



**Stratham Planning Board Meeting Minutes
January 22, 2025
Stratham Municipal Center
Time: 7:00 pm**

Members Present: David Canada, Vice Chair
Mike Houghton, Select Board's Representative
Chris Zaremba, Regular Member
John Kunowski, Regular Member
Nate Allison, Alternate Member

Members Absent: Thomas House, Chair

Staff Present: Carol Ogilvie, Interim Town Planner
Susan Connors, Planning Project Assistant

1. Call to Order

Mr. Canada called the meeting to order and took roll call. Mr. Canada appointed Mr. Allison as a voting member for this meeting.

2. Approval of Minutes

a. January 8, 2025

Mr. Zaremba made a motion to approve the January 8, 2025 meeting minutes. Mr. Kunowski seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion passed.

3. Public Hearing (Old Business):

a. Copley Properties LLC (Applicant) and Helen E. Gallant Revocable Trust of 1995 (Owner), request for approval of a Subdivision application and Conditional Use Permit for a proposed subdivision of 80 and 80R Winnicutt Road, Tax Map 14, Lots 56 and 57, into a Residential Open Space Cluster Development with 28 single-family residential lots, and five (5) joined-array lots each with four (4) separate single-family units, for a total of 48 units. The parcels are Zoned Residential/Agricultural.

The applicant was represented by Tim Phoenix of Hoefle, Phoenix, Gormley & Roberts and Bruce Scamman of Emanuel Engineering and James Verra & Associates. Mr. Phoenix outlined two requests they have of the Board. The first is that the Board determines that the Preliminary Consultation process completed for this project meets the definition of a Design Review which protects the application against subsequent zoning or regulation changes. The Board agreed. **Mr. Zaremba made a motion that the previous application discussed in June 2024 is considered Design Review. Mr. Kunowski seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion passed.**

Mr. Phoenix described the applicant's objection to the Planning Staff Memo for this meeting that asserts the application needs to comply with Zoning Ordinance Section 4.3(i). Ms. Ogilvie

45 respectfully disagreed with Mr. Phoenix and explained that Section 4.2 states that it “shall apply
46 for all lots” unless modified by other sections of this ordinance and Section 8 does not specifically
47 state there is an exemption from dimensional requirements. Mr. Canada added that Section 4.2 also
48 says that the section shall not regulate any Gateway or Town Center Zoning, therefore he believes
49 the section applies to all other zones. Mr. Allison stated that he believes Section 8 stands on its
50 own but not that it is independent from the rest of the ordinance. Mr. Kunowski agrees with Mr.
51 Allison that Section 8 stands alone and he agrees that Section 4.3(i) would apply to development
52 of the initial yield plan. Mr. Phoenix replied that the applicant has provided the squares for the
53 yield plan but believes the requirement does not apply to the final cluster subdivision plan. Mr.
54 Houghton agrees with Mr. Allison and recalls that the development of Section 4.2 was to apply to
55 conventional subdivisions and that cluster subdivisions are guided under Section 8. Ms. Connors
56 stated that the question of the applicability of Section 4.3(i) to the cluster subdivision was raised
57 by staff because there is no other way for the applicant to demonstrate that the final cluster
58 subdivision lots are not irregular if this provision is not applied. She believes that the single-family
59 lots likely meet the requirement and it would only be the array lots in question. Mr. Goddard replied
60 that the spirit of the cluster subdivision is such that the lots will be smaller and there will be higher
61 density to aid the ability to create more protections of open space, wetlands, recreation, and
62 wildlife. He asserts that Section 8 contains no provisions for shape of lots nor has he seen it
63 discussed in past cluster subdivision applications, not that it wouldn’t be worthy for future
64 applications or ordinance amendments, but he does not think it applies to his application under the
65 current ordinance. Mr. Phoenix read the definition of Open Space Cluster Subdivision in Section
66 8.4.h. and read the definition of joined-array units in Section 8.8.d. and believes they are a
67 modification to Section 4.3(i). Mr. Houghton stated that his recollection of the square is to
68 demonstrate that new lots are buildable. Mr. Canada recalls it slightly different that the reason was
69 to prevent irregular lots. Mr. Phoenix added that the Planning Board can add reasonable conditions
70 to any approval and therefore there is opportunity for the Board to review the final lots before
71 approval to ensure they are reasonably shaped. Mr. Allison stated that he believes the square was
72 required to ensure that lots have a usable yard in addition to space allowed for a well and septic
73 system. Mr. Scamman stated that the array lots are specifically designed in the Ordinance. Mr.
74 Allison asked if Mr. Scamman is asking that the development square not be applicable to the array
75 lots. Mr. Goddard replied he is asking for the exception from all lots. Mr. Phoenix added that it is
76 common for there to be a requirement that lots are not irregular but other towns do not have a
77 physical requirement. He doesn’t see the final lots as irregular. Ms. Ogilvie noted that staff
78 reviewed this interpretation with Town Counsel who opined that Section 8.2 gives the Board
79 authority to review innovations in land planning and that the Board has the authority to waive or
80 modify the request and that the Board can be more lenient or require that Section 4.3 applies to all
81 lots. Mr. Zaremba does not want to commit that the array lots are not concerning, but he doesn’t
82 think the boxes are needed for all the lots. Mr. Phoenix noted that if the Board waives the
83 requirement for this project, it does not bind the board for the next application where it would if
84 the Board determines that Section 4.3 does not apply. Mr. Canada said that is what he is trying to
85 prevent and he stated that lots 30, 31, and 32 are irregular and the box is intended to prevent that.
86 Mr. Zaremba added that he believes they can waive the box requirement and still determine that
87 the lots are irregular. Mr. Goddard believes the array lots look irregular because they are very large.
88 Mr. Houghton believes that in other recent cluster subdivisions the dimensional box was used and
89 he agrees the array homes are unique. Mr. Phoenix read to the Board the purpose of the Cluster
90 Development from the Ordinance and opined that the box does not need to apply to the array lots
91 because of the purpose of the array lots. Mr. Houghton stated that the array lots have not been
92 proposed in the past and he agrees with a waiver to the array lots but would apply the requirement
93 to the single-family lots. Mr. Allison agreed.

