

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

**TOWN OF ALTON  
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT  
PUBLIC HEARING MEETING  
Thursday, February 5, 2026, at 6:00 PM  
Alton Town Hall**

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Tom Lee, (Acting) Chair  
Paul LaRochelle, Member & Selectman's Representative  
Joe Mankus, Member  
Paul Monziona (Alternate)

**OTHERS PRESENT**

Robin McClain  
Paul Zuzgo  
Eric

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Lee called the meeting to order at 6:01 P.M.

**APPOINTMENT OF ALTERNATES**

**MOTION: To APPOINT Paul Monziona as Alternate. Motion by Mr. LaRochelle. Mr. Mankus SECONDS. Motion passed unanimously.**

**STATEMENT OF THE APPEAL PROCESS**

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

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**MOTION: To APPROVE the agenda as it is written. Motion by Mr. Monziona. Mr. LaRochelle SECONDS. Motion passed unanimously.**

**1. NEW APPLICATIONS**

<b>Case #Z26-03</b> Prospect Mountain Survey, Paul Zuzgo, Agent for Robert & Joanna Morehouse, Owners	<b>Map 12 Lot 14</b> <b>105 Bay Hill Road</b>	<b>Variances</b> <b>Residential Rural (RR) Zone</b>
--	--	--

1 **A Variance** is requested from **Article 200 Definitions “Driveway”** of the Zoning Ordinance to  
2 permit a shared driveway that services three (3) dwelling units.

3 **MOTION: To ACCEPT Case #Z26-03 as Complete. Motion by Mr. LaRochelle. Mr.**  
4 **Mankus SECONDS. Board votes unanimously.**

5 Mr. Zuzgo stated he was representing the Morehouses. He stated he had already been before the  
6 Zoning Board prior for the same driveway not being on the legal frontage. He stated the three  
7 residences on the driveway were also discussed. He stated it was mentioned that he should go to  
8 the Selectmen and get approval, which he did. He stated that it came up that he would have to  
9 get a variance to the definition of a driveway. He stated that the definition of a driveway  
10 according to the ordinance is just two residents or less. He stated that is why he is getting a  
11 variance so he can have three residents (properties) using this driveway.

12 Mr. Monziona stated he was not in attendance at the Town meetings in which this case was being  
13 heard. He stated it was interesting to him that there was a need to get a variance from a  
14 definition. He stated that he understands it is probably better to be safe than sorry with regards to  
15 this. He stated Mr. Zuzgo has authority from the Selectmen to have the driveway service three  
16 separate lots. He asked Mr. Zuzgo if there were any other restrictions in the Town’s zoning that  
17 deal with a shared driveway servicing more than two lots other than the definition.

18 Mr. Zuzgo stated that that is why he came in for the variance because there is an ordinance that  
19 says only two driveways. Mr. Monziona stated the reason he was asking is because he had a  
20 vague recollection that there is an ordinance that deals with the number of lots a shared driveway  
21 is permitted to service. He stated if the definition is stating less than three, he would have to  
22 assume that it mirrors –

23 Mr. Zuzgo stated this is the only place he sees it. Mr. LaRochelle stated that it is in the definition  
24 which he read early that day. Mr. Monziona stated that out of an abundance of caution Mr.  
25 Zuzgo went to the Selectmen and they were able to grant the authority. He stated they need to  
26 concern themselves with whether the definition would somehow enforce whether the driveway  
27 can serve more than two and therefore Mr. Zuzgo wants the variance to say it is going to work  
28 for the three. He stated he was just trying to understand this procedurally.

29 Chair Lee stated he was going to read the definition of “driveway”: “Any path of access serving  
30 less than three dwelling units.”

31 His understanding after reading this, is that three is fine, anything less than three. Chair Lee  
32 continued to read the definition: “Less than three dwelling units that are used by motor vehicles  
33 to gain entry upon private property from a public right-of-way, this includes parking pads,  
34 private roads and any other means of access to public or private property from a public  
35 highway.” He stated his only contention is what was just brought up, any path of access serving  
36 less than three. He stated in this mind that means three or less. Chair Lee asked Mr. Monziona if  
37 he was misinterpreting the definition.

