

APPROVED July 20, 2006

**Call to Order: at 7:09 p.m.**

Present: Tom Hoopes, Cynthia Balcius, Bruce Holmes, James Bureau, Jeremy Dube-Chairman, Jeanne Crouse, Town Planner-Kathy Menici, and Recording Secretary-Carolyn Schaeffner

**Appointment of Alternates:** Jim Bureau appointed for Pam McLeod

**Approval of Minutes:** January 3, 2006, April 13, 2006 and April 18, 2006  
January 3, 2006 – changes

Page 3, 6 lines down for M. Perry should read “doesn’t go right.” (Change the word “so”)

Page 4, 11 lines down take the “9” out of like.

Page 11, 8 lines from bottom, “this” point (change “hits”)

**Motion** by T. Hoopes to accept the minutes of January 3, 2006 as corrected. Second by C. Balcius. No discussion. Voted unanimous.

April 13, 2006 – changes: work session. (staff member transcribed)

Page 1, George Chrisnten

Page 3, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph after Jim Bureau appointed as an alternate for a vote was not sworn in.

K. Menici will research the tape to research this issue. Board will not take action on these minutes until confirmed of his being sworn in. **No action taken on April 13, 2006 minutes**

April 18, 2006 - changes

Page 1, Approval of Agenda, 2<sup>nd</sup> line: should be withdrawn (add “n”)

Page 3, last sentence number “two” should be spelled out.

Page 3, 3<sup>rd</sup> line from the bottom, “scarring” (add “r”).

Page 4, middle of page J. Bolduc consulted with “reworded to be clearer”

Page 4, Stated Justine Gengras stated (line under J. Bolduc) (add “Justine Gengras”)

Page 6, line after K. Menici at top, “issues” not issued

Page 6, last sentence not clear – areas “are” being shown

Page 6, B. Bailey noted this Code Officer “who” has

Page 7, last J. Dube delete detention basin should be “road frontage on a corner lot”

Page 7, delete the “ ‘ ” in “it’s” same line as above.

Page 8, under first motion should be T. Hoopes, C. Blackstone second. (Delete J. Dube)

**Motion** by T. Hoopes to accept the minutes of April 18, 2006 with changes. Second by C. Balcius. No discussion. Vote unanimous.

**Approval of Agenda:**

**Changes** in agenda

Cases continued Case P06-29, and Case P06-31, Case P06-30 all to be continued to June 20, 2006 meeting.

Cases on to be heard on Monday May 22, P06-36, P05-09, P06-39.

**Motion** by T. Hoopes to approve the agenda as amended. Second by B Holmes. No discussion. Vote unanimous.

**Public Input:**

Question (public did not come to microphone to be identified) on continued cases for Monday and the possibility of those cases assigned for Monday to be heard tonight.

J. Dube informed that these will be heard on Monday, May 22, 2006.

None else seen or heard.

APPROVED July 20, 2006

Public input closed.

**Applications for Public Hearing:**

**Case#P06-33**

**Map 14, Lot 20**

**Design Review**

**Dan Weldon**

**NH 28A East Side Drive**

Application submitted by Joseph M. Whichert, LLS, Inc. on behalf of the property owner, Dan Weldon, Trustee of C & D Realty Trust. Applicant seeks input from the Board regarding two proposals for use of property located at Route 28A – East Side Drive within the Lakeshore Residential Zone. One design proposes an 8-unit condominium development and the other proposes a 7-lot subdivision.

Present for this case: Joe Whichert, and Dan Weldon, Trustee

J. Whichert came before the Board earlier (December 2004) when Growth Management Ordinance was in place. They had presented doing a two-lot subdivision and opted not to move forward at that time under with the possibility that the Town would look into a cluster type of ordinance. Tonight they are presenting total acreage approximately 11.7 acres. There are three wet areas on property. Topography shown on the plan is field topography. Sheet one presents a conventional subdivision that they feel could get approved and believe complies with Town Ordinance. Approximately 675 ft of road. Lots average in size from 53,000 sq ft to 92,000, sq. ft. in the Lakeshore Zone. One wetlands crossing. Second set of sheets shows schematic of 8 lot subdivision that would comply to the Lakeshore Zone. This would allow for a 5 acre open space area to the rear of the property which would be directly accessible to all the lots except for lots 2 and 7. Access road is about 95 ft shorter than on the first sheet. Third Sheet proposed 8 single family residences. Reviewed by Code Officer stated this was not conforming. Basically, asking for input on 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> sheet. The third development would be a private road. Current Ordinance does not allow 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> option. Seeking guidance.

