

**APPROVED**

**TOWN OF PELHAM PLANNING BOARD  
MEETING MINUTES  
February 6, 2023**

Chairman Tim Doherty called the meeting to order at approximately 7:07 PM.

Ms. Masse-Quinn called the roll:

**PRESENT ROLL CALL:**

Tim Doherty – present  
Jim Bergeron - present  
Danielle Masse-Quinn – present  
Hal Lynde – present  
Samuel Thomas - present  
John Spottiswood – present  
Bruce Bilapka – present  
Roger Montbleau - present  
Joe Passamonte – present  
Scott Sawtelle - present  
Jenn Beauregard - present

**ABSENT/  
NOT PARTICIPATING:**

Paddy Culbert  
Kevin Cote  
Jaie Bergeron  
Jennifer Castles

Mr. Doherty said it will be a six-member vote tonight.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Mr. Thomas read the public forum announcement for the Master Plan per the Planning Board: He said Pelham residents are busy creating a new Master plan. This is a road map for the future of this town. This represents the goals and visions of the community in the town. This sets forth recommended strategies and actions to achieve them over the next 10 years. We need participation to help create this new plan. Over the next few months, we will be asking the community for input and direction. Some of the ways this can be done would be, to attend the community forum event on February 22, 2023 at Sherburne Hall from 6-8 PM. This will be an event for feedback from the community. There will be an online version of the community forum event, which will be open to the public for one month following the in-person forum. Visit the website and share the flyer that went out. Visit the website: [www.bit.ly/pelham-master-plan](http://www.bit.ly/pelham-master-plan).

**MEETING MINUTES**

Mr. Lynde had the following changes: Line 204, change Ms. to Mr. Line 213, change they to the. Line 243 he asked if we should identify who was the ‘no’ vote. Mr. Doherty said that was him and to add that to the vote results.

Mr. Thomas had the following changes: Line 40, to add ‘per the Planning Board’. Line 253 to add ‘Pelham existing condition’. Line 255 to add ‘committee’ after master plan.

**MOTION:** (Mr. Passamonte/Mr. Bilapka) To approve the minutes as amended.

**VOTE:** (5-0-1) The motion carried. Mr. Montbleau abstained.

**OLD BUSINESS**

**Case PL2022-00031 – Cedar Crest Development, LLC (Applicant), Eleanor Burton Revocable Trust (Owner) – (Map 38 Lot 1-109) 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.**

This applicant has asked to be continued to the next meeting.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**Case PL2023-00004 – (Map 28 Lot 2-12 and Map 34 Lot 2-13) Lamarre, Richard, and an unaddressed lot – Seeking approval of a lot line adjustment to add 2.95 acres from 34-2-13 to 28-2-12, leaving 34-2-13 with 1 acre and the remaining house.**

Ms. Masse-Quinn read the list of abutters.

Mr. Kurt Meisner introduced himself with Meisner Brem Corporation representing Mr. Lamarre for this lot line adjustment. He said they have about a 4-acre lot with an existing dwelling on it. That dwelling is serviced by an on-site well and on-site septic system. He is looking to adjust the lot line from the 4-acre parcel into a smaller, 1-acre lot that would be identical to the lot adjacent and to the west side of it. He showed this on the map to the board. He said they will transfer 2.9 acres to the parcel to the rear, which is a 110-acre lot, which is called the farm. He said he has State of NH DES approval for the subdivision, which was soil testing, 4K area and the well locations and the state is okay with all of that and it meets their standards. He said there are no wetlands on the site and no flood plan.

Ms. Masse-Quinn asked if he is taking a conforming lot and making it non-conforming. Mr. Meisner said no, the lot conforms. He is just reducing the 4-acre lot down to a 1-acre lot.

Mr. Bilapka asked what the footage was between the right of lot 2-13 to the lot line (from the new lot line they want to establish and the parcel)?

Mr. Meisner said it doesn’t show on the plan, but it is about 95 feet. Mr. Bilapka asked why he wants to leave the 95 feet there?

Mr. Meisner said Mr. Lamarre owns the farm to the back and it provides frontage for him on Marsh Road and he may be interested in selling this home in the future. He said they left that with 200 feet of frontage to conform.

Mr. Bilapka asked if there is a road planned for that? Mr. Meisner said they have no future plans for on this parcel. Mr. Bilapka said he doesn’t understand why they wouldn’t want to bring that lot over if they want to subdivide the back and make it part of the back, so he would have access to Burns Road on the backside.

