47

48

address. After many phone calls with the property owner explaining why the Town had adopted

this policy, and letting them know of the fine schedule, Mr. Lozowski thought this would

1

convince them to finally change the address. However, the property owner informed Mr. Lozowski that they felt they were on firm grounds, and they wanted to fight the address change policy. Mr. Lozowski met with Town Administrator Roark and the Town Council for advisement on this matter, as he did not want to take the property owner to court. He stated that the Board of Selectmen has the authority to change the property owner's address to 39 A & B Longview Circle if they choose to do so. Mr. Lozowski added that they alerted the property owners that no certificate of occupancy would be issued until the address was properly marked. He met with the property owner today, who stated he would like to discuss this with the Board of Selectmen before they vote.

Chris Womersley, the property owner, approached the Board to discuss his reasoning for not changing his address. Mr. Womersley stated that he never wanted to have to fight this. He explained that before they added on to their property, they discussed the difference between an accessory dwelling unit and an addition. He stated that they added the addition to their house for his mother-in-law who visits them from out of state and usually stays with them for a month or two at a time. He noted that no one permanently lives in it. Mr. Soucy explained to Mr. Womersley that if you add a washer, dryer, stove, refrigerator, and other items, it is better to mark the addition as an accessory dwelling unit to make sure you follow the code. Mr. Womersley stated that he was never made aware of the Town policy that requires you to change your address when you add an accessory dwelling unit. He noted that he was told by the Town Assessor that it was not required to change the address if they did not want to. Mr. Womersley stated that all necessary paperwork was submitted on June 1, 2023, and his contractor asked the Planning Department if they were all set to receive their certificate of occupancy, and this is when they were told they must fill out the change of address form. Mr. Womersley stated that they were originally told to appeal this to the Highway Safety Committee. Then, the Town Assessor told them that if they did not want to change their address they needed to submit an appeal letter to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Mr. Womersley also added that throughout this process they were never cited with any codes mandating that they must change their address if they add an accessory dwelling unit, and he cannot find any code mandating this. He added that he has spoken to nearly every department in Town, and none of them had the same answer or a straight answer as to why they legally have to change their address. He added that every required official in Town has signed off on their building permit and they passed their final inspection, so there is no reason why they should not receive their certificate of occupancy.

Mr. Croteau asked if the accessory dwelling unit was at the back of the house. Mr. Womersley stated that the door faces the side of the house that you cannot see from the front of the house or the road. Mr. Womersley stated that he does not believe changing their address poses a safety risk. Mr. Croteau asked if the accessory dwelling unit uses the same address as the main part of the house. Mr. Womersley stated that it does. Mr. Croteau asked if there was access to this unit from the main part of the house. Mr. Womersley stated that you can access the unit from inside his home, and it is a normal interior door that does not lock.

Roland Soucy, Town Building Inspector, approached the Board to discuss this issue. Mr. Soucy stated that he has been the Town's Building Inspector for around thirty years, and this is the first time this issue has ever come up. He explained that if the unit did not have a kitchen in it they could call it an addition and this issue could go away. Mr. Soucy stated that the code is clear, and

a certificate of occupancy cannot be issued until all requirements are met. He added that his hands are tied by the building code. Mr. Cote asked what code Mr. Soucy was referring to. Mr. Soucy stated that it is the 2018 International Building Code. Mr. Soucy stated that at the end of the day, he does not have the option to allow them to live in the unit without a certificate of occupancy, and their only option is to appeal his decision before an appeal board put together by the Board of Selectmen. Mr. Cote asked for a copy of the code Mr. Soucy was referring to. After looking over the code, Mr. Cote asked if all homes with accessory dwelling units have two addresses in Town. Mr. Soucy stated that every home in Town with an accessory dwelling unit attached or unattached to the home has two addresses. Mr. Croteau asked what the difference was between an accessory dwelling unit and an in-law apartment. Mr. Soucy explained that there is no difference, any addition with a full bathroom and kitchen is considered an accessory dwelling unit that needs to have its address changed.

Mr. Croteau asked Mr. Soucy why the application was called a voluntary address change. Sue Snide, Town Assessor, explained that it is called voluntary because under the E911 policy, a property owner can voluntarily change their address if they gain all the correct signatures and approval. If the property owner is cooperative and fills out the form it is considered voluntary, if they do not it is no longer voluntary.

Mr. Bergeron asked why the address needs to be changed if the owner feels there is no safety risk to not changing the address. Mr. Soucy stated that the building code states it needs to be before they can issue the certificate of occupancy.