K. Menici asked what would not comply on 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> option.

J. Whichert informed that he did not see that the 5 acre open space would be allowed because it does not have frontage.

J. Dube liked option 2.

J. Whichert asked if they were to extend the road and obtain 150 ft of frontage for the 5 acre open space parcel and denote it as not buildable, to remain an open space, would this be compliant with the Ordinance.

C. Balcius felt it just needs the road frontage and this would need to be discussed as to how the open space is deeded; to the Town or to whom.

J. Crouse asked about requirement for slopes.

T. Hoopes noted not requirement – only for Rural Residential and Rural.

General discussion on road, the extra lot, and combining this with a lot.

D. Weldon had a question on last sheet, knows cluster is not in zoning yet. Option 3 keeps everything to the front and on the flat and should he go to the ZBA for a variance that might allow this and develop cluster ordinance around this project.

C. Balcius stated the need to work on the ordinance together with the Board.

APPROVED July 20, 2006

J. Dube feels the Board needs to follow the rules but agrees with C. Balcius.

C. Balcius asked if this property is a candidate for 25 ft road and 2 ft shoulders.

J. Dube stated yes.

T. Hoopes asked who logged the road. Either this property or the adjacent lot a graveyard was found. He looked for the graveyard but could not find it. Option #2 seems most favorable.

J. Dube asked if Board would like to entertain public input.

**Motion** by T. Hoopes to allow public input. Second by C. Balcius. No discussion. Vote unanimous.

Betty Sackos asked for clarification of exactly where that property is.

J. Whichert stated directly across from Peggy's Cove.

B. Sackos expressed that neighbors would be against this.

Seeing or heard no other input, public input is closed.

**Case#P06-32**  
**Tracy Long**

**Map 27, Lot 30**

**Site Plan Review – Change of Use**  
**119 Main Street**

Application submitted by Tracy Long for a Site Plan Review to allow a retail shop at 119 Main Street, the former Irving office building. The property is located within the Residential Commercial Zone.

Present for this case Tracy Long.

K. Menici noted this is a change of use with no changes to the site being proposed. Applicant prepared a mini version with identifying abutters. Change of use would be signage.

T. Long informed she just wants to have a small retail shop selling wine, cheese, accessories with this type of product. Upgrade the building, more visually appealing. Hopefully start a trend on Main Street.

**Motion** by T. Hoopes to accept application for Case P06-32. Second by C. Balcius. Discussion on change of use when reviewing site plan regs. so you don't need to go through the waivers. C. Balcius noted there was the same discussion on the candy shop. K. Menici noted to officially accept the application the Board does have to do a blanket waiver of the site plan check list.

T. Hoopes amended his motion to grant waivers and accept application. Second for amended motion by C. Balcius. No discussion. Vote unanimous.

C. Balcius asked when applicant does renovations will the style of building remain the same.

T. Long stated yes, changes only will be beautification.

T. Hoopes asked about deliveries and size of trucks.

T. Long not bigger than the pizza shop and will be picking up most her own product.

APPROVED July 20, 2006

J. Bureau asked what is on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor.

T. Long three small rooms and a bathroom. In the back there is a meeting area. Upstairs is smaller than down stairs.

T. Hoopes asked about where trash will be kept.

T. Long have not thought about that but probably in basement.

J. Dube asked emergency exit signs, egress door opening out, smoke detectors. Site plan concerns would be trash would be put, exterior lighting and signage, following the sign ordinance.

T. Long will need to get lights outside and signage with lights. There are two doors, one on front and one on the side.

J. Dube concern about doors opening out instead of in.

T. Long door currently goes in. Stated this will not be generally highly frequented.

C. Balcius door opens in for most businesses in town of Alton, NH

Discussion of door openings.

K. Menici will follow up to see if this is applicable in this case.

C. Balcius asked on sketch land is owned by the church and Irving working with church for leasing land where septic is.

T. Long light will be on the sign.

J. Dube asked for any other concerns.

Case was open to public, none seen or heard. Public input closed.