Mr. Meisner said they will create a lot with the 200 feet of frontage to meet the town's requirements, leaving Mr. Lamarre with enough land to be flexible for the future. He said they are looking to tack on 2.95 acres onto 110 acres. Mr. Lamarre owns both properties and he wants to keep as much as he can.

Mr. Doherty opened it up to the public.

Ms. Jessica O'Neil from 6 Pondview Drive introduced herself. She said for the existing community on Pondview and Burns, she said this gives frontage for the new property on Burns and Marsh. She asked how large of a division would this be, if that is part of the planning?

Mr. Meisner said this doesn't provide frontage on Marsh Road, as there already is. He said there is 115 feet that would be left over, once this lot line is in place. He said Mr. Lamarre is a farmer and has no plans at all. He said Mr. Lamarre's purpose is only to sell this house and he wants to maintain as much of the land as he can.

Mr. Doherty asked if he was looking to subdivide this big piece of land? Ms. O'Neil asked if the effort is to maintain the farm?

Mr. Meisner said yes. Mr. Doherty said at the moment, it makes the farm bigger.

Mr. Doherty closed it to the public.

Mr. Doherty asked if there were any waivers?

Mr. Meisner said there is an existing well on the property and it goes over the lot line. He thought if the well is existing, it was okay, but not for a new lot and new subdivision. He said he did not ask for a waiver.

Mr. Doherty asked Ms. Beauregard if it would be up to the board about the existing well. She thought there may need to be waivers because the entire lot has not been surveyed.

Mr. Doherty thought he may need that waiver and we wouldn't need him to survey the entire property.

Ms. Beauregard said typically with a lot this large, we wouldn't expect them to survey the whole lot.

Mr. Doherty said where they are 'adding to it', as opposed to 'removing from it', he is concerned with the well radius. He said it may be like 40 feet outside of it, so he asked if a road ever went in there, would there be enough land there to stay out of the flood plain?

Mr. Meisner said there is enough land to do that and as a fall back position, a well radius is allowed to come into a town right of way or street (according to NH DES regulations).

Mr. Jim Bergeron said it's not typical to have such a parcel shaped this way intentionally and to leave the lot created in a state of less conformity regarding the well radius. He said Mr. Bilapka eluded to this earlier about the lot line in the back. He said he would not be looking favorably at a well waiver and a soil waiver, unless they wanted to fix those. He said he won't approve a well radius that goes out into another lot, when it was good to start with. He said he doesn't care what DES says because we can be more strict and we can apply regulations over the DES regulations. He said he will uphold Pelham's conditions and asked that he would do the same.

Mr. Meisner said sure. He said it is an existing well, but he did prepare a waiver request. He said on this lot, it states that the alternative well location to meet Pelham's regulations falls in the

driveway and that is in front of the garage. He said the well is good producing, the soils are good and there is a good water table.

Mr. Doherty said it's possible to make the well radius be in the lot they want to make smaller.

Mr. Jim Bergeron said take the top line and bring it to the west and there is no need for this area to be left open. Mr. Jim Bergeron said they are asking him to draw a lot that makes sense and complies with subdivision regulations.

Mr. Doherty said that Mr. Bilapka mentioned that the lot line comes over to the existing lot line and then down, it makes the lot bigger than the acre and the applicant wants to come down to 1 acre but it doesn't meet the well regulations.

Mr. Jim Bergeron said the representative said the lot to the west was the same size, but that lot is an anomaly to the other lots that are on that side of the street. Mr. Meisner said he understands.

Mr. Jim Bergeron said he didn't know the history of that lot, but looking at the map, all of the other lots are sizably larger.

Mr. Doherty asked what the frontage is now on the narrow strip coming down onto Marsh Road?

Mr. Meisner said now it is 115 feet from the corner to the proposed new corner. Originally there was a 50 foot strip and they moved it over 65 additional feet.

Mr. Doherty said now there is 50 feet of frontage on Marsh Road. Mr. Meisner said correct, that goes to the farm in the back.

Mr. Doherty asked if anything were on there now? Mr. Meisner said no, there is just natural woods.

Mr. Doherty asked if that would be wide enough to meet subdivision regulations to put a road there in future the way it is? Mr. Meisner said the regulations require roundings at the corners and so a waiver would be needed to eliminate a rounding coming out from the north/south lot line where it meets Marsh Road. Mr. Meisner said there are no plans now for that and Mr.

