

**TOWN OF ALTON  
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT  
PUBLIC HEARING  
Thursday, May 5, 2022, at 6:00 PM  
Alton Town Hall**

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Thomas Lee, Chair  
Frank Rich, Member/clerk  
Paul LaRochelle, Selectman's Representative  
Mark Manning, Alternate Member

Paul Monzione, Vice Chair – excused absence  
Mike Hepworth, Alternate Member – excused absence  
Tim Morgan, Member - excused absence

**OTHERS PRESENT**

Jessica Call, Town Planner  
Sean Sicard, agent for applicant  
Eric Salovich, Northam Survey LLC, agent for applicants  
Richard Helie, applicant  
Lois Helie, applicant  
Heidi Barton, applicant  
????, agent for the applicant  
Jessica Barton  
Lauren Peabody, abutter  
????, Burnell, abutter  
Thomas Varney, Varney Engineering, PLLC, agent for applicants  
Julie Harrison, applicant  
Michael Harrison, applicant  
James Wynn, resident

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Lee called the meeting to order at 6:00PM.

**INTRODUCTION OF BOARD MEMBERS**

Roll Call was taken for the Board members and individuals present at Town Hall.

**APPOINTMENT OF ALTERNATES**

**Mr. LaRochelle made a motion to appoint Mr. Manning for this meeting. Mr. Rich seconded the motion. Motion passed, 3-0-0.**

**STATEMENT OF THE APPEAL PROCESS**

The purpose of this hearing is to allow anyone concerned with an Appeal to the Zoning Board of Adjustment to present evidence for or against the Appeal. This evidence may be in the form of an opinion

rather than an established fact, however, it should support the grounds that the Board must consider when making a determination. The purpose of the hearing is not to gauge the sentiment of the public or to hear personal reasons why individuals are for or against an appeal, but all facts and opinions based on reasonable assumptions will be considered. In the case of an appeal for a Variance, the Board must determine facts bearing upon the five criteria as set forth in the State's Statutes. For a Special Exception, the Board must ascertain whether each of the standards set forth in the Zoning Ordinance have been or will be met.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

The Board reviewed the agenda. No changes were made.

**Mr. LaRochelle made a motion to approve the agenda as presented. Mr. Rich seconded the motion. Motion passed, 4-0-0.**

**(Continued from April 7, 2022 meeting)**

<b>Case #Z22-04</b> <b>Sean Sicard, Agent for John</b> <b>Jeddrey, Owner</b>	<b>Map 12 Lots 16</b> <b>Wolfeboro Highway</b>	<b>Special Exception</b> <b>Residential Rural (RR) Zone</b>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------

A **Special Exception** is requested to **Article 400, Section 401 D. 17.** of the Zoning Ordinance to permit a Contractor's Yard as defined in the Zoning Ordinance.

Chair Lee read the public notice into the record. The Board reviewed the application for completeness.

Chair Lee explained the last meeting went late and it was agreed at that time to continue this case to tonight.

**Mr. LaRochelle made a motion to accept the application for Case Z22-04, which was continued from the April 7, 2022 meeting. Mr. Rich seconded the motion. Motion passed, 4-0-0.**

Sean Sicard, agent for applicant, stated he needs extra storage for equipment; he stated the lot has a plenty of natural screening which provides security for storage. Chair Lee noted there is a 40' by 60' structure indicated on the plans. Mr. Sicard confirmed that is for a project down the road and this application is only for storage on the property at this time. He confirmed there is only one driveway, and it has been approved by NH DOT. Chair Lee asked for confirmation that all abutters were notified. Ms. Call confirmed all abutters were notified.

Mr. Rich asked if this will be used only for storage. He asked if Mr. Sicard plans to bring in materials or processing materials. Mr. Sicard stated it will only be equipment storage; no materials on site and it won't be open to the public. He stated there won't be any sale of product. Mr. Rich asked if other contractors will be on the property. Mr. Sicard stated it is for his sole use; he is purchasing the property from Mr. Jeddrey. He stated he doesn't plan to do any repairs on the property. It was confirmed there is a NH DES approved septic design on file. Mr. Sicard explained the hydraulic fluid used in his equipment is vegetable oil as he does a lot of work around the lake so there is an environmental concern with the equipment on the property.

