TOWN OF ALTON
PLANNING BOARD
PUBLIC HEARING MEETING
Tuesday, September 15, 2026, at 6:00 PM
Alton Town Hall

CALL TO ORDER

Chair O'Neil called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM.

ROLL CALL OF BOARD MEMBERS

William (Bill) O'Neil (Chair)
Mark Manning
Tom Diveny
Jack Sleeper (Selectman's Representative)
Dan Pierce
Ava Drost

OTHERS PRESENT

Cameron Armstrong (Town Planner)
Patricia Panciocco
Erik Jones
Dick Shea

APPOINTMENT OF ALTERNATES

Ava Drost

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chair O'Neil asked if there were any changes to the agenda. There were none.

MOTION: To APPROVE the Planning Board Agenda. Motion by Mr. Diveny. Mr. Manning SECONDs. Chair O' Neil asked the Board for a vote. Board voted UNANIMOUSLY.

1. Acceptance and Review of Application and Public Hearing if Application is Accepted and Complete

Case #P26-24 Green Light Development, LLC, Erik Jones, Manager	Map 8 Lot 25 182 Frank C. Gilman Hwy	Final Major Subdivision Residential Rural Zone (RR)

Proposal: Amended Subdivision to update the site layout to accommodate minor surface upgrades and to change to condominium ownership.

Chair O'Neil recused himself from this case due to familiarity with the attorney representing the applicant. Due to the absence of the Vice Chair, he deferred to the Clerk to take over in his place.

MOTION: To ACCEPT Case #P26-24 as COMPLETE for discussion. Motion by Mr. Manning. Mr. Pierce SECONDs. Board voted UNANIMOUSLY.

Attorney Pat Panciacco, representing Erik Jones of Green Light Development. She was there to assist in any way she could. She believed the application was complete. She was there to answer questions while the Board went through the Agenda. Mr. Armstrong agreed.

She stated there were 11 buildings with four units in each building for a total of 44 units. It is about 14.5 AC. The project was approved a very, very long time ago as was mentioned the last time they were before the Board. A lot of the work associated with state permits has been completed. There's also a single-family home that is already existing. She stated that her client, Mr. Jones, was proposing to build the four units in each building, some of which will have a garage. That was the reason for the amendment to the AOT permit. She stated the number of units has not changed. Mr. Manning asked if the number of bedrooms had changed.

Ms. Panciacco stated the Town water line would be extended throughout the whole project to every unit and there will be septic systems for sanitary waste. She believed all of the wetland crossings were complete. Her understanding was there were a number of discussion items on Mr. Armstrong's list. She and her client were there to answer those questions. They were proposing condominium as opposed to multifamily dwellings which is basically singular ownership of each unit with all the land and common improvements owned collectively by the association. She offered to answer any of the Board's questions.

Mr. Armstrong wanted to clarify because Ms. Panciacco mentioned 44 units, but the request is for 45 units in the subdivision because they're subdividing that individual single family home. He wanted to state for the record that it is technically 45 lots. Mr. Jones stated that was correct.

Mr. Sleeper stated there was a comment from the Deputy Fire Chief about how the buildings were going to be identified and talked about a Knox HomeBox to access. Mr. Jones stated he felt it was a good idea even if it is not required by code he was happy to do that.

Mr. Diveny mentioned that the driveways would be storm water controlled. He stated the wetlands were already mentioned. He asked if they were up to active and substantial.

Mr. Armstrong stated that the parties have already received a vote of substantial completion by the Board. He had hoped that the Board members had received the email that was forwarded from Nic Strong's synopsis as well as the active and substantial completion letter that was granted by the Board.

Mr. Armstrong stated that the only additional requirement was that the condo association is registered with the Attorney General's office. He stated that their documents have already been vetted by the Town Attorney. The Town Attorney was comfortable, pending some language from the Assessor, to make sure that that was clear to the Assessing office to make sure it was all correct and how they wanted that to be formatted.

Mr. Manning asked if the Town attorney had reviewed the condo association. Mr. Armstrong stated it is ready to be submitted to the Attorney General's office, so they need that recorded at the end and then provide a copy to the Town.