Lamarre plans to keep as much land as he can for his farm.

Mr. Doherty said the proposed lot line now is to bring it over and have the well radius on that lot. He asked if he brought it over to the well radius, would that give it enough to do the rounding of the corners to put a future road in? Mr. Meisner said he's not sure.

Mr. Doherty said three board members are concerned about the well radius and the way it is now, his plan won't pass.

Mr. Meisner said he will explain that to his client and come back to the board tonight.

Mr. Doherty told the board to take a 5-minute recess.

Mr. Meisner said he would propose a continuance and then have to come back with a different plan. He said if they ran the lot line parallel to the line that's there now and ran it so it touched the edge of the existing radius of the well, then that would be like 37 or 40 feet.

Mr. Jim Bergeron said he thinks he will need an extra 10 so he stays inside the envelope.

Ms. Beauregard said that is one of the requirements.

Mr. Meisner agreed and said he didn't do that but asked for a waiver at that point (keeping the well radius completely on this lot and slid it over). He said they would still ask for a waiver but keep the well radius on our lot.

Mr. Bilapka asked the board, if there were any setback for the well radius from the lot line?

Ms. Beauregard said the regulations require it stays within the building envelop of the lot so it's not supposed to be in any of the setbacks (which is above what the state requires).

Mr. Doherty said they've given waivers in the past to put them up to the property line. He asked what the board thought of that, and he would have to request a waiver if he brought that lot line down to the well radius.

Mr. Jim Bergeron asked if we have to accept this plan for consideration? Mr. Doherty said this plan won't come back in front of us, it would be a different plan.

Mr. Thomas said that it was said there were no wetlands on this property, but looking at it, it looks like there could be. Mr. Doherty asked if he was talking about the big lot? Mr. Thomas said there were wetlands there.

Mr. Meisner said he was speaking about the lot, that the lot line was adjusted to.

Mr. Meisner asked for a continuance, and they will adjust the lot line.

Ms. Masse-Quinn said the next meetings are February 23<sup>rd</sup> and March 6<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Meisner said February 23<sup>rd</sup> is fine.

Mr. Jim Bergeron said he recommends he comes back with a plan that requires no waivers because of what he is doing with the size of the parcel he has and the reduction of the lot. He said this board has to consider the future. He said there was discussion with the chair about potential for this access to become a roadway.

**MOTION:** (Mr. Jim Bergeron/Mr. Passamonte) To accept this plan for consideration.

**VOTE:** (6-0-0) The motion carried.

Mr. Meisner said he did not bring up the issue with the right-of-way, the chairman asked if there was enough room for a road and he was just responding. Mr. Meisner said there is zero concept of that.

Mr. Doherty said he is not suggesting he ever puts a road in.

Mr. Jim Bergeron said that statement reinforces if there is no need for it, then bring that line to the east and you're all done.

## **UPDATES**

Mr. Thomas said the Master plan committee had a meeting on January 26 with Resilience and they are preparing for the forum. This forum will be an open session with residents to get ideas of what should be put into the Master plan. He requested that all members from the planning board attend this forum, as this is the next step to finalize the Master plan, as it will be completed by June.

Mr. Jim Bergeron said for those who don't sit on the Master plan subcommittee, the plan is that we are going to walk around this room where there will be seven tables. Everyone will wear lanyards identifying each other to the public. He thought it would show our commitment if everyone could make it. He said there will also be food there that night.

Mr. Thomas said it will be on February 22<sup>nd</sup> from 6-8pm in Sherburne Hall.

Mr. Thomas said Ms. Beauregard is working with Resilience on what is going to happen. There was a meeting last Friday with himself, Ms. Beauregard, Ms. Masse-Quinn and Mr. Gowan and they went through questions. They went back to Resilience with those questions. He said after the plan is written; it won't sit on a shelf. There will be a sub-master plan group with 4-5 members that will meet quarterly and make sure that those actions are implemented within certain groups. He said in the past, there were things that weren't implemented, so they want to make sure this time all the committees will implement and work towards getting those things

done. He said there is one high school student on the board participating. He thinks we are moving forward with this plan and he's happy with the progress they are making.

