

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

MEMBERS PRESENT

Joseph Mankus (Chair & Member)
Frank Rich (Vice Chair)
Tom Lee
Paul LaRochelle, Member & Selectman's Representative
Paul Monzione (Alternate & Member)

OTHERS PRESENT

Robin McClain, Planning & Zoning Assistant
Tom Varney
Josh Thibeault
George Destremps
Carl Campbell
David Countway
John Tuttle
Dick Shea
Tina Belcastro
Bonnie Belcastro

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Mankus called the meeting to order at 6:00 P.M.

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 Thursday, July 9, 2026 agenda as written. Motion by Chair Mankus. Mr. LaRochelle SECONDS. Motion passed unanimously.

1. NEW APPLICATION

Case #Z26-15 Carl & Karen Campbell, Owners	Map 72 Lot 35 44 Larry Drive	Variance Special Exception Rural (RU) Zone
--	---	---

A **Variance** is requested from **Article 400 Section 452.A** of the Zoning Ordinance to increase the lot size from .28 AC to .35 AC to make location for the existing house (built 11/30/2018) conforming to the property lines and setbacks.

APPOINTMENT OF ALTERNATES

MOTION: To APPOINT Paul Monzione as Alternate. Motion by Mr. Rich. Mr. Lee
SECONDS. Motion passed unanimously.

Ms. McClain asked Chair Mankus if she should call the representative for this case because she did not see them in the audience. She stated that he would be the representative for the next two cases and advised if the Board wanted to move ahead to other cases, they should move to the third case.

Mr. Rich asked Chair Mankus if the Board should consider the Destremps case before the Campbells case because without the approval of the Destremps case the Campbell case couldn't move forward. He stated he may be mistaken but he wanted clarification on it. Chair Mankus stated he agreed. Mr. Rich stated if the Board disapproved the Destremps's (case) then the Campbells couldn't move forward with what they would like to do. Chair Mankus asked if this required a Motion. Ms. McClain didn't think it was necessary. Mr. Rich suggested asking the rest of the Board if they would oppose changing the order. Mr. Rich stated that in order to approve what the Campbells were requesting, the Board needed to approve the Destremps request for Special Exception because they were requesting the Board transfer 3,054 sq ft from Lot 36 to Lot 35. And Lot 35 is asking to do some other things.

Mr. Monzione stated Mr. Rich was suggesting the Board do the lot that is going to give up the land first. Mr. Rich agreed. Mr. Monzione stated that the purpose of that is if it is not approved and they're not allowed to give up the land then the lot that is going to take the land and seeks a Zoning adjustment would be mute because they're not getting the land. Mr. Rich agreed. Mr. Monzione asked if that required an amendment to the agenda because it is not in that order on the agenda. He stated they could move to amend the agenda to put one before the other.

MOTION: To AMEND the order of the agenda. Motion by Mr. Monzione. Mr. Rich
SECONDS. Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Rich stated that he believed the Board needed to move to Case #Z26-16. After that they could move to #Z26-15 after that.

Chair Mankus stated the Board would consider Case #Z26-16.

Case #Z26-16 George and Cheryl Destrempss, Owners	Map 72 Lot 36 36 Larry Drive	Special Exception Rural (RU) Zone
--	---	--

A **Special Exception** is requested from **Article 300 Section 320.F** of the Zoning Ordinance to decrease a preexisting non-conforming lot to accommodate the abutters existing house entirely on their property after the transfer of 3,054 sq ft from Lot 36 to Lot 35.

Chair Mankus asked the party to identify himself.

George Destremps, owner of 36 Larry Drive.

MOTION: To ACCEPT Case #Z26-16 as COMPLETE. Motion by Mr. LaRochelle. Mr. Rich SECONDS. The Board votes unanimously.

Mr. Destremps stated that he purchased the property June 2025 knowing that it was an oversized lot. They did a survey because they were going to put up a garage. They wanted to make sure the garage wasn't encroaching on anybody's property. They found out that part of the kitchen in the neighboring house was on his property. He stated it is a 125x122 foot piece that he has to cut off so Mr. Campbell's house is within his right and Mr. Destremps doesn't have a second kitchen. He stated that unfortunately this is the only way they could do it because he would not make them move the house so he could keep a parcel of his property. He explained and demonstrated on the Site Map for the Board.

Mr. Monziona asked if the Destremps's is a conforming lot in terms of its size as it stands currently, other than the fact that it's being encroached upon by the kitchen. Mr. Destremps stated all of the lots and all ??? are all non-conforming. Mr. Monziona understood. He stated it is non-conforming to begin with. Mr. Destremps stated that his was one of the bigger lots. He stated most of them are .24 or .23. He stated that this is .81. He stated that with this adjustment it would be down to .74. Mr. Monziona stated that they all predate Zoning and they're all non-conforming to begin with. Mr. Destremps stated he has 212 ft of frontage on the front 8 ft in the back. He stated now he will be losing 25 ft of this. He has 212 ft, he believed he needed 200 some odd ft for a conforming lot but now he will be losing 25 ft off of that. He stated Mr. Campbell will gain. He will still have a non conforming lot. Mr. Monziona stated that even after he gains it, it will still be non-conforming. Mr. Destremps agrees. Mr. Monziona stated that even after Mr. Destremps gives it up he will still be non-conforming. He asked if Mr. Destremps's lot was non-conforming only because of the frontage or are there other non-conforming aspects. Mr. Destremps stated the whole lot. Mr. Monziona asked if Mr. Destremps particular lot besides not having enough road frontage as required for a lot today, it also doesn't have enough total sq footage to be a buildable lot. Mr. Destremps continued to demonstrate on the Site Map. He explained that one of the lots is .24. Another lot got purchased last month and they are building a brand new house on that lot. He stated that property owner got permitted to put a house on that lot and a septic. He stated he was unsure what conforming and non conforming was. He knew 200 ft were needed.

Mr. Rich asked if the party he was speaking of was on a different road. Mr. Destremps stated he

1 was on a different road. He stated that the lower lot that he owns is also on a different road also.
2 He stated his address is always combined as one. He demonstrated Scott Dr and Larry Dr on the
3 Site Map. He explained how his property is comparable to an adjacent property where a new
4 house has been built.

