285

286 Attorney Hollis stated that the original application was for 100 2-bedroom units. Attorney Hollis stated that he  
287 would like to review the 5 criteria.  
288

289 Ms. Skinner asked if this proposed plan approached an entirely new plan. The Board discussed if other variances  
290 might be necessary for the plan.  
291

292 Attorney Hollis reviewed the hardship argument as part of the 5 criteria. Attorney Hollis stated that he visited the  
293 site and he reviewed the plan. Attorney Hollis stated that reviewing the history of PBT zone was interesting to  
294 Attorney Hollis and it was created in 2000. There were several efforts to make this commercial property and  
295 several times it failed. Attorney Hollis stated that these pieces in the front have been utilized because they are very  
296 visible. There is a unique aspect access for this lot. Attorney Hollis then reviewed a google earth map as well as a  
297 color-coded zoning map. Attorney Hollis explained that local business does have cross access across Route 111  
298 whereas this case does not. Attorney Hollis stated that this is also a split zone and this is also close to both of the  
299 lakes. The applicant's lots are subject to both overlay districts. Attorney Hollis stated that there is a sewer issues in  
300 the design and capacity of the area. Attorney Hollis stated that he believes they have established the uniqueness of  
301 the site.  
302

303 Attorney Hollis sites Symplex vs. Newington. Symplex stated that there were 90 acres zoned commercial. This  
304 case went to the supreme court. It is not just what the citizens wanted according to Attorney Hollis. Belanger vs.  
305 Nashua, also cited by Attorney Hollis, stated the idea of reasonable use in the area and a reasonable use on the  
306 property. Use, abutter use and hardship. The applicant is unable to market or sell the property. You cannot  
307 mandate the use of the property when that use might be a loss of revenue. Is the requested use reasonable; Attorney  
308 Hollis stated that it is. Attorney Hollis sees that this is compatible with the proposed use in the Master Plan  
309 regarding housing needs and walkable neighborhoods. The following exhibits were submitted by the applicant:  
310

- 311 Exhibit A – Mixed Use Concept, dated 4/26/22 prepared by The Dubay Group
- 312 Exhibit B – Townhome floor plan & elevations, dated 9/1/21 prepared by The Dubay Group
- 313 Exhibit C – Letter from Mark Fougere to Attorney Hollis
- 314 Exhibit D – “proposed mixed uses in residential condominium project”
- 315 Exhibit E – Satellite aerial image
- 316 Exhibit F – Zoning Map excerpt
- 317 Exhibit G – Cobbetts Pond Watershed Map, prepared by NH DES
- 318 Exhibit H – Shannon DiPietro resident and commercial outreach  
319

320  
321 Ms. Stith asked about visibility. Attorney Hollis stated that the distance from the intersection does not allow for  
322 visibility. Chairman Dunn stated that there is a traffic light that has been allowed but does not solve the entire  
323 problem of this property. Attorney Hollis and the Board discussed access to the site. Attorney Hollis contends that  
324 this site is difficult to access.  
325

326 Mr. Dubay stated that the septic and water were difficult, a challenge for certain potential restaurants. Mr. Dubay  
327 stated that the Lake Overlay District changed twice and it continually put pressure on this site in particular because  
328 they were in both of the overlay districts.  
329

330 Attorney Hollis discussed if this would alter the essential character of the neighborhood. Attorney Hollis does not  
331 believe there is any threat to public safety and welfare. Attorney Hollis stated that not developing the site is not  
332 going to be what the ordinance might not have envisioned. Attorney Hollis referenced the fiscal impact summary.  
333

334 Ms. Shannon DiPietro addressed the Board. Ms. DiPietro stated that most residents did not understand what was  
335 going to be put there. She spoke to 63 residents and they are in favor of the project. Ms. DiPietro reviewed the  
336 letters and information submitted by both residents and businesses. Ms. DiPietro stated that many of the properties  
337 being sold in Windham neighborhoods are being sold to families that have school aged children and the families  
338 living in the larger homes may be seeking to downsize.  
339

340 Discussion was open to the public.  
341

342 Ms. Shannon Ulery, 9 Magnolia Road addressed the Board. Ms. Ulery stated that there is not a lot of houses for  
343 sale. Ms. Ulery does believe that families are interested in moving here for the schools. Ms. Ulery stated that  
344 businesses were not attracted as expected. Ms. Ulery is disappointed that a new plan was dropped this evening.  
345 Ms. Ulery stated that the plan has changed significantly. Ms. Ulery stated that Windham is an anomaly. Windham  
346 is growing at a large rate and will continue to grow. Ms. Ulery stated that what she heard was that the applicant got  
347 the zone approved as a certain zone and that was the will of the voters and now they wish to change the plan. Ms.  
348 Ulery stated that there is a significant number of concerns with the plan all around.  
349

350 Ms. Cynthia Finn, Bell Road addressed the Board. Ms. Finn stated that as the school board chair she submitted the  
351 NESDEC summary and submitted it to the Board. Ms. Finn stated that there is another enrollment summary from  
352 the spring. Windham is growing unlike the rest of New Hampshire which seems to be decreasing. The district is  
353 growing .5% to 5% a year. There is no consideration for multi-unit dwellings and it was all based on single family  
354 homes. 2-bedroom households generally do not bring in as many school age children. Ms. Gogumalla asked what  
355 they meant by an anomaly. Ms. Finn stated that Windham is witnessing significant growth.  
356

357 Ms. Wendy Williams, 28 Bear Hill Road addressed the Board. Ms. Williams stated that the property would have  
358 an impact on the fire and safety.  
359

360 **A motion was made by Vice Chair Shea to continue Case #57-2021 to May 24<sup>th</sup> to the first case of the**  
361 **evening. Seconded by Ms. Gogumalla. Vote 5-0. Motion passes.**  
362

363 **A motion was made by Vice Chair Shea to enter non-public RSA 91A 3: 11 (a). Seconded by Ms. Skinner.**  
364 **Roll call vote: Chairman Dunn, Vice Chair Shea, Ms. Stith, Ms. Gogumalla, and Ms. Skinner- yes. Vote 5-0.**  
365 **Motion passes.**  
366

367 The Board re-entered public session.  
368

369 **A motion to appoint Ms. Ruth Ellen as an alternate Zoning Board of Adjustment member to a 2-year term.**  
370 **All in favor of the vote.**  
371

372 **A motion was made to adjourn at 10:42pm.**



373

374 Respectfully submitted by Anitra Lincicum

# Draft