Mr. Jim Bergeron said on the Master plan revision, our new by-laws, Ms. Masse-Quinn included Article 13, that talks about revising the Master plan. He thinks that with our new planning director and a newer board, he thinks we will be able to get things done.

Mr. Thomas said they are starting to work on a mission statement and a vision statement. He said they've had some good things coming forth.

Mr. Doherty said there is a handout regarding Foreman Lane in regard to the flooding conditions there. He asked Ms. Beauregard if she knew of anything they might be doing that wasn't on the letter?

Ms. Beauregard said this is today's update and she included Mr. Loosigian's (the developer) email from when the rain started January 26<sup>th</sup>. She said that's when they started getting complaints about two of the retention ponds not holding water and overflowing. She said the developer provided an explanation of what was happening and his plans. He was going to meet with the Dubai Group and Mr. Keach or Jeff Quirk for a solution. She said herself and Mr. Roark went to the site and met Jeff Quirk there and there may have been a miscalculation of water tables in that area. She said as of today, there was a meeting with the road agent and contractor and they will be increasing the volumetric capacity and also installing intercepting, infiltration catch basin units with beehive grates at the pond bottom extended area to introduce better water replenishment into substrate. That has been done on other sites with great success. The contractor will be starting this work within two weeks. They are going to provide a plan showing it on the septic design. She said time is of the essence with them getting this under control and she asked the board if anyone on this board wanted to see what they were doing, or she could just keep updating them?

Mr. Jim Bergeron said his concern is to see how they attempt to fix the problem. He asked if it can be fixed now while it's in failure? He asked if it would be better to fix it during the summer months when the ponds are empty? He said it sounds like they are going to extend the depth.

Ms. Beauregard said it sounded that way.

Mr. Jim Bergeron said to him, as he had been in that business, that now would be a difficult time to do this. He said effectively it may be done after this is over and this weather is an anomaly. He said for the best results, he wants the engineers to be asked if this should wait? As that emergency is now over.

Ms. Beauregard said she can ask them that question. She said what they did during that rain, they shut off and sealed a pipe to the larger pond next to the horse farm so no more water would go into that pond. They drained some water out and put it off to other areas. The one on the road, they were going to do a temporary berm to keep that from flooding onto the road. She said it seems to be under control for now from what she knows.

Mr. Jim Bergeron said he wants it to be effective and cost effective to all. He said an alternative to a failure is twice the money, time and aggravation. He said you can't fix a wet pond if there's silt and materials that are clogged and blocking the bottom from draining. He said if they wait until August, that is fine with him.

Ms. Beauregard asked the board if they want to see the plan they want to put in place?

Mr. Bilapka asked if they considered doing a graded road drain? He said he has one on his street and it takes care of a lot of water. He asked if they considered that?

Ms. Beauregard said she's not sure but can find out. She said they've spoken to the neighbors about an easement to bring a pipe to divert water and she thought they didn't have an interest in that.

Mr. Bilapka said there is a drain system of some sort on Ledge Road and if this is a seasonal issue, and if the road drain is there, then they won't get that icing if the pond overflows. He said this might now work and they may end up doing that and still have to do a road drain.

Ms. Beauregard will ask that.

Mr. Jim Bergeron asked if the engineers should come and talk to us? Ms. Beauregard said there has been enough talk and enough people are involved that it may make sense to bring it back before the board. She said abutters can come and have discussions or just let the engineers fix it.

Mr. Lynde asked if they are working on areas they can control or is on land that is owned by other people? Ms. Beauregard said it is both and now they are working on land that they own. She said it would be helpful if they had land that they could get easements through as well.

Mr. Doherty said the problem with the piece of property that this faces; is that it's always had water flowing off it because it's on a hill. He said everybody knew this property would have water flowing off of it at the same rate pre-construction. It said it appears a system was designed to try and contain the water that was on the hill. He said that is not possible to do and when he looked at it, that road is pitching back to the applicant's property. So when the water flows across the road like it did prior to construction, it has to flood the road all the way across the road before it can get on the edge of the road. That means the road becomes part of the retention area in his opinion. He asked if we want to speak to the engineers?

Ms. Beauregard said she talked to Mr. Keach, and he said that was done by design and was in the plans because the board and applicants were trying to appease some abutters to not put more water on their property. It was designed to pitch back towards the pond on the other side of the road. She asked Mr. Keach if that now became part of the drainage structure. She said Mr. Keach said it all ends up being maintained by the town.