Chair Lee asked if Mr. Sicard has talked to any of the abutters. Mr. Sicard stated he hasn't heard of any concerns.

Mr. Rich asked how many feet the equipment will be from any visible property lines. Mr. Sicard stated the closed property is directly across the highway; it is a similar operation with equipment and its over 100 yards away. He stated he won't be doing any active work on the property and it will be solely for storage of

equipment. He stated he doesn't plan to do any building of projects on the property but down the road he may need to request permission to construct items in the shop.

Chair Lee opened the hearing to input from members of the public in favor of the project. None was indicated.

Chair Lee opened the hearing to input from members of the public in opposition of the project. None was indicated.

Chair Lee closed the public hearing.

#### **Discussion – Case #Z22-04**

*The Board must find that all the following conditions are met in order to grant the Special Exception:*

Chair Lee stated that a plat/plan **has** been submitted in accordance with the appropriate criteria in the Zoning Ordinance, Article 520.B. The Board agreed.

Mr. Rich stated the specific site **is** an appropriate location for the use. He stated it is a 9 acre piece of land on Route 28, going north; the location is suited to a construction yard with ample space and restricted view by the abutters. The Board agreed.

Mr. LaRochelle stated that actual evidence **is not** found that the property values in the district will be reduced due to incompatible land uses. He stated this is a good location for storage being off of Route 28 with a State approved driveway. The Board agreed.

Mr. Manning stated there **is no** valid objection from abutters based on demonstrable fact. No abutters came forward and no letters or communications in opposition were received. The Board agreed.

Chair Lee stated there **is no** undue nuisance or serious hazard to pedestrian or vehicular traffic, including the location and design of access ways and off-street parking. He stated this location has NH DOT approval for the driveway and the design has been confirmed to be proper. The Board agreed.

Mr. Rich stated adequate and appropriate facilities and utilities **will** be provided to insure the proper operation of the proposed use or structure. He stated Mr. Sicard has indicated through his letter that he plans in the future to build a few buildings and utilize them for storage and maintenance which will likely require electricity and Mr. Sicard has indicated he wants that to be underground. Mr. Rich stated now and in the future adequate facilities will be utilized. Chair Lee stated this is a contractor yard and the facilities are appropriate. The Board agreed.

Mr. LaRochelle stated there **is** adequate area for safe and sanitary sewage disposal and water supply. He stated an approved septic design was submitted for future development on the property. The Board agreed.

Mr. Manning stated the proposed use or structure **is** consistent with the spirit of this ordinance and the intent of the Master Plan. He stated the Master Plan supports the development of small business. The Board agreed.

**Mr. Rich made a motion to grant the application for Special Exception for Case #Z22-04. Mr. LaRochelle seconded the motion. Motion passed, 4-0-0.**

#### **NEW APPLICATIONS**

<b>Case #Z22-05</b> <b>Northam Survey, Agent for</b> <b>Richard &amp; Lois Helie, Owners</b>	<b>Map 29 Lots 65 &amp; 66</b> <b>Old Wolfeboro Road</b>	<b>Equitable Waiver of</b> <b>Dimension</b> <b>Residential Commercial (RC)</b> <b>Zone</b>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

An **Equitable Waiver of Dimension** is requested in Accordance with **Article 500, Section 540 B.** of the Zoning Ordinance to provide Equitable Waiver of relief for four (4) nonconforming structures.

Chair Lee read the public notice into the record. The Board reviewed the application for completeness.

**Mr. LaRochelle made a motion to accept the application for Case #Z22-05 as complete. Mr. Rich seconded the motion. Motion passed, 4-0-0.**

Eric Salovitch, Northam Survey, explained they are looking to do a lot line adjustment which will make the two lots less nonconforming. He stated there are a few structures which are within the side and rear setbacks of the proposed lots. He stated the violation was not noticed or discovered by any former or current owner; he stated the primary structures were constructed in 1957 and 1930 and both predate the current zoning documents. Mr. Salovitch stated the physical violations do not affect the public or diminish surrounding property values; the violations are both along public rights-of-ways. He stated the structures are similar with those in the area and approval of the waiver would not adversely affect surrounding properties. Mr. Salovitch presented photographs of the properties and surrounding areas. He explained the costs for trying to correct the violations and the efforts to reconfigure the structures on the parcels would be a financial hardship for the applicants. He stated the applicants acquired the properties in 1978 and the structures were existing as were the violations; he confirmed no notice of violation was received from the Town or surrounding landowners during the time of ownership. Mr. Salovitch explained where the lot line adjustments would be made, noting a shed would be removed as its within the side setbacks of the proposed lines; he stated the properties would be made more conforming to the lot requirements with frontage and area. Chair Lee confirmed the lots would be more conforming, fair and equitable as far as zoning is concerned. Ms. Call suggested a condition of approval be that the adjustments are written into the deeds.