94
95
96
97
98
99 **Mr. Houghton made a motion to apply a waiver to Section 4.2 and Section 4.3(i) of the Zoning
100 Ordinance to provide flexibility of land use to the array lots on the Copley Properties/Helen
101 Gallant Revocable Trust Site Plan and non-array lots shall conform. Mr. Allison seconded
102 the motion. All voted in favor and the motion passed.**

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
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142 Mr. Scamman presented the yield plan that depicts in different colors, the buildable vs. non-buildable areas. Mr. Allison commented that the areas include buffers. Mr. Scamman replied that the Ordinance states non-wetlands which include buffers. Mr. Allison stated that Section 11 of the Ordinance states that buffers cannot be used for construction or be altered so to that extent, although they may be uplands, they cannot be constructed in. Mr. Scamman replied that the Ordinance only requires that the areas be non-wetlands. Ms. Ogilvie asked Ms. Connors to present the staff comments. Ms. Connors questioned compliance with the minimum contiguous upland buildable area in Section 8.9.b.i.1 and noted that Town Counsel stated that minimums do not constitute automatic approval and that the Board can require more. She read the definition of non-buildable area in Section 8.4 focusing on the phrase land that is restricted by development by covenant, easement, or other restriction (emphasis added to 'other restriction') and stated that staff believes the minimum buildable area needs to be demonstrated that it is outside the wetlands building setback which is currently 50 or 100 feet depending on soil types and if the proposed wetlands ordinance is passed will be 75 feet and will be applicable to the building permits. Staff confirmed that with Town Counsel. Mr. Goddard noted that the current discussion is on the yield plan not the final plan. Mr. Allison believes the yield plan for a cluster subdivision needs to demonstrate two acres of non-buildable areas and the yield plan presented does not do that. Mr. Scamman replied that he believes the yield plan needs to show a traditional layout with 30,000 square feet of non-wetlands on the lot and that they have done that and displayed potential houses, wells, and septic system locations. Mr. Kunowski asked for confirmation from Mr. Scamman as to which area of the lots are the contiguous non-wetland areas using Lot 21 as an example. Mr. Scamman confirmed Mr. Kunowski's interpretation. Ms. Ogilvie asked Mr. Scamman if the 30,000 square feet of contiguous non-wetland area depicted on the yield plan includes wetland setbacks as Section 11.5.1 of the Ordinance states that the contiguous non-wetland area must be sufficient in size to accommodate all applicable setbacks. Mr. Goddard disagreed with the staff interpretation. Mr. Allison asked if they will construct in the wetlands buffers. Mr. Scamman replied no, that all houses and septic systems are outside of those. He believes the Ordinance requires that the applicant demonstrate that they can build while meeting the setbacks and that it does not say that the 30,000 square feet does not need to meet the wetlands setbacks because they are two different sentences. Mr. Kunowski said that he is comfortable with Mr. Scamman's interpretation. Ms. Connors explained further that staff's interpretation is that the ordinance requires that a contiguous non-wetland area of 30,000 square feet be provided for each lot and this (emphasis added) contiguous non-wetland area must be sufficient to meet all applicable setbacks. Mr. Canada agrees with Mr. Scamman that the key term is non-wetland and that does not include the buffers. Mr. Zaremba believes it does include the setbacks. Mr. Goddard asserts that the sentences in the paragraph are intended to be interpreted separately and that the contiguous non-wetland area only needs to demonstrate that the housing and utilities will be outside of the setbacks. Mr. Phoenix stated that the staff interpretation could result in a lot that is 60,000 to 90,000 square feet of upland on a lot. He believes the intent of Section 11.5.1 is to say that a lot must have 30,000 square feet of upland and the construction meets land setbacks and the buffer. He added that if ordinance language is ambiguous then ambiguity is resolved against the drafter, which is the Town. Mr. Canada asked if they agree that all structures are subject to the buffers. Mr. Scamman replied absolutely.

