

APPROVED
TOWN OF PELHAM
PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
November 18, 2019

Chairman Roger Montbleau called the meeting to order at approximately 7:00pm.

Secretary Cindy Kirkpatrick called the roll:

PRESENT: Roger Montbleau, Cindy Kirkpatrick, Paul Dadak, Jim Bergeron, Tim Doherty, Derek Steele, Selectmen Representative Hal Lynde, Alternate Selectmen Representative Kevin Cote, Alternate Richard Olsen, Alternate Bruce Bilapka, Planning Director Jeff Gowan

ABSENT: Alternate Paddy Culbert, Alternate Samuel Thomas

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

MEETING MINUTES

November 4, 2019

MOTION: (Lynde/Doherty) To approve the November 4, 2019 meeting minutes as amended.

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

ADMINISTRATIVE

Map 28 Lot 2-7-1 - COLE'S CIRCLE, LLC - Cole's Village – Burns Road - Seeking Planning Board's recommendation to the Board of Selectmen regarding the acceptance of Savannah Drive

Mr. Gowan informed the Board there were still pieces the applicant had not satisfied; therefore, it wasn't appropriate to take action at this time. He said it didn't need to be date specified because it was not the type of thing abutters were notified of.

There was no one present in the public with regard to the agenda item. Mr. Gowan stated when the applicant provides the Town with the appropriate information, they will put the item back on the agenda.

ZONING WORKSHOP

Mr. Gowan provided the Board and members of the public with draft amendments to the following:

- 1) Article XV – Residential Conservation Subdivision by Special Permit (workforce housing)
- 2) Article XII – Special Exceptions (pertaining to detached accessory dwelling units)

He began by discussing Special Exceptions (pertaining to detached accessory dwelling units 'ADU'). Proposed amendments were color-coded in relation to the Board's suggestions, Town Counsel's recommendations and the suggestions by Mr. George Reagan of New Hampshire Housing (present for the meeting). He noted New Hampshire Housing was the driving force behind the law on the New Hampshire books. He then read aloud the section being amended and called out the proposed amendments.

The Board discussed the proposed language and amendments they felt would be appropriate.

PUBLIC INPUT

Mr. William Scanzani commented he hadn't heard the Board discuss how Pelham's population would be long term if detached accessory dwelling units were allowed. He noted there were roughly 4,800 housing units in Town. He recalled discussions from last year regarding affordable/inclusionary housing and stated if they took all 'residential zoned' land there was enough room for an additional 4,400 houses. He said there weren't a lot of large lots remaining to develop. He believed eventually if zoning wasn't changed Pelham could get to the point of population being 20,000 people. He said they may want to consider allowing apartment buildings in the residential zone and review the conservation subdivision ordinance to see how smaller 'affordable' homes could meet the needs on smaller acres. He believed the 'key' to affordable housing was the sharing of utilities (i.e. septic, wells, water). Mr. Scanzani said the Board should look at what the effect would be if a lot of people decided to make rental units within the current zoning (minimum one-acre lot); a population growth wouldn't just affect a quality of life, it would also affect the school systems and other areas in Town.

Mr. Gowan stated last year there were four ADUs approved; they weren't coming in high numbers. He pointed out it wasn't optional; the optional parts were the size and whether they allowed 'detached'. He stated the Town and State had a problem as they were now tied with Maine as the 'oldest' population in any state, which would not be sustainable over a long period of time. He said if they don't create more affordable options the Town would be in trouble in the future (30-40 years). He added the Town had to have the ability for younger people to have a place to live in the community. Mr. Scanzani agreed with Mr. Gowan. He didn't know if the Board did enough study on what the effect was to the population and school system. He spoke about the effects to other communities that tried to create affordable housing. He felt if affordable housing is approved for a property there should be an inclusion to the covenants of land to prohibit additional building on a property, this would ensure the house would remain affordable no matter how high house values rise in general. Mr. Scanzani also questioned how the State valued a detached ADU to meet the (affordability) needs. Mr. Gowan agreed that part of the process would need to include covenants.