Mr. LaRochelle asked if the shed on the lot line adjustment will be removed from the property. Mr. Helie confirmed it would be removed from the property as its falling in. It was confirmed that lot on the left hand side of the road is the one with the shed to be removed and the lot will be sold when the lot line adjustment is complete. Mr. Salovitch stated once the adjustment is made, lot 66 will be over the minimum lot size by 10,000 square feet and lot 65 will also be over the minimum lot size. He stated the side setbacks will not be encroaching and the rear lot line will be abandoned.

Chair Lee opened the hearing to input from members of the public in favor of the project. None was indicated.

Chair Lee opened the hearing to input from members of the public in opposition of the project. None was indicated.

Chair Lee closed the public hearing.

### ***Discussion – Equitable Waiver of Dimensional Requirements***

1. *That the violation was not noticed or discovered by any owner, former owner, owner's agent or*

*representative, or municipal official, until after a structure in violation had been substantially completed, or until after a lot or other division of land in violation had been subdivided by conveyance to a bona fide purchaser for value:*

Chair Lee stated the applicants were not aware of any violations and the applicants intend to adjust the lot lines so there are no violations. The Board agreed.

- 2. That the violation was not an outcome of ignorance of the law or ordinance, failure to inquire, obfuscation, misrepresentation, or bad faith on the part of any owner, owner's agent or representative, but was instead caused by either a good faith error in measurement or calculation made by an owner or owner 's agent or representative, or by an error in ordinance interpretation or applicability made by a municipal official in the process of issuing a permit over which that official had authority:*

Mr. Rich stated the applicants did not know about the violations when they purchased the property. Mr. LaRochelle stated the violation was not a result of ignorance and they are acting in good faith to correct the violation with the lot line adjustment. The Board agreed.

- 3. That the physical or dimensional violation does not constitute a public or private nuisance, nor diminish the value of other property in the area, nor interfere with or adversely affect any present or permissible future uses of any such property:*

Mr. LaRochelle stated this is something that will be a major improvement for doing the two properties; both lots will be made more conforming with the current zoning regulations and will allow one parcel to be sold. The Board agreed.

- 4. That due to the degree of past construction or investment made in ignorance of the facts constituting the violation, the cost of correction so far outweighs any public benefit to be gained, that it would be inequitable to require the violation to be corrected.*

Chair Lee stated the violation has existed for more than ten years and the adjustment is being made for equitable reasons. The Board agreed.

**Mr. Rich made a motion to approve the application for Case #22-05 based upon the written letter from Northram Survey, LLC, with the condition that the applicant and owner of the property understands that it needs to have a written deed to be recorded in part of the transfer of the land prior to the transfer of the real estate property. Mr. LaRochelle seconded the motion. Motion passed, 4-0-0.**

<b>Case #Z22-06 Heidi Barton, Owner</b>	<b>Map 9 Lot 49-6 New Durham Road</b>	<b>Special Exception Residential Rural (RR) Zone</b>
---------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------

A **Special Exception** is requested to **Article 300, Sections 32 D. & F.** of the Zoning Ordinance to permit replacement of one of the two existing houses on a lot in the Residential Rural Zone.

Chair Lee read the public notice into the record. The Board reviewed the application for completeness. Ms. Call noted no agent letter was submitted for the application but is required. The applicant submitted written authorization for her agent to represent her in this case.

