

**APPROVED**  
**TOWN OF PELHAM PLANNING BOARD**  
**MEETING MINUTES**  
**April 19, 2021**

Chairman Tim Doherty called the meeting to order at approximately 7:00 pm.

The following notice was read aloud “A Checklist to Ensure Meetings are Compliant with the Right-to-Know Law During the State of Emergency” (*regarding access to the meeting*)

Secretary Danielle Masse-Quinn called roll:

**PRESENT ROLL CALL:** Tim Doherty – present  
James Bergeron – present  
Danielle Masse-Quinn – present  
Cindy Kirkpatrick – present  
Alternate Bruce Bilapka – present  
Alternate Samuel Thomas – present  
Alternate Paddy Culbert – present  
Selectmen Representative Kevin Cote – present  
Alternate Selectmen Representative Hal Lynde – present  
Planning Director Jeff Gowen – present  
\* *Mr. Gowan left the meeting at approximately 8:30 pm.*

Via Telecommunication:

Roger Montbleau – present via Zoom; no one in the room  
Alternate Mike Sherman – present via Zoom; no one in the room  
Alternate Richard Olson – present via Zoom; no one in the room

**ABSENT/**

**NOT PARTICIPATING:** Paul Dadak

Mr. Doherty appointed Mr. Bilapka to vote in place of Mr. Dadak.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**MINUTES**

**April 5, 2021**

**MOTION:** (Cote/Masse-Quinn) To accept the April 5, 2021 meeting minutes as amended.

**ROLL CALL VOTE:** Mr. Bilapka – yes  
Ms. Kirkpatrick – abstain  
Mr. Cote – yes  
Mr. Bergeron – yes  
Ms. Masse-Quinn – yes

Mr. Montbleau – yes  
Mr. Doherty – yes

(6-0-1) The motion carried.

### **ADMINISTRATIVE**

#### **BOS seeking Planning Board’s Nomination of NRPC Commissioner for one (1) open position for four (4) years.**

Mr. Gowan explained that the Town is entitled to three NRPC Commissioners due to the Town's population. He noted that the Town had only two for a long time, currently consisting of Mr. Hal Lynde and Mr. Dave Hennessey. He stated that it came to their attention late last year that a third commissioner was available for the Town. He added that it also came to their attention that the Planning Board should nominate the candidate and have the Board of Selectmen confirm them. Mr. Gowan explained that the role of the NRPC Commissioner is to represent the official interests of the community to which they are appointed and that they should be a sitting member of a local board, have experience as a former selectman, alderman, counselor, planning board member, conservation commission member, etc. or have a direct link to the decision-making process of the community. Mr. Gowan explained that two qualified individuals applied for the position: Ms. Heather Forde, who is a previous selectwoman, and Mr. Paul Grant, who currently sits on the Budget Committee.

**MOTION:** (Masse-Quinn/Bergeron) To nominate Mr. Paul Grant for the NRPC Commissioner four-year position.

**ROLL CALL VOTE:** Mr. Cote – yes  
Ms. Kirkpatrick – no  
Mr. Bilapka – yes  
Ms. Masse-Quinn – yes  
Mr. Bergeron – yes  
Mr. Montbleau – yes  
Mr. Doherty – yes

(6-1-0) The motion carried.

Mr. Doherty asked Mr. Cote to relay this information to the Board of Selectmen.

### **NON-PUBLIC SESSION**

**MOTION:** (Bergeron/Masse-Quinn) Request for a non-public session per RSA 91-A:3, II, 1 (consideration of legal advice or council).

**ROLL CALL VOTE:** Ms. Kirkpatrick – yes  
Mr. Montbleau – yes  
Ms. Masse-Quinn – yes  
Mr. Bergeron – yes  
Mr. Bilapka – yes  
Mr. Doherty – yes  
Mr. Cote – yes

(7-0-0) The motion carried.

