

Members Present:

Drew Carter, Chairman
Russ Wilder, Clerk, Master Plan Committee
Tom Hoopes, Member
Roger Sample, Member
Scott Williams, Member, ZAC Committee
Virgil MacDonald, Selectmen's Rep.
Bill O'Neil, Alternate

Others Present:

Jessica A. Call, Town Planner
Trisha DeRoche, Planning Secretary
Paul LaRochelle, Master Plan Committee
Kelly Sullivan, Master Plan Committee
Frank Rich, CIP Committee

Attending Remotely:

Tara Bamford, Master Plan Consultant

Call to Order

Meeting was called to order at 6:12 P.M. +/-

Appointment of Alternate

Bill O'Neil was appointed as a full voting member for tonight's meeting due to Bob Regan's absence.

Approval of Agenda

Ms. Call stated there are some changes to the agenda, before getting to the agenda she introduced the new Planning Secretary, Trisha DeRoche, to the Board. Ms. Call requested that the item listed under Other Business 3 (a) be moved to the beginning of the agenda under #1 and name it #1b. Ms. Call stated the other change is to Case #P21-23, Ryan L Heath, LLC, originally on the application submitted, he was listed as the Agent for Ron & Doreen Charles; he is now currently the owner. These were the only changes to the agenda.

Mr. Hoopes MOVED to accept the changes to the agenda.

Mr. Williams seconded the motion, and it PASSED unanimously.

1. Joint Meeting with the Master Plan Committee

The Master Plan Committee will present the Draft Workplan and a First Draft of the Master Plan, Chapter 1 Vision and Chapter 2 Goals, to the Alton Planning Board. The First Draft of Chapters 1 & 2 will be available online and from the Planning Department.

Mr. Wilder stated that since Mr. Regan was not able to attend, he would give the overview for the Master Plan Committee. Mr. Wilder invited Mr. LaRochelle and Ms. Sullivan to come to the table to participate in the discussion on the Master Plan breakdown for 2022. Ms. Call addressed the Board regarding the Master Plan Consultant, Tara Bamford, and stated she was attending the meeting remotely; however, due to technical difficulties, she was not visible via zoom. Mr. Wilder discussed the

proposed schedule for the Master Plan for the year of 2022; starting in December of 2021 through April of 2022, the members will be taking on the drafting and getting together the information for the Master Plan for the various sections- Chapters 3-5 and he will address Chapters 1 & 2 afterwards. Mr. Wilder stated that after the information is gathered, in May of 2021 they will be able to do a draft action plan. Mr. Wilder stated that Chapters 1 & 2 are the Vision and Goals of the Master Plan, Chapter 3 is Natural Resources, Chapter 4 is Land Use and Chapter 5 is Infrastructure. Mr. Wilder stated that Chapters 1 & 2 are already in draft form but they need to work on Chapters 3-5 between now and April of 2022. He stated they need to gather information and in order to do this they will need to recruit volunteers who are knowledgeable on the subjects; for example, he will be gathering the information for Historical Resources. He stated that the Natural Resource section is currently being revised by the Conservation Commission in addition to other resources which he will assemble and write up a draft. Once this is done, he will provide the draft to the Master Plan Consultant, Tara Bamford, to include in the main draft. After the information has been gathered, written up and provided to Tara Bamford, they will create an Action Plan which will consist of recommendations of what the Committee thinks the Town should be doing in the Master Plan. In June of 2022, the Committee will schedule a venue for public input most likely using the survey method and social media outreach. Once the Committee has the results of the public input, they will submit a final draft to the Planning Board; in the meantime, the Committee will submit their draft results to the Board and online throughout the process to allow the Board time to review the findings. Mr. Wilder stated the committee is aiming to have the final draft ready to submit to the Planning Board for review and comment by August of 2022; once they receive the Board's comments, the committee will then revise again and present to the Planning Board to vote on the Plan, adopt it, sign it and record it with the Town Clerk.

Mr. Wilder stated the final Master Plan will be a tool to inform the CIP committee and ZAC committee for potential 2023 Warrant Articles. He provided a recap on the survey results for the Master Plan; he stated there were over 800 responses which was a higher number the Town received during voting season. Mr. Wilder stated that the work will be divided up amongst the Committee members and Ms. Call will provide overall coordination for the Committee. Mr. Wilder directed the Board to the Master Plan Summary of Chapters 1 & 2 provided in the meeting packets, which showed the results of the survey responses from the Town. He stated that Mr. Hoopes has been assigned to Chapter 4 -Land Use, Chapter 5, which is Infrastructure, has been broken down into 4 sections with Aimee Terravechia covering Community Facilities, Kelly Sullivan & Jill Houser covering Recreation, Paul LaRochelle covering Transportation & Water Supply and Bob Regan covering Information Technology. Chapter 6, which is the Action Plan, will be drafted by the Master Plan Consultant, Tara Bamford.

Mr. Wilder stated they needed the Planning Board's approval to amend Tara Bamford's contract from \$15,722 to \$25,000 (the full amount authorized by Town Meeting) to help the Master Plan Committee complete the document. Also, they have submitted a second Warrant Article for an additional \$9,000 to support further public engagement and production of the document, which includes graphic design and printing; the Warrant Article would appear in the 2022 vote. It was noted that the current Warrant Article is good through 2024 or 2025 as there was some concern from the other Board members about spending the money within the allotted timeline. For the last point, Mr. Wilder stated they believe the Master Plan is a living document that should be evaluated yearly by the Planning Board. The evaluation would assess how we are doing in meeting the goals of the Master

Plan. They believe a standing Committee such as the CIP and ZAC could be created to keep an eye on the progress. Ms. Call stated there are two things the Board needed to vote on tonight, one was the amendment to Tara Bamford's contract and the second was to approve the wording of the Warrant Article. Mr. Carter interjected with a question regarding Housing and asked if Housing was being addressed in the Master Plan; Mr. Wilder stated Housing was being addressed and it falls under Chapter 5-Infrastructure. Ms. Sullivan stated Housing was added on in the last Master Plan meeting, which is why they did not see it on the current list under Chapter 5. Mr. Carter stated he had concerns that the additional \$9,000 would not be enough for printing costs, but Ms. Sullivan and Mr. Hoopes stated those costs were factored into the \$9,000.

**Mr. Williams MOVED to increase Tara Bamford's contract from \$15,722 to \$25,000.
Mr. Hoopes seconded the motion, it PASSED, with Mr. MacDonald abstaining.**

- a. Discussion regarding extending the contract for Tara Bamford, Master Plan Consultant.

Mr. MacDonald stated he has a problem with the way the Warrant Article was drawn up and did not want the funds to come out of the unassigned Fund Balance. Ms. Call stated she sat with Liz Dionne, the Town Administrator, to go over the Warrant Article. Mr. MacDonald stated the money should go back into the Fund Balance and should not be spent like this. Ms. Call stated the Planning Board would look at this Warrant Article, vote on it as is and when it was presented to the Selectmen, at that point the Selectmen would choose which Fund Balance to use. Ms. Call stated if this money did not come out of the unassigned Fund Balance it would affect the tax rate. Mr. MacDonald did not agree with using the unassigned Fund Balance for Warrant Articles because it was not coming out of taxation, but the Town was being taxed on this money. Mr. Carter interjected and stated that no matter what, it was taxpayer money being used for the Warrant Articles.