Mr. Cote asked Mr. Soucy to point out the code where it says he must change the address. Mr. Cote noted that an accessory dwelling unit is not the same as a duplex, and by the Town's statutes, an accessory dwelling unit cannot be considered a duplex. Mr. Cote stated that the building code he is reading does not state anything about an accessory dwelling unit needing a separate address. Mr. Soucy quoted RSA 110 and explained how this RSA prohibits him from issuing the certificate of occupancy. Mr. Cote stated that he still does not see where it says they need two addresses for the home, and since the structure is attached to his home he does not see why it is necessary to have a separate address. Mr. Soucy stated that he would sign the certificate of occupancy without an address change if an appeal board approves it, but until then he will not sign the certificate.

Mr. Ignatowicz from the Pelham Fire Department approached the Board to discuss this issue. Mr. Ignatowicz stated that the address change requirement is about public safety. He explained that the E911 addressing standards guide adopted by the Town states that time is a critical factor in responding to emergencies, and inaccurate addressing can result in the postponement of emergency services while trying to locate the correct area where the emergency is occurring. The policy goes on to state that any structures containing multiple units within one discreet building, regardless of whether the building is residential, commercial, industrial, or governmental, should receive a single address, with each tenant within the structure receiving a sub-address. Sub-addresses should increase away from the point of primary access. Mr. Cote noted that the wording says "should" and not "shall", making it a recommendation. Mr. Ignatowicz stated that the Town adopted this in 2007 and has been following it for every property ever since.

Ms. Corbett asked if any exceptions for this policy had ever been made since the Town adopted it in 2007. Mr. Soucy stated that there has never been any issue with this until now. Ms. Corbett

stated that, regardless of the language of the policy, the Town has been putting in a good-faith effort since 2007 to consistently enforce this policy as standard. Mr. Cote stated nothing is saying this policy is mandatory. Ms. Takesian stated that on page 15 of the E911 Policy, it states that any structures containing multiple units within one discreet building, regardless of whether the building is residential, commercial, industrial, or governmental, will receive a single address, with each tenant within the structure receiving a unit letter designation, unit letters should increase away from the point of primary access. Mr. Cote stated that he does not want to make anyone do anything not legally required, so if the verbiage states it is a requirement, he will enforce it. Mr. Soucy states that there is an appeal process for the building code, but he does not know if there is an appeal process for the Town's E911 Policy.

Mr. Ignatowicz added that if the current homeowners ever sell the home, the new owners may be unaware of the safety issue of not having two separate addresses.

Mr. Womersley approached the Board again to question whether or not his addition should be considered its own separate unit. He added that the wording truly does matter as the decision will set a precedent for future homeowners who do not want to change their address when adding on an accessory dwelling unit. He also questioned what the difference was between Mr. Soucy signing the final inspection and issuing the certificate of occupancy since the final inspection was signed but they were not issued a certificate of occupancy. Mr. Womersley went on to explain that he does not think keeping his residence as one address is a safety issue.

Mike Palumbo, 26 Hayden Road, approached the Board to give his opinion on this issue. Mr. Palumbo explained that he does not believe Mr. Womersley was correctly informed by Town officials on the address change policy. He believes the process needs to be made more clear for all residents in Town. Mr. Cote agreed that going forward, the process needs to be made clearer. Mr. Cote closed the public forum.

Ms. Takesian stated that she recognizes that this has never been challenged before and there are loose instructions for this policy, but, due to the Town adopting the E911 policy, and the recommendations from Town safety officials, she thinks the policy should be enforced. Ms. Takesian asked if Mr. Womersley would have not built the accessory dwelling unit if he had known he would have to make the addresses A and B. Mr. Womersley stated that they originally wanted a detached unit, but they did not have enough space per the Town's code, so it did influence his decision.

Mr. Bergeron asked what the Board could do if Mr. Soucy had the final say in issuing the certificate of occupancy. Mr. Cote explained that even if the Board decided they did not think Mr. Womersley should have to change his address, Mr. Soucy still would not be able to issue the certificate of occupancy until Mr. Womersley contested his decision and the Board of Selectmen formed an appeal board to discuss the case.

 Mr. Croteau stated that he would like to clarify the building permit process for the public so everyone can understand why the inspection was signed but a certificate of occupancy was not issued. Mr. Soucy explained that signing off on the inspection is a lot different than issuing a certificate of occupancy, and many other things need to be in place before it is issued. He added that the inspection is just one part of what you need to get the certificate of occupancy.