143 Mr. Canada asked when there will be an engineering review and if the yield plan will be reviewed
144 by engineering. Mr. Phoenix and Ms. Ogilvie agreed it is not standard to have the yield plan
145 reviewed by engineering. Ms. Ogilvie further clarified that the density bonus request will need to
146 be reviewed after approval of the yield plan.
147

148 **Mr. Kunowski made a motion to approve the yield plan as presented of 35 lots subject to**
149 **additional review regarding the density bonuses to be applied. Mr. Zaremba seconded the**
150 **motion. All voted in favor and the motion passed.**

151
152 Mr. Canada asked Ms. Ogilvie to describe the list of density bonuses. Ms. Ogilvie stated the
153 application requests a threshold bonus of 1 lot, a buffer preservation bonus of 2 lots, unique land
154 features of 10% of the base, innovative layout of 10%, and 5% for trail development.
155

156 Mr. Scamman presented the bonus requests related to the open space parcel, the unique
157 development to retain the existing farmhouse and barn, the addition of the array clusters for
158 different style homes, and preservation of the front of the development. Mr. Goddard asked if they
159 could explain each bonus individually. He stated that the required minimum Open Space lot
160 percentage is 35% and they are providing more than that and are requesting one bonus lot for that.
161 They are asking for two lots for preserving a buffer at the entrance on Winnicutt Road. Mr.
162 Goddard requests 10% for preservation of unique land and environmental features and/or facilities
163 for the repair and preservation of the existing historic house and barn. He stated that they tried to
164 arrange the road in the subdivision to showcase the home and barn and minimize tree clearing and
165 wetlands impacts throughout the subdivision. The wetlands impacts are only 3,000 square feet total
166 which is minimal with regards to the amount of wetlands on the property. He proposes to preserve
167 the on-site pond and provide an access easement for public recreation. A no-cut buffer is proposed
168 along Spring Creek to preserve the wildlife corridor. Mr. Goddard said regarding the house and
169 barn he would like to preserve and renovate it with input from the Heritage Commission. He
170 anticipates the renovation could cost hundreds of thousands if not close to 1 million dollars and
171 therefore is asking for the maximum bonus. Mr. Canada stated that it is wonderful the amount of
172 money Mr. Goddard is willing to invest in the house and the barn and asked if he is willing to put
173 a preservation easement on the structures, so they don't get changed. Mr. Goddard replied that he
174 does not want to fully commit to that right now and he would like to get through the next density
175 bonus to see where he is with bonuses. He added yes, it is on the table, and as long as he is satisfied
176 with the overall project, then he will be willing to provide the easement. He stated that typically
177 those easements are provided at a compensation and he is not requesting compensation but as long
178 as he gets through the density bonuses tonight in a way that satisfies his project objectives, he
179 would be agreeable to provide the easement. Mr. Canada stated he will ask the question again later.
180 Mr. Goddard continued with the bonus requests. Regarding innovative layout, he believes he has
181 harnessed the village layout as best as he can in a rural setting with diversification in housing type,
182 lot sizes, house sizes, and bedroom sizes. He stated that a large portion of the open space will be
183 useable and enjoyable for public access. He believes the pond will serve as a meeting and green
184 space with public parking spaces. Regarding the layout, they have been conscious of limiting
185 wetlands crossing. Mr. Goddard is asking for a 5% bonus for trail development and has spoken
186 with the Parks and Rec Department, but he does not anticipate having a proposed trail network
187 designed even within a month but commits to providing easements to the Town for trail
188 connectivity. He thinks the value of the trail density bonus isn't necessarily related to what he
189 creates today for a trail, but what's in the future. Mr. Goddard stated that if the Board grants his
190 request on each item, he will not maximize it, he ultimately is looking for enough bonuses to get
191 to 39.5 lots. Mr. Scamman described the bedroom calculations at the bottom of plan sheet C3