Ms. Panciacco stated that would be fine tuned a bit and it would be returned to run by the Town Attorney before they actually sign and record it. She stated what they usually try to do is reconcile the 911 addresses with the Tax Map and Lot numbers because it prevents a catastrophe when the first units start to close and when the numbers get jumbled. She stated it would need to go to the Attorney General. The Attorney General would scrutinize everything.

Mr. Armstrong stated in light of that he would request that the Board make that a part of conditions, for full sign off on the plan that they get that finalized document.

Mr. Manning asked if the Conditions Precedent had been met. He stated that it must be satisfied prior to the Planning Board Chair signing. Ms. Panciacco asked Mr. Armstrong if they had checklist corrections. Mr. Armstrong stated that the checklist corrections were those listed under "Items required by Section 9, Major Subdivision Design Review". He stated everything has been provided and to the satisfaction of. That is where the Board voted on the completeness of the application. Ms. Panciacco understood. She stated there are no waivers being requested. She stated she would add a note to best management practices. She stated there was a note on the plan with the conditions imposed during this meeting, and a list of permits.

Mr. Armstrong stated outside of the language being added to the plat, as listed here, would be the submission of sample deeds and his request to the Board to add the condition of the HOA document or condo association documents provided. She stated that would be the only other addition to that outside of whatever the Board's purview to add anything else that they see fit. Ms. Panciacco understood. Mr. Armstrong stated they had one year to comply with that.

Mr. Manning asked Mr. Armstrong if that meant the Board didn't need to see the subdivision plan. Mr. Armstrong stated the Board should have a copy of that. Mr. Jones offered larger copies for the Board to look at.

Mr. Sleeper asked what the expected completion of the project would be. Mr. Jones stated that it is conceived as a three year build out. It would be driven somewhat by market absorption. He couldn't get ahead of himself with his financing. If there was an extension needed that would be the reason. Mr. Sleeper stated that would be like anything else, the Board would have to approve an extension if it goes beyond. Mr. Jones stated he believed that was what Mr. Armstrong was mentioning. Mr. Sleeper stated he wasn't able to absorb that while looking over other documents. Mr. Jones stated that he knew the Board had not seen a lot of condos come through Alton. He stated that it was important to note that the blow up on the top details the difference between common area and limited common area. He stated limited common area is a subset of the common area and each unit has its own limited common area in front and in back for them to enjoy personally. If you're a resident and you want to have a barbecue in your neighbors limited common area you can't. Mr. Sleeper asked if the areas would be fenced or just measured belonging to each property. Mr. Jones stated they would be measured on the plan and confirmed by the as built survey on completion of the building. He stated his thought was to put some amount of privacy fencing between units. He stated he didn't want to have fences all over the place, but he felt some would be appropriate.

Mr. Manning asked Mr. Armstrong if a project this large needed some kind of traffic impact. Mr. Armstrong didn't believe so since the plan has already been approved and developed and permitted. It has been allowed to be permitted as a multifamily development. He stated the only change is really the type of ownership for these units. All of that has already been approved. He stated there is no change to the traffic analysis of this. The unit count isn't changing. The bedroom count isn't changing. Mr. Manning asked if what they were approving was the addition of the garages. Mr. Armstrong stated the addition of the garages and the creation of individual lots for each one of those units. He stated that as it is now, they could only be rented as multifamily. This would allow them to be sold as single units. He stated it is not materially changing the buildings themselves outside of the addition of the garages.

Mr. Manning stated it would not be his professional recommendation to the Board to request a traffic study. He stated it is the Board's purview to request those things, but it would not be his recommendation to do that. Mr. Diveny asked if a traffic study was done prior. Mr. Armstrong believed it was. Mr. Armstrong stated it was extensively examined throughout all of the iterations of the project.

Mr. Sleeper asked whether there had been perc tests and systems designed for each unit in the designs for each building. He asked if there had if it would meet current – Mr. Jones stated there had been perc tests for all of buildings. Units one and two have stated approved designs. He stated those were the tougher ones due to proximity of clear areas to get to and seasonal high-water tables.

