

**APPROVED  
TOWN OF PELHAM PLANNING BOARD  
MEETING MINUTES  
APRIL 3rd, 2023**

Chairman Tim Doherty called the meeting to order at approximately 7:05 PM.

Secretary Danielle Masse-Quinn called roll:

**PRESENT ROLL CALL:** Tim Doherty – present  
James Bergeron – present  
Roger Montbleau – present  
Danielle Masse-Quinn – present  
Joe Passamonte – present  
Bruce Bilapka – present  
Selectmen’s Representative Charlene Takesian - present  
Alternate Hal Lynde – present  
Alternate Samuel Thomas - present  
Alternate John Spottiswood – present  
Alternate Scott Sawtelle - present  
Planning Director/Zoning Administrator Jennifer Beauregard – present  
Recording Secretary Heidi Zagorski – present

ABSENT /

NOT PARTICIPATING: Selectmen’s Alternate Representative Jaie Bergeron  
Alternate Paddy Culbert

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Chairman Tim Doherty announced the new Selectmen’s Representative for the Planning Board, Charlene Takesian.

**OLD BUSINESS**

**Case #PL2022-00031**

Map 38 Lot 1-109

Cedar Crest Development, LLC (Applicant), Eleanor Burton Revocable Trust (Owner) – 243 Sherburne Road – Seeking approval of a \*3 lot subdivision (previously 4 lot subdivision) consisting of 3 single-family/duplex lots accessible from Sherburne Road.

**MOTION:** (Bilapka/Montbleau) To continue Case #PL2002-00031 to the requested May 15<sup>th</sup>, 2023 Planning Board Meeting.

**VOTE:** (7-0-0) The motion carried.

**MEETING MINUTES**

Mr. Hal Lynde requested the following correction to the March 20<sup>th</sup>, 2023 Meeting Minutes: On line 90, add a missing zero to correct the number 53,000. Ms. Danielle Masse-Quinn requested a correction to the wording on line 199 from workhouse to workforce housing. Ms. Masse-Quinn requested on line 204 to add the wording ‘land use ordinance’ following the word innovative.

**MOTION:** (Bilapka/Montbleau) To approve the amended March 20th, 2023 meeting minutes.  
**VOTE:** (6-0-1) The motion carried.

Ms. Charlene Takesian abstained as she was not the Selectmen’s Representative for the March 20<sup>th</sup>, 2023 Planning Board meeting.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**Case #PL2023-00007**

Map 16 Lots 13-89 & -90

Szmyt, Mark & Kelley – 19 & an unaddressed lot St. Margaret’s Drive - Seeking approval of a Lot Line Adjustment adding 0.23 acres from Map 16 Lot 13-89 to Map 16 Lot 13-90, for a total of 1.25 acres. Map 16 Lot 13-89 will be left with 1.26 acres, this lot was granted a Variance for less than 200’ of frontage on August 8, 2016, Case #ZO2016-00015.

Ms. Masse-Quinn read the list of abutters.

Shayne Gendron of Edward N. Hebert Associates introduced himself representing Mark and Kelley Szmyt. Mr. Gendron explained the history of the two lots. The first lot, 19 St. Margaret Drive, Lot 13-90 is the Szmyt’s residence since approximately 1989. The Szmyts have owned both properties since that time. Mr. Gendron further explained that in approximately 2016, there was work happening to the North, and J&S Investments bought the parcel. There was a paper street off St. Margaret Drive that was never built. The two owners, Mr. Mark Szmyt and J&S Investments came together and received variances from the Planning Board and took over the right of way to the paper street to allow access to the two back lots. Mr. Gendron explained the well and shed for Szmyt’s property are on the back lot. Mr. Mark Szmyt asked Mr. Gendron if they could do a lot line revision between the two lots to keep the shed 16 feet on the property to eliminate a zoning violation and to keep the well on his property so that in the future if Mr. Szmyt was to transfer their rear property, a new house and a new well could be drilled on the back lot. Mr. Gendron concluded that they are requesting to take .23 acres from the rear lot and put it into the front lot. He added that both lots would conform to the lot sizing requirements with room to locate a home on the rear lot in the future.

Mr. Tim Doherty stated that the lot line adjustment would turn a rectangular shape lot into an irregular shape lot not typical for a subdivision.