Mr. Doherty said it is part of the drainage structure because every time that water bleeds off that property, it has to flood the road. If that road was higher, it would be no different than any other town road when water runs across it. He said the town can salt that road, so it doesn't freeze up. He thought there may have been about 4-6 inches of water on one side of the road.

Ms. Beauregard said if they did the temporary berm now to keep the water contained in the pond, with the road pitched that way, the water may get trapped into the road and have nowhere to go.

Mr. Doherty said it won't be able to drain back into the pond.

Mr. Doherty asked if the board wants to see the engineers back here?

Mr. Bilapka said he would. Mr. Doherty said he would. Mr. Doherty asked if anyone didn't want them to come in front of us?

Mr. Jim Bergeron has concerns about the applicant having to put out costs for engineering that didn't work, that were told would work. He wants to see them but doesn't want to see money spent for 'talk'. He said if they can do something right the first time, that's what he wants to see happen. He said they won't get their bond if this doesn't work. He said that is up to the engineer that designed that, not us.

Mr. Doherty said how Mr. Bilapka mentioned putting a grate in the road, and how it would go through the grate and go down.

Mr. Montbleau said he agrees with Mr. Jim Bergeron.

Ms. Masse-Quinn said initially she wanted them to come back, but after hearing Mr. Jim Bergeron, she doesn't want it to be an expense for the applicant. She said we have a bond.

Mr. Jim Bergeron asked if that bond was sufficient if the town had to take it into its own hands to get it done?

Ms. Beauregard would have to look at the amount, but she thought it was and that the developer contributed to a betterment fund for Foreman Lane. She will keep the board updated along the way.

Mr. Doherty said the board would like to talk to Mr. Dubay and Mr. Keach to find out what can be done to the road, so the water won't be collected in the road.

Mr. Bilapka said there is only a binder now and if the road has to be raised, then now is the time to do that.

Mr. Doherty said he didn't understand why the engineers designed a road for water to get trapped in. He asked Mr. Montbleau if he'd ever seen that? Mr. Montbleau said no. Mr. Doherty said the engineers did this to appease the neighbors. Mr. Doherty said to contact Mr. Keach and tell him the board isn't happy with the water in the road.

Mr. Lynde said there is a nice building there that isn't used year-round, and it's only used in the summer. He said they are trying to make something to be year-round that isn't designed to be year-round.

Mr. Doherty said it's not a seasonal thing and this winter is strange, and this would have happened in the spring.

## **DISCUSSION**

Mr. Jim Bergeron wanted to discuss revamping the well ordinance. He said there was discussion at the Selectmen's meeting where a contractor submitted information that didn't match the information that the well drillers gave the state. He said that brought forward some of the problems that we've been having. He said we could start with the well ordinance, where we go out and get certification of what a well is doing really (and not what was submitted). He said that was proven the other night by research done by Ms. Masse-Quinn and Kristine Kamal.

Ms. Masse-Quinn asked if board wanted to update and start working on the well ordinance?

Mr. Bilapka is in favor. Mr. Doherty asked if that was in our subdivision regulations or was that in the Selectmen's health ordinance? Ms. Beauregard said it's in the Selectmen's health ordinance.

Mr. Jim Bergeron thought that Selectmen would be here tonight. He said the Selectmen will work off of our recommendations.

Mr. Doherty asked what the process is now on how permits are given out for wells?

Ms. Beauregard said now, when a new home is built a permit gets issued in two phases. One is the foundation permit, then prior to a building permit, they need to provide a sustained yield that's been certified by the well driller. That is four gallons per minute over a four-hour period. She heard the research that came out and there were 1-2 wells that she talked to our health agent about to get his thoughts on. She said that agent said a 'sustained yield' and a 'test yield' given to the state are different. She said that agent said we can update our well ordinance to require so much sustained yield over so much time, plus a standard for a tested yield that goes to the state. She said we need to talk to that agent more and get his expertise on how this works. She said it is Paul Zarnowski.

Mr. Jim Bergeron said Paul Zarnowski isn't a well expert and we should talk to well drillers and to other towns. Ms. Beauregard agreed and she said Paul Zarnowski was the health agent that was involved with helping to write the well ordinance that we have now, in conjunction with the



Selectmen, as the board of health. She said our current ordinance did get DES review and said that's what they recommended.