**Mr. LaRochelle made a motion to accept the application for Case# Z22-06 as complete. Mr. Rich seconded the motion. Motion passed, 4-0-0.**

????, representative for the applicant, stated the owner wants to build a new house and move the house to a different location on the lot. She explained there are two structures on the property but she can't remove the one she is living in currently so she can take care of her handicapped son. After the new home is built, the existing home will be removed. It was confirmed the new home will meet all the setback requirements; while the construction is taking place, there will be three structures on the property but once its complete the current residence, the "chicken coop" will be removed; the mobile home will remain on the property as it's a rental unit. There is currently two wells for the property but both are located on abutters' property; a new well will be drilled on the lot for the new house as well as supply the mobile home. The easement is for the property owners to gain access to property behind the lot which is landlocked. After discussion, it was agreed with the applicants and the Board that the current residence would be removed within four months after the certificate of occupancy is issued for the new home.

There was discussion about the current easement for the well water to the mobile home. It was clarified that would no longer be needed if a new well can be installed. Chair Lee stated its an easement which is in place and can remain if they choose to keep it or if there are problems with putting in a new well.

Chair Lee opened the hearing to input from members of the public in favor of the project.

Jessica Barton, applicant's daughter-in-law, stated the property has been in the family and she would like to see her in a newer, safer structure.

Lauren Peabody, abutter, stated she is in favor of the project and would like to see them have an adequate home in order to take care of their son.

Michelle ????, stated she is the applicant's sister, caretaker to the son and also lives in the "chicken coop, she stated the property has been in the family for generations and is looking forward to making this project happen.

Burnell, abutter, stated he owns the 22 acre abutting parcel and is in favor of the project. He asked if there is a septic design on file to show the location of the proposed septic system; he explained the location of the access easement for his property and noted the access is very close to the existing septic system as well as the proposed septic system. Mr. Burnell stated he will be building a road on the easement but wants to be sure the location of the septic will be okay. He stated there have been complaints about the water quality from the old dug well for the last 19 years he's owned his property; he stated he doesn't mind if the existing easement remains but he doesn't believe it's a viable water option. The Board reviewed the maps and plans presented as well as the locations of Mr. Burnell's property, well and septic locations. Mr. Burnell stated his land is landlocked by wetlands; a condition of the subdivision approval was that access would be through another lot.

Chair Lee opened the hearing to input from members of the public in opposition of the project. None was indicated.

Chair Lee closed the public hearing.

Chair Lee stated Mr. Burnell brought up valid points; he noted the side setbacks are fine with the proposed plans and Mr. Burnell has no problem with the plans but would the applicants like to reconsider the foundation and drainage issues. Chair Lee stated to go forward, conditions would be to know exactly where the house would be located to ensure the wetlands won't be involved and to accommodate the abutter who is going forward with a road. He noted there appears to be enough room to do so. The Board agreed.

Mr. Rich suggested removing the current structure first so they can move the new home over further to put it further from the easement and possibly future road. Ms. Barton stated the road isn't a concern as much as the issue of where they will live while the new home is being built. Chair Lee suggested a portion of the "chicken coop" could be removed. Ms. Barton stated she would love to have a new house on the same foot print but she needs a safe place for her son to live and she doesn't have other options at this time. There was discussion about options for phases of construction to accommodate the applicant's needs. Chair Lee noted the changes will need to be documented on the site plans submitted to the Building Inspector.

**Discussion – Case #Z22-06**

*The Board must find that all the following conditions are met in order to grant the Special Exception:*

Chair Lee stated that a plat/plan **has** been submitted in accordance with the appropriate criteria in the Zoning Ordinance, Article 520.B. The Board agreed.

Mr. Rich stated the specific site **is** an appropriate location for the use. He stated the use is not changing; the applicant has gone to great degree to make it an appropriate location. The Board agreed.

Mr. LaRochelle stated that actual evidence **is not** found that the property values in the district will be reduced due to incompatible land uses. He stated no evidence was presented that values would be reduced. Mr. Manning stated that if anything, the values will be reduced with the removal of an old structure and the construction of a new home. The Board agreed.

Mr. Manning stated there **is no** valid objection from abutters based on demonstrable fact. No abutters came forward and no letters or communications in opposition were received. Mr. Rich noted there was good information presented by an abutter in regard to a future road being put in. The Board agreed.

Chair Lee stated there **is no** undue nuisance or serious hazard to pedestrian or vehicular traffic, including the location and design of access ways and off-street parking. He stated nothing is changing regard to this. The Board agreed.

Mr. Rich stated adequate and appropriate facilities and utilities **will** be provided to insure the proper operation of the proposed use or structure. He stated there are currently adequate facilities and utilities; it will be a different configuration with putting up a new home and removing an old structure. The Board agreed.