5
6 Mr. Rich stated that what Mr. Destremps has been willing to do is grant the next applicant the
7 footage because it is on your property. Mr. Destremps stated that the only other way to give up
8 less square footage would require the other party to take their deck off. He stated it wouldn't be
9 totally 25 ft, but he didn't think it was fair to have to take the deck off. He stated they would go
10 10 ft 8 inches past the deck. He stated Norway Plains surveyed it all. They would get to leave
11 their deck and not have to take anything down and the lot would be just over 25 ft.

12
13 Mr. Rich stated that he understood that all of the lots in this area were non-conforming. Mr.
14 Destremps agreed. He stated that this was one of the bigger lots. There's only a handful that are
15 larger. He stated all of the other ones are .23 ft.

16
17 Mr. Monziona asked when they do the new lot line would they have a 10 ft set back between the
18 lot line and the deck. Mr. LaRochelle stated that that is what Mr. Destremps was saying. Mr.
19 Destremps stated that he believed it would be exactly 10 ft 8 inches.

20
21 Mr. Monziona stated in a sense they would be making it less non-conforming because right now
22 that lot has no setback between the Destremps' and the Campbells. He stated the neighbor's
23 structure is on the Destremps' land. He stated when they do this adjustment it will not be made
24 less non-conforming regarding road frontage or total acreage or size, but they would make it less
25 non-conforming by virtue of the fact that they are creating a 10 ft setback between the
26 Destremps' structure and the Campbell's neighboring lot. He stated that Mr. Destremps said for
27 some reason that the two lots have been being treated as one. He asked if they are two separate
28 lots of record currently.

29
30 Mr. Destremps stated that on the Town map the whole black shaded area is all one lot. Mr.
31 Monziona stated they got merged into one lot somehow. He asked if there was any way that Mr.
32 Destremps takes the lower lot with the main lot if there was any way they could have a total of
33 appropriate road frontage. Mr. Destremps stated 80 ft on Scott Rd. Mr. Monziona stated that
34 those are the only two roads that they were abutting. He stated that those two combined would
35 get them to 200 ft, but it is two separate roads.

36
37 Chair Mankus asked if he said they were 212 ft currently. Mr. Destremps stated the way it sits
38 now before the pins are moved he is at 212 ft. Chair Rich stated that the Destremps would give
39 the Campbells the 10 ft 8 inches. Mr. Destremps stated he was giving 25 ft ???. Chair Mankus
40 stated it was an admirable thing Mr. Destremps was doing. Mr. LaRochelle stated it would make
41 the Campbells less non-conforming and it gets them off of your property. Mr. Destremps stated
42 it gets the Campbells off his property and gets them where they need to be. He stated
43 unfortunately it is still non conforming. Mr. LaRochelle stated that it is not enough to make it
44 totally conforming on either property.

1 Mr. Monzione stated that Section 320 for Special Exception says: "A single-family residence
2 may be erected on any legally existing lot that is non-conforming due to inadequate frontage
3 and/or lot size below the required minimum provided the lot meets all of the applicable
4 requirements." He stated that they were not really talking about wanting to erect a structure. It
5 is a lot line adjustment. He wondered whether Section 320 was the appropriate Zoning
6 ordinance in which to proceed or whether there's another one that is more applicable. He did not
7 know the answer to that. The structure is already erected, it exists. They were creating a new
8 lot. They were actually creating two new lots. Mr. Destremps agreed. Mr. Monzione stated that
9 what they were seeking to do is to create two new lots, one at a time. He stated Mr. Destremps is
10 seeking to create a brand-new lot and that lot will be a non-conforming lot. Mr. Destremps
11 agreed. Mr. Monzione stated that they wanted to make a non-conforming lot. He wondered if
12 that required a Variance. He understood what Mr. Destremps wanted to do and why, he believed
13 the whole Board did. He stated without going through the criteria that it all makes sense. They
14 have a structure encroaching on a lot. He believed that when it is done it makes the situation
15 better for both lots. They would be creating a setback so it will be less non-conforming. He
16 stated that it all seemed to be very positive. He stated he was being a bit nit picky about the
17 procedure where a Special Exception permits someone to build a structure. He stated that if they
18 came to the Board with this lot and it's non-conforming and you wanted to build a building and
19 there was none, Section 320 would be your ordinance that you would proceed under. He stated
20 that he was unsure if this was being done correctly. He stated he doesn't even know the answer
21 to the question because he hasn't viewed the Zoning ordinance to see what else is out there.
22

23 Mr. LaRochelle stated that F was the only one in the category that pertains to the non-
24 conforming lot. He stated that it makes sense for that. Mr. Rich stated that he didn't believe
25 there was anything in their ordinance that actually works with this particular case other than this
26 particular exception. He was not positive. Mr. LaRochelle stated that it doesn't specify anything
27 else in that ordinance. Mr. Rich stated they basically had a special condition with this case. He
28 stated nothing suggests what Mr. Monzione stated.
29

30 Mr. Monzione stated that as far as Special Exceptions are concerned there's nothing that seems to
31 be on point. But if you're trying to create a brand-new lot that is non-conforming what came to
32 his mind is that would be a Variance. He stated that would be doing something that Zoning
33 doesn't allow. It could be procedural nit picking because there are separate criteria for Variance
34 and Special Exception. He was unsure. He stated that the grandfathering goes away because
35 they're creating a brand-new lot. When they create a brand-new lot that is going to be non-
36 conforming right from the get-go for a number of reasons. It would need a Variance. It would be
37 different criteria to use.
38

39 Mr. Destremps stated that it started off as a non-conforming lot. Mr. Monzione stated that is
40 right. Mr. LaRochelle stated that it is still non-conforming but less non-conforming. Mr.
41 Monzione stated they would be making it better. Mr. LaRochelle stated they would be making a
42 better lot out of what they have there. They're taking the non conformity from one. Mr.
43 Monzione stated there is no question. He just wondered procedurally how to go about doing this
44 in a way that stands up.
45