Mr. Carter posed a question to Ms. Call, if they approved the Warrant Article tonight as written and the Selectmen then rewrote it, the Warrant Article would have to go back to the Planning Board; Mr. MacDonald interjected and stated the Selectmen would not rewrite it they would just deny it which was why he mentioned this now because the Selectmen only vote yes or no for Warrant Articles. Mr. Carter clarified this statement and Mr. MacDonald reiterated that the Selectmen were not permitted to amend a Warrant Article, only vote yes or no. Ms. Call stated that was not her understanding from the Town Administrator as the Selectmen were presented with a Warrant Article from the Highway Department that was written in the exact same language. Ms. Call asked at what point do the Selectmen decide if they would take the funds from the unassigned Fund Balance; Mr. MacDonald stated this process started last year and he disagreed with it because when it goes to the voters and they are informed that the monies would not be coming from their taxes, they would most likely automatically vote yes and he disagreed with that. Another Board member interjected and stated that there have been times when they have had discussions with the Town Administrator regarding Warrant Articles, not to amend them but to determine which fund they would come from and resolve it through that discussion. Mr. Sample recommended tabling the discussion to the December Planning Board Meeting and going to the Selectmen to pose the question how do you want the Warrant Article written going forward, which may solve this issue. Ms. Call stated that although she disagreed with this, if this is what the Board wanted, she would comply.

Mr. Sample **MOVED** to table the discussion to the December Planning Board Meeting to pose to the Selectmen whether the Warrant Articles should be funded by the unassigned fund or through taxation.

Mr. Wilder seconded the motion, and it **PASSED** with Mr. MacDonald abstaining.

2. Public Hearing on the Capital Improvements Program (CIP) of 2022-2027

Mr. Carter read the Public Hearing Notice for the CIP Plan of 2022 as proposed by the CIP Committee, to be held in the Alton Town Hall at 6:00pm on Tuesday, November 16, 2021, at the Planning Board Meeting. Copies of the Plan of 2022 will be available at the hearing on the Town's website at www.alton.nh.gov, or they can be picked up in draft form at the Town Hall Planning Department during regular business hours.

Frank Rich, CIP Committee Chairman, approached the table to discuss the CIP Plan for 2022-2027, which provided their recommendations to the Board for the next 5 years for the Town of Alton. Mr. Rich stated since presenting to the Planning Board last year, the CIP Committee has worked diligently and Ms. Call has been incredibly instrumental in helping the Committee to further their efforts to create a comprehensive report. Mr. Rich stated the report is the CIP Committee's recommendation to the Planning Board in terms of the capital improvements for the next five years (2022-2027). Mr. Rich stated the Committee met with every department head over the course of a few months to discuss their capital needs for the next five years. Mr. Rich stated that the CIP report does not refer to capital needs for any buildings and grounds, which is important to recognize, but it does include the capital needs for the highway road reconstruction, which is the most significant portion of the CIP report. Mr. Rich stated that in the report, all of the department's requests, with the exception of the highway department, are reflected in the report.

Mr. MacDonald interjected and asked if the requests for replacement equipment are immediate or for later on down the line. Mr. Rich responded and stated that some requests are for new equipment but some are also for replacement equipment. Mr. MacDonald interjected and stated that the CIP report is more of a "wish list" for them because you are adding equipment that the Town hasn't even voted to add and you're putting money away for it now, and Mr. Rich responded, we are, as we have done in the past. Mr. MacDonald interrupted and stated again that it is a "wish list" that should be voted down because CIP was set up to replace what we have, not to have a wish list to say, "I'm gonna buy a loader or I'm gonna buy a whole new set up for Jones Field"; Mr. Hoopes interjected and stated it was also set up for all of the Fire Department needs and we know that we are going to have to replace x, y or z so that is something that is needed; Mr. MacDonald responded, that's right but it's not to buy a dozer for the highway department that they want to buy five years from now and you start putting money away when we haven't even said "yeah we're gonna get a dozer" but we haven't allowed the people to vote on it yet, so it makes it into a wish list instead of...your putting money away for stuff they might want. Ms. Call interjected and explained that money does not get put away until the voters vote on it so they need to look at a proposal in order to vote it in or not... Mr. MacDonald responded and stated that most voters are uninformed and when you take a list like this and for example, Bobcat L28 small articulated loader that the Town does not own, which makes it a wish list that they want to buy this and we're taking the taxpayer's money and putting it in the bank when the CIP was designed to replace equipment we have and the needs of the Town. Mr. Hoopes stated in response that it is also for

anticipated needs too, it's not just a replacement list, but if there is something that does come up and a piece of equipment that the Public Works needs and knows that they are going to have to do, it means it is something worthwhile putting in the list and explaining to the Town; Mr. Carter interjected and stated it's called being fiscally responsible.

Mr. Williams responded and stated that it goes both ways and Mr. MacDonald was right in that, but that wouldn't work in regards to the IT department because we are not replacing IT equipment because we don't have IT; Mr. MacDonald agreed and stated no we are building it and Mr. Williams responded and stated that is a wish list but he did not see what they were talking about in regards to the requests for equipment. Mr. MacDonald agreed with Mr. Williams and stated that's right, we are adding new equipment that the people haven't even voted on yet, but we're taking their money this year and putting it into a bank account. Ms. Call responded and stated that's not what the plan was doing; Mr. Hoopes interjected and stated what if the fire chief came to the Committee and stated they needed to replace the fire station in the next 10 years, it would be in the Master Plan because it came from CIP and then the CIP report would be presented to the Selectmen and it matches the Master Plan and says that we wanted to build a new fire station in the next 10 years, wouldn't that be covered in this? Mr. MacDonald stated we would also put a Warrant Article out to have the people vote on to put the money aside. Mr. Williams responded and stated the voter is the key element; you can say we need a new fire station or the fire chief can say they need a new fire station but sometimes the voters say, no, we are not going to buy you a new fire station and that happens time and time again. Mr. MacDonald responded and stated, you don't take their money and put it into a bank account and up their tax rate when they haven't even been asked; Ms. Call interjected and asked that the Board members turn to page 3 of the CIP Plan and referred to the Fire Department Equipment Capital Reserve Fund; the deposit amounts listed on this report are in green, so for 2022 \$450,000 would be written into a Warrant Article to be placed on the ballot for 2022 for the voters to vote for those funds to be put aside. Mr. Williams interjected and asked if this was a separate Warrant Article or was there a catch all that captured all of it; Ms. Call responded and stated there was no money currently being deposited into an account without the voters first voting on it; the CIP Plan is a tool to use to anticipate needs for each department and the voters are going to be voting on individual Warrant Articles for each department. Mr. MacDonald responded and stated that when the Town bought the grader they put a Warrant Article out that we're buying a grader and let the people decide; now you have listed a loader for the highway department, so are they going to vote on the whole report so they don't lose out on the loader? Mr. Hoopes interjected and stated that he believed the voters would be voting on the Warrant Articles from the CIP Plan, not the actually CIP Plan itself; Ms. Call responded, that is correct. Ms. Call further explained that the Warrant Articles would be written from the items listed in the CIP Plan. Mr. Hoopes responded that the CIP Plan is a tool for the Selectmen, and Mr. MacDonald agreed with that statement, but stated there are items in the plan that the voters should be voting on. Mr. Hoopes stated the voters would be voting on these items because anything in green would become a Warrant Article that they would have to vote on. Mr. MacDonald asked if the voters would be able to see the entire CIP list because they needed to have that information; Mr. Hoopes responded that the Selectmen decide what Warrant Articles go on the ballot, so the ones listed in green would be considered to be Warrant Articles for the Selectmen to place on the ballot, so you have the authority as the Selectmen to not put one of the Warrant Articles on the ballot. Both Mr. Williams and Ms. Call agreed with Mr. Hoopes, and Ms. Call tried to explain further but was interrupted by Mr. MacDonald, he stated they are already adding into the money to buy a loader so you're putting the taxpayers money in a bank account; both Ms. Call and Mr. Hoopes interjected and

stated no that is not the case, we are not putting money aside until the Town votes on the Warrant Articles. Mr. Williams interjected and stated it is an equipment fund, like the Fire Department they have an equipment fund; Mr. Rich then interjected and stated the voters have to vote on the individual items just like they did last year but then the Selectmen make their own definitive choices. Mr. Williams compared this to the general budgets and stated the Budget Committee does its chopping, then it goes to the Selectmen, they do their chopping and that's how the system works. Mr. MacDonald interjected and stated that it looks like we are paying for a loader that is already added in here; Mr. Williams responded that he understood what Mr. MacDonald was saying but it's not really in there as that.