192 derived from the Subdivision Regulations section 4.6.7. Mr. Goddard provided the example that a
193 2-bedroom home is worth 0.65 lots. Mr. Scamman continued that a 3-bedroom home is worth 0.85
194 lots and a 4-bedroom home is one lot. They propose 20 2-bedroom homes, 10 3-bedroom homes,
195 and 18 4-bedroom homes. The 20 2-bedroom homes is equivalent to 13 lots; the 10 3-bedroom
196 homes is equivalent to 8.5 lots; and the 18 4-bedroom homes is equal to 18 lots for a total of 39.5
197 lots. The yield plan has 35 lots so they are seeking enough bonuses for 39.5 lots and they believe
198 they submitted justification for enough bonuses to achieve 46 lots. Mr. Kunowski stated that the
199 Ordinance allows for bonuses for lots or units and questioned if the Board authorized the maximum
200 density of 46 units, he questions why the plans show 48 units. Mr. Scamman believes the term unit
201 in the ordinance translates to Section 4.6.7 of the regulations where a 4-bedroom unit is equal to 1
202 and a 3-bedroom unit is equal to 0.85. Mr. Goddard added in response to Mr. Kunowski that the
203 density section in the ordinance states that the maximum number of bonuses cannot exceed 50%
204 of the yield plan so for this project would be $(35 / 2) + 35 = 52$ lots. The lots and/or units combined
205 cannot exceed 52 and he is only requesting 48 units and therefore below the threshold. Mr.
206 Goddard suggested that instead of the Board detailing individually how many percentage points
207 are approved for each category, that instead the Board consider that the overall discussion of all
208 bonuses, he has applied a lot of the attributes that are mentioned and ultimately, he is approved for
209 a lot yield of 40 lots. Mr. Canada asked Ms. Ogilvie if the Board can do that. Ms. Ogilvie replied
210 that the Board does not need to itemize the bonuses, but the Board should review each request
211 individually and agree that they meet the individual intent of the bonuses. Mr. Houghton asked for
212 clarification from the Applicant that they are asking for 39 lots and 48 units. Mr. Goddard replied
213 he is rounding up to 40. Mr. Houghton does not think he can round up. Ms. Ogilvie agreed. Mr.
214 Zaremba asked questions to clarify lots vs. units. Mr. Goddard stated that he does not think he can
215 get 48 units if it is calculated using 39 lots because of the bedroom calculations, that he needs 40
216 lots. He added that he could ask for 46 lots and not utilize all of them. Mr. Scamman noted that
217 Section 8.11.b.2.viii allows rounding up where the final number is greater than 0.5. Mr. Canada
218 called for a board discussion on bonuses. He asked the Board if they agree the applicant is approved
219 for the Open Space bonus. There was no objection. Mr. Canada asked the Board if they agree that
220 the applicant is approved for 2 lots for buffer preservation along Winnicutt Road. Mr. Kunowski
221 asked for a description of the general dimension of the buffer space on either side of the roadway.
222 Mr. Scamman replied it is 400 feet long and 200 feet wide. Mr. Zaremba asked if it is one lot or
223 two lots and asked if Lot 11 goes all the way to Winnicutt Road. Mr. Scamman replied correct and
224 explained that there is limited visibility into the development past the first wetlands crossing into
225 the development. Mr. Zaremba asked how large the front open space lot is. Mr. Scamman replied
226 about 2 acres. There was no objection from the Board on this bonus. Mr. Canada asked the Board
227 if they agree with the preservation of unique land and environmental features. There was no
228 objection from the Board on this bonus. Mr. Canada asked the Board if they agree with the
229 innovative layout and design bonus request. Mr. Zaremba took exception to granting that bonus.
230 He stated that he doesn't see a village on the plan, he sees increased density and he would expect
231 to see sidewalks in a walkable village. Mr. Houghton also does not see features relative to common
232 land and recreational opportunities and gathering spots for that particular density bonus. Mr.
233 Canada thinks the pond and trails and different styled homes and grouping of homes answers the
234 bonus partially but not to the full extent. Mr. Kunowski thinks it meets some of the criteria but not
235 all of it. He agrees there is a park/open space area, he is not sure that the view of the house meets
236 the community viewshed, there is no protected farm activity, and the trail system could be a
237 recreational opportunity, but that is not existent. Mr. Allison had no comments. Mr. Canada asked
238 the Board if they agree with the recreation and public access bonus. He doesn't think the trails are
239 deserving because they haven't been developed. Mr. Houghton agreed. Mr. Goddard summarized
240 the calculation so far. They have 35 lots, he is asking for 1 lot for the Open Space, 2 lots for one