Mr. Manning asked if it was Mr. Armstrong's suggestion that the Board accept everything that was processed in 2004, as being still viable in 2026. Mr. Armstrong stated that it was the Town Attorney's recommendation that nothing is touched from 2018 and beyond because that has already received substantial completion and vested. Mr. Manning understood. He stated the fact that it is moving over to condo is no big deal. Mr. Armstrong stated essentially not. All of these buildings could be constructed today as multifamily units and rented and the Town could do nothing to stop it. All that is changing is the ownership structure of the development, a pickleball court.

Mr. Manning asked when the original project was accepted and approved. He believed it was in 2004. Mr. Armstrong stated it was 2008. It was approved with conditions in 2008, extensions granted in 2010, 2012, 2017 was when substantial completion came through. Mr. Manning asked if there was something from the Town Attorney that says ??? discussion. Mr. Armstrong stated he believed there was an email that was provided at the previous meeting that included that. He stated if Mr. Manning did not have it, he would provide him a copy. He stated he was good. He asked if the Board was waiting on anything. He asked if the water source was going to be Town water. Mr. Jones stated it was already punched into the property. Mr. Manning stated it sounded like Mr. Jones was willing to agree to the Knox Box. Mr. Jones agreed. Mr. Manning stated the only thing they needed to include now was the condo association agreement. Mr. Armstrong agreed. Mr. Diveny asked if there would be any guidelines as far as what needs to be done when or was it already taken care of. Mr. Armstrong stated that under conditions precedent they will have a year to comply with those and they're eligible for a six-month extension if the

board grants it after the fact. His recommendation was to adhere to the normal timeline of a year to comply with all of those for assigned plan. Mr. Manning asked if the conditions precedent that occurred when the original launch was approved was listed. Mr. Armstrong stated the conditions precedent was basically boilerplate conditions precedent that they always provide for the Planner review document that is generally standard language. The addition of anything else comes after with the Board. He stated to answer his question, it is boiler plate, so they are typically ones that should have come forward before, but things have changed over the years. He stated that was part of the earlier discussion as to what actually happened with this project because up until 2010, the State did not make clear what conditions precedent versus subsequent conditions were. He stated that was where it got muddy. He stated all of this should have been taken care of previously. Where things have been approved the Board was looking at it just as its own item standalone.

Mr. Diveny asked if anyone else had any questions. He opened to the public. There were no comments.

MOTION: To ACCEPT Case #P26-24 the amended site plan to update the site layout to accommodate minor surface upgrades and to change to condominium ownership as submitted with the requirement that both the conditions precedent and conditions subsequent get met within the one year timeframe, one of which, to point out, which he feels is the one that requires the most work is the condo association agreement, needs to be submitted as well. Motion by Mr. Manning. Ms. Drost? SECONDs. The Board votes unanimously.

Mr. Armstrong asked if the Board would add to the Motion the KnoxBox requirement. Mr. Manning stated it was in there.

Mr. Diveny reintroduced Chair O'Neil as Chair.

Other Business

1. Old Business: NONE
2. New Business:
    a. Request for extension of approval dated September 16, 2025 from Jeffrey Green, Agent for Bucky & Joey Holdings, LLC, re: Case #P25-27, Final Minor Site Plan

Chair O'Neil asked Mr. Armstrong if the parties needed to be present. Mr. Armstrong stated that was his understanding. Chair O'Neil stated this was the place near the General Dollar. Mr. Sleeper stated he believed it was the Old Tire Warehouse. Chair O'Neil stated he remembered the case, and they weren't doing anything. They just needed approval for minor things like lighting etc. He stated they were just detailing cars. He stated he had a bunch of questions for the applicant, but they're not present for the meeting. Mr. Armstrong stated he had no conversation with the applicant. He stated that the Planning Department has a tickler file for folks who are running up against their deadlines. He stated that Ms. McClain reached out to them and said they needed the extension and that they hadn't submitted their documentation. He

stated that was what was received from the applicant. Chair O'Neil stated there was not a lot there.