1 Mr. Destremps stated that the man on Scott Drive was building that brand new house and that
2 is .24 ft. He stated it is already a non-conforming lot. He got a building permit to put a brand-
3 new house up and septic on that lot. Mr. Monziona stated that would have been a good example
4 of a Special Exception because that was someone who was trying to erect a building on a non-
5 conforming lot. He stated that the chances are that that person came before the ZBA and got a
6 Special Exception and now it is up there. He stated that what Mr. Destremps was doing was
7 creating a brand-new lot. It would no longer be the grandfathered lot. Right now, they are fine
8 because it is grandfathered. As soon as they do a lot line adjustment it is really in the form of a
9 minor subdivision because they are creating two lots. He was unsure how to do it procedurally.
10 He stated looking at Section 320 that deals with erecting a structure on a non-conforming lot,
11 looking through the criteria, he is not sure how he would apply those to what was being asked.
12

13 Mr. Destremps stated that this all came about because he had it surveyed because he wanted to
14 put a garage on the property. He asked if this would affect his being able to put up the garage.
15 He has enough land to put up a garage. Mr. Lee stated that the lot is already a non-conforming
16 lot. Mr. LaRochelle stated that it is still non-conforming even after the lot line adjustment.
17

18 Mr. Monziona stated that this deals with residence. Mr. Destremps wondered if that meant the
19 garage wouldn't have any affect. Mr. Monziona stated that if the garage can go on the lot and
20 meet all of the appropriate setbacks, you're just building a structure. He stated it is not a
21 residential structure. He stated that the fact that the lot is non-conforming shouldn't come into
22 play there at all. As long as the structure is going to be built in a way that complies with all of
23 the appropriate setbacks. He stated they would need to get a building permit in order to do it.
24

25 He stated that he believed on a lot line adjustment he was unsure whether Special Exception 320
26 is what would be used to do the lot line adjustment. He stated he was just putting it out there and
27 did not have the answer.
28

29 Mr. Rich asked Mr. Monziona is he thought the applicant needed to apply for a Variance. Mr.
30 Monziona stated that his understanding is that it should be an application for a Variance to create
31 a non-conforming lot and to show all the reasons why creating a non-conforming lot is
32 appropriate.
33

34 Mr. Rich reassured Mr. Destremps that the Board understood what was presented. He asked Mr.
35 Monziona if once Mr. Destremps applies for the Variance he will no longer be grandfathered in
36 for his existing lot. Mr. Monziona stated no, because if the Variance is denied then it maintains
37 the status quo. If the Variance is granted, then he is good because he has a Variance. He would
38 no longer need the grandfathering. The Board had permitted it, and his lot is legal and he can do
39 what he wants to do at that point.
40

41 Mr. Destremps asked if the Variance is denied does he have to live with that house on his
42 property. Mr. Monziona stated that if the Variance is denied, he would still grandfathered and he
43 is a property owner who has an encroachment from a neighboring property. Mr. Destremps
44 asked what he would do about that. Mr. Monziona stated that that was not a matter for the Board.
45 Mr. Destremps stated that that was why he came before the Board. Mr. Monziona stated that

1 what the parties were seeking to do made complete sense and it solves the problem. Mr.
2 Destremps stated that his bank isn't very happy that his neighbor's house is on his property. Mr.
3 Rich stated that the Board is in support of it, but they wanted to make sure for the record that
4 going forward they would be okay with everything that has been done including with your
5 abutter that you're trying to accommodate.

6
7 Mr. Monziona stated that lawyers are famous at conjuring up bad scenarios and then trying to do
8 things to avoid them. He stated that what he was thinking about was if down the road someone
9 does a title search of this property and they see that a Special Exception was granted to do this
10 and they challenged the validity of the Special Exception because it wasn't the appropriate
11 process by which to create a non-conforming lot, maybe it becomes a headache. Maybe it never
12 does. Maybe 100 years go by and everybody dies in peace. Mr. Monziona feels it is appropriate
13 to make sure that everything is being done correctly so that down the road nobody can ever
14 question what happened, if the Board proceeded according to the appropriate Zoning ordinance,
15 if you met the criteria, it was granted, everything is fine. He stated this one is seeking a Special
16 Exception to erect a building on a non-conforming lot. He stated that they were not there to erect
17 a building. He stated they were there for a boundary line adjustment and they were going to
18 create a lot that is in violation of Zoning. He believed it needed a Variance.

19
20 Mr. Destremps stated he bought the house in June of 2025. He stated it had a title search done
21 and his neighbor had a title search done and none of these issues came up. Mr. LaRochelle stated
22 that nobody caught it. Mr. Destremps stated that it was done by two different companies. Chair
23 Mankus stated that in 2019 a house was also partially built crossing property lines. Mr.
24 Destremps stated that his house is only three or four years old.

25
26 Mr. Monziona stated that on the title that was being discussed, he felt this issue was more in the
27 realm of surveying as opposed to title. He stated once you create a new lot, that gets recorded, so
28 that would be a title issue. He stated that nobody is looking at doing a title search and seeing
29 anything about encroachment because it is not being surveyed. Once this step is done you will
30 have created a new lot. Mr. Destremps stated that this all came about because he had his
31 property surveyed. He paid Norway Plains to survey it. He stated that the builder, who was in
32 attendance at this meeting had three houses built and not one was surveyed. He stated that his
33 house was the newest one.

34
35 Mr. Lee made a comment that even though the Board flipped the order in which the cases were
36 being heard, if they had gone with the cases as they were originally lined up to be heard, which
37 was for a Variance, and then the Destremps' came after and the Variance was granted on
38 (Case)15, that satisfies what the Board is looking for, they would have a Variance on the abutter.
39 He stated then the Destremps' would come forward with the Special Exception. Mr. LaRochelle
40 stated that made sense. Mr. Monziona stated they both need a Variance and he didn't feel the
41 Special Exception was necessary. The Variances were enough. They were not asking to build a
42 family residence on either of these lots. They were asking to create brand new lots that are going
43 to be non-conforming. He stated that application #Z26-15 is seeking a Variance to do that. He
44 felt that was the right process to get that.

1 Mr. LaRochelle asked if that was without going to the Special Exception. Mr. Monzione stated
2 he didn't think they need it because once they get a Variance their lot would be okay. They
3 legally have the right to do it but they don't logistically have the right to do it until the next lot is
4 granted and the properties can actually be exchanged or conveyed.