Mr. Roger Montbleau stated that if the back lot would be built on, the lot would have to have a well location and a house location determined. Mr. Doherty explained this case has been in front of the Planning Board many times. Mr. Doherty stated that the Planning Board added the 25-foot strip of land as a lot line adjustment. It received a variance from the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) with 1.49 acres of land and now the applicant would like to reduce the size after they had previously been given a variance.

Mr. Joe Passamonte asked with this lot line adjustment, would the well radius remain on its lot or would it cross the lot line? Mr. Gendron answered no it wouldn’t be but it wouldn’t be now either. Mr. Gendron explained the lot line is minor between the two lots. The existing well would spill over into the other lot as well as would a proposed well on the front lot if they were to drill a new well. Mr. Doherty stated they are proposing a non-conforming well to the subdivision regulations. Mr. Gendron agreed. Mr. Doherty discussed other options for the location of the well with Mr. Gendron that would remain within the lot lines. Mr. Gendron stated there is room in front of the existing home that would remain within the lot lines. Mr. Doherty asked where the well would be placed on the back lot if the lot line was adjusted. Mr. Gendron answered the well would spill off the lot line if drilled in the rear.

Mr. Passamonte asked if the two lots currently have one owner. Mr. Gendron said they are both owned by the same people but with different ownership. Mr. Gendron confirmed the rear lot does not have a house on it. Mr. Passamonte asked if the back lot was to be sold separately, the person who purchased the lot would have to meet Planning regulations. Mr. Doherty answered that they would not be able to meet the regulations and that the Szmyts are asking for waivers to create a lot that does not meet the Planning Board regulations. Ms. Jennifer Beauregard stated they would have to meet all setback requirements to put a house on the lot.

Mr. Bergeron asked Mr. Gendron if the dotted line on the proposed plan is the existing lot line for lot 13-90. Mr. Gendron replied yes. Mr. Bergeron stated that the well was drilled just off the property line. Mr. Gendron confirmed this. Mr. Bergeron explained that it appears the applicant is moving the lot line around the well to allow the well to be in possession of lot 13-90 to eliminate confusion. The well currently extends over into lot 13-89. Mr. Bergeron continued to state that the lot size change is two-tenths of an acre. The 1.49-acre lot (13-89) would become a 1.26-acre lot and the existing lot (13-90) would become a 1.25-acre lot. Mr. Bergeron added that the lot line adjustment would allow lot 13-90 to access the well and sees this as a logical lot line adjustment.

Mr. Doherty stated the applicant could leave the property line as is and have a well easement for the front property to access the well. This would leave the well on lot 13-89 and allow lot 13-90 to access it.

Mr. Bilapka asked if it would be possible to have two pumps out of the existing well for both properties to use. Mr. Doherty replied they would need a bigger well radius if a common well is used. Mr. Gendron replied it would depend on the total number of bedrooms for both properties.

Mr. Doherty discussed the history of the property with the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) and the Planning Board. Mr. Gendron confirmed when this property previously came before the Planning Board that the well was in the same location as it is today, not on the correct lot 13-90. Mr. Gendron stated that when this previously came before the ZBA it was for not having a conforming frontage. This lot was originally 1.26 acres before the land and the right of way were added to it. The access point that was added to it brought it to 1.49 acres. Mr. Gendron said the proposed lot line adjustment is bringing the lot back to 1.26 acres.

Ms. Charlene Takesian asked how the Zoning Board of Adjustment would have dealt with the well being on the wrong lot after they approved a lot line with a home on it. Mr. Doherty stated the Board was not given this information about the well. They were asked about building on a lot with a small frontage. The Planning Board did a lot line adjustment and added twenty-five feet of land that were previously a town road. The homeowner petitioned the town to sell this and the owner split this into two pieces for each lot. The Planning Board was asked to add this section to the lot and the Zoning Board was asked if they could build a home with the reduced frontage and the ZBA granted a variance to allow this. Mr. Doherty continued by stating that years later, the Planning Board found out that the well for the front house is on the wrong lot and the applicant has also put a shed on the wrong lot. The applicant would like to keep the shed and well where they exist and are asking the Board to waive their subdivision regulations for well radii because they have the well and shed in the wrong spot.

Ms. Takesian asked if the applicant had to come back before the Board when they build a home on the lot with the variance for the small frontage. Mr. Doherty stated he believed they exercised their variance by cutting in a driveway.