Mr. Williams asked why the Fire Department's equipment went from a 25 year life span to a 20 year life span. Mr. Rich responded by explaining that was a recommendation by the Fire Chief at the time. Mr. Williams responded that it has been 25 years for a piece of apparatus for a long time and Ms. Call asked him what he was referring to and Mr. Williams stated all of them, ladder truck 20 year life span, command vehicle 10 year life span, 10 year span on the 550... Mr. Rich stated he cannot answer the question of why the life spans have changed, that was the recommendation of the Fire Chief at the time and he put these longevity dates on the list. Mr. Williams stated he gets it and the Selectmen need to fix that if they so desire. Mr. Sample stated this is CIP so it's for replacement; now the truth of the matter is that loader is replacement, somebody is saying that what we have is not good enough and they want to replace it. Mr. MacDonald interjected and stated, no they want two loaders, the big and the small but the ones we sent down there weren't meant to be replaced, they were sent down there because we didn't want to send them to the auction when we could still use them; so we sent the trucks down there to be used up, now they're on this list and all this adds up and it goes into that account. Mr. Williams interjected and stated the loader is for the sidewalks and you want that loader for the sidewalks. Mr. Sample interjected and stated in order to fix this it needs to go to the Board of Selectmen and they can weed through it as they see fit. Mr. Rich responded that this is only a tool; Mr. MacDonald stated he was aware of that but they have money added in there and it all adds up to one amount you want to put in the CIP Plan. Mr. Hoopes responded to Mr. MacDonald and stated it is there for you to look at, nothing is added yet, it won't be added until the Town votes on it. Mr. Rich stated that when he came to the Planning Board last year they looked at the CIP Plan as a tool for recommendations of what each department head was asking for to service the people of this community. He further stated if the Board of Selectmen choose to do otherwise, that is their privilege, this is just a tool. Mr. MacDonald stated alright and agreed to take it up with the Board of Selectmen. Mr. Rich then gave an example by reminding the Board that last year they went and asked the community members and the voting members to vote on a ladder truck for the Fire Department and it was approved based on obtaining a grant, but they did not get the grant and the money was reserved; The Selectmen then decided to buy a used ladder truck that wasn't on the CIP. Mr. Williams stated that all three ladder trucks they have had have been used ladder trucks. Mr. Rich then stated to Mr. MacDonald that he as a Selectmen made a conscious, conservative decision to buy a ladder truck that was not on the CIP and he was just using that as an example. Mr. MacDonald responded and stated that Mr. Rich missed what he was saying, when you turn this into a wish list with everything they want, that amount goes up going in, you are raising that amount. Mr. Williams stated there should be some parameters to the department heads on how the Selectmen or somebody wanted this thing presented so it is presented properly. Mr. Hoopes asked if the Selectmen could have someone from the CIP come to the meeting to discuss it and provide more information and then decide which items become a Warrant Article.

Mr. Rich stated that at the end of the day, it's going to be the Selectmen that decide what goes into the Warrant Articles for that particular year; again, this is just a tool. We went to each department head and asked what it is they needed to have replaced and what they needed to service the constituents of this Town. Mr. Rich gave an example, he stated he went to the Selectmen and asked why they were putting the highway fund into capital reserve and their answer was, I really didn't get a clear answer from the Selectmen because that really wasn't a reserve we use it every year, we use the amount every year; it's not a capital piece of equipment. Mr. MacDonald interjected and stated they use it every couple of years and Mr. Rich responded that he found that out at that meeting, that they only used it every couple of years and they have been putting in \$950,000 for a number of years and sometimes they use it all and sometimes they move it over to the following year. He further stated that the department head came in and stated his methodology, which made sense, that they were building three miles of road but they were not maintaining the roads that they had, he utilized the money to build new roads which was a large amount of savings in his opinion. The new director stated they were not maintaining the roads the way they should and it's going to come back and bite us down the road so he'd like to increase. He came into the Committee and he requested \$1.5 million per year, which raised the tax rate to 1.5 to the tax base. Mr. Rich stated they had to reevaluate and dilute that amount down to about \$1,050,000 to start and then increased it by \$100,000 a year because they couldn't justify a tax impact of 50% in those years; however, they understood his methodology which made some sense and they wanted to give him some leeway and those were their recommendations. So the recommendation here for the highway department for that particular area, which is on page 1, the deposit for the 2022 is going from \$950,000 to \$1,175,000 but his request was \$1.5 million. They increased it every year by a little to give him an opportunity to work with the Selectmen on deciding what roads and what maintenance he saw as a priority; what this did was it brought the tax impact down. With this new tax rate over the next five years, with everyone getting what they requested would only increase by 1.10 or .10 cents more per \$1,000 and they thought that was prudent, they still think it's prudent and this is based on their current assessments. This CIP plan is not based on future assessments that would be coming in the next week or so, so with the highway department needs and the fire apparatus, the tax rate comes to 1.134 or .13 cents. Mr. Rich stated it appeared that the new assessments would add \$408 million dollars to their assessment from \$1 billion and \$770 million to \$2 billion and \$180 million; if that becomes the case and even if it is a little bit less, then this CIP Plan would basically be irrelevant in terms of the tax impact. The goal of the CIP is to manage the tax impact to the Town so there are not huge waves of increase but level across; with the new assessment, the tax impact for 2022 would be .89 which would create a reduction of the tax rate. Mr. Rich reiterated that the CIP Plan is not a contract but a tool to use when reviewing the needs of each department. Ultimately, the decision is up to the Board of Selectmen and they hope that it will be approved. Mr. Carter interjected and stated that this five-year plan is important because you have to know what is coming down the road as best as you can guess, there are always surprises that you do not anticipate, but it is imperative that you think ahead; that's being responsible. Mr. Williams interjected and stated that because they have two selectmen present, they have to look at how they would rebuild the roads because some roads that have been replaced have not been repaired correctly; if anybody comes in and builds a road in this town to put a subdivision road on, it's built to the same spec as I-95 with the exception of thickness of asphalt. Mr. Rich started to discuss the building needs of each department and Ms. Call interjected and called for a Point of Order and explained that this discussion that Mr. Rich has started to discuss is listed more towards the end of the agenda under Any Other

Business to come before the Board (#1), so can the Board agree to amend the agenda to have that discussion now being that Mr. Rich is present- **So Moved, seconded by the other members.**

Mr. Rich began discussion of the Master Plan regarding the building needs for some of the departments; he stated the two biggest areas of space needs are the Fire Department and the Highway Department. Both department heads feel there is a need for more space because they are working under stressful conditions, so they hope the CIP Committee would be able to work on that going forward once the Master Plan is put in place. Mr. Rich shared a recommendation by the CIP Committee regarding a possible municipal multi-complex facility and where it should be located; he stated this is a recommendation the CIP Committee feels is important and requested that money be reserved for this need. Ms. Call interjected with a request to add to Mr. Rich's discussion; she directed the Board members to the cover page within their meeting packets entitled Building Needs and stated that each department head has an individual packet with their specific comments and requests. She stated the Master Plan Committee along with Pat O'Brien and CIP, gathered all of the information from the department heads and created a proposal to present to the Board. Mr. Rich recommended that the Board take their time and go through the proposal because there are large numbers involved and if they are going to address these needs, how we go about it should be conscious decision making and planning for the Town. Mr. Williams interjected and stated that a new fire station could run about \$3 or \$4 million dollars and they need to look closely at this proposal. Mr. Hoopes interjected and stated that some of the comments from the Town survey addressed some of these items, and one of the things that really amazed him was how many requests were put down for Parks & Recreation. He stated if the citizens are asking for something like this, they need to consider the requests. Mr. Rich responded by reiterating that this proposal is not for discussion tonight, he is here tonight to ask for the Board's approval so the Committee can move the proposal on to the Board of Selectmen; again, it is a guide and a tool for future anticipated needs for the Town.