5
6 Mr. Lee asked if at this point it would be best to go with a continuance and no charge to either
7 party come back and have it rewritten as a Variance. That would protect Mr. Destremps
8 especially with him wanting to build a garage down the road. It couldn't be questioned. Mr.
9 Monzione stated he felt the Variance was the way to go and get back on in the very next session
10 with a Variance application on both of these lots. He didn't want to give legal advice but he
11 didn't see that a Special Exception 320 F deals with the correction of a residential structure.
12 They weren't looking to build anything. He didn't feel they needed to come in with any Zoning
13 ordinance that addresses itself to whether you can build something on a lot or not. They were
14 looking to create lots. They want non-conforming lots. If it gets denied they will still be okay
15 because you are still grandfathered in. Mr. Rich stated that the way he understood what Mr.
16 Monzione was saying was the appropriate thing, the Board wants to make sure that the applicant
17 is given every appropriate avenue to do what they want to do on their own lot, because they're
18 trying to help out their neighbor and at the same time the Board doesn't want to jeopardize the
19 applicant's lot and create a problem. Mr. Destremps needs to reapply for a Variance. Chair
20 Mankus agreed.

21
22 Mr. Destremps stated that he didn't realize that his neighbor applied for a Variance. Mr. Rich
23 stated that he may have prompted this whole thing by changing the order in which the cases were
24 heard. He stated that they would still need a Variance and the Board would still have to
25 disapprove it. The Board wanted to continue this with no charge to either applicant. He stated
26 he would like to do it right and make sure it's legal and appropriate. The Board wanted to make
27 sure that the applicant and his abutter do not have issues down the road. Mr. LaRochelle stated
28 they wanted to make sure it was recorded properly. Mr. Rich stated that the Board understood
29 what Mr. Destremps wanted to do and they are in agreement, but just want to make sure it is
30 done right.

31
32 Mr. Destremps understood. Mr. Rich stated that it wasn't about structures being built. It was
33 about land changing. Mr. Lee stated that for the record, if Mr. Destremps wants to go forward,
34 he has to ask for a continuance. Mr. Rich stated that he needed to ask for a continuance. Mr.
35 Destremps asked for the continuance. Chair Mankus stated he could.

36
37 **MOTION: To MOVE at the request of the applicant that Case #Z26-16 be CONTINUED**
38 **for the next ZBA meeting. Motion by Mr. Monzione. (Unsure if this was given a SECOND)**
39

40 Ms. McClain stated that the date of this meeting was the deadline for new applications so this
41 would need to be continued to the October 2026 meeting.

42
43 **MOTION: To AMEND the previous Motion that it be continued to the October meeting.**
44 **Motion by Mr. Monzione. (No SECOND was given)**
45

Ms. McClain asked if this would be considered a new application or a continuance. The Board stated a continuance. Ms. McClain stated that in that case September would be fine. She was under the impression that this would be a new application. The only issue she anticipated, which she could work with Norway Plains was she would need to get things very quickly so she could renotice for a Variance. She stated that she could speak to the applicants and see if they could continue to the following month if it got held up somehow. Mr. Monziona stated that at least as far as the Board is concerned if the Board makes the motion and Mr. Rich stated September 3rd.

MOTION: To ALLOW a continuance to amend the application to seek a Variance and the continuance would be September 3rd, 2026 meeting. Motion by Mr. Monziona.
Mr. LaRochelle SECONDS. (Mr. Countway interrupted the Board vote.)

Chair Mankus asked them to step up to the microphone and introduce themselves.

David Countway, Realtor, Maxfield Real Estate. He was involved with the builder John Tuttle who is in the audience. Mr. Tuttle built house that has the encroachment five years ago. He was unsure if they had a photograph on the back of their information. Mr. LaRochelle stated that the Board did have a photograph. Mr. Countway stated that the picture shows how it impacts. He stated the previous owner of the property did some wonderful landscaping all around the house. Mr. Campbell and his wife, the new owners of the property last year are new residents of Alton. He believed the application that was before the Board was done carefully with input from the Planning Department, with Norway Plains trying to make sure everything was done appropriately and carefully with the goal of taking the appropriate action that would allow this to move forward with Planning Board meeting scheduled for the 18th of August. He did not know how appropriate input from the Planning Department or Norway Plains could have not foreseen the fact that this was a request for a Variance as opposed to just a lot line adjustment. He stated that in Wolfeboro they have a procedure called a reconfiguration of non-conforming lots, which is basically what was being proposed at this meeting, a lot line adjustment.

He represented John Tuttle on the sale of the property that Mr. and Mrs. Destremps bought last year. Both Mr. Campbell and his wife Karen and George and Cheryl both said they would never have bought the properties if they had known there were boundary questions. He stated that he talked with Sharon Wister at the Total Pro office. As a realtor he has seen in certain cases a request to have survey work done to identify and show appropriately where the corner pins are on the property. He stated that is part of getting a mortgage. He said that Sharon said about 15 years ago the banking industry gave up that requirement and instead they charge \$50 when someone is seeking a mortgage. He stated that is because in 100 cases maybe there's one case where somebody has an exception that has to be addressed. He stated that seems to cover the concerns as opposed to requiring somebody who is a first-time home buyer trying to buy a house with 3% down. The added cost of having a full survey done on the property might prohibit them from buying a property. He stated that in his understanding the application was done appropriately to bring it before the Board for this meeting. He understood the concerns that Mr. Monziona was raising as well. They want it to be done properly. He wanted both the Destremps and the Campbells to know that there was the community of Alton and the volunteers that serve on the Boards have an interest in helping property owners solve problems such as this.

1 He scheduled a meeting with Ryan Heath. He wanted him to know there was somebody
2 personally involved in the government that was interested in their dilemma because it was a
3 dilemma and terribly upsetting factor to both families. He stated that it sounded like the matter
4 was moving forward which was great. He was unsure that what was being requested was a lot
5 line adjustment that can't be addressed this evening. He stated that he knew they had tried to do
6 everything to elicit good communication between the parties involved. He stated that has
7 certainly been a goal. He stated he was not trying to represent John Tuttle as the builder. He
8 stated he was just wanting to make sure that the Destremps' and the Campbells know that this is
9 a community that cares about their problem and wants to help them get it resolved.