Ms. Drost asked if this could be postponed and then ask the Planning Department to request whoever is representing the applicants to be at the meeting. Chair O'Neil stated the Board can do that. He asked Mr. Armstrong if the applicants were informed that they needed to be present. Mr. Sleeper wondered if the applicant misunderstood Ms. McClain's email which stated this email was adequate for the purpose of this request. Mr. Armstrong understood. He stated the applicant mentioned he would be at the meeting to ask for an extension. He agreed with Mr. Sleeper's thought that the email could have been misunderstood. He hesitated to suggest that the Board should move this item. He stated that the applicant's one year deadline is the day after this meeting. Mr. Sleeper asked if the Board could grant a one-month extension.

Mr. Manning asked what the applicant is trying to do. Chair O'Neil agreed and asked what they have done. Mr. Armstrong stated that his understanding was, and he may have misunderstood because it was prior to his being with the Town of Alton, but the applicant stated they forgot to submit the documentation for signing by the Planning Chair. He stated they have completed all of their conditions, all of their subsequent and just forgot to submit the actual document and have it signed. Chair O'Neil asked if they needed an extension for him to sign a document. Mr. Armstrong stated that was his understanding. He stated there were things that they needed to add to the plat and the Board needed a copy of the finalized plat for Chair O'Neil to sign which they never received. Mr. Manning stated to the best of his knowledge there weren't going to be any additions because the outside of the building was enough to stop any run off. They weren't going to be changing oil. They weren't going to be using water. Chair O'Neil stated that it wasn't going to be a car wash.

Mr. Armstrong stated the large issue comes from – Mr. Manning asked if the Board felt it should be extended for a month to get things done. Mr. Sleeper stated that was his question. He stated he did not want to just grant an extension that allows them to complete. He asked if there was a way to grant them a stay to get to the next meeting so it doesn't go stale and get kicked out, but not approve it either so there can still be conversation in October. Chair O'Neil stated the one-year deadline was the day after this meeting. Mr. Manning stated it is possible there was confusion from the email. He stated if you read the email from Ms. McClain, it is possible they misunderstood.

Mr. Armstrong suggested the Board continue the case until the next Board meeting and that will be enough coverage because of all that has been said on the record during this meeting.

MOTION: To extend Case #P26-27 extension request for another month, but also require that the Board notify the party that they are required to be present. Motion by Mr. Manning. Mr. Sleeper asked for clarification if the Board was granting the extension or extending the extension. Chair O'Neil stated they were continuing this for a month so the party can be present to answer questions.

Ms. Drost asked if that would then automatically – if that would also apply to the one year. Chair O'Neil stated he believed it would backdate. Their expiration date is the day after this meeting. The Board is giving them an extension until next month because it was unclear whether to not they needed to be present. But if he shows up next month and answers the Board's questions and it gets approved it would still be backdated to September 16th. Mr. Armstrong agreed. Chair O'Neil stated he didn't think it would be good to go down that rabbit hole where people start extending to get more time.

Mr. Diveny SECONDs the Motion. Board votes unanimously.

b. Discussion of NFIP updates and creation of a Technical Review Committee to the Site Plan Review and Subdivision Regulations.

Chair O'Neil stated this was what Mr. Heath had suggested at last month's meeting. Mr. Armstrong stated that the two pieces that the Board should have to this is a synopsis of the subdivision regulation changes and the Site Plan Review Regulation changes. He stated the Subdivision Regulations will just have the creation of that Technical Review Committee which would take place of the paper notifications that the Board gets. He stated it would be a conglomerative staff sitting with the applicant to review their project to note any issues before it actually goes to the Planning Board. He stated that Site Plan is the same thing, the creation of the Technical Review Committee as well as language updates for NFIP standards to make sure the town remains in compliance with the National Flood Insurance Program and allows the community members to receive all the benefits of being part of the NFIP community.