Opened for public comment... Kelly Sullivan approached the table to thank Mr. Rich and the CIP Committee for working on this over the past few months; she feels it is important to view this as a tool for the Town and any improvements. Mr. Rich reiterated that the Committee's main goal is to reduce the tax impact for the Town while still planning for the future. **Closed public comment.**

Mr. Hoopes MOVED to submit the CIP Plan for 2022 as presented to the Board of Selectmen and Budget Committee as the CIP Committee's recommendation for 2022.

Mr. Wilder seconded the motion, and it PASSED with Mr. MacDonald abstaining.

Ms. Call stated that the Building Needs discussion would be continued to the December meeting.

3. Joint Meeting with the Zoning Amendment Committee (ZAC)

The ZAC Committee will present their recommendations for proposed amendments to the Zoning Ordinance to the Alton Planning Board. Copies of the draft proposed zoning amendments are available online and from the Planning Department. Public Hearing date and snow date to be scheduled.

PLANNING BOARD PROPOSED AMENDMENT #1:

To amend Article 200 Definitions “Seasonal Cabin” and “Seasonal Use”, to include a “Winter Season”, and to amend Article 400 Zoning Districts Regulations, SECTION 401 D. 44. Permitted Uses - Table of Uses, to allow “Seasonal Cabin” in the Rural (RU) Zone by Special Exception.

*Seasonal Cabin: A small residential structure that ~~does not have all year round water availability (because of water service, insulation, heating, etc.), and is used for only the spring, summer~~ **season (May 1st – October 30th) and fall the winter seasons (December 15th – March 15th). In no case shall the structure be used for more than six (6) consecutive months.***

*Seasonal Use: **For the purpose of this use, the summer season is from May 1st – October 30th, and the winter season is from December 15th – March 15th.** A use carried on for the spring (starting May 1), summer, and fall (ending October 31) seasons of the year.*

D.	Retail Business and Service	R	LR	RC	RR	RU	RS	Notes
44.	Seasonal Cabin	N	E	N	N	N E	Y	*See SECTION 413 (As amended 14 March 2017)

Rationale: The attraction to the natural beauty and recreational activities in the Town of Alton during the winter months have been ever-increasing, and by allowing a winter seasonal use, it would accommodate the increase of visitors to the town during that season. The timeframes are designated to limit occupancy for less than six (6) months. Under no circumstances would seasonal cabins be used for permanent residency.

Discussion: Mr. Williams discusses the amendment proposal- this is an attempt to allow space for people to go for the winter season and limit the amount of days by keeping it at 182 days.

**Mr. Williams MOVED the amendment and rationale forward to the public hearing.
 Mr. MacDonald seconded the motion, and it PASSED unanimously.**

PLANNING BOARD PROPOSED AMENDMENT #2:

To amend Article 300 General Provisions, SECTION 328 B., C., & D. Height Restrictions, to allow an increase in the maximum height of “Boathouses/canopied boat slips” to 20 feet by Special Exception.

SECTION 328 HEIGHT RESTRICTIONS

- A. Boathouses/canopied boat slips - a maximum of 15 feet above the reference line for the water body.
- B. ***A boathouse or canopied boat slip higher than provided above, but in no case greater than 20 feet high, may be permitted if granted a Special Exception by the Zoning Board of Adjustment.***

- B. **C.** All other buildings and structures - a maximum height of 35 feet except as provided in **€D.** below. The height is the distance measured above grade to the top of the structure. Grade is the average of the finished ground level of all sides of a building or structure.
- €. **D.** The Zoning Board of Adjustment may grant a Special Exception to the 35-foot height restrictions in any zone provided the structure is any of the following, and does not constitute a hazard to any established public or private airport or heliport; these structures would be: church towers, belfries, monuments, tanks, water and fire towers, silos, cooling towers, ornamental towers and spires, chimney, elevators, bulkheads, smoke stacks, conveyors, flagpoles, and cupolas. Structures regulated under RSA 674:30 are not subject to this ordinance.

Rationale: Currently, boathouses/canopied boat slips are restricted to a maximum of 15 feet in height. The intent is to follow the State's maximum height requirement of 20 feet, and to allow this use by Special Exception. The Zoning Board of Adjustment may grant the Special Exception if they determine, in addition to the Special Exception criteria specified in SECTION 520, that the architectural style, building size, building height, and exterior building materials of a boathouse or canopied boat slip shall be visually compatible with other similar structures in the area.

Discussion: This amendment brings them in line with State rules.

Mr. Cater MOVED the amendment and rationale forward to the public hearing.

Mr. Macdonald seconded the motion, and it PASSED unanimously.

PLANNING BOARD PROPOSED AMENDMENT #3:

To amend Article 300 General Provisions, to add a new section, SECTION 364 Lots in two or more Zoning Districts.

- A. Where a zoning district boundary coincides within ten (10') feet or less of the lot line, the zoning district boundary shall be construed to be the lot line. In any instance where there is doubt as to the location of a zoning district boundary, the Planning Board shall determine the location of such boundary, consistent with the intent of this ordinance and zoning map, and record its findings in the minutes. The frontage or point of access shall determine the applicable zoning district. In the event that there is insufficient frontage or acreage for that district, then the more restrictive requirements shall apply.*

The Zoning Board of Adjustment may grant a Special Exception to allow the zoning requirements in the smaller portion of the lot be applied to the whole lot if a property owner wanted to use a use on the smaller portion of the lot.

If the uses on the larger portion of the lot are more restrictive than that of the smaller portion, the Zoning Board of Adjustment may grant a Special Exception to allow the uses permitted on the smaller portion of the lot to apply to the entire lot, in accordance with Article 500, Section 520, and Special Exceptions.

Rationale: The addition of this ordinance would clarify the issue on what zoning regulations a lot had to abide by if it was divided/split by two (2) different zoning districts.

Discussion:

Mr. Hoopes MOVED the amendment and rationale forward, including the recommendations from Jim Sessler, Town Counsel, to the public hearing.

Mr. Carter seconded the motion, and it PASSED unanimously.

PLANNING BOARD PROPOSED AMENDMENT #4:

To amend Article 400 Zoning Districts Regulations, SECTION 401 A. 5. Permitted Uses - Table of Uses, to strike “Garage, workshop, or shed” and insert “Non-habitable Structure” so it coincides with the definition listed in Article 200 Definitions and with SECTION 360 Non-habitable Structure as a Principal Building on a Lot.

TABLE OF USES

A.	Residential Uses	R	LR	RC	RR	RU	RS	Notes
5.	<i>Non-habitable Structure</i> Garage, workshop, or shed larger than 240 s.f., as principal building on lot	E	E	E	E	E	N	*See SECTION 360 (Added 11 March 2014) (As amended 13 March 2018)

SECTION 360 NON-HABITABLE STRUCTURE AS PRINCIPAL BUILDING ON A LOT

- B. A private garage, workshop or shed larger than provided above may be permitted, per SECTION 401 Permitted Uses - Table of Uses, if a Special Exception is approved by the Zoning Board of Adjustment. The Zoning Board of Adjustment may grant the Special Exception if they determine the following criteria are met in addition to the Special Exception criteria specified in SECTION 520:
 1. The architectural style, building size, building height, and exterior building materials of a private garage or workshop shall be visually compatible with other buildings in the neighborhood; and,
 2. An attic in a private garage or workshop is restricted to storage or workshop use only, must be unfinished floor space, and not used for habitation.
- C. A private garage, workshop or shed larger than provided in A., above, is not permitted in the Recreation Service (RS) Zone.

Definition:

Non-habitable Structure: Any structure that is not used for habitation such as a private garage, a shed, a workshop, a gazebo and similar non-habitable structures.

Rationale: The description of the use listed in the Table of Uses did not coincide with its accompanying definition and section in the Zoning Ordinance, SECTION 360 Non-habitable Structure as a Principal Building on a Lot. Instead of listing the individual types of structures that could be built in accordance with that section, it made sense to list the use as stated in the definition and title of SECTION 360.

Discussion: Only a word change to this amendment and the rationale covers it.

**Mr. Hoopes MOVED the amendment and rationale forward to the public hearing.
Mr. Carter seconded the motion, and it PASSED unanimously.**

PLANNING BOARD PROPOSED AMENDMENT #5:

To amend Article 400 Zoning Districts Regulations, SECTION 401 D. 14. Permitted Uses - Table of Uses, to strike “or Repair Shop”.

TABLE OF USES

A.	Residential Uses	R	LR	RC	RR	RU	RS	Notes
14.	Building Trade or Repair Shop (Excluding barge loading associated w/building trade use)	N	N	Y	N	E	N	(As amended 14 March 2017)

Rationale: By having “Repair Shop” listed in this use, it conflicted with another existing use, “Repair Shop for Appliances”. These uses are allowed/not allowed in different zones, therefore, creating an issue as to where these uses could or could not take place.

Discussion: Word change for this amendment.

**Mr. Hoopes MOVED the amendment and rationale forward to the public hearing.
Mr. Carter seconded the motion, and it PASSED unanimously.**

PLANNING BOARD PROPOSED AMENDMENT #6:

To amend Article 400 Zoning Districts Regulations, SECTION 401 D. 45. Permitted Uses - Table of Uses, to strike “or Warehouse”.

TABLE OF USES

A.	Residential Uses	R	LR	RC	RR	RU	RS	Notes
45.	Self-Storage Facility or Warehouse (Indoor only)	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	

Rationale: By having “or Warehouse” listed in this use, it conflicted with another existing use, “Warehouse and Wholesale Marketing”. These uses are allowed/not allowed in different zones, therefore, creating an issue as to where these uses could or could not take place.

Discussion: We have self-storage covered for outdoors but not indoors, this amendment addresses the indoor storage.

**Mr. Carter MOVED the amendment and rationale forward to the public hearing.
 Mr. Wilder seconded the motion, and it PASSED unanimously.**

PLANNING BOARD PROPOSED AMENDMENT #7:

To amend Article 400 Zoning Districts Regulations, SECTION 401 D. 49. Permitted Uses - Table of Uses, to strike “Travel Trailer Park”.

TABLE OF USES

A.	Residential Uses	R	LR	RC	RR	RU	RS	Notes
49.	Travel Trailer Park/ Recreational Campground or Camping Park	N	N	N	E	E	Y	*See SECTION 355 (As amended 14 March 2017)

Rationale: There is no separate definition listed in the Zoning Ordinance for “Travel Trailer Park” and it is outdated terminology, and it is not included in the definition of “Recreational Campground or Camping Park”, nor is it listed in SECTION 355.

Discussion: This covers old usages, and would remove the wording of Travel Trailer Park.

**Mr. Carter MOVED the amendment and rationale forward to the public hearing.
 Mr. Hoopes seconded the motion, and it PASSED unanimously.**

THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENTS #1.A. – 4.A. ARE ADMINISTRATIVE IN NATURE

1.A . To amend Article 200 Definitions for the following uses:

FDO: *An acronym that shall mean the Floodplain Development Overlay District.* The definition pertains to the Floodplain Development Overlay Districts SECTION 660.

FEMA: [from FDO] *An acronym that shall mean,* The Federal Emergency Management Agency.

2.A.

1. To add to Article 200 Definitions:

Modular-Sectional Home: See Pre-site Built Housing.

Pre-site Built Housing: As defined in RSA 674:31-a, a pre-site built house means any structure designed primarily for residential occupancy which is wholly or in substantial part made, fabricated, formed, or assembled in off-site manufacturing facilities in conformance with the US Department of Housing and Urban Development minimum property standards and local building codes, for installation, or assembly and installation, on the building site. This definition shall not include manufactured housing as defined in RSA 674:31.

2. To amend Article 300 General Provisions, SECTION 350 Manufactured Housing:

SECTION 350 MANUFACTURED *and PRE-SITE BUILT* HOUSING

A. Manufactured Home *Housing*

For health, safety and welfare, manufactured homes not certified as meeting HUD standards are not permitted.

Manufactured homes under 14 feet in width, with flat or rounded roof, and exterior walls not of traditional site-built appearance to be permitted only in Manufactured Home Parks.

B. Modular - Sectional Home/*Pre-site Built Housing*

1. Residential and Lakeshore Residential zones - minimum width of 20 feet.
2. All other zones - minimum width of 14 feet.

Discussion: The Board decided to lump the administrative changes forward and they do not need to be voted on.

3.A. To amend Article 300 General Provisions, SECTION 361 Bunkhouse, to delete “A Bunkhouse” from the beginning of each criteria on the list, and to relist the permitted criteria separate from the not permitted criteria for clarification.

A Bunkhouse is permitted as follows:

1. ~~A Bunkhouse is permitted~~ **O**n a lot accessory to a residential use.
2. ~~A Bunkhouse is not permitted to have any of the following:~~
 - a. ~~A Bathroom;~~
 - b. ~~A Kitchen; or~~
 - c. ~~Pressurized potable water.~~
3. ~~A Bunkhouse m~~ **M**ust comply with the setback requirements.
4. ~~A Bunkhouse cannot be leased, rented, or used as a dwelling unit.~~
5. **3**. A Bunkhouse is counted as an additional bedroom for septic system loading. The following must be met to provide adequate wastewater treatment for a Bunkhouse:
 - a. The septic system for the principal building must be constructed to accommodate the number of bedrooms in both the principal building and the Bunkhouse.
6. ~~A Bunkhouse shall not exceed 260 sq. ft. in area~~
7. ~~A Bunkhouse shall not exceed a single story in height with walls not exceeding eight (8') feet in height.~~
8. ~~A Bunkhouse shall not have attic storage.~~
9. ~~A Bunkhouse shall not have lofts.~~
10. ~~A Bunkhouse shall not have a basement.~~
11. ~~Bunkhouse p~~ **P**ier foundations must be fully enclosed, screened or skirted.
12. ~~A Bunkhouse is permitted~~ **O**n a lot only if the lot is a conforming lot that meets the minimum lot size, minimum shore frontage and minimum road frontage requirements.
13. ~~No more than one (1) Bunkhouse is permitted on any lot.~~
14. ~~A document, with the notarized signature of the landowner, must be recorded at the Belknap County Registry of Deeds specifying and acknowledging the Bunkhouse use restrictions outlined above.~~

A Bunkhouse is not permitted as follows:

1. ***Cannot have any of the following:***
 - a. ***A Bathroom;***
 - b. ***A Kitchen; or***
 - c. ***Pressurized potable water.***
2. ***Cannot be leased, rented, or used as a dwelling unit.***
3. ***Shall not exceed 260 sq. ft. in area.***
4. ***Shall not exceed a single story in height with walls not exceeding eight (8') feet in height.***
5. ***Shall not have attic storage.***
6. ***Shall not have lofts.***
7. ***Shall not have a basement.***
8. ***No more than one (1) Bunkhouse is permitted on any lot.***

A document, with the notarized signature of the landowner, must be recorded at the Belknap County Registry of Deeds specifying and acknowledging the Bunkhouse use restrictions outlined above.

-
-
- 4.A. To amend Article 300 General Provisions, Section 362 Inclusionary Zoning F.1., d. to delete the reference to “Alton’s Class V Road Specifications” in two (2) places and replace it with “Alton Highway Policies and Regulations”.

SECTION 362 INCLUSIONARY ZONING

C. Conditional Use Permit

1. Conditional use approval for relief from the dimensional standards found within the Zoning Ordinance may be granted by the Planning Board (RSA 674:21 II) after proper public notice and public hearing provided that the proposed workforce housing development complies with the following standards:
 - a. That the development reinforces the housing goals set forth in the Alton Master Plan.
 - b. The project shall not detract from either the ecological or visual qualities of the environment.
 - c. There will be no significant adverse impacts resulting from the proposed use upon the public health, safety, and general welfare of the neighborhood and the Town of Alton.
 - d. That the proposed development is located on an existing paved Town road that meets *the minimum requirements of a Alton-Class V Road Specifications, as indicated in the Alton Highway Policies and Regulations*, or will include a road upgrade that meets *the minimum requirements of a Alton’s-Class V Road Specifications, as indicated in the Alton Highway Policies and Regulations*, as an off-site improvement.

Discussion: Ms. Call stated that Mr. Wilder has a comment on 4A Section 362 regarding Class V Road Standards. Mr. Wilder stated he wanted to point out that the Town does not have Class V Road Standards, they have Town Road Standards. Mr. Wilder stated that Class V Road means a Town maintained road.

Mr. Hoopes MOVED to remove the wording Class V Road Specifications and replace it with Alton Highway Policies and Regulations.

4. Design Review (Continued from October 19, 2021)

Case #P21-21 Scott Lawler, P.E., of Norway Plains Associates Inc., Agent for Jeffrey F. Hertel & Van E. Hertel, Sr., Owners	Map 15 Lot 9-3 NH Route 28 N, Miramichie Hill Road (f/k/a Hogdon Road)	Design Review/Major Site Plan Residential Rural (RR) Zone
--	---	--

The applicants requested Case #P21-21 to be continued to December 21, 2021.

5. Conceptual Consultation (Continued from October 19, 2021)

Case #P21-23 Ryan L. Heath, LLC, Agent for Ron & Dorene Charles, Owners	Map 31 Lot 30 Wilbert Way	Conceptual Consultation/Site Plan Residential Commercial (RC) Zone
--	------------------------------	---

The Chair read the case into the record.

Mr. Heath, who is the sole member of Ryan L. Heath, LLC, came forward to the table to discuss a conceptual proposal for Wilbert Way. He stated he recently purchased the property and apologized for the two continuances as he was waiting for the survey results. Wilbert Way was a private road owned by the Town but not maintained by the Town. He stated there are two Ranch style homes located on the property which are currently being rented. Mr. Heath explained in the back is the bulk of the acres and it terraces off, and the slopes are not ideal but the road ends at the last structure. The proposal for the new housing would be right into the clearing at the end of the road where it exists right now and he would like to extend the roadway into the parking area in order to utilize the topography and the clearing so each building and every unit has ground floor access; the lower level of parking lots will service the first lower level of buildings, 30 x 30 units, 2 bedroom, 1 bath and the parking would go in at the ground level for the first set of units and you would then drive up and around to the second row of parking, which would give the tenants ground floor access to the second floor units. He stated that each footprint of the two story buildings would be 30 x 90 and the rectangles in between the buildings are designated septic space so they can put the systems within the condensed area of the whole complex.

Mr. Carter stated that there is a grade change and it looks like the lowest parking lot is going to sit about 45 feet above Main Street; Mr. Heath confirmed this and stated the existing road has quite a grade to the second part and then starts to plateau off a bit. Mr. Carter stated the intent here is to have the units serviced by municipal water and he assumed they will have to be sprinkled; Mr. Williams stated there is no rule for that. Mr. Carter stated he is concerned about the water pressure getting up and Mr. Williams stated it should be fine because the units are quite a bit below the reservoir. Mr. Heath stated both units that currently exist are being serviced by municipal water and he will not have to extend it as it has already been extended up; Mr. Carter and Mr. Williams interjected and stated he will need to change the diameter and get a larger service line up there. Mr. Williams asked if the current buildings on the property are going to stay; Mr. Heath stated yes, but they will be improved along with the rest of the project. He stated part of the proposal is to cut behind the first unit and crane the whole thing up onto a full foundation as it is very close to the roadway. Mr. Williams asked if he has spoken to DOT about access; he stated he has not yet and Mr. Williams recommended that he speak to DOT before going any further with his project. Mr. Carter interjected and agreed stating it is going to be a difficult in and out, especially with the traffic flow.

Mr. Wilder stated that he looked at the property on Google Maps and noticed there is a stub at the end of the last cul-de-sac which could be a potential access point and possibly something Mr. Heath should consider as it might be more desirable and might prevent the heavy flow of traffic. Mr. Heath stated that he has dealt with the DOT in the past regarding road cuts and increased use and in this instance, this is not a driveway cut but a recognized road adopted by the Town which is in his favor and DOT has to take into consideration that this is not a regular driveway access. Mr. Heath stated that he has considered this as an alternate access point but has not discussed it with the current owner.

Mr. Heath stated there is down brush from the previous owners and he would like permission to clean it up because we are coming into the winter season. Ms. Call stated according to the regulations, clear cutting cannot be done ahead of time but being Mr. Heath did not cut the trees, she does not see any issue with allowing him to clean it up. The Board agreed.

Board took a 5-minute recess...

6. Design Review (Continued from October 19, 2021)

<p>Case #P21-27 Stephanie Richard, P.E. of Changing Seasons Engineering, PLLC, Agent for Alton Bay Christian Conference Center, Bradley Smith</p>	<p>Map 34 Lot 33 Beacon Avenue</p>	<p>Design Review/Major Site Plan Residential (R) Zone</p>
---	--	---

The Chair read the case into the record.

Stephanie Richard, PE, of Changing Seasons Engineering, PLLC, as agent and Bradley Smith as Executive Director of the Alton Bay Christian Center came to the table to present the case. Ms. Call gives the Board a brief recap from the last meeting and stated there was an issue on noticing two individuals, so Ms. Richard dropped off an updated waiver form and a letter requesting Sheets 1 & 2 be removed from the submittal, so this would take care of not having to notice the original plan preparer and the soil scientist; In lieu of that she submitted the soils report to cover the fact that the soils were not indicated on Sheet 2. Ms. Call stated there are also additional waivers they are requesting due to the fact that the two front pages are not being submitted, the Board will need to review the waivers but would not vote on them as this is a Design Review application. Mr. Williams stated he does not have a problem with the two sheets being deleted. Mr. Carter stated the intent is to add three cottages on the grounds and they have identified where they will be placed and the size and look of the cottages but he thinks it would be helpful to know what the restrictions and guidelines are for them instead of doing a flat waiver of the requirement. Ms. Call asked the Board to clarify which waivers they are discussing; Mr. Carter stated the waiver is 4.01 F.11 & F.12. The Board questioned whether the land was located outside of the shoreland; Ms. Richard responded it is located outside of the shoreland. Ms. Call suggested Ms. Richard add a note to the plan stating that it is not located within the shoreland protection overlay district. Mr. Hoopes addressed the septic system and noted that it is a new one and asked if they have septic capacity to cover 24 units; Ms. Richard stated they have a system that is sufficient to cover the units. Mr. Williams stated the amount of gallons per day available and where they

stand with building the three units should be listed on the plan. Mr. Carter stated the Board is not voting on the waivers tonight, only advising; Mr. Hoopes stated he does not have a problem with #4, #7, #9 or #24.

Mr. Williams asked if the buildings are 20 feet apart and Ms. Richard confirmed they are 20 feet apart, Sheet 3 of the Plan should show the 20 foot separation. Mr. Smith stated the cottages are only allowed to have one and a half floors, nor more than two bedrooms.

Mr. Carter addressed the case notes which stated the PE stamp was provided but it is not in the paperwork and noted that it will come later on in the process; also he wanted to verify the fire protection measures were in place; Ms. Richard stated that each cottage has a 20-foot separation as a fire protection measure but if they need to do more, she will work with the fire department. Mr. Carter stated that was a passive approach and that fire protection also includes a centralized fire alarm and a sprinkler system; Ms. Call interjected and stated this is a proposal to approve the building of the three cottages, which is a little different than your average site plan.

Ms. Call addressed Mr. Carter regarding waivers F.11 & F.12 and asked if the Board was inclined to waive them or do they require additional documentation; Mr. Carter stated he would like additional documentation, possibly a write up of their guidelines and what the limitations are within the Center. Ms. Call addressed Ms. Richard and Mr. Smith and suggested adding this as a note on the plan and a list reflecting what is needed; Regarding waiver #26, Ms. Call stated it is not needed because it is not located in that district. Mr. Carter interjected regarding an additional note to add regarding the septic's capacity, location and type of drainage system elements and the overlay district should be noted on the plan as well. Ms. Richard asked if Section 602 of the zoning ordinance addresses any of these items; Mr. Hoopes stated it will direct her where to find the information. Ms. Call recommended that Ms. Richard review that section of the zoning ordinance and stated the Planning Department does have a map in the office that she can reference for guidance.

Ms. Richard asked about next steps in the process and Mr. Hoopes stated they will need to submit a Major Site Plan application. Ms. Richard inquired about the requirement to list all abutters on the plan because they have so many abutters and it would be difficult to list all of them on the plans; Mr. Williams stated that most of the abutters are located outside of the property and he does not feel it is necessary. Ms. Call stated the list of abutters is already in the file, so a note with the location of the list of abutters is sufficient.

Mr. MacDonald asked about the comments from the Water Department; Ms. Call read the Water Department's comment, "all new homes are required to have a meter and remote reader installed and establish an account with the Water Department; new services need to be constructed to their specs". The Board requested they add an As-Built on the current plan regarding the water line.

Ms. Richard stated they will make the changes and submit the Major Site Plan Application.

7. Completeness Review of Application and Public Hearing if Application is Accepted as Complete

Case #P21-29 Belinda McLin, Agent for Linda Breese, Owner	Map 15 Lot 48 6 Gilmans Corner Road	Final Minor Site Plan Rural (RU) Zone
--	--	--

The Chair read the case into the record.

Belinda McLin approached the table to discuss her application for possible approval. Mr. Carter read the details of the application and asked Ms. McLin to allow the Board time to go through her application before deciding if the application is complete.

**Mr. Hoopes MOVED to accept the application for Case #P21-29 as complete.
 Mr. Williams seconded the motion, and it PASSED unanimously.**

Mr. Hoopes stated “he is familiar with the location of the house as he drives by it every day and stated the only reason there are several reports in the back here from the Police and whatnot is simply because it was once a drug house, Ms. McLin responded and stated that was not accurate, and Mr. Hoopes stated, yes, it was raided several times and Ms. McLin responded, no, my house, how many years ago, and Mr. Carter interjected and stated, are you sure you have the right house and Mr. Hoopes responded, yep, 10 years ago and Ms. McLin responded, no, my house has never been raided, and Mr. Hoopes stated, I believe so and Ms. McLin responded, by whom? Mr. Williams interjected and stated this is not a conversation we need to have and Mr. Carter agreed and stated, they did not need to have that conversation now. Mr. Hoopes interjected and stated, not your house, the house you are in now and Ms. McLin stated, I’ve been in that house for almost 20 years and it used to be the Sanborn house and it used to be Sanborn’s Garage as well and there was never a drug raid at my house, I mean I’ve had some issues at that house but... Mr. Hoopes interjected and stated, wasn’t there somebody there between you and the Sanborns...Mr. Carter interjected and stated, Tom, let’s get this back on track”.

Mr. Hoopes stated there was a question as to the loading on the septic system; Mr. Carter interjected and stated there is a question about the number of occupants. Mr. Williams stated that a three-bedroom house allows for 450 gallons per day; he did research and found that it would be 150 gallons per chair with 20 gallons per operator, so it would require 170 gallons in addition to the 450 gallons a day. Ms. McLin stated that she does not use a large amount of water on her customers as she usually sprays their hair down with a water bottle so she will not be using a lot of water, but if the septic needs to be pumped more, she will do so as she does not want her septic to fail. Mr. Williams stated that the regulation showed 150 gallons a day per chair, and that this regulation is from 1972; Mr. Hoopes stated you have to look at the number of bedrooms, the amount of water per occupant (150 gallons per day) and also add in 50 gallons per bedroom for a three bedroom house, this amount exceeds the regulated amount of 450 gallons per day.

Mr. Williams recommended Ms. McLin obtain an approved septic design so she can move forward with her minor site plan for the salon. Mr. Williams stated she will need this for the extra volume in case the septic does fail. Ms. McLin stated she lives alone in the home and is not renting any rooms. Mr. MacDonald explained if the septic fails, your approved design is already in place; the cost of the septic design is about \$1,500 and \$300 to the State. Mr. Carter further clarified that even though she lives alone, they must go by the regulations for a three-bedroom home. Ms. McLin stated she will have up to 25 clients a week and parking is not a problem. She stated she will hang a lit sign (3 feet by 1 ½ feet) on her tree in her yard. Ms. Call stated the Planning Department can provide her a list of septic designers in Town.

Mr. Williams interjected and stated, "McLin's house is located at Gilmans Corner and Finnethy, and yep she's the corner lot... Mr. Sample stated, you've been there for 20 years, and Ms. McLin stated yes; Mr. Sample responded, were you married? Ms. McLin responded nope. Mr. Sample stated, the guy with the boats and all that... Ms. McLin stated, that's all gone, Mr. Sample responded, I can't think of his name and Ms. McLin responded, who cares and that's a dead issue. Mr. Wilder stated, I think we're going into an area we don't need to....Ms. McLin stated I can't believe this is the topic of conversation, drugs and being married, okay. Mr. Carter stated, apparently there is some stigma attached to this particular property and Ms. McLin interjected and stated, I don't know if the house is haunted somehow or what it is but... Mr. Williams stated, we just don't need to go there and Mr. Carter agreed"....

Ms. Call stated that she sat with Ms. McLin to go over the application checklist, and she has everything needed for the plan. Ms. McLin stated "Ms. Call is a great asset and she does a good job". Mr. Carter agreed and Mr. Hoopes stated, don't say too much we'll have to give her a raise. Ms. McLin stated, "Considering what I'm sitting here going through, you should because I feel like I'm on the chopping block".

Public input.... No public input.

Mr. Carter recommended that Ms. McLin contact Paul Galinous, Jr. to revise the plans as he previously installed the new septic system in 2005 and he should have copies of everything which will be less costly.

After due hearing, Mr. Williams MOVED that the Alton Planning Board hereby approves Case #P21-29 for Belinda McLin, as agent for Linda Breese, owner, for a Home Business to operate a one-chair beauty salon located at Map 15 Lot 48, 6 Gilmans Corner Road, Alton, NH, with the following conditions:

CONDITIONS PRECEDENT

The following conditions precedent must be satisfied prior to the Planning Board Chair signing the plans:

1. Submission of revised plans in the number required by the Site Plan Regulations and *that include all of the Checklist corrections listed under PLAN REVIEW in this Planner Review, any corrections as noted at this hearing, and any waivers granted by the Board.*
2. Addition of a note to the site plan prior to plan signing as follows:
"This site plan is subject to the Conditions of Approval itemized in the November 16, 2021, Notice of Decision on file at the Town of Alton Planning Department."
3. Addition of a note to the site plan prior to plan signing by the Planning Board Chair as follows:
"This site plan contains a total of ___ sheets. (List number of sheets included with the plan). In combination, these plans constitute in their entirety the site plan as approved by the Town of Alton Planning Board. All sheets are on file at the Town of Alton Planning Department."

4. Obtain and provide to the Alton Building Department a septic design approved by NH DES, to encompass the additional loading. This septic is not to be built currently, but would be available in the case of septic failure.

SUBSEQUENT CONDITIONS

The following subsequent conditions shall be met during construction and on an on-going basis:

1. All site improvements are to be completed as per the approved site plans, prior to the issuance of any Certificate of Occupancy per this Notice of Decision and Section 1.22 of the Site Plan Review Regulations.
2. The approved hours of operation for the salon are Tuesday through Saturday, 10:00 am - 8:00 pm.
3. The applicant shall comply with all of the Town of Alton's Site Plan Review Regulations.
4. The approval is based upon the plans, specifications and testimony submitted to the Planning Board. Any alterations, additions or changes to the plans are not authorized and require additional Planning Board approval.
5. A site plan which has been approved, conditionally or otherwise, may be revoked, in whole or in part, by the Planning Board when an applicant or successor in interest to the applicant has performed work, erected a structure or structures, or established a use of land, which fails to conform to the statements, plans, or specifications upon which the approval was based, or has materially violated any requirements or conditions of such approval.
6. Once any and all conditions of approval have been met and the Chairman of the Planning Board or his designee signs a site plan, the applicant has twelve (12) months from the date of signing to start construction and, unless a different schedule is approved by the Board, must complete construction within twenty-four (24) months, if applicable.
7. Site plan approvals that have not started construction within twelve (12) months shall automatically expire, at which time no building permits shall be issued, unless an extension has been formally requested and granted by the Board. Normally the Board shall not grant more than one extension per project, shall only grant an extension for reasonable cause, and shall normally not grant an extension for more than six months.
8. No site may be occupied or used until a Conditional or Permanent Certificate of Occupancy Permit has been issued by the Code Official in accordance with Section 1.22 of the Site Plan Review Regulations.

ACTIVE AND SUBSTANTIAL DEVELOPMENT OR BUILDING AND SUBSTANTIAL COMPLETION OF IMPROVEMENTS:

1. Within 24 months after the date of approval, the following items must be completed in order to constitute "active and substantial development or building" pursuant to RSA 674:39,I, relative to the 5-year exemption to regulation/ordinance changes:
Obtain sign permit.
2. The following items must be completed in order to constitute "substantial completion of the improvements" pursuant to RSA 674:39,II, relative to final vesting:
Obtain sign permit.

Unless otherwise approved by the Board, the applicant shall have one (1) year from the date of the meeting at which the application is approved with conditions to complete any conditions precedent that are required prior to signing and recording the subdivision plat. Failure to complete any conditions within the one (1) year timeframe shall invalidate the Board's approval, unless an extension is approved by the Board under Section IX, A. 2. of the Town of Alton Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. MacDonald seconded the motion, and it PASSED unanimously.

Other Business:

1. **Old Business:** None.
2. **New Business:**
 - a. **Approval of Minutes:** Planning Board Meeting minutes of October 19, 2021

Ms. Call stated she did not have minutes from the October 19, 2021, meeting to approve as she has been extremely busy. The Board commended Ms. Call for all that she does as they realize how hard she has worked with each committee-ZAC, CIP and juggling all of this while still being available for the Board and Selectmen. Ms. Call thanked the Board for their appreciation of all that she does on a daily basis.

3. **Correspondence for the Board's review/discussion/action:**
 - a. Board to review and approve the wording of a proposed Warrant Article for a "Master Plan Consultant" to assist with the completion of the Master Plan update. **(Moved up to beginning of agenda)**
4. **Correspondence for the Board's information:**

Any Other Business to Come Before the Board

1. The Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Committee and the Master Plan Committee to discuss the Town's capital building needs based upon the input of the Town of Alton's Department Heads.
2. Board to vote on whether non-year-round residents may sit on Committees.

Mr. Carter stated this recently came up in relation to Short-Term Rentals and stated there is a person who is a property owner in Alton who was participating in the ZAC Committee meetings and they wanted to be on the Committee for Short-Term Rentals. Ms. Call stated she did research by going through the previous minutes and there was no indication that committee members had to be year

round residents. She stated that her concern is they would not be here for a meeting if they were not year round residents. The other Board members argued that they need a different point of view so perhaps they should be allowed. Mr. Carter stated they do not have to be on a Committee to participate or have a voice. The other Board members suggested to alleviate the concern they allow the non-year-round residents participate by Zoom. Mr. Carter stated they have the opportunity to attend these meetings, to be a voice that is heard at the meetings to influence these committees and contribute in that manner, it doesn't mean they have to be on the Committee in order to contribute and be heard. Mr. Hoopes stated they are still part of the community even though they do not vote; Mr. Carter stated that is a contradiction by saying they are a part of the community just because they own a piece of property here in Alton that does not mean they are a part of this community; they could well be an individual that purchased property to use it as an Air B&B or Short-Term Rental. Mr. Hoopes interjected and stated these are participatory people, rather than a resident that does not want to participate. Mr. MacDonald stated he is in favor of allowing them to participate via Zoom because they have enough trouble obtaining volunteers to help with the committees; Ms. Call stated that was another point she wanted to address regarding this issue. Mr. Carter stated that if they elect to allow them to participate via Zoom, they have to address the IT issues surrounding Zoom.

Mr. Hoopes MOVED to allow non-resident tax payers to serve on committees. Mr. MacDonald seconded the motion, and it PASSED unanimously.

Public Input on Non-case Specific Planning Issues

Adjournment

At 9:07 +/- P.M., Mr. Hoopes MOVED to adjourn.
Mr. MacDonald seconded the motion, and it PASSED unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Trisha DeRoche
Planning Secretary

Minutes approved as presented: December 21, 2021