Mr. LaRochelle stated there **is** adequate area for safe and sanitary sewage disposal and water supply. He stated a new well and septic design are being proposed for the property so it will be adequate supply. Chair Lee stated there are also other options with the easements to other wells. The Board agreed.

Mr. Manning stated the proposed use or structure **is** consistent with the spirit of this ordinance and the intent of the Master Plan. He stated the proposed plans will improve the property. The Board agreed.

**Mr. Monziona made a motion to grant the application for Special Exception for Case #Z22-06 with the condition that a new site plan be submitted to the Building Inspector for review and that the setbacks on the property are conforming to the new home. Mr. LaRochelle seconded the motion.**

**Motion passed, 4-0-0.**

<b>Case #Z22-07 Thomas Varney, P.E., Agent for Julie &amp; Michael Harrison, Owners</b>	<b>Map 39 Lot 14 Cascade Terrace</b>	<b>Variance Lakeshore Residential (LR) Zone</b>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------

A **Variance** is requested to **Article 300, Section 327 A.** of the Zoning Ordinance to permit the installation of an 8'x 40' shed that will be 3.5' from the front/ROW property line along East Side Drive (Route 28A).

Chair Lee read the public notice into the record. The Board reviewed the application for completeness.

**Mr. LaRochelle made a motion to accept the application for Case# Z22-07 as complete. Mr. Rich seconded the motion. Motion passed, 4-0-0.**

Tom Varney, Varney Engineering, PLLC, representative for the applicants, stated they are looking to add a shed to the property; the slope has timber retaining walls but those are deteriorating so will be replaced and a level area created for the shed. He stated the only level on the property is within the Town setback on Route 28; a stormwater management plan will be required with NH DES. There is a house on the lot and is the Harrison's residence. Mr. Varney stated the shed will require upgrade of the property with a 16' retaining wall; the location of the shed is near the property line and will be lower than the road, 8' by 40' long and within the 25' setback from Route 28 and 3.5' from the property line. Mr. LaRochelle noted he is familiar with this property; it is unique and the retaining walls are clearly deteriorating and needing to be replaced. Mr. Harrison stated the building will be 9' high, it will have a green metal roof and will be aesthetically pleasing to match the house. He stated there will be about 2' between the building and the retaining wall; there will be a person door on the west side of the building and access on one end; there are no plans for a permanent foundation at this time. He stated there will be electricity to the building, noting it will be the lightest weight structure he can get for this area near the wall. Mr. Varney stated the propane tank will be moved out of the road area as well; there will be some upgrades to the road area.

Chair Lee opened the hearing to input from members of the public in favor of the project. None was indicated.

Chair Lee opened the hearing to input from members of the public in opposition of the project.

James Wynn, resident, stated he owns the property directly across from this lot; he stated he looked at the application and has a couple concerns; he noted the shed roof appears to be a single roof and in his opinion if it had two slopes, it would decrease the highest point of the roof to reduce what he sees from across the road. He stated he thinks the building could be lowered if the grading was changed and it would reduce the visual impact of the 40' structure. Mr. Wynn stated there are no markers on the lots to indicate the property line for the Building Inspector to validate the setbacks; he stated the application does not indicate the roof line overhang so he would like the setback requirement considered for that. Mr. Harrison stated the overhang and gutter would be about 8".

Chair Lee closed the public hearing.

Mr. Harrison stated he can accommodate the concern about the ridge height of the roof and will work to change the plans; he stated he will work to see how low they can get the overall level of the building and



will put on a typical roof on it.

Chair Lee stated in regard to the property lines and markers, that will be overseen by the Building Inspector to ensure there are no encroachments. Mr. Harrison stated that with the slope of the property, there is no other place for him to put a shed that does not encroach on the right of way.

***Discussion Case #Z22-07***

*The Board must find that all the following conditions are met in order to grant the Variance:*

Mr. Rich stated granting the variance ***would not*** be contrary to the public interest. He stated no evidence has been presented to support that it would be contrary to the public interest. The Board agreed 4-0-0.