Chair O'Neil stated the flood insurance part on the Site Plan review regulations look like it was more of a housekeeping thing. Mr. Armstrong stated it is. Chair O'Neil stated it was changing from 100-year flood plan to special flood hazard area. Mr. Armstrong agreed. He stated all of the language was given to him from the state at the DES level. Chair O'Neil stated the Board needed to approve it. He asked if once it is approved and the committee is put together and they have the first application, is it going to be part of the Planner review. He asked what the Board would get after everyone meets with the applicant. Mr. Armstrong stated that the Board would still receive their planner review. The intention of the TRC is to draft a more comprehensive memorandum encompassing the discussion that is had at the TRC with the applicant. The intention with the TRC is to sit with the applicant so they can get ahead of some of the issues that are drafted and submitted as part of the circle document that tell the issues of the project. There still will be a memorandum attached. The Board will still receive planner review and will receive comments from the department heads. It would be a separate memorandum that is drafted more coherently rather than fragmented sheets from each department head. His intention of writing it is that it would occur between a conceptual. He stated a conceptual could still come to the Board independent of going to a TRC but the minute you lodge an application for design review of final, you have to go to a TRC.

Chair O'Neil asked if the Board was voting to approve this. Mr. Armstrong stated that they were not because they were subject to a public hearing. The next meeting there would be a public hearing. Chair O'Neil stated that this is the first one, a review for the Board. Mr. Armstrong

agreed. Chair Oneil asked if the Board had any other questions. Ms. Drost commented to Mr. Armstrong that this was basically streamlining the process, getting all players in the room that need to be with the applicants. Mr. Armstrong agreed. He stated he had done this at a previous municipality and found it worked very well to get ahead of some of those issues, storm land issues, wetland issues, driveway issues. It helped to get department heads into the room to talk with the applicants, so they have an understanding of the Town's regulations. It is not just getting a blind sheet of comments and the applicant trying to figure out what those comments mean or decipher them. He stated it is a more robust conversation and helps applicants feel more comfortable coming to the Planning Board that they've addressed those critical issues before they come before the Board.

Chair O'Neil stated he believed it would help with issues they have had where applicants have had to come back or a department head has shown up and said they couldn't do something. Having the discussion ahead of time means they applicants will know what the department heads are requiring. He stated it would also help the Town where people will be saying they didn't know, because they have been informed at the meeting and the department heads were there explaining what needed to be done.

Mr. Armstrong stated it would also help the Board with the conditions precedent question rather than having to decipher everything, the memorandum will specifically lay out from each of the departments and the conversations with the applicants will have happened ahead of time, so it is not a surprise that things are added into the conditions precedent. Chair O'Neil stated that was a strong argument.

Ms. Drost asked if the memorandum was something Mr. Armstrong would be generating. He stated he would be. Chair O'Neil asked if the Board had any other questions. There were none. He stated this was just for review. Next month there will be a public hearing, and the Board will vote on it.

c. Approval of Minutes: Planning Board meeting minutes of Tuesday August 18, 2026.

Chair O'Neil asked if there were any changes to the minutes for August.

MOTION: To APPROVE the minutes for August 18, 2026. Motion by Mr. Diveny. Mr. Pierce SECONDs. Chair O'Neil asked the Board for a vote. Board voted UNANIMOUSLY.

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

Mr. Shea commented on the TRC stating it was a great idea for the town, for the staff and mostly for the applicants. He stated he had had experience with one in another municipality, he found it

was a great advantage and little things that may have been a concern and weren't quite sure about were addressed during those meetings. He stated that it was helpful in bringing attention to things the staff was unsure of and they were able to research things. He stated he saw no negatives about having those meetings other than the time involved. He stated he hoped they would have a public meeting and he hoped the public would support it. He felt it would be a win-win.

Chair O'Neil stated there would be a public hearing next month. He asked if there was anything else from the public. There was no comment. He closed to public.

Adjournment:
William O'Neil, Planning Board Chairman

> **MOTION: To ADJOURN the Planning Board meeting. Motion by Ms. Drost. Mr. Sleeper SECONDs. Chair O'Neil asked the Board for a vote. Board voted UNANIMOUSLY.**

* If there is foul weather or lack of a quorum, the Public Hearing on applications will be continued to Tuesday, October 20, 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