10
11 Mr. Rich stated that Mr. Countway was absolutely right. The Board is there to try to make sure
12 that their constituents when they have a hardship like this is to make sure the Board does the
13 appropriate thing. He felt the Board understands what the two landowners are trying to do. The
14 Board just wants to make sure that it is done appropriately so that down the road they don't get
15 into legal issues later, especially if they want to sell their properties. They wanted to get it right.
16 He stated Mr. Monziona has brought up a very good point. If they need a Variance, make sure to
17 do it appropriately. He stated it would not change anything. The homes are there. It is a lot line
18 adjustment to adjudicate the issue that was evidently created in 2018, without their knowledge.
19 He stated that the Board wants to do it correctly. They want it to be on the record if anyone was
20 to appeal this later on. The Board wants to be sure that they did the appropriate thing and felt
21 comfortable with it. He stated that they wanted to make sure that the applicants are comfortable
22 with what the Board did. The Board wants to be sure the parties feel comfortable with what they
23 did. I it was holding up a home or construction or something that would be a different story. He
24 stated maybe they could accelerate it. This is just to get it clarified properly. He believed Mr.
25 Countway has heard from the Board that they don't have an issue with what both landowners are
26 trying to do. They commend them for doing that. He stated that they want to do it the right way.

27
28 Mr. Countway stated that in the example that George gave about the building on the lot in back,
29 Mr. Monziona stated that that individual probably had to get a Special Exception. He stated that
30 that was not the case. He represented a number of families buying individual lots or selling
31 individual homes. If you can demonstrate that the land will support a well and a two-bedroom
32 septic design, then you can get a permit without getting a Special Exception to build. He had a
33 case on Larry Drive on the other side the Varney Engineering Company came out and
34 demonstrated that there was a seasonal stream. Varney Engineering stated that that was an
35 unbuildable lot. He stated that the owner of that property blended two lots together because they
36 owned the lot next to it. There is oversight on what you can and cannot do on these small lots.
37 He did not believe you needed to get a Special Exception to get a building permit for a septic
38 design if a well location can be identified.

39
40 Mr. Rich stated that if you see what is in the information that was given to the Board, it says pre
41 '67. Mr. Countway agreed. Mr. Rich stated that these lots were approved in 1961. He stated
42 there was no Zoning. He stated that the Board understands that. He stated that moving forward
43 neither of these landowners have to worry about what is going to happen in the future. He stated
44 that this will be done appropriately and they can refer back to this hearing going forward. This

Board is especially sensitive towards these small lots. The Board commends both parties for doing what they think is the appropriate thing to do.

Mr. Countway stated he served as a library trustee for 23 years. He stated that they expanded their beautiful library in town. He hoped that George and Carl might see themselves serving on a Board in the future just because Alton is that kind of a community where people can come together and work to resolve problems.

MOTION: Board voted unanimously.

Mr. Rich stated that the case would be continued until September 3rd. Chair Mankus stated that would be for both cases.

Chair Mankus addressed Case #Z26-15.

Case #Z26-15 Carl & Karen Campbell, Owners	Map 72 Lot 35 44 Larry Drive	Variance Special Exception
--	---	---

1. A Variance is requested from Article 400 Section 452.A of the Zoning Ordinance to increase the lot size from .28AC to .35AC to make location of existing house (built 11/30/2018) conforming to property lines and setbacks.

2. A Special Exception is requested from Article 300 Section 320.F of the Zoning Ordinance to increase a pre-existing non-conforming lot in order to accommodate the existing house and deck entirely on the property after the transfer of 3,054 SF from abutting lot.

Chair Mankus invited the Campbells to introduce themselves.

Carl Campbell, 44 Larry Drive.

Chair Mankus asked Mr. Campbell after listening to the previous case whether he was in agreement with continuing until September 3rd. Mr. Campbell agreed.

MOTION: To CONTINUE Case #Z26-15 to the next meeting of September 3rd, 2026.
Motion by Mr. Monziona. Mr. Lee SECONDS. Board votes unanimously.

Mr. Campbell asked if his paperwork for the next meeting was all set. The Board agreed.

Chair Mankus called the next case.

Case #Z26-17 Varney Engineering, Tom Varney, Agent for Henry & Ellen Decker, Owners	Map 34 Lot 33-11 81 Mount Major Highway	Variance Special Exceptions Residential (R) Zone
---	--	---

1. A Variance is requested from Article 300 Section 327.A.1 & 2 of the Zoning Ordinance

1 for the replacement of a building to be rebuilt 6' inside the front set back and within 10.5'
2 in the shore setback.

3 **2. A Special Variance** is requested from **Article 300 Section D.3.e** of the Zoning
4 Ordinance to allow the expansion of more than 10% of gross floor area.

5 **3. A Special Exception** is requested from **Article 300 Section 320.D.3** of the Zoning
6 Ordinance to allow the expansion of a non-conforming use.

7 **4. A Special Exception** is requested from **Article 300 Section 320.E.2** of the Zoning
8 Ordinance to allow the replacement of a non-conforming structure.
9

10 **MOTION: To ACCEPT application #Z26-17 as COMPLETE. Motion by Mr. LaRochelle.**
11 **Mr. Rich SECONDS. Board votes unanimously.**
12

13 Chair Mankus asked the parties to introduce themselves.
14

15 Tom Varney, Varney Engineering and Josh Thibeault of Varney Engineering.
16

17 Mr. Varney stated that he was presenting in behalf of Henry and Ellen Decker. The property is in
18 the Christian Conference at the bay. The owners were in Pennsylvania. They have been
19 connected to the campground for 60 or so years. They own this cottage which is along Rand
20 Cove. He stated it is beyond Bob's Clamshell going towards Laconia. There's a series of
21 houses. He stated it is a white house that you might recognize if you looked at the pictures. The
22 water is behind it and the water is in front of the lake. The building is 75 years old with a dirt
23 crawl space. They would like to demolish the cottage and build another in the same footprint. A
24 full foundation is to be installed. A second floor is to be built. The campground association has
25 approved the proposed structure. The septic system, water supply, landscaping are to remain the
26 same. A New Hampshire Shoreland Permit is required and will be applied for.
27