**Motion** by C. Balcius to approve Case P06-32. Second by T. Hoopes. No discussion. Vote unanimous.

**Case#P06-22**  
**Robert Landry**

**Map 5, Lot 42**

**3-Lot Subdivision**  
**Coffin Brook Road**

Application submitted by Eckman Engineering, LLC, on behalf of the property owner, Robert Landry for a proposed 3-lot subdivision. The property is located at 127 Coffin Brook Road and is within the Rural Zone. This application was continued from the April 18, 2006, meeting at the applicant's request.

Present for this case Robert Landry-applicant and Paul Hugo.

K. Menici informed the Board of Waiver Requests.

7.2.19 location

7.2.20 details on abutting properties

7.2.23 natural and cultural features

APPROVED July 20, 2006

- 7.2.27 elevation
- 7.2.28 public use
- 7.2.29 future development
- 7.2.31 descriptions
- 7.2.32 reserved areas
- 7.9.14 parcel size ratio

Noted two waivers that were requested are required on this application. 7.2.28 and 7.2.32 neither is applicable.

J. Dube has a problem with lot 1 that pertains to the acceptance of application. Feels there is missing important information on the wetlands. The abutting property came in for a subdivision and the wetlands were quite comparable to Lot 2. Even though this is an existing house that affects the 25 ft no cut buffer and that buffer being zoning. As it appear now is does not go along with current zoning. You cannot determine the size of the wetland and this is missing information for the Board to make a decision.

T. Hoopes stated this creates a new lot and lots must comply.

J. Crouse added need topo on the plans.

C. Balcius asked if this is in the flood plain.

P. Hugo noted part of Lot 3 and 2.

J. Dube commented that this behind the previous town dump.

T. Hoopes stated the Board and also the applicant has a responsibility for selling the lot to make sure it is not contaminated.

P. Hugo stated the well has been tested.

C. Balcius suggests environmental site testing for contamination..

T. Hoopes concern for conservation inspection they noted a cemetery stone base. This usually means there is a stone that goes with it.

P. Hugo located that and has revised plans showing stone location.

R. Landy stated he found the stone and turned it over so it could be seen but feels because this does not have a depressed site with it and feels the stone has been moved and is not in an area affected by the subdivision.

P. Hugo stated it falls on Lot 2 towards the front.

T. Hoopes stated if there is a cemetery site it has to have a perimeter protection.

R. Landy feels it would be hard to show it was a grave site unless it was dug up.

P. Hugo noted it has a perimeter of 15 ft sq. with a 25 ft buffer around the perimeter.

J. Dube asked about the topo on Lot 1.

T. Hoopes feels they need the buffers for the wetlands.

APPROVED July 20, 2006

J. Dube stated they definitely need the natural and cultural features, wetlands, grave site to be shown.

J. Dube asked the Board to go through the waivers.

Location – Board agreed to grant the waiver

Details on abutter properties – wants to see former dumpsite marked and stated on plans and also an ESA (Environmental site assessment) around the site to check for contamination on Lot 43.

Natural and cultural features – extend the wetland map for Lot 1. – need to know the size of the wetlands.

Topo – Board agreed to grant the waiver.

Future development – Board agreed to grant the waiver.

Descriptions – cemetery on new plans – Board agreed to grant the waiver.

Size ratio – Board agreed to grant the waiver.

J. Dube noted the applicants did know they needed to have these items requested and they are not on plans tonight.

J. Crouse noted she would like to see the driveways.

P. Hugo noted there is an existing driveway to the house, and existing wood road going to Lot 2, noted they are shown on the 11x17.

J. Dube stated on the plan submitted tonight there is a driveway shown and a building site shown, but on the full-size plans, they are not there. Does not feel comfortable about a conditional acceptance.

J. Crouse stated she would like complete information required.

C. Balcius agrees.

T. Hoopes would like to move on quicker but sees the reason for needing the information.

B. Holmes agrees.

J. Bureau agrees with majority.

**Motion** by J. Crouse to deny acceptance of the application for Case P06-22 due to non-conforming to zoning requirements. Second by J. Bureau. No discussion. Vote unanimous.

Recess at 8:30

Meeting back to order at 8:38

**Case#P06-34**

**Map 3, Lot 26**

**3-Lot Subdivision**

**William and Marilyn Stevens**

**Prospect Mountain Road**

Application submitted by Dennis J. Rialland, LLC of Brown Engineering on behalf of the property owners, William and Marilyn Stevens for a proposed 3-lot subdivision. The property is located at 518 Prospect Mountain Road within the Rural Zone.