1 Mr. Monzione stated his understanding is that three is not permitted by nature of that definition.  
2 Mr. LaRochelle stated it could be understood either way. Mr. Monzione stated in order to be  
3 safe, if they treated it as though three is one too many and therefore the application for variance  
4 is appropriate, then they just apply the criteria. He stated looking at a Zoning Ordinance that  
5 prohibits something, the reason why it is prohibited, a setback for example, you need 25 ft off the  
6 right-of-way, we know why its doing that, because the ordinance addresses all those things. He  
7 stated, here it is just a definition. He stated that as they sift through to see if he meets the criteria  
8 for a variance why don't they let three lots? He stated, if they give him three lots, is that going to  
9 violate the reason why they do not allow three. Zoning ordinances can usually be figured out.  
10 Mr. Monzione stated it would be helpful if Mr. Zuzgo could explain why allowing three lots on  
11 this driveway is not going to be an issue. The first criteria to be considered is that it will not be  
12 contrary to public interest.

13 Mr. Zuzgo stated the driveway is already there and it already services two. He stated he created  
14 a lot on the frontage and the driveway; the new lot is basically only using that driveway for about  
15 100ft and then they will be turning off of it and onto their own driveway. He stated he could  
16 have put a driveway on the frontage but then there would be three driveways in a row.

17 It was suggested by Chair Lee and Mr. Monzione that it be brought before the ZAC committee to  
18 see how this matter could be further clarified. Mr. Monzione suggested whether a zoning  
19 ordinance was needed to address how many lots a driveway can service other than relying on just  
20 the definition of less than three.

21 Mr. Zuzgo stated he did not believe he was the first one to come before the Board for this. Mr.  
22 Monzione stated that he felt the points that Mr. Zuzgo made that it served two lots already and  
23 there are no issues with traffic or crowding or any problems one might be concerned about,  
24 where it becomes a road instead of a driveway because there is so much traffic on it.

25 Mr. Zuzgo stated one of the comments he received is if he had three, now he would need a road  
26 sign and a road name. He stated that was in the Planner review that he had received. Mr.  
27 LaRochelle asked if that was a comment from one of the department heads. Mr. Zuzgo affirmed.  
28 Mr. LaRochelle asked if it was from the Fire Department. Mr. Zuzgo stated it was not from the  
29 Fire Department. He stated it was either from Jessica or the Road Agent.

30 Mr. Monzione stated it brought up a good point. He stated that going through the criteria it is  
31 hard to know what is contrary to the public interest with a driveway serving less than three lots.  
32 He questioned what the zoning board was driving at by that definition.

33 Mr. Zuzgo stated this driveway has been there for a while. He stated the new lot will only use  
34 100 ft. He stated any driveway has to meet Fire codes. Chair Lee stated this is why they have  
35 department heads that weigh in on these decisions.

36 Chair Lee asked if there were any other questions from the Board. There were none. He stated  
37 that this case has been before the Board before, so a lot of questions have already been answered.  
38 Mr. Mankus stated he had a question with regard to a width requirement of the driveway since it  
39 would be serving three homes. Mr. LaRochelle asked Mr. Zuzgo what the width of this driveway  
40 is currently. Mr. Zuzgo was uncertain of that. He stated the right-of-way was 50 ft. Mr.  
41 LaRochelle stated Tax Map 12 Lot 14-3 shows a driveway to Bay Hill. Mr. Zuzgo explained that

1 that driveway goes to one property. He pointed out the shared driveway. Mr. LaRochelle stated  
2 that it is not shown on the Tax Map. He wanted it to be clear on record that that was separate.  
3 Mr. Zuzgo stated that is why he is presenting this to the Board because there is no need for three  
4 separate driveways right next to each other. Mr. LaRochelle stated the first one where the new  
5 house will be is going to be the shortest 100 ft that will curve right into that property. He stated  
6 they would not be allowed to put a separate driveway coming off of 28 anyway.

7 Chair Lee stated Tax Map 12, Lot 14-3 has their own driveway that is not involved in this. Mr.  
8 LaRochelle agreed. Chair Lee stated that Tax Map 12, Lot 14-4 is the new proposed driveway.  
9 He stated Tax Map 12, Lot 14 currently shares that driveway right now and Tax Map 12, Lot 14-  
10 1 also has access to that driveway.