28 He shared pictures so they can see the building and get an idea of what it is. He stated he also
29 had architectural drawings which were done to fit the building on the footprint with no expansion
30 at all other than squaring off the roof and a full foundation. That gives the building more space
31 as the Deckers simply need more space. The sill of the building would stay the same. He stated
32 they have close proximity to the other buildings like everywhere in the campground. They have
33 a nice landscape around the building. They are proposing to tear down the building and then
34 build it, same footprint but incorporate some storm water measures to keep dirty water out of the
35 lake which has phosphorus which is the element that pollutes the lake. It comes off of the roof,
36 off the road, off the soil etc. They have drip edges and rain gutters to do that. The landscaping
37 will come back because the association owns the land and somebody in the neighborhood is a
38 real landscaper with quality type plantings etc. The Deckers stated that they do not do the
39 landscaping, but it is impressive. There are no issues with the driveway, the septic or things like
40 that. It stays the same use just a different structure. They asked for different Variances and
41 Special Exceptions which is the reason for their attendance at this meeting.
42

43 Mr. Lee asked Mr. Varney or Mr. Thibeault to address the difference in height from the current
44 structure to the new structure. (Could not hear Mr. Varney's response due to noise in mic). Mr.
45 Rich asked Mr. Varney if he had a Variance of 10% gross floor area, over 10%. Mr. Varney

1 agreed. Mr. Rich asked how much more it would be. Mr. Varney stated it would be a lot more.
2 The second floor would be expanded. The basement adds a lot. Mr. Rich stated that the floor
3 space is actually going to be the basement and the second floor. Mr. Varney agreed. Mr. Rich
4 stated that it was still on the same footprint. Mr. Varney agreed. Mr. Rich stated that was why
5 one of the Variances that he had was over 10% gross floor space, but really is not changing the
6 footprint. The height is only a couple of feet more than what it is now. He asked if it was
7 blocking anyone's view. Mr. Varney did not believe so. He stated it was on a little peninsula by
8 itself. Mr. Rich stated he went by but he didn't see anything that it could obstruct. He wanted to
9 make sure that it was stated for the record. Chair Mankus stated there's nobody in the other
10 direction near the wooded lot.

11
12 Mr. LaRochelle asked if he could clarify something that Mr. Rich and Mr. Lee had touched on.
13 He stated that looking at the old structure, the second-floor center was the part that was the
14 second floor and then the added sections on either end were short of being a second floor. He
15 stated that what was being done was squaring that off, front and back, on the footprint that is
16 existing now. Mr. Varney agreed. Mr. LaRochelle stated that Mr. Varney would not be enlarging
17 that in any way, not moving forward, not encroaching on the road or encroaching backwards or
18 on either side. He stated that they would be building the structure the exact same footprint
19 straight up and finishing off the second floor to utilize that footage. Mr. Lee added that there
20 would be a 4 ft height difference. Mr. Rich stated that from everything that he could see Mr.
21 Varney and Mr. Thibeault had taken the time to make sure the water run off is being mitigated by
22 everything that they were doing on the property in terms of roof drains and pervious areas etc.
23 He commended the parties for making it all work. He asked what the distance was between the
24 two homes on the sides of the home. He stated it looked pretty narrow. Mr. Varney stated that
25 the closest was 10.1 ft on the left looking at the plan. He stated it is 19.5 ft on the right. Mr.
26 Rich stated that the Board struggles with the Christian Center all the time in terms of what
27 transpired 25-30 years ago. There was a tremendous fire there. He stated the Board is always
28 very concerned about safety at the Christian Center as he was sure the residents were also. He
29 stated that the new home would have to go with the new building codes and fire safety.

30
31 Chair Mankus stated he believed the spacing between each of the homes was pretty equal. Mr.
32 Varney stated it's a little lopsided. The building could be moved over, even though they were not
33 suggesting that, but it could be balanced out. Chair Mankus stated that each house is in a small
34 space. Mr. Varney stated that there are other buildings that are a lot closer. Mr. LaRochelle
35 agreed. Mr. Rich agreed. Mr. Monziona stated that he believed there was a comment from the
36 Fire Department requesting that the structure (Indiscernible). Mr. LaRochelle stated they wanted
37 the parties to adhere to all of the NFPA life safety codes, State of New Hampshire codes for new
38 construction. Mr. Rich stated that the parties did bring that up. He asked the parties if they
39 would mind the Board putting it in as a condition. Mr. Varney suggested they put in fireproof
40 clapboards and that kind of thing. He stated he was limited with that kind of thing. He stated it
41 had been asked for and done in the past. Mr. Monziona stated there was an outside oil tank. He
42 asked if that would remain or would it go in the newly constructed basement. He stated he saw it
43 in the picture he was unsure of whether it was actually there. Mr. Varney and Mr. Thibeault were
44 unsure as well.

1 Mr. Monzione asked if on Variance number one, a Variance to rebuild 6 ft inside the front
2 setback. He asked what the front setback was. Mr. Varney stated it was 25 ft from the –Mr.
3 Monzione asked if it was the right of way. Mr. Varney stated that was correct. Mr. Monzione
4 stated that the front setback referred to was a right of way setback. Mr. Thibeault stated it was
5 Route 11. Mr. Monzione asked what it meant when it said 6 ft inside since they said they were
6 staying in the same footprint. Mr. Varney stated they are but they are non-conforming . Mr.
7 Monzione stated that in other words they were asking for a Variance for what already exists. Mr.
8 Varney agreed. Mr. Monzione stated that the structure that it currently there, that they are
9 staying in the footprint of is 6 ft into the 25 ft setback. Mr. Varney agreed. Mr. Monzione stated
10 that they were not changing that. He stated that they were seeking a Variance because it exists.
11 Mr. Varney stated that if the building gets torn down and is vacant and the neighbor says what are
12 you doing over there, and he says he's going to rebuild it, and then the neighbor doesn't agree.
13 Mr. Monzione stated that the Variance allows you to put it on the same footprint which he
14 thought was the right thing to do. He stated that inside the front setback within 10.5 ft in the
15 shore setback, again that is the current footprint. He asked if they were talking about the 30 ft
16 setback. Mr. Varney stated 30 ft from the lake. Mr. Monzione stated they would be 19.5 ft from
17 the lake. He stated they would be 10.5 ft in the setback, just like they would be 19 ft from the
18 highway because you're going to be 6 ft into the setback. He stated it was the same footprint,
19 just getting a Variance to cover themselves.

20
21 Mr. Varney stated he was trying to address some issues that's why he asked for the Variance for
22 the 10%, no skirting around that one. Chair Mankus asked if the Board had any more questions.
23 There were none. He asked if there was any public input against the application. There were no
24 comments. He asked if there were any in favor. There were none.