Mr. Reagan felt the comments were good. He said in New Hampshire they couldn't require affordable housing to be built; there was a voluntary inclusionary zoning (which is not like 40B). He stated long-term affordability covenants were important; however, it would include a lot of complexity regarding how to size and value development to meet a community's goal and make it attractive for developers. He said they had spoken to many assessors regarding how to value a single-family unit that's highest and best use as work force housing. He said in the end what the Town would use to delineate whether its meeting work force housing was not necessarily the value, but rather what it was being rented for. If it's within the \$1,300 range, it provides realistic opportunities. He said they saw development being a good idea but happening slowly. Mr. Reagan noted they had put out several studies regarding how many children would reside within certain sized units. In conducting research with Pelham, he found there had been a decrease in enrollment (approximately 40 per year) within the last five years. He ended by saying they had to think about how Pelham saw itself in 20-30 years. Mr. Gowan concurred there was a deficit in the number of students; the per student cost is reduced with more students within the school. He noted the Town had built a lot of age-restricted housing that excluded children and also noted people were having less children. He said New Hampshire was losing population and the only increase was through immigration. He said the goal was to create places for people to live in a measured way over time. He suggested the Board also discuss workforce housing.

Mr. Cote believed that the ADU was designed (more/less) for a family and didn't think people were likely to move into Town and build an ADU to rent out. Mr. Gowan pointed out the law changed. They could no longer restrict ADUs to a familial connection. Mr. Montbleau noted ADUs could also be used for a homeowner to (retire/downsize); the owner could move into the ADU and rent out the main house to a young family. Mr. Cote understood families could live together by having their parents reside in the ADU. He said there seemed to be a lot of attention given to the workforce housing portion of the ADU, which he found it hard to believe that someone would come into Town to build an ADU for the purpose of solely renting it out. Mr. Cote inquired if

the four ADUs that were built were done so for family or for rent. Mr. Gowan believed most of the ADUs were to accommodate a family member. Going forward, he believed they would primarily be for family members.

Mr. Doherty believed the potential decrease in student population was due mostly to the numbers of aging population was moving up. He felt there would also be a change in demographics for the usage of ADUs, such as use for caregivers. This is due to the increased cost of nursing homes; people could build an ADU for same cost as residing in a nursing home for a couple months.

Mr. Gowan stated he would amend the ADU language based on the earlier discussion and bring it back to the Board for additional discussion prior to public hearings in January. He then spoke about workforce housing, which was a challenge for communities throughout the State. In speaking with Town Counsel, he said one possibility was to review the density they allowed for age restriction housing and allow something approximate to that as long as some threshold number of units meets workforce housing (sale or rent). He noted Amherst, Londonderry and others have workforce housing on the books. He said to do so it would be about density.

Mr. Michael Castagna came forward. He was involved with the housing charrette held earlier in the year. He said during the New England Planner's conference he and five of his colleagues gave a presentation (as a work out session) on affordability of housing; a lot of the discussion was about what it looked like and the different things that could be done. He noted every town was different and unique with their own yet similar issues. He said the housing issue was at a crisis level which he equated to the situation that happened post WWII and how the government attacked the issues with veterans returning and having no place to live. He noted housing and the economy were tightly linked. He said the aging population of the State went to its economic vitality of the companies. He said politicians quote there is less than 3% unemployment; however, they don't discuss the 30,000+ jobs that aren't being filled because employers can't find workers. He added workers weren't coming to the State because they couldn't afford to live here. It's not a town problem, it's a regional problem. Mr. Castagna told the Board the function of allowing workforce housing in Pelham helped larger companies in other towns the ability to bring employees to the area. He said towns should look at what they can do rather than trying to solve the world's problems. Mr. Castagna told the Board the Town had to drive the process. He said a developer wasn't going to come to in with an affordable housing project because they want to make a profit. He said there were some that have figured out the formula to do a project and work with towns and stakeholders (residents within the community). He suggested having conversations with surrounding communities since it's a regional problem.

In reference to affordable housing, Mr. Doherty spoke about the standards expected from a developer. He said there wasn't 'affordable building' because of the standards and requirements across the nation. Mr. Castagna stated he was currently doing an affordable project in Hampton Falls with high performance construction (highly energy efficient) that meets/exceeds most of the building codes. He understood how building codes have changed and spoke about the changes recently made by the State. He said density was a big thing and agreed that construction costs were high and added they had a way of dealing with it. Mr. Castagna believed the mindset of dealing with the issues and having accommodations for something to grow and try to solve the problems would go a long way. Mr. Montbleau asked for an explanation of what made Mr. Castagna's current project 'work'. Mr. Castagna explained phase I was one building, predicated on what's allowed from a tax credit standpoint. The State is only allowed a set number of credits (set number of dollars) so the size of the project is limited. He said his project was able to get tax credits for phase II and III so they could build the last two buildings within the same tax credit timeframe. He's also involved with a project in Hudson where there are two buildings (4 story and 3 story) that will need to go through two different rounds. Tax credits are part of the capital stack which require the building to be affordable for a minimum of fifteen years (during tax credit period). He noted it was a highly competitive point system; there were a set number of tax credits available and only one round per year to submit an application to receive them. Mr. Montbleau suggested the Board go out and see what some of the properties look like.