Mr. Doherty noted that when the Board returned, after the non-public session, the Board would move forward with the meeting. The Board entered into a non-public session at approximately 7:17 pm.

**MOTION:** (Cote/Bilapka) To leave the non-public session.

**ROLL CALL VOTE:** Ms. Kirkpatrick – yes  
Mr. Montbleau – yes  
Ms. Masse-Quinn – yes  
Mr. Bergeron – yes  
Mr. Bilapka – yes  
Mr. Doherty – yes  
Mr. Cote – yes

(7-0-0) The motion carried.

The Board returned to public session at approximately 8:14 pm.

**MOTION:** (Bergeron/Masse-Quinn) To indefinitely seal the minutes of the non-public session.

**ROLL CALL VOTE:** Ms. Kirkpatrick – yes  
Mr. Montbleau – yes  
Ms. Masse-Quinn – yes  
Mr. Bergeron – yes  
Mr. Bilapka – yes  
Mr. Doherty – yes  
Mr. Cote – yes

(7-0-0) The motion carried.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **Case #PL2021-00005**

#### **Map 30 Lots 11-157, 11-158, 11-162, & 11-163**

#### **CROOKER, Kevin & Constance & TERRY, Angela – 2 & 4 Andover Street and 3 & 5 Methuen Street – Lot Line Adjustment between lots 11-157 & 11-158 and 11-163 & 11-162**

Ms. Masse-Quinn read the list of abutters aloud. There were no persons present who asserted standing in the case, who did not have their name read, or who had difficulty with notification.

Mr. Tim Peloquin of Promised Land Survey came forward to represent the applicant. Mr. Kevin Crooker came forward as well. Mr. Peloquin informed the Board that Mr. Crooker owned lot 11-157, his daughter Ms. Angela Terry owned lots 11-158 and 11-163, and Mr. John Charest owns lot 11-162. He explained that Mr. Charest wanted to adjust his back lot line to add land from 11-163 to 11-162 due to encroachments on the back of his property onto 11-163 to make it more conforming. He added that the second adjustment was to adjust the lot lines of 11-157 and 11-158 to go straight to the road. He noted that this would add additional

frontage and side yard to lot 11-158 but take away a small piece from lot 11-163 back to 11-157 to make it all more normal and more conforming. Mr. Peloquin stated that these are all very old lots, and he is confident with how they pieced it together. He thought it was relatively simple in terms of lot line adjustments as they were making one lot more conforming and making two lots straighter and in line. He stated he was willing to answer any questions from the Board and the Public.

**MOTION:** (Cote/Montbleau) To accept the plan for consideration.

**ROLL CALL VOTE:** Ms. Kirkpatrick – yes  
 Mr. Montbleau – yes  
 Ms. Masse-Quinn – yes  
 Mr. Bergeron – yes  
 Mr. Bilapka – yes  
 Mr. Doherty – yes  
 Mr. Cote – yes

(7-0-0) The motion carried.

Mr. Cote asked what the relation was between Mr. Charest and the others. Mr. Peloquin replied that he was a friend and long-time neighbor, not a relative. Mr. Cote asked if there was a new building going in on Mr. Charest's property. Mr. Peloquin replied that there was an existing shed that is 15' from the back lot line.

Mr. Bergeron asked if the L-shaped portion of land was two lots or one lot. Mr. Peloquin replied that it was one lot that is 1.76 acres in size that will remain 1.76 acres in size after the lot line adjustments. Mr. Bergeron noted that Mr. Peloquin stated that moving the lot line on 11-162 west would bring the structures into conformity with the zoning regulations and dimensional setbacks. Mr. Peloquin replied that that was correct. Mr. Bergeron stated that it seemed like the lot line adjustments would result in a loss of area for lot 11-163. Mr. Peloquin replied that was correct. He explained that lot 11-158 would increase from 3,774 square feet to 4,749 square feet, and lot 11-163 would go from 0.46 acres to 0.39 acres, losing 0.07 acres on a vacant lot.