25
26 Mr. Rich asked Chair Mankus if they could start with the first Variance. Chair Mankus agreed.

27
28 *The Board must find that all the following conditions are met in order to grant the Variance:*

29
30 Chair Mankus stated that the Variance **will not** be contrary to the public interest. He felt it would
31 be the opposite because they would be upgrading a home into today's codes and standards. Mr.
32 Monzione agreed. Mr. LaRochelle agreed. Mr. Lee agreed. Mr. Rich agreed.

33
34 Mr. Monzione stated that the request **is** in harmony with the spirit of the Zoning Ordinance and
35 the intent of the Master Plan and with the convenience, health and safety and character of the
36 district within which it is proposed. His reason for saying was they were staying within the
37 footprint. They're simply improving the structure and making it better in many ways,
38 environmentally, and in terms of safety. Mr. LaRochelle agreed for the same reasons. Mr. Lee
39 agreed. Mr. Rich agreed. Chair Mankus agreed.

40
41 Mr. LaRochelle stated by granting the Variance substantial justice **will** be done. He stated that
42 the existing seasonal residential use is going to remain. Mr. Monzione agreed. (Note: Not all
43 Board members voted on this.)
44

1 Mr. Lee stated that the request **will not** diminish the value of surrounding properties. He stated if
2 anything it would enhance the surrounding properties with an upgrade as far as the basement is
3 concerned, and finishing off a new house. Mr. Rich agreed and stated it would also improve the
4 fire safety issue that always exists in that complex. Chair Mankus stated safety issues and the
5 aesthetic value of the neighborhood. He believed that was the last house. Mr. Monziona stated
6 there was a likelihood that it would enhance the value. Mr. LaRochelle stated he agreed as well.
7

8 Mr. Rich stated that for the purposes of sub paragraph unnecessary hardship means that owing to
9 Special Conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, **no** fair
10 and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the Ordinance
11 provision and the specific application of that provision to the property. He stated that the
12 Christian Center is a very special property. All of these homes are on one lot and it takes the
13 Board a lot of time to make sure that they treat the residents there appropriately and at the same
14 time make sure that it is safe and secure and sound for the community. Chair Mankus agreed to
15 both. Mr. Monziona stated he agreed. He stated he thought that this Variance – Mr. Rich
16 interrupted stated that the proposed use is a reasonable one. Mr. Monziona agreed. He stated he
17 thought there was no fair and substantial relationship that exists for the general public purpose of
18 the ordinance. He stated they were discussing Variance 1 which is 6 ft inside the front setback
19 and 10.5 ft on the shore setback. He stated they existed and they're not being increased in any
20 way. He stated the proposed use is a reasonable one. He stated it is the same use, which is
21 residential. Mr. LaRochelle agreed on both. Mr. Lee agreed.
22

23 **MOTION: To ACCEPT application #Z26-17 for a Variance from Article 300 Section 327 as**
24 **passed. Motion by Chair Mankus. Mr. Monziona SECONDS. Board votes unanimously.**
25

26 Chair Mankus moved to the second Variance. A Variance is requested from Article 300 Section
27 D.3.E of the Zoning ordinance to allow the expansion of more than 10% of the gross floor. Mr.
28 Monziona asked if they were going to the worksheet or if they were opening to public input. He
29 stated he thought they were covered in one. Mr. LaRochelle stated they should go right to the
30 worksheet. Mr. Monziona asked if they were going to public input. Chair Mankus asked if they
31 should go right to public input. Mr. Monziona agreed.
32

33 Chair Mankus opened to public input for this application for the Variance from Article 300.
34 There were no comments. He asked if anyone was against the application. There were no
35 comments.
36

37 *The Board must find that all the following conditions are met in order to grant the Variance:*
38

39 Mr. Rich stated that the Variance **will not** be contrary to the public interest. There has been no
40 public interest in anything contrary to it. The improvement of the building being demolished and
41 being rebuilt is only going to be an improvement for the entire community. Chair Mankus
42 agreed. Mr. Monziona agreed. Mr. LaRochelle agreed. Mr. Lee agreed.
43

44 Chair Mankus stated that the request **is** in harmony with the spirit of the Zoning Ordinance and
45 the intent of the Master Plan and with the convenience, health and safety and character of the

1 district within which it is proposed. The safety of the neighborhood would improve in bringing
2 the house up to code. Mr. Monzione agreed. Mr. LaRochelle agreed. Mr. Lee agreed. Mr. Rich
3 agreed.

4
5 Mr. Monzione stated by granting the Variance substantial justice **will** be done. The 10% increase
6 beyond the 10% gross floor area is being captured inside the building. It is being done in a very
7 appropriate way. There is nothing that is going to adversely impact anything in the
8 neighborhood and is basically in compliance with what is up there. Mr. LaRochelle agreed. Mr.
9 Lee agreed. Mr. Rich agreed. Chair Mankus agreed.

10
11 Mr. LaRochelle stated that the request **will not** diminish the value of surrounding properties. If
12 anything, taking down an old building that needs to be replaced and putting up a new building in
13 code and to all specifications, usually only increases the value of the neighborhood. Mr. Lee
14 agreed. Mr. Rich agreed. Chair Mankus agreed. Mr. Monzione agreed.

15
16 Mr. Lee stated that for the purposes of sub paragraph unnecessary hardship means that owing to
17 Special Conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, **no** fair
18 and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the Ordinance
19 provision and the specific application of that provision to the property. Yes. And the proposed
20 use is a reasonable one. Yes. Mr. Rich agreed. Chair Mankus agreed. Mr. Monzione agreed.
21 Mr. LaRochelle agreed.

22
23 **MOTION: To APPROVE application #Z26-17 for Variance #2 with the condition that the**
24 **Fire Department concerns as stated on the review sheet be met. Motion by Mr. Monzione.**
25 **Mr. LaRochelle SECONDS. Board votes unanimously.**

26
27 Chair Mankus moved to the Special Exception from Article 300 Section 320.D.3. He asked if
28 there was any public input for or against the application. There were no comments.

29
30 *The Board must find that all the following conditions are met in order to grant the Special*
31 *Exception:*

32
33 Mr. Lee stated that a plat/plan **has** been submitted in accordance with the appropriate criteria in
34 the Zoning Ordinance, Article 500, Section 520.B. The Board agreed.