Mr. Dadak inquired if the projects were 'stick' built or modular. Mr. Castagna replied the building he spoke about was modular; walls pre-built in factory, floors done on site. He said the trusses were done conventionally. Doing the building this way (through a factory) saved approximately 8%. He said modular comes as a kit; they had all three stories with a roof (25,000SF footprint) enclosed in less than three weeks. There are several companies within the area that do the panelized buildings. Mr. Dadak questioned if it was less expensive to build with stick or panels. Mr. Castagna replied it depended on the project. In this case it saved on the labor; they were able to build a 25-unit apartment building three months quicker than it would have taken had it been stick built.

Mr. Gowan stated he would try to find ordinances and photographic evidence for the Board to review. He agreed it would be helpful to go see (in person) developments that had been done.

Mr. Montbleau thanked Mr. Castagna for attending Pelham's housing charrette. Mr. Castagne said buildings wouldn't have to be more than one story, if they could achieve density. He said having a decent sized site and creating a small village within the site would still provide density and make it affordable.

Mr. Cote heard Mr. Castagna mention housing was in a crisis level. He wanted to know how it related to Pelham. He understood towns were 'figuring' it out but felt in some regard the State was forcing towns to do so. He said some people may not want this to come because they moved to Pelham because it was rural, and the developments would diminish that aspect. He noted many of police and fire employees prefer to live out of town because if they lived in Pelham they would feel as though they are constantly working. Mr. Cote commented he was all about creating ways to make things affordable and pointed out a one-bedroom apartment (in Pelham) cost approximately \$1,500. He wanted to know how they could convince community to get 'affordable housing' if they might not want it. Mr. Castagna wondered why a community wouldn't want it. He spoke about the benefits and believed they should look at it from a master plan standpoint as to how the community could grow. He said opportunities would be created by what the Town does.

Mr. Gowan stated he brought specific language (minor changes) to the conservation subdivision but wasn't convinced it was the 'way to go' so he personally would rather not get into the details of the language. He suggested the Board consider looking at what they had allowed for density within senior projects to see if that language could lead to something. He said they could use that language and compare it with what other communities have done.

Mr. Montbleau asked Mr. Castagna if his projects had water and sewer. Mr. Castagna replied Hudson had water and sewer; however, the project in Hampton Falls did not.

PUBLIC INPUT

State Representative Hershel Nunez, 21 Webster Avenue wanted to remind people the State laws (RSAs) do not require a certain number/amount of dwellings be established as 'affordable housing'; nor is there a percentage of the housing that needs to be required in any town to be recognized as 'affordable or workforce housing'. He said everyone has had a lot of time to think about what it means to Pelham and current residents. He couldn't envision Pelham turning into a high-density town or turn in to Dracut, MA which is stacked with houses and high density and lower valued homes. He believed people were concerned about having apartment buildings everywhere and lot sizes being decreased smaller than a half-acre to satisfy something. He commented senior living in Town had its place and was built out. During the last election voters stopped the senior ordinance. Representative Nunez encouraged the Town to remember there was no type of statistic being forced by the State; no percentage or number of houses that had to be in place. Through conversations with the State Governor, he understood Pelham should not be able to be sued for not having an ordinance in place. He said he would go back to Concord and get language to bring back to the Board. He added if there was a breakdown from what Concord believes and what the Town believes it needed to be addressed. He understood they wanted to satisfy the needs of the current RSA.