- Jen Beauregard, Planning Director, approached the Board to weigh in on this issue. Ms. 192
- Beauregard explained that although this has never been an issue before now, they have already 193
- 194 made some changes to the application. She stated that they did make it more clear in the
- application that you will need to have two addresses if adding an accessory dwelling unit. 195
- Ms. Takesian noted that when the Town adopted the E911 Policy, many residents in Town had to 196
- change their addresses. She added that the Town adopted the policy for a reason, and it is 197
- 198 important to abide by it for safety reasons.

199 200

Mr. Cote stated that he sympathizes with Mr. Womersley, however, they have to think about the future. He stated that if they ever sold their house, the new owners could be at risk if the address is not properly marked.

202 203 204

201

Mr. Womersley asked if they would be able to leave their address as 39 and make the accessory dwelling unit 39A so they do not need to change their mailing address or licenses. Mr. Croteau stated that he believes Lieutenant Ignatowicz said that was not an option.

206 207 208

209

205

Mr. Cote stated that he thinks it is important to think about consistency for the Town, and, since every other accessory dwelling unit has had to have a different address, they should continue with this.

210 211

- 212 Ms. Takesian asked if they are allowed to make any changes to the E911 Policy for the Town.
- Mr. Cote says they can make changes if they go through the process. 213

214

- (Takesian/Corbett) To change the address at 39 Longview Circle, Map 6, Lot 4-215 **MOTION:** 139-27, to reflect dwelling units showing A&B per RSA 231:133a ensuring 216
- property is compliant with the Towns E911 Policy. 217

218 219

VOTE: (3-2-0) The motion carried.

220 221 222

Police Chief Perriello: Highway Safety Committee recommendation to adopt two new stop signs on Hayden Road

223 224 225

226 227

228

229

230

231

232

233 234 Chief Perriello stated that she was there to represent the Highway Safety Committee as a chairperson. She explained that there have been several issues on Hayden Road that resulted in complaints from residents. Some of the complaints include a dog being hit by a car and killed, a rollover accident where the operator was impaired, and kids boarding a school bus when a box truck drove by the bus with the stop sign out and red lights on. Chief Perriello stated that due to the amount of traffic and speeding vehicles on the road, they knew something needed to be done. Around this time, the Police Department had ordered signs attached to telephone poles alerting drivers of their speed. The first-place signs were hung were on Hayden Road. Between the end of May and the beginning of July, twenty-five out of forty-seven of those days' vehicles were traveling 50 mph or above. The speed limit on this road is 30 mph. She explained that this road was not developed in the past, so she guesses people have been speeding on this road for years. The sign has clocked vehicles going as fast as 80 mph. She added that approximately 1500 to

- 235
- 236
- 237 1800 vehicles travel on Hayden Road every day. Chief Perriello stated that the Highway Safety
- Committee discussed many different solutions to the speeding problem. They do not think speed 238
- bumps are a good idea because they can cause more crashes. They also discussed painting 239

"Slow, Children" on the road, but did not think it would make a big enough impact. They did, however, hang up signs about slowing down due to children at play, but this has not made a difference. The Committee decided that a three-way stop sign is the best way to slow cars down on Hayden Road.

Mr. Cote asked Chief Perriello when the Highway Safety Committee met to discuss this issue. Chief Perriello stated that they put the sign up in May, and believes they met in either May or June to discuss it.

Ms. Corbett asked if the high speed limits usually occur on Friday or Saturday nights, or during commuting hours. Chief Perriello stated that the largest volume of cars occurs during a four-hour block midday. However, she did not see an exact day or time pattern for the highest speeds.

Chief Perriello stated that she is not a fan of putting in stop signs everywhere there is a speeding complaint in Town, however, she does not see another option for this situation.

Mr. Bergeron asked if adding stop signs to this area would create traffic since there is such a large volume of cars traveling on the road every day. Chief Perriello stated that she thinks adding a stop sign will cause cars to turn down different roads without stop signs, deterring more cars from traveling on Hayden Road. Mr. Bergeron asked if this would create problems on other roads. Chief Perriello explained that half of the people would not mind the stop sign, and half would go down other roads, so it probably would not create more issues.

Chief Perriello stated that if the Board does approve the stop signs on this road, they plan to add signs stating, "Stop Sign Ahead" and keep an Officer in the area in the beginning.

Ms. Takesian asked if patrolling the area had helped at all. Chief Perriello stated that she has not seen a big difference in having an Officer patrol the area, and they cannot be there full time.