241 lot protected along Winnicutt Road, and 10% for preservation of the home (3 lots) which would
242 result in 41 lots. Mr. Goddard continued that they can leave it there or he can add an exterior
243 preservation easement on the house and barn to work with the Heritage Commission and he can
244 add access easements for future trails to coordinate with Parks and Recreation and the Trail
245 Advisory Committee, but request no bonuses for the trails. Mr. Canada replied that he sees a couple
246 of points off for two of the items and but they seem well below what the maximum would be. Mr.
247 Canada called for a motion regarding 40 lots. Ms. Connors requested that before that motion is
248 made, can the Board clarify that in the Ordinance where bonuses are discussed, that 'lot' refers to
249 'parcels' and 'units' refers to 'structures'. Mr. Houghton replied that is what he tried to question
250 at the start of this conversation. Ms. Connors explained her interpretation of the Ordinance with
251 respect to this project, that a yield plan of 35 lots results in a potential maximum of 52 lots or units.
252 She does not understand why the application is seeking approval for 40 lots if only 35 lots are
253 presented on the plan. Mr. Goddard replied that the yield plan shows 35 lots but for density bonuses
254 he is asking for 40. Ms. Connors stated the yield plan shows 35 lots and the final subdivision plan
255 shows the same so she doesn't understand why bonuses are needed. Mr. Goddard replied that the
256 density bonuses are the lots, but regarding the number of units allowed in the subdivision
257 regulations at section 4.6.7, he cannot exceed the yield plan plus 50% which is 52 lots or units. He
258 stated that he is not exceeding that number in either lots or units. He agrees the calculation is
259 confusing and believes the essence of the ordinance of why it states that two-bedroom units are
260 worth 0.65, is because if a two-bedroom unit was worth the same as a four-bedroom unit, it would
261 force a developer to only build four-bedroom units. So, it allows an open space plan to be
262 innovative and create unique parcels and smaller lots. It incentivizes a developer to construct two-
263 bedroom units. Mr. Goddard stated that this plan cannot exceed 52 units or lots and they are
264 requesting only 48 units and 33 lots. Mr. Scamman added that there are less lots on the cluster
265 subdivision plan than on the yield plan. Mr. Canada asked for confirmation that they are seeking
266 5 bonus lots. Mr. Goddard replied correct.