Mr. Doherty asked if lot 11-163 and 11-158 were under the same ownership. Mr. Peloquin replied yes. Mr. Doherty asked if they were proposing to take part of 11-163 away and give it to a larger piece of property and then take part of 11-163 away to lot 11-162, which are all under different ownership. Mr. Peloquin replied that was correct. Mr. Doherty stated that the nonconforming lot of 11-163 would shrink on both sides when it is already nonconforming, and asked if Mr. Peloquin thought that was something that this Board could do. Mr. Peloquin replied yes and that it was making other lots more conforming.

Mr. Lynde asked if there were structures on lot 11-163. Mr. Peloquin replied that there was one existing shed that belonged to 11-159 that is depicted as an encroachment on the parcel, but no other structures. Mr. Lynde asked if they planned to build on that parcel. Mr. Crooker replied that they had no plans to build on the lot.

Mr. Cote asked Mr. Peloquin to elaborate on the shed located on lot 11-163 that belongs to lot 11-159. Mr. Peloquin reiterated that shed was an encroachment on parcel 11-163, but Mr. Crooker was not asking the owners to move it. Mr. Cote asked if the leach field in lot 11-163 belongs to lot 11-158. Mr. Peloquin replied that was correct. Mr. Cote asked why they would not get rid of the lot line between lots 11-163 and 11-158. Mr. Peloquin replied he was not sure of the owner's intent was, but it might be something that the owner would consider doing.

Mr. Doherty added that lot 11-163 seems to have all the problems on it and that the applicant was asking them to make the lot more nonconforming than it already is, which he stated was the job of the Zoning Board of Adjustment and not the Planning Board. He stated that the Planning Board did not approve and create nonconforming lots and did not understand why they would be in front of the Planning Board. Mr. Peloquin replied that they had not been advised to go that route. He stated that he was confused and that no building was on that lot. He added that if anyone were to apply for a building permit on that lot, they would be denied without a variance. Mr. Doherty replied it was irrelevant for what they were asking the Board to do. He stated that the applicant was looking to subdivide their land, which would make lot 11-163 more nonconforming and in a worse situation. Mr. Peloquin replied that he did not see it that way. He added that this allowed two more lots to become more conforming and that no matter what they did, there would still be nonconforming due to the nature of the lots.

Mr. Peloquin stated that they were not asking for a building permit or a subdivision. Mr. Doherty replied that he was asking them to carve land off of a nonconforming lot. Mr. Peloquin reiterated that if anyone wanted to build on that lot in the future, they would need to be denied. Mr. Doherty replied that he did not believe that the Board had the authority to put a stipulation on a plan, but if they made it a non-building lot, it could not go to the Zoning Board for a variance. Mr. Peloquin replied that that was not what he was saying.

Mr. Doherty opened the discussion up to the Public.

Ms. Janet Bornstein came forward to represent her sister, Ms. Donna Bibeau, who lives at 6 Andover Street, lot 11-159. She noted that the shed mentioned she believed was on her property. She stated that they are not currently disputing the shed and they have no plans to but wanted to note it.

As no one else from the Public came forward, Mr. Doherty closed the discussion to the Public and brought it back to the Board.

Mr. Cote stated that it bothered him that they were not joining lots 11-158 and 11-163 and that it did not make sense to him as to why they would not. He asked why they would not join those two lots together. Mr. Peloquin replied that he just received confirmation from the landowner that they would be willing to do that. He noted that it would still be a nonconforming lot, even though it does get bigger. He did not agree that they should have to go to the Zoning Board for the lot line adjustments.

Mr. Bergeron stated that action is happening on four lots that would render lot 11-163 less conforming regardless of the size of the lot. He stated that the lot has vested rights as it is an existing lot of record in New Hampshire, but the net effect is a reduction of lot area, which, in his opinion, the Board cannot act on. Mr. Bergeron stated that the members of the Board were asking if Mr. Peloquin would like to go in front of the Zoning Board or adjust the lots in such a way that they do not reduce any registered lot of record in size to less than what it is now. Mr. Peloquin replied that they were just trying to clear up the current situation. He stated that if the Board wanted them to merge lots 11-158 and 11-163 as part of a condition of approval, then they were willing to do that.