Ms. Takesian asked if the Board can approve a change in lot size for a lot that has already been previously approved by the Board. Ms. Beauregard stated that the Board could not allow the lot to be non-conforming in size by being less than an acre. Ms. Beauregard added that the variance was specific to the frontage requirement and not to the lot size requirement. Ms. Beauregard stated that the previous lot line was a landlocked parcel. The right of way was gained by

the applicant and allowed them to gain access to the lot. Mr. Doherty stated that the lot was technically not landlocked because there was a town paper road there. The applicant bought the town paper road and added it to the lots.

Mr. Bergeron explained that the right of way off of St. Margarets Drive will be used as private access to the two lots in the rear, lot 13-87 and lot 13-89.

Ms. Takesian asked Chairman Doherty if an odd size shape lot would not be the expectation of the Planning Board. Mr. Doherty explained that the subdivision regulations are set up to allow for ease of ownership when you look at a property line with the goal to have the property lines as straight as possible.

Ms. Danielle Masse-Quinn asked how the lot line adjustment would change the look of the property and added that there are no other lots in the area that match that shape. She asked Mr. Gendron if the well has always been in this location. Mr. Gendron stated that this is how the property was when the Szmyts purchased the property in 1989. The goal was to adjust the lot line to have the well within the lot lines of the property. Mr. Doherty asked if it was possible to have an easement in place for the well and leave the lot lines remaining as is. Mr. Gendron stated the applicant was also hoping to keep the shed in its existing place.

Mr. Bilapka stated the well easement would be the easiest solution at this time allowing the configuration of the lot to remain the same within zoning codes. Mr. Gendron added he believed the lot line adjustment would allow the lot to remain within zoning codes as well. After further review, Mr. Gendron stated he would be able to put a well in the front of lot 13-89. This would allow Mr. Gendron to remove the easement from lot 13-90. Mr. Bergeron and Mr. Gendron continued to discuss the size of the lot. Mr. Passamonte clarified that the location of the well and home were preexisting before the applicant purchased the property. Mr. Gendron confirmed this.

Mr. Doherty opened the discussion to the public. As no one from the public came forward, Mr. Doherty closed the discussion to the public.

Mr. Doherty asked the Board if any members had input or would like to make a motion. Ms. Beauregard stated that the Board has not accepted this for consideration at this point.

**MOTION:** (Masse-Quinn/Passamonte) To accept the plan for consideration.

**VOTE:** (7-0-0) The motion carried.

Ms. Masse-Quinn asked Mr. Gendron why was the well location not caught during the times the property was before the Planning Board and Zoning Board previously. Mr. Gendron stated he is not sure if the well was or was not shown on the lot previously. He concluded that the applicant is trying to achieve simplicity upon the potential future transfer of the property.

Mr. Doherty confirmed with Mr. Gendron that with the lot line adjustment, it will change the shape of the lot, and also the applicant will need to receive a waiver on the well radius.

Ms. Takesian asked if they would need to receive a well radius waiver if they did or did not move the lot line. Mr. Doherty stated that without the lot line adjustment, the well would not need to receive a radius waiver. Ms. Beauregard explained that it is not a newly created lot so the applicant would not have to meet the current land use regulations. If the lot line adjustment was made, they would need to meet the new regulations which would require a well radius waiver. Ms. Takesian asked if they could put an easement for the well and shed. Ms. Beauregard replied that they could place an easement for the well but not the shed.

Mr. Bergeron stated that the lot line change is less complicated than keeping it the way it is. This would prevent lot 13-90 from needing a well waiver and a waiver to have the well radius pass over to lot 13-89. If the lot line adjustment

is made now, and moves the lot line, the well stays on lot 13-90 where it belongs, eliminating the dispute of ownership and the well radii waivers because the well predates 1989.

Mr. Passamonte stated to add a stipulation that the new well be placed in the front of the property and remain within the lot boundaries. Mr. Gendron agreed with this.

**MOTION:** (Passamonte/Bilapka) To approve the lot line adjustment with a 75-foot well radius to remain with the lot line.

**VOTE:** (7-0-0) The motion carried.

**PL2023-00008**

Map 24 Lot 12-221-13

Patalano, Raymond – 97 Drummer Road - Seeking approval of a Waiver to Article: XII, Section: 307-74F of the Zoning Ordinance to permit a second front door as a means of ingress & egress of an attached Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) to accommodate an elderly person.

Ms. Masse-Quinn read the list of abutters.