11 Mr. Monziona asked if 14-4 was the new lot. He asked if they would come off Bay Hill for  
12 about 100 ft and turn onto the proposed lot. Mr. Zuzgo agreed. Mr. Monziona asked if there was  
13 a right-of-way on the new lot. Mr. Zuzgo explained they do not need a right-of-way because it's  
14 on their property. He explained that the other two properties will have rights into that. Mr.  
15 Monziona asked if the new lot that is going to use a driveway off of Bay Hill, if that driveway is  
16 on their property. Mr. Zuzgo agreed. He stated that for deed purposes the second lot and the  
17 third lot will have a right-of-way over that new lot portion of property. Mr. Monziona asked if  
18 the other lots only have rights of way that got to their lot. Mr. Zuzgo said that was all. Mr.  
19 Monziona stated that the right-of-way does not go beyond their own property. Mr. Zuzgo stated  
20 they could grant them a right-of-way on the second lot because it goes go by the new lot. Mr.  
21 Monziona stated that for purposes of what kind of use this shared driveway is going to be getting  
22 by three lots, if each lot only has a right-of-way that goes to their boundary line, that restricts the  
23 use of that by virtue of the right-of-way. He stated that it is not as if these three lots will have  
24 cars anywhere they want to put them on those lots. He stated the right-of-way only permits them  
25 to get onto their lot. Mr. Zuzgo explained in the deed they will have access to get to their  
26 property. Mr. Monziona stated that rights of way on shared roads typically go to the boundary  
27 lines.

28 Chair Lee asked if the Board had any other questions. There were none. Chair Lee opened the  
29 meeting to public input. There were none in favor, none against. Chair Lee closed to public  
30 input.

31 Chair Lee began working on the worksheet.

32 *The Board must find that all the following conditions are met in order to grant the Variance:*  
33

34 Chair Lee stated that the variance **will not** be contrary to the public interest. Mr. LaRochelle  
35 agrees. Mr. Mankus agrees. Mr. Monziona agrees, stating that this is only 100 ft and he does not  
36 see anything being contrary to public interest with allowing this.  
37

38 Mr. LaRochelle stated the request **is** in harmony with the spirit of the Zoning Ordinance and the  
39 intent of the master plan and with the convenience, health and safety and character of the district  
40 within which it is proposed. He stated it would allow them to subdivide the lot in order for them  
41 to build a third property. Mr. Mankus agrees. Mr. Monziona agrees. He stated it serves the

1 convenience, health and safety and character of the district and is not creating a big change of  
2 what is there already. Chair Lee agrees.  
3 Mr. Mankus stated substantial justice by granting the Variance substantial justice **will** be done.  
4 Mr. Monziona agrees. Chair Lee agrees. Mr. LaRochelle agrees.  
5 Mr. Monziona stated that the request **will not** diminish the value of surrounding properties from  
6 looking at submissions with the application. He stated it looks like it won't have any impact at  
7 all on the other lots and there has been no evidence from anyone in public input or otherwise that  
8 there would be and diminution of value. Chair Lee agrees. Mr. LaRochelle agrees for same  
9 reasons. Mr. Mankus agrees.

10  
11 Chair Lee stated that for the purposes of sub paragraph unnecessary hardship means that owing  
12 to Special Conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, **no** fair  
13 and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance  
14 provision and the specific application of that provision to the property. He agrees. He also stated  
15 the proposed use is a reasonable one. Mr. LaRochelle agrees to both. Mr. Mankus agrees to both.  
16 Mr. Monziona agrees. He stated the special conditions of the property are that there's a place  
17 there with two lots already sharing these driveways and it has been successful, and the other lot  
18 is at the very beginning of it anyway with only 100ft. He stated he would say yes to that and the  
19 proposed use is a reasonable one, it's a driveway.

20  
21 **MOTION: To APPROVE the Variance for Case #Z26-03. Motion by Mr. Monziona. Mr.**  
22 **Mankus SECONDS. Board votes unanimously.**  
23

<b>Case #Z26-04</b> Prospect Mountain Survey, Paul Zuzgo, Agent for William & Jill Duca, Owners	<b>Map 33 Lot 31-1</b> <b>22 Mariette Drive</b>	<b>Variences</b> <b>Lakeshore Residential (LR) Zone</b>
--	--	--

24 A **Variance** is requested from Article 400 Section 463B of the Zoning Ordinance to permit  
25 driveway access other than the required street frontage.