Mr. Montbleau said the understanding of the Board and suggestion from Town Counsel was Pelham had to create an opportunity for it (workforce housing) to happen. He said they had to have language in place so the opportunity could exist. He agreed there was no criteria for a number of units. Mr. Gowan also agreed there was no specific threshold established. Mr. Montbleau stated the Town was exposed because they didn't have a zoning ordinance in place that could accommodate workforce housing. Mr. Nunez understood. He felt the premise of the discussions was to get an ordinance on the books because Pelham had limited land use. He said when those things are discussed it also opens the way for apartment housing or smaller lots to be constructed. He stated people like the feel of the rural Town and were concerned about what would happen as density increases. He ended by reiterating there were no statistics that require percentages or a specific number. He believed if they reviewed the existing apartment complexes or multiple dwellings/accessory dwellings the Town would be able to satisfy language that says they are already an 'affordable housing' town. Mr. Gowan stated the first sentences of RSA 674-59 Workforce Housing were the most pertinent because it specifies what the Town 'shall' do. He noted Pelham isn't a rural community and hadn't been for decades; the Town is suburban that has a special small-town feel. Mr. Gowan believed some accommodation could be made to allow something on a reasonable scale. Mr. Nunez understood phase I would be to get an ordinance on the books to be in compliance with State law. He said it was phase 2 and 3 citizens were concerned about. He said they would continue to attend the Board meetings to see the progress, check on the language and make sure the residents understand what it all meant.

Mr. Doherty commented the reason why they put language in the conservation subdivision ordinance was because it is an innovative land use ordinance which gives the Board the leeway to grant their own 'variances'. He said they haven't had an applicant go out of their way to grab tax credits. He said someday when someone targets Pelham and comes in front of the Board the Board will be able to work with the applicant because it'll be an innovative land use ordinance. He completely disagreed with lining language up to entice developers to come to Pelham and fill the Town with development. He reiterated if that time came the Board could work with a developer because it's an innovative land use ordinance. Mr. Gowan noted there was a limit of 20% density. Mr. Doherty replied the Board could vary its own innovative land use without going to the Zoning Board. Mr. Gowan suggested whatever language they came up with should be an innovative land use ordinance. Mr. Doherty said if the language was put elsewhere (outside of innovative ordinance) the Board wouldn't be able to negotiate with a developer in good faith (publicly) and would open the situation to a lawsuit. In his opinion, workforce housing shouldn't come out of the conservation subdivision ordinance and reiterated he didn't want to entice developers to come to Town. Mr. Montbleau said in order for it to work everyone had to be 'tuned in' and work together. He said the Board needed to be able to work with the developers. Mr. Gowan agreed that the language would need to be an innovative land use ordinance so the Board would remain in control. However, he felt confident that the Board couldn't approve more than 20% density.

Mr. Dave Hennessey, 71 Dutton Road agreed with the discussion in the sense that if they are going to move ahead with workforce housing it shouldn't be to satisfy a real or imagined threat from the State. He said they ought to be doing it because it was right for Pelham. He felt one issue to address would be updating the Master Plan once the numbers from the census are received. In reviewing the goals and aspirations from the Master Plan (2002), he saw at that time it was to keep Pelham rural, even though it was actually suburban. He continued to speak about the Master Plan and pointed out the Town had experienced an enormous amount of growth between 2000 and 2008; however, when the market stopped Pelham started to lose population. Mr. Hennessey noted the Town 'tipped the scale' a number of years ago by encouraging age restricted housing, which was the reason the Town voted last year to do away with it. He pointed out the concern about allowing housing and having too many children move into Town was gone. Pelham has the infrastructure and is paying the teachers but was still losing children within the public schools. He said it was time for the Board to reexamine Pelham's goals. Mr. Hennessey read in the Master Plan's goals that the Town had to accommodate the Town's fair share of the region's population growth. He wasn't sure that the census would show significant growth in Pelham or the region. He noted Maine was the oldest state (population age) and New Hampshire was kind of tied with Vermont for second. He stated the unemployment rate was at 3% because employers couldn't find people to

work for them because employees can't afford the houses. He heard an earlier comment that some of the police officers didn't want to live in Town. He pointed out there were some Town workers who couldn't find housing and had to live as far away as New Boston. He said they needed to find some mechanism for affordable housing, not because of the State requirements, but because it was the right thing to do to. He added younger people were needed in Town. Mr. Hennessey found the sixth goal interesting because it suggested Pelham remain predominantly single-family housing units. He agreed about not having block after block of apartment buildings but felt there was a need for some.

Mr. Hennessey believed the Town should be providing more housing for people to live within the community. He understood they may need to wait to get it done until after the census numbers are in but pointed out they've been discussing it for ten years. He said it was time to make adjustments given they had basically redrawn the demographic of Pelham over the last eight years into a graying population by encouraging senior and elderly housing. He said it was time now to encourage younger people to come into Town.