Mr. Raymond Patalano from 97 Drummer Road introduced himself and asked for a waiver for the placement of the door on the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU).

Ms. Masse-Quinn asked Mr. Patalano to clarify if the garage, breezeway, and ADU were all part of the proposed addition. Mr. Patalano confirmed this. Mr. Patalano stated the addition is 996 square feet in total. Ms. Masse-Quinn asked Mr. Patalano which door was being discussed for the waiver. He stated the door to the left of the breezeway door looking at the presented building plan. Ms. Masse-Quinn stated that it does look like there are two front doors. Mr. Patalano stated the breezeway door connects directly to the backyard. Ms. Masse-Quinn asked if the breezeway door is visible. Mr. Patalano confirmed yes. Ms. Masse-Quinn asked if Mr. Patalano would be able to move the door to the side of the building to comply with the ordinance. Mr. Patalano stated that the slope of the land on the side of the property would create a safety issue.

Mr. Passamonte asked if the breezeway exists now. Mr. Patalano replied no. Mr. Passamonte asked if there would be three entries total once the two doors were added to the front. Mr. Patalano replied the breezeway is not an entry as it goes directly to the backyard. Mr. Passamonte replied it is a door that would create three doors total on the front.

Mr. Doherty explained that in the past if an ADU was added to a home the appearance should remain as a single-family home. He confirmed with Mr. Patalano that the three doors were visible from the front. Mr. Patalano added there is nobody across from him. The land is conservation land. Mr. Doherty explained that the Board has to look at the neighborhood as a whole and the value of the neighborhood. Mr. Doherty asked for clarification on where the location of the current garage is located. Mr. Patalano explained that the garage is under the ground-floor window to the right of the proposed breezeway while looking at the building plan.

Mr. Patalano presented the full building plan to the Board.

Mr. Bilapka asked the applicant if they are looking for a waiver request for the well radius. Ms. Beauregard explained that the ADU would remain under the same ownership so the applicant would be able to waive the well requirement himself.

Mr. Doherty opened the discussion to the public. As no one from the public came forward, Mr. Doherty closed the

discussion to the public.

Mr. Roger Montbleau asked if the existing garage would no longer be utilized as a garage. Mr. Patalano explained that the ADU is offset approximately 6-8 feet and connects to the back of the house. Mr. Patalano refers to the full building plan to show how you would access the existing garage.

Ms. Beauregard explained that in 2022 the rules changed to allow attached ADU to be issued by a conditional use permit through the Zoning Administrator as a designee for the Planning Board if all of the criteria are met. If the criteria are not met, then the applicant would need to come before the Planning Board to receive a waiver. Ms. Beauregard explained that in this case, the applicant is not meeting the zoning code 307-74F which states “no new entrance or exit to an ADU shall be constructed on the front of a single-family residence.” The applicant is before the Board now because this is something that the Zoning Administrator cannot waive within their office. Mr. Doherty explained that the Board has to decide if an additional front door on an ADU in this residential neighborhood would be allowed.

Mr. Bergeron discussed that in the case packet, the Board has approval for the construction and asked Ms. Beauregard if this is for the approval of the construction. Ms. Beauregard explained this is for the approval of the construction for a three-bedroom residence with a one-bedroom ADU for a total of 675 gallons per day. Mr. Bergeron stated that the existing house is four bedrooms. Ms. Beauregard confirmed with Mr. Patalano that they would eliminate one of the bedrooms in the existing 4-bedroom home which would be verified by the Building Inspector for occupancy of the ADU. This would allow the residence to remain as 4 bedrooms total: Three bedrooms in the existing home and one bedroom in the ADU.

Mr. Bergeron continued to discuss the drawing of the ADU stating that the construction of the ADU combined with the main house appears to be more of a duplex than an ADU. He explained that an ADU is supposed to be clearly secondary to the primary dwelling and it should not look as though there is an additional building. He explained that this is clearly not an ADU as regulations state. Mr. Patalano explained there is a breezeway connected to the main house. Mr. Bergeron stated the breezeway is connected to the garage and the ADU is clearly not secondary to the main dwelling. Mr. Patalano questioned how it could not be secondary. Mr. Bergeron stated that the criteria for ADU state that the ADU should clearly be secondary to the main dwelling. He further explained that an attached ADU must have the appearance of a single-family home and within the inside of the structure, there is an ADU. Mr. Bergeron explained the architectural appearance seems to show two houses. He confirmed with Mr. Patalano that his lot is one acre in size. Mr. Patalano respectfully disagreed with the statement made regarding the proposed plan appearing as a duplex. He explained the roof line matches the other house and that the aesthetics work. He believes it cannot be called a separate building.