26 Mr. Monziona asks to be recused from this case. He stated he has a relationship with the  
27 applicants.

28 **MOTION: To ACCEPT Case #Z26-04 as Complete. Motion by Mr. LaRochelle. Mr.**  
29 **Mankus SECONDS. Board votes unanimously.**

30 Mr. Zuzgo stated that he had come in once before on this case for Mariette Drive. He stated it  
31 was brought up in the Planning Board meeting that he would have to get a variance for the  
32 driveway on the Duca's lot because it is not on his legal frontage. He stated that they have  
33 access on both places. He stated he had already gotten a variance for one. He stated that they  
34 hardly use their driveway on the courtyard. He stated that because it is not on Jewett Farm Road  
35 which is where his legal frontage is he needs to get a variance.

36 Chair Lee stated he saw this come up on the Planning Board. He stated this is a small case but  
37 has taken on monumental concerns.

1 Mr. Zuzgo stated that every time he goes to a meeting something else comes up. Mr. LaRochelle  
2 stated that what is being asked for for this parcel makes total sense, for what they are asking for  
3 of that section of property to enter into their property.

4 Mr. Monzione asked to be excused for the rest of the meeting since there was a quorum and he  
5 was unable to vote on the current case.

6 Chair Lee asked if Mr. LaRochelle had any further comments. Mr. LaRochelle stated he was just  
7 trying to clarify where this parcel of land that is being swapped for the record. Mr. Zuzgo stated  
8 that because it is a road, a right-of-way, but it is land owned by someone else and it's a lot, it's  
9 not buildable, it didn't have the right road frontage for the zone. Chair Lee stated that they had a  
10 covenant bestowed upon them, the Duca's lot, that they had access as well as them and three of  
11 the other lots to Marriette Drive.

12 Mr. Zuzgo stated the big lot only has a legal right-of-way on Jewette Farm. He stated that he has  
13 two places he can access it, on Courtyard and Mariette. He stated the driveway isn't on Jewette  
14 Farm. Chair Lee stated that for purposes of clarity and for the record and the homeowners, this  
15 is painful to go through it again, but it squares it away.

16 Chair Lee asked if the Board had any more questions or concerns. He opened to public input.  
17 There was none in favor or opposition. Chair Lee closed to public input.

18 *The Board must find that all the following conditions are met in order to grant the Variance:*  
19

20 Chair Lee stated that this Variance **will not** be contrary to public interest. Mr. LaRochelle  
21 agrees. Mr. Mankus agrees.  
22

23 Mr. LaRochelle stated that the request **is** in harmony with spirit of the Zoning Ordinance, the  
24 intent of the Master Plan and with the convenience, health, safety and character of the district  
25 within which is proposed. He stated nothing is changing other than ownership. Mr. Mankus  
26 agrees. Chair Lee agrees.  
27

28 Mr. Mankus stated that by granting the Variance substantial justice **will** be done. Chair Lee  
29 agrees. Mr. LaRochelle agrees.  
30

31 Chair Lee stated that the request **will not** diminish the value of surrounding properties. He stated  
32 it does not have any detrimental effect on any other properties and it actually improves the value  
33 because it cleans up boundary lines. Mr. LaRochelle agrees. Mr. Mankus agrees.  
34

35 Mr. LaRochelle stated that for the purposes of sub paragraph unnecessary hardship means that  
36 owing to Special Conditions on the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area,  
37 **no** fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance  
38 provision and the specific application of that provision to this property. He agrees. He believes  
39 that the proposed use is a reasonable one. He agrees. Mr. Mankus agrees. Chair Lee agrees.  
40

1 **MOTION: To APPROVE the for Case #Z26-04, Variance of the Zoning Ordinance of the**  
2 **Town of Alton. Motion by Mr. LaRochelle. Mr. Mankus SECONDS. Board votes**  
3 **unanimously.**  
4

5 **1. Previous Business:** None

6 **2. New Business:** None

7 **3. Approval of Minutes:** ZBA meeting minutes of January 8<sup>th</sup>, 2025.  
8