267
268 Mr. Houghton stated that he is struggling with how the plan meets the Open Space criteria. Mr.
269 Scamman replied there is open space around the entire development. Mr. Houghton clarified that
270 the open space should be usable and read from the Section 4.6.6 of the Regulations: "Useable Open
271 Space shall be reasonably available for recreational use by residents of the subdivision. General
272 Public Use may be considered, which shall not be required. The usability criteria are necessitated
273 by the subdivision where land is to be developed in a manner that will result in a significant number
274 of people forming a community on the land, adequate recreational space is a necessity". He stated
275 that the regulations continue to state that a minimum of 25% of total required open space land must
276 be usable uplands and reasonably available for recreational purposes, provided, however, that no
277 more than 50% shall be utilized for such purpose in order to preserve a reasonable portion of
278 natural area on the site. He stated the regulations continue to describe ski trails, tennis facilities,
279 swimming pools, playgrounds, off-road bicycles, horseback riding, etc. In his opinion, he does not
280 see that useable space provided. Mr. Goddard explained that 75% of the open space will be upland,
281 usable, walkable and there will be parking spaces with access easements to the open space that is
282 accessible not just to the residents of the community or that park there, but to residents of nearby
283 neighborhoods. He stated that walking trails are not necessarily needed, that there are a lot of
284 people that just like to go for a nature walk, so the essence of having the access and usability of
285 that it is the one bonus. Mr. Houghton asked where the access is. Mr. Goddard identified the
286 location of public parking spaces and stated they can access the pond for recreation and there will
287 be access easement to the open space that goes around the entire perimeter. Mr. Houghton asked
288 if that's where all the trails will be. Mr. Goddard replied that they are not showing any trails at this
289 point and he doesn't think he needs to request a density bonus for the trails, but he is willing to

290 provide a trail easement to the Town for the creation of trails in perpetuity. Mr. Houghton
291 understands not requesting a trail bonus, but his comment is a point of discussion for the plan
292 review because the cluster subdivision regulations require that trail systems and recreation areas
293 be developed, and that's not an easement. Mr. Goddard replied that the easement is if the Trail
294 Committee determines in the future they need an additional trail, they would have the authority to
295 create that trail and this parcel won't be a blockade.
296

297 Mr. Canada summarized that the request is for 40 lots including 5 bonus lots to build 48 structures
298 with a trail easement to be given to the Town throughout the entire open land and to put a
299 preservation easement on the exterior of the house and barn. The Board discussed the details of
300 bonus itemization and Mr. Canada summarized the following: 2 bonuses for the preservation of
301 each potential frontage lot as open space and up to 3.5 bonuses for unique land and environmental
302 features allows for 5 bonuses. **Mr. Canada made a motion to approve that. Mr. Kunowski**
303 **seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion passed.**
304

305 Mr. Kunowski asked if the project will receive engineering review by the Town. Mr. Canada
306 replied yes. Mr. Goddard stated that they have received comments from Stratham DPW that they
307 are addressing and they will continue to work with the Fire Chief and he acknowledges that the
308 project needs to go to third party fire protection engineering review. Mr. Goddard asks if there is
309 anything needed from the Board's perspective on the site plan. Mr. Kunowski asked for the plans
310 to be more readable and clear with regards to the various areas – open space, individual lots, etc.
311 Ms. Ogilvie asked the Board about the public comment regarding a traffic study. Mr. Canada
312 replied that would be a matter for DOT. Ms. Ogilvie replied DOT won't perform a study. Mr.
313 Scamman added that DOT will require it if they think it is necessary. Mr. Kunowski asked about
314 Conservation Commission review. Mr. Scamman replied they will present the project to the
315 Conservation Commission when they apply for the wetlands permits. Ms. Ogilvie added that staff
316 have received estimates for engineering review of \$4,000 for the general review and \$2,200 for
317 the fire protection review. Ms. Connors clarified that the first engineering review is just for the
318 application and that a second escrow will be needed for on-site inspections.
319

320 Mr. Canada asked if anyone from the public wanted to speak. There were no comments from the
321 audience.
322

323 There was a discussion as to whether the plans are ready for third-party review. It was determined
324 that the plan presentation would continue at the February 5th meeting prior to sending the plans out
325 for the general engineering review. Ms. Connors asked Mr. Goddard if they want to initiate the
326 conceptual plan of the fire protection review. Mr. Goddard replied that is fine as he does not expect
327 many changes on what has been submitted. Mr. Canada summarized that the plan is for the
328 Applicant to return on February 5 with semi-finished plans and for the Board to review them to
329 determine if they are ready for third-party review. Mr. Goddard agreed.
330

331 Mr. Canada made a motion to continue the public hearing to February 5, 2025. Mr. Zaremba
332 seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion passed.
333

334 **4. Adjournment**
335

336 **A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting at 9:23 pm. All voted in favor and the**
337 **motion passed.**