Mr. Doherty stated that the problem was that lot 11-162 needs part of 11-163 and because lot 11-163 does not have over an acre to give, then they are creating a lot that is more nonconforming. He stated that it was not as simple as merging the two lots because they would still be less than an acre, so it was irrelevant to him that they were making 11-158 larger.

Mr. Lynde stated that he believed they needed to eliminate lot 11-163 as the solution and divvy it up amongst the three remaining lots so there would be nothing to worry about. Mr. Doherty reiterated that they could not create nonconforming lots and thought that this was something for the Zoning Board of

Adjustment. Mr. Bergeron agreed that the only board that could touch this was the Zoning Board. Mr. Doherty replied that he would see no problems if the Zoning Board granted a variance.

Mr. Lynde asserted that he did not see how, if they eliminate lot 11-163 why they would need to go to the Zoning Board. Mr. Doherty replied that if they were to combine the lots, they were still nonconforming lots. Mr. Lynde explained that they would be adding land to all three lots and doing away with the fourth lot. Mr. Bergeron asserted that the net result of that would still be creating new nonconforming lots. He reiterated that the Board did not have the authority to create nonconformities, even if they are better nonconformities. Mr. Lynde did not agree with Mr. Bergeron's statements.

Mr. Bilapka asked if the Board had the right to combine lots. Mr. Doherty replied that it was possible but that this was still a nonconforming lot that is smaller than an acre in size and would still need to go in front of the Zoning Board to get the proper approvals.

Mr. Bergeron suggested that they suggest to the Zoning Board that the lot line adjustment would be a better situation when all is said and done if the applicant is willing to merge those two lots, otherwise he would not accept it.

Mr. Lynde asked if lot 11-163 did not exist and they came in with three lots, would they allow the lot line adjustments then. Mr. Bergeron replied that if those lots were nonconforming, then they could not. Mr. Lynde asked if that was true, even if they started off nonconforming. Mr. Bergeron replied that would be a creation of a new nonconformity. He stated that if legal came back with examples of where that was precedented, then he would have a different opinion, but as it stands, the Planning Board could not touch anything nonconforming. Mr. Doherty reiterated again that they did not have the authority to create nonconforming lots. Mr. Lynde stated that they were not creating lots; they were working with existing lots that were going to stay existing lots. Mr. Bergeron stated that lot 11-163 has vested rights to put a house on that lot in common law and that lot would become less conforming with the lot line adjustment. Mr. Lynde replied that it would not become less conforming because it will not exist since the owner is willing to split the lot up.

Mr. Peloquin asked if they took the nonconformity off the easterly line where 11-162 is encroaching and only asked for one lot line adjustment on the westerly most line where there is an equal land transfer; would that be okay. Mr. Doherty replied that it would not, as lot 11-163 and 11-158 were not the same lot. He added that if it was one piece of property, then they could do it. Mr. Peloquin asked if they could ask for a lot line adjustment between lots 11-157 and 11-163 with equal land areas with the condition that lots 11-158 and 11-163 be merged and then later go to the ZBA to adjust the line between lots 11-163 and 11-162 with a variance to allow the betterment of lot 11-162 and its encroachment. Mr. Doherty replied that he would then need to come back before this Board to get the lot line adjustment if they were granted a variance. Mr. Peloquin replied that there was a lot of time and money involved in that.

Mr. Doherty stated that they were suggesting that they go to the Zoning Board and then come back to this Board. He noted that they normally see cases like this go to the Zoning Board to get the variance they need and then come before the Planning Board with a variance in hand so that they are able to work with it. Mr. Peloquin asked why they had to go to the Zoning Board if they were changing four lots to three to make the three lots more conforming. Mr. Cote replied that they were still creating lots that were not conforming to the Town's zoning ordinance.