Mr. LaRochelle stated the request ***is*** in harmony with the spirit of the ordinance and the intent of the Master Plan to maintain the health, safety and character of the direct district within which it is proposed. He stated it is common to have a shed on a property; the lot is unique, very sloped and its difficult to have storage of any kind; it will be an improvement for the property. Mr. Manning stated he doesn't believe it's in harmony with the ordinance. it is a large shed 3.5' off the road. Chair Lee stated he believes it is in harmony, noting its hard to meet all the criteria with the older homes and difficult lots; he stated Mr. Harrison has worked to meet the spirit of the ordinance and make it a workable piece of property. Mr. Rich stated he agrees with Mr. Manning in some respects; with the exception of the Alton Bay lots; the configurations of the lots and the sizes make it nearly impossible to do things that would normally be convenient, healthy and in the character of the district so he does believe its in the spirit of the ordinance. The Board voted, 3-1-0.

Mr. Manning stated that by granting the variance, substantial justice ***will not be*** done. He stated they need to take in to account the size of the lot; he stated he's not in favor of saying its not required for substantial justice. Chair Lee stated in his opinion, justice will be done. Mr. Rich agreed and Mr. LaRochelle agreed. Mr. LaRochelle stated this will allow the property owner to properly store everything he needs to maintain the property. The Board voted 3-1-0.

Chair Lee stated the values of surrounding properties ***will not be*** diminished. He stated the depiction of how this will be construction ensures it won't be intrusive and the applicant is willing to accommodate the abutters' concerns. Mr. Rich stated the improvements of the area, including removing the propane tank, will help with maintaining a safe environment. Mr. LaRochelle stated the exterior of the storage container will be properly sided and have a roof installed to make it more accommodating to the surrounding properties. Mr. Manning stated no data has been submitting to substantiate a diminishing of the values of surrounding properties. The Board agreed 4-0-0.

Mr. Rich stated that for the purposes of this subparagraph, *"unnecessary hardship" means that, owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area:*

- i. No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property;*
- ii. The proposed use is a reasonable one.*

Mr. Rich stated to deny this variance would impose a hardship; the use is reasonable. He stated its an unusual lot with over 30' of topographical variances; he stated it won't just be a trailer but a shed of good purpose and there is a hardship of special conditions which distinguish this from other properties. Mr. LaRochelle stated he believes there is a hardship on this property. Mr. Manning stated he agrees the proposed use is reasonable but the standard of sheds in the area are smaller. Chair Lee stated he doesn't believe a relationship exists and the proposed use is reasonable. The Board did not agree, 3-1-0 on

paragraph i; the Board agreed 4-0-0 on paragraph ii.

**Mr. Manning made a motion to grant the request for a Variance for Case #Z22-07 with the condition that the applicant ensures the structure is sided and fits in with the neighborhood. Mr. LaRochelle seconded the motion. Motion passed, 4-0-0.**

### **OTHER BUSINESS**

1. Previous Business: Mr. LaRochelle stated the Master Plan Committee has met and is working on chapter 3 and 4. He stated Tara Banford is working well with the committee to move forward with a presentation to the Planning Board.
2. New Business: Ms. Call stated an email went out about NH Senate Bill 400; she stated it relates to how the notice of decision is written, noting it will require additional items such as listing the findings of fact. She stated this will affect both the Planning and Zoning boards. Ms. Call stated there was also a proposed amendment which would change the requirements of municipalities for workforce housing.

Mr. Rich gave an update on the meetings of the facilities committee; he stated the consensus was that they need about 10 acres, and they are thinking of it being for police, fire and highway departments which would free up other facilities. He stated there was also discussion about the fire station being used down the road as a wastewater treatment plant.

3. Approval of Minutes: Meeting of April 7, 2022 – Postponed.
4. Correspondence: Chair Lee stated notice was received from the Town of Tamworth regarding a proposal about an old Italian restaurant; he stated it was bought by a developer and he is proposing a gentleman's club. It was determined there was nothing in the Town's ordinances prohibiting the business, so Chair Lee has asked Mr. Dever to confirm Alton's ordinances address this issue as to whether this type of business is allowable. Ms. Call stated the ordinance is pretty extensive and detailed.

### **ADJOURN**

**Mr. Rich made a motion to adjourn. Mr. LaRochelle seconded the motion. Motion passed, 4-0-0.**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:47PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

*Jennifer Riel*

Jennifer Riel, Recording Secretary