9 Mr. LaRochelle stated page 12, Line 9, Motion to approve Case #Z25-35, when they were  
10 talking about the approval of the Contractor Yard and then talking about no materials will be  
11 stockpiled or stored on the premises, only business equipment and vehicles will be stored onsite.  
12 He continued to read the minutes and stated that it goes on to say heavy equipment and vehicles  
13 will be stored in the barn when not in use. He read further, no equipment maintenance  
14 operations will be conducted on the site. He stated this is where he needs further clarification.  
15 In the January minutes Mr. LaRochelle stated he had a problem with the no equipment  
16 maintenance operations on site (he agrees he stated that). He stated it goes on to say that he  
17 believes that it covered a broad scope and that it could include things like oil changes and fluids.  
18 He stated he wanted to make sure that it **is included** as long as it is inside the building and not  
19 removed. In the January 8<sup>th</sup> minutes, it was recorded that he did not agree that it should include  
20 things like belts, however, Mr. LaRochelle stated he **does agree** that it **should be** things with  
21 belts. He stated his point was he was making it clear what could be done with regard to repairs  
22 on his own vehicle due to the condition that was placed. He stated he brought up examples like  
23 changing belts, fixing tires, brakes are all things he **should be allowed** to do on his property. He  
24 stated the line referenced did not capture what he was trying to convey.  
25

26 Chair Lee stated that the Motion is most important. He read from the January 8 minutes: Mr.  
27 Morgan modified his Motion to change the “No Equipment Maintenance required onsite” to “No  
28 Equipment Maintenance which would involve changing...” Mr. LaRochelle stated that this is  
29 incorrect and needs to be changed. He stated that the Motion was to allow maintenance within  
30 the building, things like oil change, fluids as long as it was not outside. He stated: doing repairs  
31 such as a lawnmower or hoses, belts, minor repairs. Chair Lee stated it was accurate up to that  
32 point. He stated this was a point Mr. LaRochelle brought up that was contentious and it was  
33 discussed. He stated it was agreed upon that changing fluids was allowed. He stated he did not  
34 believe this to be a dealbreaker for Thane. He stated they will abide by whatever is stated but  
35 added to Mr. LaRochelle’s point it was not recorded correctly.  
36

37 Mr. LaRochelle stated that it needs to be fixed. Chair Lee agreed. Mr. LaRochelle stated that is  
38 not how he said it. He stated it may have been interpreted that way, but his point was to allow it.  
39 Chair Lee stated the only maintenance that would be allowed onsite in the barn would be the  
40 changing of fluids and general maintenance. He stated this does not mean overhauling an engine  
41 and rebuilding it. Mr. LaRochelle agreed and stated minor repairs. Mr. LaRochelle stated all he  
42 was saying was considering letting them do things like belts and hoses and repair work besides  
43 just oil changes. Mr. LaRochelle stated he just has a problem with the way it was written. Chair  
44 Lee stated perhaps it would be helpful if Mr. LaRochelle wrote out exactly what he means and  
45 then he can submit it to Ms. McClain.

1 Ms. McClain stated that that would be helpful. She stated she would submit it to the recording  
2 secretary. Mr. LaRochelle stated he would write it the way he meant it when he said it. Ms.  
3 McClain asked whether she would need to do a modified NOD correction with the different  
4 condition. Chair Lee stated that everything else was correct, just for minute purposes it needs to  
5 be on the record correctly. Mr. LaRochelle stated it needs to be on the record so if somebody  
6 goes back into this they do not question the Town on the answer on this thinking that they were  
7 not allowed to do that, because it says it on here. He stated that was not the meaning. He stated  
8 he would write up something and give it to Ms. McClain so the minutes could be changed. Mr.  
9 Mankus stated they could review it at the next meeting to make sure it is as it was intended.

10

11 **MOTION: To NOT APPROVE the Minutes for January 8<sup>th</sup>, 2026. They are to be amended**  
12 **and they will be considered at the next meeting in March, where they will be reviewed.**  
13 **Motion by Chair Lee.**

14

15 **MOTION: Chair Lee MOTIONS for adjournment. Mr. LaRochelle SECONDS. Board**  
16 **votes unanimously.**

17

18 *ADJOURNMENT*

19 Chairman Tom Lee

20

21 \*If there is foul weather or lack of a quorum, the public hearing will be continued to Thursday,  
22 March 5, 2026, starting at 6:00 P.M. at the Alton Town Hall, and a notice shall be posted stating  
23 same.

24 Respectfully Submitted,

25

26 Sandra Monaco, Recording Secretary