Mr. Bergeron stated that he wanted to vote in the negative to send the plan to the Zoning Board. Mr. Peloquin replied that he understood the points, but they were asking for a lot of time and money from them. Mr. Doherty asked how long the structures had been encroaching. Mr. Peloquin replied that it had been many years. Mr. Doherty asked how this would be costing the applicant time and money. Mr. Peloquin

replied that there was an added expense and time to go before the Zoning Board and then to come back before this Board.

Mr. Peloquin asked if they could ask the Town attorney to review this case and make sure that this was the correct protocol. Mr. Doherty replied that someone would need to make a motion for that but did not feel the need to do so. Mr. Cote added that he did not feel it was necessary either. Mr. Peloquin stated that they would be willing to date-specify the case so that he could ask his attorney advice on his client's behalf and see if there is case law, and if so, he would present something back to the Board at a date specified meeting and go from there.

The case was date-specified to June 7, 2021.

**Case #PL2021-00007**

**Map 6 Lot 4-166**

**BOUCHER, Barbara – 55 Gibson Road – Site Plan Review for a General Home Occupation to operate a Pet Service Company in a residential zone. Special Exception Granted 3/8/2021, Case #ZO2021-00008**

Ms. Masse-Quinn read the list of abutters aloud. There were no persons present who asserted standing in the case, who did not have their name read, or who had difficulty with notification.

Ms. Barbara Boucher came forward with her daughter Ms. Nichole Boucher to discuss the case. Ms. B. Boucher explained that Ms. N. Boucher would be running the business and lives with her.

Mr. Bergeron informed that he sat on this case on the Zoning Board and asked if the Board wanted him to step down. Mr. Doherty replied that he thought it meant he had more knowledge on the case.

Ms. N. Boucher explained that she started the business, Peace of Mind Pet Care, two years ago primarily as a dog walking and pet sitting business. She added that when the pandemic hit, she had to pivot and look at alternative ways of bringing in income because people were not needing pet sitting and pet walking as much. She explained that she attended Alvirne High School and took their vet-tech program, where she learned how to groom. She noted that she also worked at Hudson Animal Hospital and at a boarding and grooming facility. She stated that from the time she was 12 until college, she worked with animals with boarding and grooming. She decided to take a small corner of their basement to set up a grooming table and had an elevated table installed to bring in some grooming clients.

Ms. N. Boucher explained that she only averages about 1-2 dogs a week. She noted that there were some weeks where it would be a little busier, but not by much. She explained that she completed a majority of her work outside of her home, as a large portion of her clientele is elderly, which reduces the stress for the animals. She added that she does not see the business solely becoming a grooming business, as dog walking, nail service calls, and pet sitting are the main focuses. She informed that she had considered boarding at one point but decided against it, as she only works with one animal at a time. She noted that she tries to have a minimum of fifteen minutes between each client to ensure there is minimal to no overlap between clients.

Mr. Doherty asked if they knew how many acres their lot is. Ms. N. Boucher replied that it is approximately 40 acres in size. She noted that the two major abutters were the Remus's, her father and sister, and the cell towers. She stated that no one had expressed any concern to her and that it actually gave them all something to talk about, as they are all interested in seeing which dogs come by.

Mr. Doherty asked what the hours of operation would be. Ms. N. Boucher replied that it would be from 10:00 am – 4:00 pm seven days a week. Ms. Kirkpatrick asked for clarification as the application stated the hours were from 10:30 am – 5:00 pm. Ms. N. Boucher replied that she had revised it and would never take a client at 5:00 and that the latest she would take a client is 3:30 pm.

Mr. Doherty asked if they would need to do any kind of additions to the house that would be noticeable from the outside. Ms. N. Boucher replied that they would not and that there was only a small, removable sign.