The Board members continue to discuss options to make the appearance of the ADU appear as a single-family home. Mr. Doherty stated that the front door on the ADU is the cause of making the ADU not appear as a single-family home.

Ms. Beauregard expressed that she had some of the same concerns about the appearance of the front door not meeting the criteria of an ADU. She continued to state that this is why the case is before the Board to determine if the design meets the criteria of an ADU.

Ms. Takesian expressed that there is no connection to the roof line making the ADU appear as a second home. She confirmed with Mr. Patalano that the breezeway door is at an angle and not flat with the front of the existing home. Ms. Takesian discussed the use of the breezeway door with Mr. Passamonte and confirmed with Mr. Patalano that there are four doors within the breezeway: one door is an entrance into the breezeway, one door is the exit leading into the backyard, another door allows entrance into the existing garage, and the fourth door leads into the ADU. Ms. Beauregard explained that the addition of the proposed front door on the ADU is where the criteria are not being met.

Mr. Patalano explained that he wanted the front door for an elderly family member to be able to transition easily.

The Board continued to discuss design ideas for the attached ADU with the applicant to allow the ADU to be compliant with all zoning codes.

Mr. Montbleau explained because the applicant, Mr. Patalano has a one-acre lot, he must remain within the regulations for an attached ADU.

Mr. Doherty explained that the applicant, Mr. Patalano can have the plans redesigned and go back to the Planning Department. The applicant, Mr. Patalano stated that he would like to withdraw the application. Mr. Doherty confirmed the application has been withdrawn.

## **DISCUSSION**

Mr. Doherty stated there would be a discussion for the Appointment of the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) Subcommittee members.

Ms. Beauregard stated she has prepared a letter draft that Mr. Samuel Thomas is reviewing to send to the department heads. She asked Mr. Doherty to set the subcommittee up so they may begin. She suggested Mr. Thomas be appointed as the Chair of the CIP subcommittee and suggested the Chair of the CIP subcommittee also have the authority to appoint other members to the subcommittee.

Mr. Doherty asked Mr. Thomas if he would be on the CIP subcommittee as a member and be the Chair of the CIP subcommittee. Mr. Thomas replied yes. Mr. Thomas stated he had one request. Mr. Thomas expressed that from his perspective in the past, the CIP subcommittee has given the Budget Committee recommendations including a spreadsheet of possible projects. He expressed that from his view he sees very little outcome from the Budget Committee from this process. Mr. Thomas stated that the ideas given to the Budget Committee do not result in a response. He suggested arranging a time to meet with the Budget Committee and the Town Administrator to discuss what they expect of the CIP subcommittee and what will they do with the information they provide to them. Mr. Doherty asked the Selectmen's Representative, Ms. Takesian, to explain further. Ms. Takesian stated that the Board of Selectmen is committed to using the CIP plan as a planning tool and they expect the department heads to also give their input to the CIP committee so that they can plan better for the future. Ms. Takesian assured the Board that they will take the CIP plan very seriously this year. Mr. Doherty confirmed with Ms. Takesian that the Budget Committee is an elected Board. Mr. Bergeron explained that the process is the Board of Selectmen approves everything first before it goes to the Budget Committee. Ms. Takesian confirmed this. Mr. Bergeron asked if the Budget Committee has recently gone against the Selectmen's recommendations for budgetary items. He expressed that the CIP subcommittee would want to work with the Budget Committee and the Board of Selectmen. Mr. Bergeron discussed the dog kennel as an example of an issue presented by the CIP subcommittee in prior years that had not been resolved.

Mr. Bergeron explained they have other ideas including starting a capital fund. The fund would be for the acquisition of open space. Currently, the town is borrowing money for land which Mr. Bergeron explained does not make sense. He said they have not gotten an answer on this, however, they are going to move forward with this on the CIP subcommittee this year. Mr. Montbleau stated that an increase in taxes can be a reason ideas do not move forward. Mr. Bergeron said the CIP subcommittee thinks seven years out and works proactively now for the future.