Mr. William Scanzani came forward. He told the Board he agreed with Mr. Hennessey with regard to his comments about the Master Plan. He said they needed to get voters involved to discuss what was needed as a community going forward. He felt the community had the right to give the Board direction on how much affordable housing they wanted to provide in Town. In order to do that he said they would have to review how much affordable housing was currently in Pelham. He noted there were many homes built in the 1950s and 60s that under current regulation would be considered affordable. He felt the Board should get a handle on how many of those homes and ADUs there currently were. Ms. Kirkpatrick gave the following statistics: currently 219 ADUs, 277 potential rental units and 2,122 single-family homes that assess under \$350,000. There's a total of 4,600 homes in Pelham. Mr. Scanzani asked what percentage was 'affordable'. Mr. Montbleau replied the Board was working on an ordinance. Mr. Scanzani replied he asked about the percentage because the Town may be meeting a great part of the region's numbers already. He said if they knew how much more they needed it would allow the Board to limit the number of affordable units built down the road.

Mr. Montbleau pointed out there was testimony about people traveling great distances to work in the Town because they couldn't afford to live here. Mr. Scanzani understood there wasn't enough homes available. He agreed with Mr. Gowan it should be a separate zoning that the Board could control. He said they might be able to take sections from the previous senior housing and create an ordinance for affordable housing. That way they will have separate ordinances for basic zoning, affordable housing, ADUs and density for conservation subdivisions which would all be controlled by the Board.

Mr. Doherty questioned how they would stop the elderly, who have part-time jobs and low income, from buying the affordable housing so the young people can purchase them. Mr. Scanzani replied they couldn't because there was no Federal law allowing them to prevent it. Mr. Doherty said if the Town built the affordable units and the older people purchase them the Town still wouldn't have housing for young people. Mr. Scanzani reiterated the community had to define within its master plan what they are looking for, what problems they're responsible for and how to solve it.

Mr. Hennessey told the Board that Nashua had seen generation wars. As the old houses (built in the 1970s) come onto the market, there have been battles between the younger and older generations. The older generation wins every time because they have more money as they are downsizing to move into that type of housing. He said the age restrictive housing has changed the possibility of it changing in the future. He commented once a town has age restrictive housing it can't be changed because was done as an exception to the Federal Fair Housing Laws. Mr. Doherty questioned if they built a high-density development if there was a way to guarantee young people would live there. Mr. Hennessey answered no.

Mr. Lynde commented the Town had a lot of houses that were considered 'affordable', but no one was moving out of them because they had no place to go. He said 'elderly housing' was built but the people currently in houses couldn't afford to move into them and people came from out of Town to live in them. He said Pelham

needed young people to move into Town. He noted they had a school system waiting for them that wasn't close to being full. Mr. Lynde didn't believe Pelham would ever turn into Dracut, MA because the residents valued its atmosphere and uniqueness. He said they could make affordable housing if people were willing to build it. He's had discussions with developers and learned the 20% (density) wouldn't work for them to be able to build affordable housing. He's learned if the Town doesn't do anything a developer could come in and indicate Pelham is not compliant and turn around and go to court and get a subdivision approved without the Board's okay. He stated they had to have something on the books but at the same time they needed to do something for young families and added they weren't going to build Section 8 housing. It needed to be something affordable so young people could move into Town and bring up a family. He wanted everyone to work together and do something in that direction.

Mr. Montbleau agreed with Mr. Lynde and felt the Board should keep thinking about how to relieve the situation with new families and young people the Town desperately needed to carry on the infrastructure. He said older people don't want things to change, they just want to 'ride it out'; however, if young families come in, they want to create, expand and make the community better than what it is. He stated the people in the workforce were making the Town be what it was, what everyone loved about it. Mr. Montbleau commented the dilemma was how to create something so Pelham could grow. He felt it would be worth to visit the affordable home sites that were built and in the process of being built so they could foster new ideas and develop what the Town needed in the future to enhance it.

Mr. Doherty spoke to the comment regarding the 20% density and recommended removing all items except 'workforce housing' within the conservation subdivision ordinance. He said a developer would either build the same amount of housing they would within a conventional subdivision or took the opportunity to have additional lots, they would be workforce housing. Mr. Lynde didn't feel that would occur. Mr. Doherty believed if a developer could get additional lots by developing workforce housing, they would build them. He felt removing the other items in the ordinance would be a good test to see if anyone wanted to build workforce housing in Pelham. Mr. Lynde replied it wasn't that a developer didn't want to build it, but rather they couldn't afford to do so with the 20% density. Mr. Doherty wanted to know from a builder if they would build workforce housing as a bonus.