**MOTION:** (Cote/Bergeron) To accept the site plan review for consideration.

**ROLL CALL VOTE:** Ms. Kirkpatrick – yes  
Mr. Montbleau – yes  
Ms. Masse-Quinn – yes  
Mr. Bergeron – yes  
Mr. Bilapka – yes  
Mr. Doherty – yes  
Mr. Cote – yes

(7-0-0) The motion carried.

Mr. Doherty noted that it was already determined that the septic system could handle the load of the grooming.

Mr. Montbleau stated that he understood that she sometimes works seven days a week, but judging by her location, it would not interfere with the other neighbors. He felt that the Board should not restrict her from being open on Sundays.

Mr. Culbert asked what kind of chemicals she would be using. She stated that she uses pet shampoo and conditioner. Mr. Culbert asked if she used any chemicals that were harmful to dogs. She replied that she does not, and if a product recommends wearing gloves, she will not use it.

Mr. Doherty opened the discussion to the Public, but as no one came forward, he brought it back to the Board.

**MOTION:** (Masse-Quinn/Kirkpatrick) To approve the site plan review.

**ROLL CALL VOTE:** Ms. Kirkpatrick – yes  
Mr. Montbleau – yes  
Ms. Masse-Quinn – yes  
Mr. Bergeron – yes  
Mr. Bilapka – yes  
Mr. Doherty – yes  
Mr. Cote – yes

(7-0-0) The motion carried.

## **DISCUSSIONS**

**Discussion regarding changes to Land Use Regulations.**



Mr. Doherty explained that the Board had received copies of the Land Use Regulations with edits from Geo Insight for the MS4 Permit. He noted that he had not received this prior to the meeting and would like to hold this off for a further meeting. He asked the Board to look it over and make changes of their own to discuss at the next meeting.

**Discussion of establishment of PB subcommittee to focus on Workforce Housing ordinance development potentially for Dec/Jan public meeting for 3/22 ballot.**

Mr. Doherty asked if anyone would like to be a part of the subcommittee. Mr. Cote and Ms. Masse-Quinn both replied that they would like to be a part of the subcommittee. Ms. Kirkpatrick also expressed her interest in the subcommittee. Mr. Doherty stated that they should look into what some other towns have to see what works for them and what hasn't. Mr. Doherty said it could be beneficial to reach out to some towns and ask them what they would change about their ordinance if they could.

Mr. Cote informed that he had received two recommendations from Attorney Ratigan and had begun reading both of them. He stated that he had done some online research and that there is a lot of information out there already; they just need to see what fits the direction of the Town.

Mr. Doherty stated they needed to get something on the books to cover them to meet the State's requirements. He stated that he wanted a minimum of three people working on it and thought it was too premature to get more than that together as a formal subcommittee at this time.

Mr. Montbleau stated that he went to look at a project on the seacoast and could try to get some pictures from his phone printed out to show everyone.

Mr. Sherman stated that he disagreed with Mr. Doherty on the subcommittee and timing of it. He stated that they were already three weeks into April and knew that things become very busy when it gets closer to the end of the year. He thought they should consider having a subcommittee together by the end of May. He stated that he would be glad to be a part of this.

Mr. Doherty stated they could look into having optional meetings towards the end of April or the beginning of May to get people together to start sharing ideas. He asked Mr. Cote to start looking into some conference rooms that may be available. Mr. Cote stated he would do that.

Mr. Sherman asked if this would be offered up to the Public and other boards, such as conservation. Mr. Doherty replied that he had talked to some other boards. He stated he was not sure if anyone else was nearly as ambitious as Ms. Masse-Quinn or Mr. Cote, and he did not want to bog it down and drag it out with extra people. He stated that the more people who get involved, the slower it goes, so he wanted to keep it streamlined so that they could bring it to the Board easier and act on it together as a Board.