Cynthia Balcius stepping down from this case.

Present for this case Dennis Rialland, and William Stevens-applicant.

K. Menici noted no waivers and staff review shows none required.

APPROVED July 20, 2006

J. Dube asked about conservation comments.

K. Menici read the Conservation Commission comments.

K. Menici lot 26-1 does not meet zoning requirements and lot 26-3 needs house location.

**Motion** by T. Hoopes to accept the application for Case P06-34. Second by B. Holmes. No discussion. Vote unanimous.

D. Rialland noted property is 42 acres, smallest 8 and largest 17. Also noted significant wetland on lot 26-1. Approximately 600 feet of frontage for each lot. 2 existing driveways will be used. Driveways accepted by Alton Highway department on April 11.

T. Hoopes Lot 26-2 asked if house would be up on higher area.

D. Rialland yes this is a potential house site and excellent test pit area.

T. Hoopes driveway length?

D. Rialland approximately 800 feet.

T. Hoopes stated the application should get a copy of the new driveway regulations and noted that as they get longer they must get wider.

J. Dube expressed concern about the slope going up to the upper portion of the property.

W. Stevens noted where it is not shaded it is open blueberry pasture.

T. Hoopes asked about frontage on Lot 2. Is it roughly 580 ft?

D. Rialland yes.

J. Crouse asked about plans to further subdivide.

W. Stevens chose to plan this with big lots; that is what he prefers.

J. Dube asked about Lot 3-26-1 question on no cut buffer with regard to the well

D. Rialland noted the well on outside of buffer.

J. Dube question on 4-k area on lot 2.

D. Rialland stated he should have crossed hatched it in the other direction. Noted it was outside the 25% or greater and can change that cross hatch so it is a little bit more obvious.

Case was open to public input.

None seen or heard.

Public input closed.

APPROVED July 20, 2006

T. Hoopes suggested they check on driveway regulations.

C. Balcius spoke on behalf of Mr. Stevens.

Driveway is when building permit is issued and happened after approval.

Discussion on where the driveway would be located on site 2 but the determination has not been made where the house would even go.

K. Menici addressed Mr. Hoopes concern on driveway. There have been cases to provide engineering design but these were where steep slopes were involved. This is an existing woods road and appears to follow the contour

J. Bureau is fine with driveway since it is pre-existing.

B. Holmes is fine with this.

J. Dube fine as well but with a question on fitting house on lot 1.

T. Hoopes (inaudible)

J. Crouse question on future development on back lot.

D. Rialland discussion on shading on plans

K. Menici noted the state likes the contours dropped off Mylar.

**Motion** by T.Hoopes to approve Case 06-34 with following conditions of approval.

1. Trees along the boundary of the 25-foot of wetlands buffer be flagged on the plat and in the field on trees approximately every 25 feet with permanent marked identifying them as the wetlands buffer. All proposed signage to be reviewed and approved by the Planning Board.

2. A note be added to the plat state erosion control will be in place prior to excavation or timber cutting.

3. A note on the plat stating the total acreage of each current use category for each lot number.

4. The following notes be added to the plat:

This subdivision plan contains a total of (1) sheet, which constitutes the subdivision plans as approved by the Town of Alton Planning Board. This sheet is recorded at the Belknap County Registry of Deed and is on file at the Town of Alton Planning Department.

This subdivision plan is subject to the Conditions of Approval itemized in the May 16, 2006, Notice of Decision on file at the Town of Alton Planning Department.

5. All necessary state, local, and federal permits to be obtained prior to the beginning of excavation or timber cutting; copies to be provided to the Planning Department.

Second by B. Holmes. No discussion. Vote unanimous.





APPROVED July 20, 2006

R. Henderson stated they need to seed and clean one ditch line but the improvement of the roads have been brought up to the beginning of the last lot.

T. Hoopes question on bringing the road up to grade up to the culvert.

C. Balcius why are there road improvements being done before the subdivision has been approved?

R. Henderson explained that from the meeting last June the Board reversed it's previous decision that the road would have to be re-engineered. This has been done and after the engineering was done, posted the bond in December, went ahead had the road work done in December.