Mr. Castagna stated the market rates subsidize the workforce housing units. He said the math didn't work to build ten conventional houses at approximately \$450,000-\$500,000 and then have to build two workforce housing units that had to sell at approximately \$250,000. Mr. Doherty asked if the math worked with no land cost. Mr. Castagna believed with one-acre zoning they would need to have approximately 4-5 living units per acre. Mr. Gowan felt developers should meet with the Board to discuss why it wouldn't work. In his conversations, not one has believed work force housing could be done based on what the Town has on the books. He said that didn't mean they had to create a terrible matrix that would cause an inordinate number to be built, but felt the language had to be reasonable and realistic; what they currently had was neither. He believed they could come up with something without turning the Town into an urban community. Mr. Montbleau felt it would behoove the Board to see Mr. Castagna's projects in person and see how the numbers work.

Mr. Bergeron inquired how many units were in (Mr. Castagna's) Hampton Falls project. Mr. Castagna replied there were three, three-story buildings with 75 living units (combination of studio and one-bedroom). Mr. Bergeron questioned what infrastructure he relied on for wastewater and domestic supply. Mr. Castagna replied there was an on-site well for water and the disposal was an on-site septic system. There is a pre-treatment plant built into each building which allowed them to build a smaller leach field. He said there is quite a bit of wetlands around the lot so usable land was at a premium. Mr. Bergeron questioned the size of the site. Mr. Castagna replied it was a little under twenty acres. There is a community well and septic and also a cistern system for fire suppression. He noted they also had walking trails around the development that went into conservation land. He welcomed the Board to visit the site and offered to give them a tour. Mr. Bergeron wanted to know if the water system was controlled by a landlord. Mr. Castagna stated it was run by a management company, who was

also the owner. Being that the water was considered a small community water system, it was regulated by the State and Federal rules.

Mr. Gowan told the Board he would speak with his counter parts in Londonderry and Exeter for potential language and work with Mr. Castagna to obtain additional information (copy of the plans and photographs of developments). He said they could work on a couple versions of the ordinance; one within the conservation subdivision ordinance and also a stand-alone innovative land use ordinance. He noted either way it would keep the Board in control.

Mr. Castagna told the Board Hampton Falls was similar to Pelham in the size of the community. He said the development was the first of its kind in that community and took four years to get it through. He welcomed the Board to speak with the Hampton Falls selectmen and town manager; they were skeptical at first, but now loved the development. Mr. Montbleau asked how the process went with their planning board. Mr. Castagna replied once their selectmen 'bought in' to the whole concept their planning board only reviewed it from a regulatory standpoint. He said it was relatively easy once they got through the initial process of getting it, so they liked the project and allowed it to happen.

Mr. Montbleau stated the Board heard the testimony which has given them a lot to think about. He reiterated his belief that a site walk would be beneficial. He said for issues relating to the diminishing children population in addition to meeting State requirements, Pelham had a need to continue the process and keep their focus on doing something.

Mr. Steele stated he moved to Pelham after living in Manchester for twenty years because of what the Town is. He understood the importance of keeping its character but also understood the need to keep an open mind about where they were going tomorrow and in the future. He liked seeing they had different options. Being a taxpayer, one of his concerns was the steady decline of students and children coming into the community. He was open to visit the site to get ideas for the next step. Mr. Steele understood the concerns of creating a balance for everyone and not creating 'cookie cutter' development.

Mr. Montbleau believed the Board vetted out a lot of information and thanked the guests for coming and having the discussion.

Mr. Gowan stated he would work with Mr. Castagna to determine site walk dates and would get back to the Board with information.

Ms. Laura Spottiswood, Webster Avenue came forward. She understood Pelham was in need of putting an ordinance on the books and liked the thought going into the process. She would like to see the foresight as to what the Town's need is and how many families the Town could handle when the Board discusses the type of project that might be proposed. She wanted to better understand the goal as the market had shifted from the time she moved into Town.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: (Lynde/Dadak) To adjourn the meeting.

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

The meeting was adjourned at 9:55pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Charity A. Landry
Recording Secretary