Mr. Hal Lynde stated from his prior experience of being a Selectmen for 34 years, he suggested the CIP subcommittee bring their ideas directly to the Board of Selectmen. Ms. Takesian explained the Board of Selectmen tries to accommodate the wish lists for the Departments, the CIP plan, and other wants and tries to weigh that by not raising

taxes. Ms. Takesian suggested that the CIP subcommittee could provide a plan over 7 years or a 10-year period which could help to mitigate some of the spikes in the tax rate.

Ms. Beauregard stated that she appreciates Mr. Thomas' frustration but has a bit of a different perspective on it. She explained that she has seen the Selectmen and the Budget Committee refer to their CIP Plan. She continued to explain that the CIP subcommittee begins its plan early on in the process, followed by recommendations based on what everyone brings in, and by the time it gets to the Board of Selectmen, they have to start prioritizing what needs to be done and what could wait. She continued to state that she believed regarding Mr. Thomas' thoughts on receiving an update from the Budget Committee that it should fall on the department heads. Ms. Beauregard stated that this is one of the reasons they are starting early this year. She is sending all of the department heads the most recent CIP. This would allow them to look at the spreadsheet and they can answer to the committee about what has or may not have happened to each item. Ms. Beauregard added that this could be a good tool to allow the process to work in a better way. Ms. Beauregard suggested requesting a meeting at the end of the budget season to see where everything stands.

Mr. Thomas explained that the spreadsheet does provide a system to prioritize each activity on it based on the input that the CIP receives. Mr. Thomas accepted the position of Chair for the CIP subcommittee and will be a member. Mr. Thomas stated he would like to include Ms. Beauregard, Ms. Masse-Quinn, and Mr. Bergeron on the CIP subcommittee as members.

**MOTION:** (Passamonte/Montbleau) To appoint Mr. Samuel Thomas to Chairman of the Capital Improvement Plan subcommittee.

**VOTE:** (7-0-0) The motion carried.

**MOTION:** (Masse-Quinn/ Passamonte) To allow Mr. Thomas to appoint other members to the CIP subcommittee.

**VOTE:** (7-0-0)

Mr. Thomas asked the Board if any other members would like to be on the CIP subcommittee. Mr. Bilapka stated that he would like to be on the CIP subcommittee. Mr. Thomas stated that in the past the CIP subcommittee had a representative from the Board of Selectmen. Mr. Thomas also stated that the Budget Committee would also have a member on the CIP subcommittee. Ms. Beauregard added that the School Board would also like representation on the CIP subcommittee.

### **BOARD MEMBERS / PLANNING DIRECTOR UPDATES**

Ms. Beauregard stated she spoke with the Electrical Inspector regarding the new solar energy ordinance. Ms. Beauregard explained that the Inspector asked a question regarding residential rooftop solar arrays. She explained that the way the ordinance is written, any rooftop solar array over 15KW is required to come before the Board. The Inspector questioned if the applicants must come before the Board explaining there is an engineered report that comes in with every rooftop solar array that provides for loading, wind, etc. and it is then required to get the array inspected by the Building Inspector and the Electrical Inspector. Ms. Beauregard asked if this is something the Board would want to see or would this Board entertain rooftop residential-only solar arrays receiving permission through a designee through the Planning Board.

**MOTION:** (Bergeron/Montbleau) To allow the Planning Director, Jennifer Beauregard to find out if the Board could designate a designee to approve rooftop solar array plans that are over 15KW.

**VOTE:** (7-0-0) The motion carried.

Mr. Montbleau announced that a year ago the Pelham Blue Bird Society was created and now has 164 members. A Blue Bird Sanctuary was created in the Merriam Farm preserve. This is presently growing. Mr. Montbleau stated they have twelve boxes set up and an additional eight to put up during the coming nesting season. He explained on Friday, April 7<sup>th</sup>, 2023 at 6:30 PM there will be a Blue Bird slide show and PowerPoint presentation. This meet and greet event will be held in the Sherburne Hall at the Pelham Town Hall. More information about the Blue Bird Society can be found on the [Pelham Blue Bird Society Facebook Page](#). The April 7<sup>th</sup> event will also be recorded if you are not able to make the event. Mr. Montbleau concluded by stating that the mission statement is to have the highest density of Eastern Blue Birds in New Hampshire right here in Pelham.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION:** (Montbleau/Passamonte) To adjourn the meeting at 9:33 PM

**VOTE:** (7-0-0) The motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,  
Heidi Zagorski, Recording Secretary