Mr. Croteau stated that he thinks stop signs seem to be the most extreme solution to the problem on Hayden Road. He asked if adding a blinking crosswalk sign would help. Chief Perriello stated that this would probably only cause drivers to slow down the first time they go through it, and then the speeding would happen again. Mr. Croteau stated that he is worried they will have to install stop signs everywhere there are speeding complaints in Town if they do this. Chief Perriello explained that she is not in support of installing stop signs everywhere, only when the data is clear there is a serious issue.

Mr. Cote suggested they gather a few months more data on the speeding before they decide. He asked if they could get a speed-reading sign in the area full time. Chief Perriello stated that it will cost more money, but they can look into a solar option, so they do not have to worry about replacing the batteries. Mr. Bergeron asked how much it costs. Chief Perriello stated that the solar signs with installation cost around \$5,600.00.

Ms. Corbett stated that she does not think a sign telling people how fast they are going is a proper preventive measure, as people can already tell how fast they are going from the speedometer in their vehicle.

Ms. Takesian stated that she does not think people will stop at the stop signs since it is a straight-ahead road. Chief Perriello stated that they will have an Officer there as often as possible to monitor the stop signs and pull people over if necessary.

Chief Perriello let the Board know that some residents from Hayden Road were in attendance to speak to the Board about the issue. Chairman Cote explained that this is not a public hearing, but once they go through the agenda he will open a public forum and they can speak if they would like to.

Mr. Croteau asked if they would be able to put up a temporary stop sign to see if it makes a difference. Chief Perriello stated that they do have temporary stop signs, but she is unsure of the legality of them. Mr. Croteau stated that if they use the temporary stop signs they can see if this creates problems on other roads before making the signs permanent. He suggested that Chief Perriello research the legality of the temporary stop signs and come back next week so they can make a final decision. Mr. Cote stated that he is not in favor of putting up stop signs in the area, as there are many side roads with this issue in Pelham and he does not think it will make a big difference.

MOTION: (Croteau/Corbett) To table this discussion until the next meeting, where Chief

Perriello will provide more information on the temporary stop signs.

VOTE: (4-1-0) The motion carried.

Brian Johnson, Parks and Recreation Director: Dog Policy at the parks

Brian Johnson, Pelham's Parks and Recreation Director, approached the Board to discuss the dog policy at the parks. Mr. Johnson stated that he has been working with Town Administrator Roark to develop a policy for dogs on athletic fields and parks in Town since there is not currently a policy in place. He explained that they do not want to discourage people from bringing leashed dogs to the parks, but they want to discourage loose dogs running on the playing fields. Town Administrator Roark noted that the policy will require dogs to be on a proper leash no more than six feet long at all times on the athletic fields. He also stated that they prefer dogs do not go on the athletic fields at all due to pet waste issues. Town Administrator stated that they also included the Village Green, Meeting House Park, and the Town Common, but stated that these are discretionary and could be removed from the draft if the Board wants to. Mr. Cote stated that he thinks they should leave them in there due to the number of activities that take place in these areas.

Mr. Croteau thanked Mr. Johnson and Town Administrator Roark for working on this policy, as he has seen many kids step in pet waste on the athletic fields. Mr. Croteau asked if it was possible to install pet waste bag dispensers at the fields and parks. Mr. Johnson explained that they have installed them in the past, and they were up for two days before it was ripped out of the ground and thrown in the pond. They do have one up on Veteran's Park currently. They also have issues with people taking all of the bags in the dispensers.

Chairman Cote stated that they will hold another public hearing on this matter.

OPEN FOR	<u>UM</u>
No one came	e forward in open forum.
SELECTM	EN AND TOWN ADMINISTRATOR REPORTS
	nistrator Roark reported that there was a successful Old Home Day in Town, and y they had decent weather for the event.
	reported that the Electrical Aggregation Committee will be coming before the coming weeks with more information.
Mr. Bergero	on had nothing to report.
Chairman C	Cote had nothing to report.
veteran's gra	n reported that Wreaths Across America is trying to hang a wreath on every ve in Gibson Cemetery over the holidays. They are currently half-way to their goal. ate a wreath to Gibson Cemetery on their website.
Mr. Croteau	had nothing to report.
Chairman Co	ote stated that there was no need for a non-public session.
MOTION:	(Corbett/Croteau) To adjourn the meeting.
VOTE:	(5-0-0) The motion carried
The meeting	ended at approximately 8:25 pm.
ADJOURN	<u>MENT</u>
Respectfully	submitted,
•	
	SELECTMI Town Admi he was happy Ms. Corbett Board in the Mr. Bergero Chairman C Ms. Takesia veteran's gra You can don Mr. Croteau Chairman Co MOTION: VOTE: