TOWN OF ALTON
PLANNING BOARD
PUBLIC HEARING MEETING
Tuesday, October 20, 2026, at 6:00 PM
Alton Town Hall

CALL TO ORDER

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

ROLL CALL OF BOARD MEMBERS

Douglas Brown (Acting Chair)
Tom Diveny
Mark Manning
Jack Sleeper (Selectman's Representative)
Roger Sample
Dan Pierce
Tom Hoopes
Ava Drost

OTHERS PRESENT

Cameron Armstrong (Town Planner)
Tom Varney
Josh Thibeault
Gary Nadeau
Dan Devereaux
Kelly Sullivan
Jeff Green
Paul Zuzgo
Dick Shea
Kevin Ashe
Jonathon Sherrill

APPOINTMENT OF ALTERNATES

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chair Brown asked if there were any changes to the agenda. There were none.

MOTION: To APPROVE the Planning Board Agenda as listed. Motion by Mr. Sleeper. Mr. Manning SECONDs. Chair Brown asked the Board for a vote. Board voted UNANIMOUSLY.

1. Joint Meeting with the Capital Improvements Program Committee (CIP) of 2027-2032
The CIP Committee will present their recommendations for the 2027-2032 CIP Plan to the Alton Planning Board. Copies of the draft CIP Plan are available on the Town's website at www.alton.nh.gov and in the Planning Department. Public Hearing date and snow date to be scheduled.

Mr. Armstrong stated he was sitting in for Mr. Frank Rich who is the Chair of the CIP Board. Mr. Rich was unable to attend due to surgery. The co-chair, who works for the Alton Fire Department, was on a call at the time of this meeting and was also unable to attend. Mr. Armstrong did his best to represent the wishes of the Board. Mr. Sample is also a member of the CIP Board so he was able to provide any corrections needed.

Mr. Armstrong stated that the Board has had five meetings and has heard the requests from all of the departments throughout the Town who utilize CIP. He stated that CIP is any item, equipment or project that has a life span of five years or greater in cost than $10,000 or more. It can be added to the CIP for future capital planning purposes. The current requested amount is $2,996,920 which represents $1.32 per thousand-dollar valuation of a home.

He requested the Board view Page 13 where they would see a yellow line, a green line, and an orange line. He explained that the yellow line is the proposed CIP impact. It is not a cumulative amount. It is a per year amount. In 2027 the per year amount would be $1.32 which would represent (in the per $1,000 ratio) an impact on a $500,000 home would be $663.93 and on a $350,000 home $464.80. He stated he would be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Diveny asked if the total amount was $2.9 million give or take. Mr. Armstrong stated that was correct. Mr. Diveny asked what had changed from the previous year. Mr. Armstrong stated that there were quite a few things last year that went unfunded. He stated there was a request from IT that went unfunded. A request from the Fire Department Building fund went unfunded. Mr. Diveny asked what the amount of those requests were.

- $500,000 was requested by the Fire Department for equipment CRF went unfunded.
- $160,000 was requested by the Highway Department CRF went unfunded.
- $15,000 in the Alton sidewalk fund CRF went unfunded.
- $10,000 for the highway sand shed went unfunded.
- $45,000 was requested for Grounds and Maintenance, Vehicles and Equipment which was partially funded. The request was for $45,000. It was partially funded at $25,000.
- $3500 into the Assessing Department Vehicle CRF went unfunded.
- $3500 of the Building Department vehicle CRF went unfunded.
- $20,000 for the Police Building Expansion went unfunded.
- $35,000 into the IT CRF went unfunded.

Mr. Diveny understood that none of this was new. Mr. Armstrong stated that the only additions to this year's chart was that the library has approached the CIP for a roof replacement that they would like done by 2032. They are starting to build capital reserves to get that done. Chair Brown asked if that was the only change. Mr. Armstrong stated it was the only new addition to the plan. All others were a continuation.

Mr. Armstrong stated that if the Board had a plan from last year some modifications have

been made to the plan. He stated that the Grounds and Maintenance Vehicles shifted into the combined department model of the DPW. The sheet may look different, but the plan and projects are largely the same.

Mr. Diveny asked for clarification regarding funds withdrawn from the CRF. He asked if that meant the money was withdrawn and spent. Mr. Armstrong stated that was the plan-year of CRF withdrawals. He explained when you have a line item for computers in the IT Department, it shows two withdrawals, one in '27 and one in '28 which means they're going to take money out of that fund in 2027 and 2028 to execute that project. Mr. Diveny understood that to mean the money has not yet been spent. Mr. Armstrong stated this was the plan for when the money would be spent. Mr. Diveny asked if it was approximately a 19% increase. Mr. Armstrong agreed. He stated it was largely because of the $660,000 that was unfunded last year between the Fire Department equipment and Highway Department equipment.

Chair Brown asked if there was any discussion about trying to cut that back further by the committee to try to reduce that percentage. Mr. Armstrong stated that the CIP Committee has already cut from their last meeting $433,000 from what was already asked of the CIP Board. They cut $233,000 from the Department of Public Works and $200,000 from the Fire equipment. Mr. Diveny asked if that was already reflected in this chart. Mr. Armstrong stated it was. Chair Brown commented that it was still a 19% increase. Mr. Armstrong stated that looking through the history of this and considering the cost, in speaking with the CIP Board, they tried to stay around $1.00. The math almost works out perfectly. Two or three years ago there was a $500,000 increase to the line item which is the highway reconstruction road paving fund. If that $500,000 was (excluded?) it gets you down to the $1.00 amount. He did not recommend the Planning Board touch that money. He stated that with that item moving the amount that much another $500,000 would need to be backed out of to get down to the $1.00 goal. Chair Brown asked if there were any other questions from the Board.

Mr. Hoopes asked if the Board's role in this meeting was to vote to push this forward to the Selectmen. Mr. Armstrong explained this was merely an informational session. The next meeting would be a public hearing on this matter before moving on the Budget Committee. Chair Brown asked if that would be at the next Planning Board meeting. Mr. Armstrong stated it would be in November.

Mr. Manning asked for clarification on the base number of how many thousands of dollars' worth of real estate has increased. Mr. Armstrong mentioned that was one of the hard parts of the assessment year. He stated it is roughly speculation. He stated numbers have come out. He did not have the cumulative total at that time because numbers were released the day prior to this meeting or same day. He stated he could get those numbers for the next meeting. Mr. Manning mentioned it would be interesting to know. Chair Brown agreed it would be beneficial to have that. Mr. Manning commented that Mr. Armstrong did good work preparing this information.

Mr. Armstrong stated the only other thing he would add to this was on the back of Page 13

there were some numbers there which were a rough calculation that he did tracking what the CIP spend is and adjusting it for inflation. When his data started in 2018, they were about $100,000 short of just covering inflation for what their spending was. He explained that to equal what they were getting in 2018, they would need to spend $100,000 more this year. Mr. Manning asked if the inflation was 3.4%. Mr. Armstrong stated in the chart on the track line 2018 1.9%, he extrapolated over the years. The largest share of that being in 2021 and 2022 where there was almost 13%-14% inflation. Mr. Manning asked for clarification as to why Mr. Armstrong put that in. Mr. Armstrong explained it was for posterity's sake. He realized it was difficult to ask for more money but to show that with inflation eating into every aspect of what municipal budgets were doing, they are on track for covering what they need to, but to cut even more could seriously jeopardize operations.

Mr. Manning asked if he was right to summarize by saying that at an inflation rate of 3.4% they were being asked for an increase of approximately 20%. Mr. Armstrong agreed. Chair Brown stated that the majority of that was for the paving. Mr. Armstrong stated the $500,000 is what brings them down to that $1.00. Mr. Manning stated it is more than paving it is also for the Fire Department. Mr. Armstrong stated they would have to find roughly $100,000 throughout the entire budget and strip that out to meet that $1.00. Chair Brown stated that there was no action at this point.

2. PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE ADOPTION OF THE TOWN OF ALTON PLANNING BOARD UPDATED SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS

Mr. Armstrong stated as far as the subdivision regulations were concerned, as was discussed at the last meeting, this is the addition of the language to create the Technical Review Committee which would be the introduction of the step rather than getting those department head review sheets sent around to all of the departments to comment on, it would provide an opportunity for applicants to come and meet with department heads to address the Town to address their plans. That provides an opportunity to get feedback in real time with all the department heads who touch these plans in the room together.

Mr. Sample noted that it was suggested they meet 10 days prior to the meeting. He asked how the applicants would be able to get something accomplished in 10 days. Mr. Armstrong stated that this stage comes before Design Review. That would leave ample time to approach it in Design Review or to do it as part of the final application process. It is no different than when they get the sheet. This way provides the information in person. He added that the intention of this is to also craft a document that comes out of these meetings that he would draft for the Board to go over all the technical points from the members of the committee. Mr. Hoopes added that it would be for the records as well. Mr. Sample stated that technically they got those anyway. He was not present when this was discussed previously. He felt it was just having a meeting before the meeting.

Mr. Armstrong stated that the purpose of the TRC is to address the substantive issues in the room with the applicant rather than just giving them a sheet of paper that says what they need to address. These meetings are conducted throughout many municipalities. He has worked

in many municipalities that have had these and they work wonderfully to address problems. Mr. Sleeper stated that it ensures completeness before the meeting so that it doesn't waste the Board's time on something that was missed.

Chair Brown asked if everyone on the CRC was in agreement and willing to commit the time to doing this. Mr. Armstrong stated they were already filling out the sheets anyways. Mr. Hoopes stated that it is not really something that is going to add another month to an application. Mr. Armstrong stated it was not their intention. Chair Brown stated the intent was to have a face to face with the applicant. Mr. Sleeper stated it was more streamlined.

Mr. Sample commented that all of these people have to get together and have a meeting. Chair Brown wondered how efficient that would be. Mr. Armstrong mentioned with the advent of technology these meetings could be held over Zoom, if necessary. Mr. Sleeper asked if these meetings typically happened during the workday when they were already in the building. Mr. Armstrong stated that was correct. Mr. Sleeper stated that all that was needed was for the applicant to show up. Chair Brown anticipated a lot of Zoom calls to make this work.

Mr. Manning stated that the last time this was discussed he asked a similar question. His concern was about where people would find the extra time to do this. He stated that Mr. Armstrong assured him that this would be more efficient than what they're doing in their regular jobs. He stated it was awesome that they have the spare time to do this.

Mr. Armstrong mentioned that if it does not work out it is something that can be removed from the books. He had worked with other municipalities with a larger territory that this had worked well for and he had hoped that this would help streamline and improve the process for Alton. Mr. Manning suggested they try it. He agreed that it was a meeting before the meeting, but it could make things more efficient. Mr. Sample stated concerns for the people that had to attend the meeting. He agreed they could try it. Chair Brown asked if they should try it for six months on a trial basis.

3. PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE ADOPTION OF THE TOWN OF ALTON PLANNING BOARD UPDATED SITE PLAN REGULATIONS

Chair Brown asked if Mr. Armstrong would like to address the Board about Site Plan Regulations. Mr. Armstrong stated that this is just the introduction of the same TRC Committee as well as adding language in for Special Flood Protection Provisions. Flood Protection Provision language was a mandate that came down from the State DES. He stated that that language and Zoning Codes needed an update. Chair Brown stated they could try it for six months on a trial basis and if it needs to be modified, they could revisit it. Mr. Manning asked Mr. Armstrong if this would help to avoid meetings because everything would be done and complete upfront. Mr. Armstrong stated that an example of that is during this meeting there is a continued application because of issues that have arisen from the Site Plan that was presented to the Board. If there was an opportunity to meet with the applicant as well as the agent before the meeting to discuss those it could all have been addressed in

one meeting and they wouldn't be in the position of continuing an item for a month, essentially delaying someone.

Mr. Hoopes asked if they had any Federal Flood Hazard maps. Mr. Armstrong was not aware of any. He received an email around the first week that he was on the job stating that this language needed to be added to the Site Plan regulations and the Zoning Code. Mr. Sleeper stated they were essentially replacing the 100-year flood plan. Mr. Armstrong commented the SFHA. Mr. Sleeper commented with regard to the technical board that they would all have their hands on the application at some point anyway, so they are theoretically already making that time, it is just making that time more collectively. Mr. Armstrong agreed. Chair Brown stated that they would need to prepare for the meeting in advance. That would be an additional commitment on their part, being realistic. He asked if anyone was opposed to trying it. There were no objections. Mr. Armstrong stated that these were public hearings items so there is no need to vote. Chair Brown asked if there were any comments from the public regarding these items. There were no comments from the public. Public closed.

MOTION: To ADOPT the subdivision regulations document dated 9/8/2026 as stated with the provision that it be done on a trial basis for 6 months under Mr. Armstrong's tutelage. In 6 months they can review the results and decide whether to go forward. Motion by Mr. Manning. Mr. Pierce SECONDs. The Board votes unanimously.

MOTION: To ACCEPT the changes to the Site Plan Review Regulations document as adopted on 12/18/2012 with the same provision as the prior that we accept Cam's recommendation for the Technical Review Committee and we look at the impact after 6 months. We will decide at that point whether we will go forward. We also accept the changes to item 5.11 which is Special Flood Protection provisions as required by the State, accept those as of now. Moton by Mr. Manning. Mr. Pierce SECONDs. The Board votes unanimously.

4. <u>Acceptance and Review of Application and Public Hearing if Application is Accepted and Complete</u>

Case #P26-25	**Map 21 Lots 29-4 & 29-6 43 Four Seasons Drive and 57 Four Seasons Drive**	**Lot Line Adjustment Lakeshore Residential Zone (LR)**
Verdantas, Kevin Ashe, LLS, Agent for Michael & Andrea Duloc (1/2 Int), Joseph & Despina McNulty (1/2 Int), Owners and POTAMI, LLC, Andrea Duloc & Despina McNulty, Members		

Proposal: To adjust lot lines for two (2) lots of record, with Map 21 Lot 29-4 adjusted from .85AC to 1.15AC, and Lot 29-6 adjusted from 13.37AC to 13.07AC.

Mr. Armstrong stated there was one waiver attached to this application. Article 7F7H.

MOTION: To the waiver request on Case #P26-25 be allowed as stated that there would be a hardship due to cost of showing on existing lots. Motion by Mr. Manning. Mr. ??? SECONDs. The Board votes unanimously.

MOTION: To ACCEPT the application #P26-25 as COMPLETE for discussion. Motion by Mr. Manning. Mr. Sleeper SECONDs. The Board votes unanimously.

(Mr. Ashe speaking off Mic) Michael & Andrea Duloc and Joseph & Despina McNulty as individuals they own these two lots, and the two women, Andrea and Despina are the principles of POTAMI LLC, which owns this lot, the bigger lot. The two lots are owned by McNulty and Duloc together. This proposal is a simple boundary line adjustment to eliminate this orange boundary line. The purpose, apart from making the smaller lot more in accordance with Zoning regulations, gives it more shore frontage and more area, it also makes all the improvements that are pertinent to this house. As it is now, the driveway, building and footbridge area are encroaching on the lot. It would leave Lot 6 without any encroachments and give them more options for what they want to do with that bigger lot. They may end up selling it or developing it. Originally, there was a house on the back lot that was razed a number of years ago. In his cover letter he mentioned the year that it was razed. There is no septic system but there is an existing well. Otherwise, the lot is undeveloped. The lot has an approved septic system and a well on the lot. Regarding the monuments for the points for the new boundary line they did that prior to this meeting, and he didn't have time to revise the plan. He's hoping for a conditional approval pending receiving the MyLoc. He asked the Board if there were any questions.

Mr. Hoopes stated he could not find on the map where the access to Map 21 Lot 29-6 is. Mr. Ashe stated the access is on Homewood Dr. Mr. Hoopes asked how that was shown on the big map. Mr. Ashe demonstrated frontage on Homewood Dr. Mr. Hoopes asked if it could be demonstrated on the other map. Mr. Sample stated it is not on the map.

Chair Brown asked if it was a conforming lot. Mr. Ashe (Spoke off mic). Mr. Sample asked if there were three actual lots currently and basically what would be done would be to make the middle lot more conforming. Mr. Ashe agreed. Mr. Sample stated he could see multiple reasons why that should be done. Mr. Hoopes stated there's no access to the waterfront on the larger lot. Mr. Ashe spoke off mic. He demonstrated it on the map for the Board. He stated a big portion of this lot was added to the small lot about 25 years ago.

Chair Brown stated that for the record there were no issues with department reviews. Mr. Armstrong stated there were not. Chair Brown asked if the Board had any other questions.

Chair Brown asked if there was any input from the public regarding this case. There was none.

MOTION: To APPROVE Case #P26-25 lot line adjustment of two lots. Motion by Mr. Sample. Mr. Manning SECONDs. The Board votes unanimously.

Case #P26-26 Prospect Mountain Survey, Paul Zuzgo, Agent for GT Nadeau Properties, LLC, Gary Nadeau, Manager	**Map 9 Lot 16** **New Durham Road**	**Final Minor Subdivision** **Residential Rural Zone (RR)**

Proposal: To subdivide the parent lot of 62.5AC that is in two towns into two (2) lots of record with the parent lot being 29.9AC and the proposed lot in next town being 32.6AC.

Chair Brown asked if the submission was complete. Mr. Armstrong mentioned there were six waiver requests with this application that are being considered. This property splits both Alton and New Durham. The requested subdivision is on the municipal boundary line with New Durham. He stated this has received conditional approval from New Durham at this point with the condition that the Planning Board in Alton approves this. In compliance with State law he reached out to New Durham's Planning Department to make sure there was nothing in their code book that would prevent this and they said there wasn't anything in their code book that would prevent Alton from accepting this subdivision. Chair Brown stated both towns are in accord with this. Mr. Armstrong agreed.

Chair Brown recommended they deal with the waivers first. Beginning 7.D.1.1, 7.D.1.J ??? jurisdiction of wetland, delineations, special flood hazard area 7.D1.K, aquifer protection overlay district which is 7.D.1.1, centerline profile 7.E.2.J.1 and a driveway cross section 7E.2.J.2. He stated none of these are impacted based on the proposed lot line adjustment.

Mr. Manning stated that if the waiver is approved it precludes the need to have a wetland engineer sign off on it.

Mr. Zuzgo stated they were done but they hadn't finished in Alton with the delineation because they use apps on the phone and they give incorrect information. They didn't get enough in Alton so they had to go back out and he hadn't gone out to locate the new ones yet. All the wetlands on the lot have been delineated. He was asking for a waiver in the Alton part because he hasn't located them yet. It would not affect this lot at all really. As far as being buildable, the frontage is all hay field, wide open. The soils are good and it is a big lot.

Mr. Sample asked if there were any wetlands on the lot that's being created. Mr. Hoopes stated there are wetlands you can see on the map. Mr. Zuzgo stated there are wetlands, it is just that they're not completely located. Mr. Hoopes added that there is access to the property without going on the wetlands. Mr. Zuzgo agreed. Mr. Hoopes stated that any further work that has to be done obviously would necessitate DES permit. Mr. Zuzgo agreed. He stated by then they will all be located. Chair Brown asked if that was being pursued at this time. Mr. Zuzgo stated it has all been delineated, they just hadn't gone out to locate the flags yet. He spoke of NWI wetlands from granite. Chair Brown asked if the Board was comfortable with moving forward with a waiver request. Mr. Hoopes stated any further development would require more stuff. Chair Brown stated they would be forced to.

MOTION: To APPROVE all Waivers 7D1.1 jurisdiction of wetlands, 7D1.J wetlands that have been partially delineated, 7D.1K special flood hazard area, 7D.1.L aquifer protection overlay, 7E.2.J1 centerline profiles and 7E2J2 driveway cross section. Motion by Mr. Pierce. Mr. Sleeper SECONDs. The Board votes unanimously.

Chair Brown stated the application is complete. He invited Mr. Zuzgo to speak.

Paul Zuzgo representing Gardy Nadeau who owns the property. It is one big lot that is in two towns. They are subdividing along the town line to make two separate lots so there's one

separate lot in New Durham and one separate lot in Alton. That way if the owners decide to develop in the future in New Durham he doesn't have to come to Alton, but Alton will be notified because it's on the Town line. He stated they have already gone through New Durham and got approval there contingent upon getting approval in Alton.

Mr. Armstrong mentioned that Courtney, Director of Water, added a note stating the water line stops at Alton Family Medicine, which is nowhere near there so it doesn't impact, it's not applicable.

Chair Brown asked if they needed a motion stating the application is complete. Mr. Armstrong stated they do.

MOTION: To ACCEPT Case #P26-26 submitted as COMPLETE for discussion. Motion by Mr. Manning. Chair Brown SECONDs. The Board votes unanimously.

Chair Brown asked if the Board had any questions. There were none. Chair Brown added the only department comment was relative to the border line. All the others had no issues. Chair Brown asked if the monuments were in place on the parcel now. Mr. Zuzgo stated the Town line monument on the road, and the stone walls in back.

Chair Brown asked if the access was for the new road would be on New Durham Rd. Mr. Zuzgo stated it already had a barway there where farm tractors go in to do the hay. There is over 400 ft of frontage in Alton.

Chair Brown asked if there was any public input. There was none. He closed to public input.

MOTION: To ACCEPT Case #P26-26 as submitted having already accepted the waivers, the subdivided parent lot (as described above?). Motion by Mr. Manning. Mr. Sleeper SECONDs. The Board votes unanimously.

Mr. Armstrong stated that there were two different Moore requests, one is a lot line adjustment, and one is a subdivision request. The applicant had requested to continue both of those items until the next meeting, but because they made the agenda, the Board still has to open them and accept the continuation and put a date on when that continuation would be, which would be the next meeting in November.

Case #P26-27 Norway Plains, Associates, Inc., Steve Oles, Agent for Nancy Moore & Deborah Allison and James and Allison Brown, Owners	**Map 9 Lots 35 & 35-4** **Moore Farm Lane** **Moore Farm Lane**	**Lot Line Adjustment** **Residential Rural Zone (RR)**

Proposal: To adjust lot lines for two (2) lots of record, with Map 9 Lot 35 adjusted from 190AC to 188AC, and Lot 35-4 adjusted from 4.88AC to 6.81AC.

Mr. Manning asked if Mr. Armstrong would talk to the applicant about the items that were missing. Mr. Armstrong stated he would. He stated there were issues with the application for

completeness purposes. As the application has been presented, they would need to go to ZBA for variances. They have not done that, so the application is not complete at this time.

MOTION: To CONTINUE Case #P26-27 to the next Planning Board Meeting for November 17, 2026. Motion by Mr. Manning. Mr. Sleeper SECONDs. The Board votes unanimously.

CONTINUED TO NOVEMBER 17, 2026

Case #P26-28 Norway Plains, Associates, Inc., Steve Oles, Agent for Nancy Moore & Deborah Allison, Owners	**Map 9 Lot 35** **Moore Farm Lane**	**Final Minor Subdivision** **Residential Rural Zone (RR)**

Proposal: To subdivide the parent lot of 188AC that is in two towns into two (2) lots of record with the parent lot being 162AC, and the proposed lot being 25.52AC.

MOTION: To CONTINUE Case #P26-28 to the next Planning Board Meeting for November 17, 2026. Motion by Mr. Manning. Mr. Sleeper SECONDs. The Board votes unanimously.

CONTINUED TO NOVEMBER 17, 2026

5. Design Review

Case #P26-29 Varney Engineering, Thomas Varney, PE, Agent for Sherrill Holdings, LLC, Jonathan Sherrill, Member	**Map 27 Lot 15** **69 Main Street**	**Design Review for Major Site Plan** **Residential Commercial Zone (RC)**

Proposal: To construct a 4,000 square foot tradesman workshop/storage building with an office space.

Mr. Armstrong stated this still requires acceptance of a completed application. Chair Brown asked if the case was complete. Mr. Amstrong stated the only note he had on this case was the escrow account, the check to pay for the engineering review of this was submitted today. They will be working through the end of this week to set up an escrow account to get engineering review as part of the design review process. Mr. Armstrong recommended the Board not close the design review process at this meeting. The engineering review was needed before this design review could be completed. It would need to be revisited during the November meeting. Chair Brown stated there were two waivers on top of that. Mr. Armstrong stated that was correct.

Josh Thibeault, Varney Engineering presented with Tom Varney and Jon Sherrill, who is the owner of Sherrill Holdings LLC which owns the property at 69 Main Street. The existing property at 69 Main Street is currently a mix of residential and commercial use. There is a 400-square foot office building in the existing building as well as a three-bedroom apartment. The total parcel is .76 AC in size. It is in the residential commercial zone. The building is serviced by municipal water, and as with everywhere in Alton it has an onsite septic system. There are

two driveways that exist that access the site now. Much of the property is lawn area, but there is vegetation around the edge of the property, a lot of thick vines that conceal it from surrounding properties. The proposal is to add a 4,000 sq ft workman/trade shop/storage space; 800 sq ft of that will be an office space. The existing garage will be removed from the building, and the second driveway will be expanded to get access to the rear of the lot. The existing septic system will remain in place as it is sized for 600 gallons per day. The three-bedroom apartment is to be removed from the existing building. There will be three separate office spaces in the existing building.

The proposed building will have a trade shop/storage area as well as office space. There will be a total of eight employees on site at any time. The Town requirements for parking spaces were 13 spaces, one of those is required to be handicapped. Snow storage is demonstrated on the site map. A dumpster has been located on site. Storm water management for the building is a drip edge on the north side of the building and then a drip line infiltration trench along the south side of the parking lot to capture the storm water from the south side of the building and the parking area. The hours of operation are proposed 8 am to 5 pm Monday through Friday and it will be closed Saturday and Sunday. On sheet three there is a mix of details showing silt fence, typical parking area cross section, detail for the handicapped parking spot. There are floor plans as well as lighting plans for the existing and proposed building. The street sign is existing and is proposed to remain the same. There is no current DOT driveway permit, so they are working with DOT to obtain a driveway permit for both entrances. He stated he could answer any specific questions from the Board.

Mr. Manning asked for clarification on the two driveways. He asked if that was referring to one driveway seen on the Site Map that is split in half. He never found two driveways on the Site Map. Mr. Thibeault stated in front of the building is a concrete driveway and it has a grass strip in between it. There's the second paved driveway which is in front of the garage in the office space with the old garage door that you can see into. Mr. Manning asked if the space was wide enough for two-way traffic or was that the plan. Mr. Thibeault stated it is not necessarily designed for two-way traffic. There's currently an HVAC company that operates out of this office building. Mt. Sherrill is looking to have equipment on site that he can store here. The crew comes in in the morning, picks up their equipment and drops off what they need, and they leave and return at the end of the workday.

Mr. Sample stated the Fire Department looks for 20 + feet and that's enough room for two cars to pass. Mr. Thibeault stated it is currently shown at 12 ft but if it needs to be expanded they could. Mr. Sample stated the Fire Department would want that. Mr. Thibeault understood. Mr. Sleeper stated 18.2.3.5.1.1 Fire Apparatus Access Road shall have an unobstructed width of not less than 20 ft as designed the access is only 12. Mr. Thibeault stated they could certainly update the plan. He stated there was room to expand that to 20 ft.

Mr. Manning asked if he had the document from the department of Public Works. Mr. Thibeault stated he did not. Mr. Manning stated there were a bunch of concerns about parking. Mr. Sleeper added a concern about curb cuts. Mr. Armstrong stated he would make sure they received the document. Chair Brown stated the DPW has a number of issues with respect to parking stalls.

Mr. Manning stated the applicant may as well address the issues before they go too far. None of the issues raised were major other than needing to be addressed. Mr. Sample added the curb cut was an issue raised by the State. Mr. Thibeault stated they could either move the parking over and do a hammerhead design or expand another area. They would cut it off at the leech field. He stated there was about 30 ft there in addition to the 12 ft of the driveway that is shown. Mr. Manning stated the Board had the pictures and he was familiar with where the property is located. He asked what is on both sides of the property. He asked if it was residential and what is currently on both sides. Mr. Thibeault stated that to the south of the property there are two residential buildings. He demonstrated on the map other properties that were residential. He mentioned an apartment building. He pointed out the Village Center. Chair Brown asked if all the abutters had been notified. Mr. Thibeault stated he believed so. Mr. Armstrong stated they had.

Mr. Thibeault stated within the packet there should be a rendering of the proposed building. One of the waivers he asked for was for the existing building not to show elevation profiles because it's an existing structure. They did provide a floor plan and elevation profile of the proposed building.

There is quite a thick layer of vegetation between the abutting properties. Mr. Sample asked if this was an ongoing design review. Chair Brown stated it was a design review. Mr. Armstrong stated they still need the Town's engineering to review this plan so the design review phase cannot be complete this evening without that. Mr. Sleeper asked if they could discuss parking. The DPW comments about parking stall mentions the proposed parking stall mentioned as shown in the Site Plan do not meet the Planning Board's minimum dimensional requirements of 9 ft wide by 20 ft long. Mr. Thibeault stated he believed they did. They were roughly 10 x 19 but he could label the dimensions on them if that would be helpful. He could increase it by one foot if he finds it is not the full 20 ft.

Chair Brown asked if they could go back to the status of the driveway permits as they currently stand. Mr. Thibeault stated as it stands, there has never been a DOT driveway permit obtained. He submitted the application about two weeks ago. They have been working with Mr. Gubitose and supplying him with the information that he wants. There has been no final determination. Chair Brown stated there were some reservations about backing out onto the main highway. Mr. Manning stated parking spots 1, 2, and 3 are too close to the road. They're saying you have to back out onto the road. Mr. Sample stated that is what is existing. The garage is going to be taken down and there's not going to be any backing out onto the road. Chair Brown commented as long as they are aware of that, that is the point.

(Mr. Sherrill?) Everybody will be parking in the back. Mr. Manning stated that this is what the DPW is saying. He stated that from the document it looks like you took down two garages so you could have parking spaces in front of the office. Mr. Thibeault stated that was correct. Mr. Manning stated that still, that house is relatively close. Mr. Thibeault stated that if the Board would prefer, he felt they could fit the spaces in question somewhere else with some rearranging of snow storage to show that there could be adequate room for all 13 spaces in the back if that was preferred. Mr. Sleeper asked if those spaces were there, what would happen to the hammer

head turnaround for the fire apparatus. Mr. Thibeault stated he would have to make adjustments to the plan. Mr. Sleeper stated that there was another DPW comment regarding parking stall 10 does not meet the minimum dimension requirements for parallel parking of 9 ft wide x 24 ft long. Mr. Thibeault stated he could increase the size of that as well. Mr. Sleeper asked if the abutters were in favor.

Chair Brown asked the party to speak into the mic. Mr. Sherrill stated they were an HVAC company and they were having a very difficult time getting supplies in Alton. The closest one is F.W. Webb in Dover. There was also one in Gilford. He mentioned that getting supplies to serve Wolfeboro and Alton had become really problematic. He mentioned they were not stocking furnaces and broilers. There would be a couple of CSRs up there. He had 20,000 sq feet in his primary location. This would serve as their northern location. It would probably be four service techs and one install crew that would work out of that building, and two CSRs. The install crew and service techs aren't there at all. The CSRs would be there from 8-5, it's usually 8-4:30. Mr. Manning asked if he expected customers to be going there. Mr. Sherrill stated customers would come occasionally. They have a showroom in the existing building. He mentioned appearing before the Board prior and said they have an ADA approved bathroom in there. They have customers come in for meetings.

Mr. Manning asked if this would have to go back before Zoning, Mr. Armstrong stated it would not. Mr. Thibeault stated this is an approved use in this zone. Mr. Armstrong stated the use is approved and they meet their setbacks. Mr. Sherrill stated they went through that the last time. Mr. Manning stated that for something like this they probably would request a landscaping plan. Mr. Sherrill mentioned that they had an issue the last time they came with regard to the landscaping. Chair Brown stated with respect to the waivers he felt it would be beneficial to have elevations prepared for the buildings. It is in a semi residential area.

Mr. Thibeault stated they had provided the Board with an elevation profile of the proposed building. They were just asking for a waiver on the existing building. Chair Brown understood. He stated likewise on the landscaping and stated it would be beneficial to have that in there. Mr. Sherrill stated that it couldn't be seen from the road. He asked where the Board would want to see landscaping. Chair Brown asked if the abutters could. Mr. Sherrill stated there was a tree line on both sides. Chair Brown stated it would be beneficial to have something along those lines. Mr. Manning stated having a statement from the abutters stating that they were okay with this, it would take them a step ahead.

Mr. Sleeper mentioned that the apartment would be removed. He asked if the only business on the premises would be KEY. He asked if the apartment would then become showroom or office. Mr. Sherrill stated they would be a couple of offices. There is a conference room on the first floor. There are only two bedrooms in that house, not three. There are two offices upstairs and a conference room. There is a kitchen there that is used as a common kitchen to the existing office that is there now.

Chair Brown asked if the Board had any further questions. Mr. Sleeper asked if the proposed building would be similar in facade as to what is there now, white siding, shingled roof. Mr.

Sherrill stated he was unsure. He may want to do a brick red or something to make it look a little more farm like. They were thinking of putting a little ??? on top of it just to dress it up a little bit. He stated he didn't believe it would be able to be seen from anywhere. The apartment building is three stories on the right side. The house has a barn back there so you can't even see the property at all. The blue one in the back is the only one that can see that piece of property. They would put trees back there to block the view. He didn't expect with the floor pitch and 12 ft walls that the building is any more than 24 ft high at the most.

Mr. Sleeper asked if there would be any permanent lighting. Mr. Sherrill stated that right now it is on timers. The front of the building is lit up with a timer. He stated that at some point they would probably have some sort of lighting in the back, and there would be some sort of security. He stated there wouldn't be any fencing back there. Mr. Hoopes stated the Town does want to see dark drives, downlighting only. Mr. Sherrill stated he had been down that road too. He stated that is why the sign is the way it is. He felt they could really clean things up. For the company it makes more sense to run the company out of that location. He hoped he could get the Board's approval.

Chair Brown asked if the Board had any more questions. Mr. Armstrong stated that it was a Design Review, and no vote was necessary. He addressed Mr. Varney and Mr. Thibeault and told them he sent the comments to their email and apologized for not getting them to them.

Mr. Varney stated they would take that list and the engineers list and revise the plan. He stated the purpose of the design review is to see the way it is and hear from abutters and next month they can decide on the waivers.

Other Business

1. Old Business:

Mr. Armstrong stated there was an extension request last month for Bucky & Joey Holdings, a Final Minor Site Plan Review at 46 Suncook Valley Rd. The Board had requested that the applicant come in to meet with the Board for their extension request as they were not able to be here at last month's meeting. Chair Brown stated he was not at the last meeting and asked to be brought up to speed.

Mr. Armstrong stated it was an approved site plan that was on September 16th, 2025. It was to change the use to permit automative detailing and minor aftermarket add-ons to be permed entirely inside the shop. It was not designed to be an automotive repair operation and no onsite storage of oils or similar fluids. The Board had approved this September 16th, 2025. There was not a final plan set that was provided into the department. The Planning Board has a file to reach out to folks who are about to hit the one-year lapse. So they reached out to the folks that were doing the minor site plan and asked them to come in to see if they needed an extension or if they were going to let the project lapse.

Mr. Green, land surveyor that represented Dan Devoe back in September of last year. He apologized to the board. He stated what happened was he had been ill, and no one reminded him

and it never got taken care of. When it came to his attention a month ago, he was all set to come in and ended up having another setback in his illness. He was not trying to use the illness as an excuse. He just wanted to let the Board know the reason it wasn't taken care of is because he didn't follow up on it. He stated most of the time the owners don't know the difference. They just go forward and they expect me to finish it.

Mr. Devereaux stated that was correct but mentioned he also could have followed up and reminded Mr. Green and kept his part of the deal up. He also apologized to the Board.

Mr. Green stated what they were looking to do is finalize it the way they got it approved. He reviewed it all. He didn't get it all done yet. He stated he still had a couple of things to do. The main thing that needed to be done was the septic needed to be reviewed. Most of it, on the notice of decision there were a lot of minor things that had to be done to the plan. There were conditions that the Board wanted and that type of thing. He stated most of those had been done, but he hadn't gotten to the point where he got the inspection done. He hadn't received approval from the state as to whether they needed to update the driveway permit or not. Those are the two things that are major. He stated he could have finished the other things, but he hadn't gotten to do it yet. He was requesting an extension on this project. He would like 60 days. He expects to come back next month. The only reason he doesn't is because of the septic. Everyone is busy. He wanted to make sure he got everything done. He's asking for 60 days to make sure they get all of the material in hand and to the Board so they can come back and have it finalized.

Chair Brown asked if that was for December Planning Board Meeting. Mr. Green agreed. He stated that way it would also be done before the end of the year. Mr. Armstrong stated he did not believe this one had to come back before the Board. They have approval. The Planning Board just needs the updated finalized plans set for signing by the Chair. To note, per section 9A1, the extension is generally granted for a year. It's up to the Board's purview if they want to grant the full year, but that is the general standard accepted number. Mr. Green stated if the Board gave him a year he would take a year. He stated he did not expect to need that kind of time. He stated it is up to the Board how they want to handle that.

Mr. Sample asked for clarification. He stated what the Board is doing is giving him an extension for an expired extension. Mr. Armstrong stated the extension expired in September. Because the Board at the time had authored to continue this item, the expiration has not technically lapsed at this point. Mr. Sample said that was a good thing. Mr. Armstrong agreed. He stated the Board could grant them their one-year extension, no harm, no foul. They just need to get the plan in to the Planning Department with the revisions. The Chair will sign and they're moving forward like any other plan. Chair Brown suggested they say year end to make sure they stayed on a timeline. Mr. Green stated he had no issues with that. He stated if there is one little thing holding him up he can come in and talk to the Board about that, but he didn't foresee any issues. Chair Brown felt leaving it open for a year was a potential can of worms. Mr. Hoopes agreed that it was a good courtesy.

Mr. Devereaux stated he would keep an eye on the time. Chair Brown asked if everyone on the Board was comfortable with that. The Board agreed. Chair Brown said more or less 60 days. Mr. Green agreed. Mr. Armstrong stated they needed a motion on that.

MOTION: To EXTEND Case #P25-27 through the end of the year. Motion by Mr. Sleeper. Chair Brown SECONDs. The Board votes unanimously.

2. **New Business:**

    a. **Approval of Minutes:** Planning Board meeting minutes of Tuesday September 15, 2026.

Mr. Armstrong stated to his knowledge there's only one set of minutes to consider from the September meeting. Chair Brown stated he also had the minutes from the August meeting. He asked if those were approved at the last meeting. Mr. Armstrong stated he believed so. Chair Brown asked the Board if there were any changes with respect to the September meeting minutes.

Mr. Diveny stated his name was spelled wrong. Chair Brown asked if there were any other comments on the minutes.

MOTION: To ACCEPT Planning Board Meeting Minutes as listed. Motion by Mr. Sleeper. Mr. Pierce SECONDs. The Board votes in favor with the exception of Mr. Sample and Chair Brown.

3. **Correspondence for the Board's review/discussion/action:**
4. **Correspondence for the Board's information:**
5. **Correspondence for the Board's information on State Permit Applications:**

Public Input on Non-Case Specific Planning Issues
Adjournment:
Doug Brown, Planning Board (Acting) Chairman

* If there is foul weather or lack of a quorum, the Public Hearing on applications will be continued to Tuesday, November 17, 2026, at the Alton Town Hall starting at 6:00 P.M.

**All meetings will last no longer than 10:30 P.M., with no new cases or hearings starting after 10:00 P.M., unless extended by a majority vote of the members present. Any items remaining as unfinished business on the agenda will be given priority on the agenda of the next meeting.

Respectfully Submitted,
Sandra Monaco, Recording Secretary