T. Hoopes asked if the power line easement moved. Snowmobile trail to move?

R. Henderson move snowmobile trail to back of property, power lines not moved.

J. Dube noted a question from the Conservation Committee about the possibility of future development for Lot 27-5. From noting the wetlands he does not have a concern.

C. Balcius noted between the setbacks and the wetlands they will not be able to develop.

Case was open for public input.

Chuck Weston concern on roadwork and the ditch made deeper than what the Road Agent had originally wanted and feels this is unsafe in winter and also clean up on top and with stonewall replaced back. Also with Lot 5 being wet and would like to see noted on plat that lot 5 undevelopable.

T. Hoopes stated it looks to be approx 2-3 acres of wetlands. This is well over the 10,000 sq. ft.

C. Balcius due to size of wetlands this is noted already.

C. Weston added a cemetery noted.

T. Hoopes cemetery is marked and noted

C. Weston would allow the snowmobile trail to move also.

Dan Rines noted his family owned property and wants to assure that cemetery is not disturbed.

T. Hoopes assured him that it cannot be under law.

C. Balcius asked another question on the road upgrade. Noted a concern of everyone locally to maintain the narrow road and asked if the stone wall was still there.

R. Henderson noted it was never a stone wall, when the road was improved all the materials were stacked on either side of the road.

Sandra Weston noted the stonewall was on road in 1700s.

C. Weston stated you can see from lot 5 you can see where the stone wall was.

APPROVED July 20, 2006

T. Hoopes discussion on defending the stonewall.

Nora LaRue wanted to ask if there were any plans to enlarge the existing culvert that is there.

R. Henderson noted Road Agent did not want them to touch the culvert.

N. LaRue asked also about the driveway for Lot 2, and expressed concern where the driveway will be placed.

(R. Henderson indicated to her on a map, but nothing audible was heard).

N. LaRue asked if a cistern is required for five lots.

C. Balcius noted it was indicated on map on the tip. Lot 27-1.

C. Weston asked a question on wetlands

E. Roseen not all wetlands are delineated on plans.

Public input closed.

Discussion on noting no further subdivision for Lot 5.

T. Hoopes satisfied with exception of notes for Lot 5 – no further subdivision.

C. Balcius satisfied noting that cistern and cemetery buffer.

J. Crouse satisfied noting with seeing driveways.

Motion by T. Hoopes for case P05-35 for conditional approval

1. Trees along the boundary of the 25-foot of wetlands buffer be flagged on the plat and in the field on trees approximately every 25 feet with permanent marked identifying them as the wetlands buffer. All proposed signage to be reviewed and approved by the Planning Board.
2. A note be added to the plat state erosion control will be in place prior to excavation or timber cutting.
3. A note on the plat stating the total acreage of each current use category for each lot number.
4. The language and conditions of the proposed easement deed for the cistern to be accepted by the Board of Selectmen. If the Selectmen do not accept the language and conditions of the proposed easement deed, an Administrative Review will be required.
5. All necessary state, local, and federal permits to be obtained prior to the beginning of excavation or timber cutting; copies to be provided to the Planning Department.
6. The soils should be marked from the updated Belknap County soils maps.
7. The Road Completion should meet the Road Agent's requirements.
8. The driveways should be placed on the plat.
9. A Wetlands Scientist stamp must be affixed to the plat.
10. On Lot 5 a note stating no further subdivision.
11. The following notes be added to the plat:

This subdivision plan contains a total of (1) sheet, which constitutes the subdivision plans as approved by the Town of Alton Planning Board. This sheet is recorded at the Belknap County Registry of Deed and is on file at the Town of Alton Planning Department.

This subdivision plan is subject to the Conditions of Approval itemized in the May 16, 2006,

APPROVED July 20, 2006

Notice of Decision on file at the Town of Alton Planning Department.  
Second by B. Holmes. No discussion. Vote unanimous.

**Other Business:**

J. Crouse questioned when approved for Sauliner for number of shops permitted and concern for advertisement and would like it to be checked .

Discussion on Route 28-A logging road putting in culverts. (David Canada)

J. Bureau question on a case for review of land, what permission do you have to access the land

K. Menici noted that once an application turned in you have authority to access the property.

Motion by C. Balcius to adjourn. Vote unanimous.

Respectfully submitted,  
Carolyn Schaeffner  
Recording Secretary