Mr. Doherty said if we used the state forms prior to issuing a permit and that was how we based our standards, a lot of these houses wouldn't have ever gotten built (the ones with well problems now).

Ms. Beauregard thinks we need to get other town's input and well driller's input. She said they are required to sign a form that is certifying by the well driller that they are getting the number that they are getting.

Mr. Doherty said the problem is when a lot of money is spent on building and then the wells are coming up dry, there seems to be incentive to push numbers to the town that are getting people to have wells that don't work. He said the developers are trying to get their money back and we need to make sure that isn't happening. He said if we are using the state numbers, they aren't lying to the state because the state will pull their license.

Mr. Bilapka asked if there was a way to hold the bond up to year, to a certain number, tied in directly with the well?

Ms. Beauregard said yes, and right now there is an ordinance going before the voters that will require that.

Mr. Doherty said that is to drill another well because we aren't going to give that bond money back and they still won't have water after they drill a new well.

Mr. Bilapka asked how we hold the well drillers responsible, if they send this to state and can we have someone oversee those numbers? He asked if someone oversees these numbers between the well driller, the developer and the state?

Ms. Beauregard said there isn't a witness like that now.

Mr. Bilapka said that information that came out was shocking that a well was sent up saying it had 6 gallons per minute and the well is dry. He said that got missed because there is no oversight on this and that needs to be changed.

Mr. Doherty said to use the state numbers.

Ms. Beauregard said we can do that; we would just have to amend our numbers to match the state's. She said the state only has a recommended standard for residential wells, but she doesn't believe they oversee residential wells.

Mr. Bilapka asked if someone from the state comes and checks those numbers? Ms. Beauregard said no.

Mr. Doherty said the state is getting different numbers than the town is getting.

Ms. Masse-Quinn asked if when someone brings their numbers to the town, can someone in the town verify those numbers are the same?

Ms. Beauregard said those numbers come in at two different times. She said our ordinance allows us the sustained yield, which is a different test than what is being sent to the state. We require the sustained yield. She said right before occupancy, for informational purposes only, we receive the well data report for the homeowner to have. She said there should be a way someone can verify if these numbers work together.

Mr. Passamonte asked if we could get a certified copy of the well report given to the state as part of the package to the town?

Ms. Beauregard said the state isn't overseeing residential wells.

Mr. Passamonte said whatever gets reported to the state, then they come to Pelham and that has to match what was reported to the town.

Mr. Bilapka said then they are held to that certification.

Mr. Thomas said we need in our ordinance; a third-party inspection and a report that mimics what the state requires. He said it would be the same type of test.

Mr. Bilapka agreed with that.

Mr. Montbleau asked if any other towns were doing third-party inspections?

Ms. Beauregard isn't sure but can try and find out.

Mr. Montbleau said he thinks we should do a survey of other neighboring towns to see what they are doing for proving out water. He said to also have Paul Zarnowski come in and find out how that test was developed and his thoughts.

Ms. Beauregard agreed with that and back in 2013 the ordinance was revised to match what the state recommended.

Ms. Masse-Quinn said she would help with the research.

Mr. Lynde reminded the board that there was a developer off of Sherburne Road that said wells were good and the people that moved there had no or little water. He said the testing should be long term and that would be a good solution.

Mr. Jim Bergeron asked Mr. Doherty to find if there is a consensus on the board to request to the Selectmen that we begin working through Planning to get a new well ordinance set up?

Mr. Lynde asked if we have the jurisdiction to have the criteria to do it?

Ms. Masse-Quinn asked if we could put it together and present it to the Selectmen?

Mr. Jim Bergeron said what Mr. Thomas suggested is a start. He said we need to start checking wells, just like everything else gets inspected when building a house.

**MOTION:** (Mr. Jim Bergeron/Mr. Passamonte) For Mr. Doherty to get a consensus from the board to ask the Selectmen to give us the authority to write a new ordinance and for them to consider and accept.

**VOTE:** (6-0-0) The motion passed.

Mr. Jim Bergeron said if that shows up on the Selectmen's agenda, he will go to that meeting and ask them to do this.

Mr. Doherty said board members will start to do their own research on this and begin to put something together for the Selectmen.

## **ADJOURN**

**MOTION:** (Mr. Montbleau/Mr. Passamonte) To adjourn the meeting at 8:43 PM

**VOTE:** (6-0-0) The motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,  
Jennifer Castles, Recording Secretary