**Master Plan Update.**

Mr. Thomas stated that there were four points that he wanted to address to the Board. He wanted to review the results of the Master Plan candidates, request to put on the agenda a vote on which company they wanted to select, wanted to discuss the formation of a committee, to start canvassing, and wanted the Board and committee to work with the Planning Department relating the 2022 Budget.

Mr. Thomas stated that after taking all of the forms he received, he broke it down by voting and nonvoting members, their analysis, and averaged it. He noted that he was not drawing any conclusions, only the average of the votes. He put an analysis of the comments made to try to classify the types of attributes that members wanted to see in these companies. He noted that these summaries should not necessarily be the driving force of their decisions.

Mr. Thomas asked if he could have a future date where they could prepare to select a firm so that people can start to think about their votes.

Mr. Bergeron stated that Mr. Thomas had done incredible work and that the Board should give him a big thanks. He stated that the Board was blessed to have him.

Mr. Thomas informed that Mr. Gowan had been handling most of the correspondence but will begin to take over as the Master Plan Committee forms.

Mr. Doherty asked the Board if they would like to drop Dubois & King from the running.

**MOTION:** (Cote/Bilapka) To not accept Dubois & King for the Master Plan.

**ROLL CALL VOTE:** Ms. Kirkpatrick – yes  
 Mr. Montbleau – yes  
 Ms. Masse-Quinn – yes  
 Mr. Bergeron – yes  
 Mr. Bilapka – yes  
 Mr. Doherty – yes  
 Mr. Cote – yes

(7-0-0) The motion carried.

Mr. Thomas stated he would ensure that he would get a letter sent to them later this week.

Mr. Lynde asked if they were not including the cost. Mr. Thomas replied that was correct. Mr. Thomas noted that the price could change by 2022 and that there may be additional things they want to take out or add. He stated that they could have a subcommittee meeting to look at a proposal for 2022, as this was all built off of 2021 work projects.

Mr. Doherty asked which of the two companies was more expensive. Mr. Thomas replied that Resilience cost about \$80,600.00 and NRPC cost about \$41,000.00 with a \$10,000.00 discount.

Mr. Bergeron stated he thought it should be up to the voters to decide the future of the Town. He stated that they should have a discussion about the two companies and then allow the public to give feedback. Mr. Doherty replied that he wanted to set it for a lighter meeting so that they could give it the fullest attention.

Mr. Doherty asked if there was a discussion at a previous meeting where Mr. Gowan found money in the budget to start some of this. Mr. Thomas and Mr. Cote replied it was for a build-out analysis and conservation inventory which could help to inform the Master plan.

Mr. Doherty stated that for the next meeting, be prepared to bring the two companies back for further questioning or to vote one way or the other.

**Discussion regarding February 18, 2021, Meeting Minutes.**

Mr. Cote asked for a discussion on the February 18, 2021, Meeting Minutes. He stated that Ms. Masse-Quinn mentioned she would work on them, but he did not think she should do it. Mr. Culbert felt like they should be verbatim.

Ms. Masse-Quinn asked if they could go to the Board of Selectmen to request money to cover the cost of the minutes. Mr. Cote stated that they could request to be put on the agenda or show up for open forum.

**DATE SPECIFIED PLANS** – June 7, 2021

Case #PL2021-00005 - Map 30 Lots 11-157, 11-158, 11-162, & 11-163 – CROOKER, Kevin & Constance & TERRY, Angela – 2 & 4 Andover Street and 3 & 5 Methuen Street

**ADJOURN**

**MOTION:** (Montbleau/Cote) To adjourn the meeting.

**ROLL CALL VOTE:** Mr. Cote – yes  
 Ms. Masse-Quinn – yes  
 Mr. Montbleau – yes  
 Mr. Bilapka – yes  
 Ms. Kirkpatrick – yes  
 Mr. Bergeron – yes  
 Mr. Doherty – yes

(7-0-0) The motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:43 pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
 Jordyn M. Isabelle  
 Recording Secretary