35
36 Mr. LaRochelle stated the specific site **is** an appropriate location for the use. This is a residential
37 structure and the use is not changing and it is staying on the same footprint. The Board agreed.

38
39 Mr. Monzione stated that factual evidence **is not** found that the property values in the district
40 will be reduced due to incompatible land use. There is no incompatible land use and second,
41 there is no evidence from testimony from abutters or anyone else that would establish that the
42 property values would be reduced. The Board agreed.

43
44 Chair Mankus stated there **is no** valid objection from abutters based on demonstrable fact. The
45 Board agreed.

1
2 Mr. Rich stated there **is no** undue nuisance or serious hazard to pedestrian or vehicular traffic,
3 including the location and design of access-ways and off-street parking. The Christian Center has
4 been there for a long time. They manage their roads and are very serious about pedestrians and
5 traffic. He saw no undue nuisance whatsoever. Chair Mankus agreed. Mr. Monziona stated he
6 agreed there was nothing about the changes to the structure that are going to impact pedestrian or
7 vehicular traffic. It is staying within the footprint. Mr. LaRochelle agreed. Mr. Lee agreed.

8
9 Chair Mankus stated adequate and appropriate facilities and utilities **will** be provided to ensure
10 the proper operation of the proposed use of the structure. Mr. Monziona agreed that it will be
11 provided. Mr. LaRochelle agreed. Mr. Lee agreed. Mr. Rich agreed that the utilities and
12 facilities at the complex are in excellent condition.

13
14 Mr. Monziona stated there **is** adequate area for safe and sanitary sewage disposal and water
15 supply. The Board was told by the applicant's representative that the same water supply and
16 septic and sewage etc. will remain. Mr. LaRochelle agreed for the same reasons. Mr. Lee
17 agreed. Mr. Rich agreed. Chair Mankus agreed.

18
19 Mr. LaRochelle stated the proposed use or structure **is** consistent with the spirit of this Ordinance
20 and the intent of the Master Plan. He stated that it is a very difficult property. There are many,
21 many structures on this property. As stated earlier it is an old development area. It is an existing
22 residential and being maintained as residential, so it is exactly where the Master Plan and the
23 ordinance would want it to be to make it a better updated and safe property. Mr. Lee agreed. Mr.
24 Rich agreed. Chair Mankus agreed. Mr. Monziona agreed.

25
26 **MOTION: To APPROVE Case #Z26-17 for a Special Exception Article 300 Section**
27 **320.D.3. Motion by Mr. Lee. Mr. Rich SECONDS. Board votes unanimously.**

28
29 Chair Mankus moved to the last Special Exception application for this case. Special Exception
30 requested from Article 300 Section 320.E.2 of the Zoning ordinance to allow replacement of a
31 non-conforming structure. He asked if anyone in the public had comments for or against this
32 application. There were no comments.

33
34 *The Board must find that all the following conditions are met in order to grant the Special*
35 *Exception:*

36
37 Chair Mankus stated that a plat/plan **has** been submitted in accordance with the appropriate
38 criteria in the Zoning Ordinance, Article 500, Section 520.B. The Board agreed.

39
40 Mr. Monziona stated the specific site **is** an appropriate location for the use. The use is not
41 changing and it is a residential use. Mr. LaRochelle agreed. Mr. Lee agreed. Mr. Rich agreed.
42 Chair Mankus agreed.

43
44 Mr. LaRochelle stated that factual evidence **is not** found that the property values in the district
45 will be reduced due to incompatible land use. If anything this is just increasing the value. Mr.

Lee agreed. Mr. Rich agreed. Chair Mankus agreed. Mr. Monzione agreed and stated that there is no incompatible land use involved in this.

Mr. Lee stated there **is no** valid objection from abutters based on demonstrable fact. Mr. Rich agreed. Chair Mankus agreed. Mr. Monzione agreed. Mr. LaRochelle agreed.

Mr. Rich stated there **is no** undue nuisance or serious hazard to pedestrian or vehicular traffic, including the location and design of access-ways and off-street parking. Chair Mankus agreed. Mr. Monzione agreed. Nothing about this structure was going to interfere with vehicular or pedestrian traffic. Mr. LaRochelle agreed. Mr. Lee agreed.

Chair Mankus stated adequate and appropriate facilities and utilities **will** be provided to ensure the proper operation of the proposed use of the structure. Mr. Monzione agreed. It was represented by the applicant that the water supply and septic or sewerage would remain the same. Mr. LaRochelle agreed. Mr. Lee agreed. Mr. Rich agreed.

Mr. Monzione stated there **is** adequate area for safe and sanitary sewage disposal and water supply. Mr. LaRochelle agreed. Mr. Lee agreed. Mr. Rich agreed. Chair Mankus agreed.

Mr. LaRochelle stated the proposed use or structure **is** consistent with the spirit of this Ordinance and the intent of the Master Plan. It is an existing building footprint and it remains existing. The use is not changing so this follows the Master Plan. Mr. Lee agreed. Mr. Rich agreed. Chair Mankus agreed. Mr. Monzione agreed.

MOTION: To APPROVE Case #Z26-17 for a Special Exception from Article 300 Section 320. Motion by Chair Mankus. Mr. Monzione SECONDS. Board votes unanimously.

Case #Z26-18	Map 49 Lot 31-2 12 Boat Cove Road	Variances Special Exception Lakeshore Residential (LR) Zone
Varney Engineering, LLC, Tom Varney, Agent for The Tina M. Belcastro Revocable Trust, Tina Belcastro, Trustee		

1. A **Variance** is requested from **Article 300 Section 320.E.1** of the Zoning Ordinance to allow the alteration of a non-conforming structure with the deck being partially converted to living space.
2. A **Variance** is requested from **Article 300 Section 327.A.3** of the Zoning Ordinance for the expansion of living space.
3. A **Special Exception** is requested from **Article 400 Section 320.E.2** of the Zoning Ordinance for the replacement and expansion of a non-conforming structure.

MOTION: To ACCEPT Case #Z26-18 as COMPLETE. Motion by Mr. Rich. Mr. Lee SECONDS. Board votes unanimously.

Josh Thibeault, Varney Engineering, with Tom Varney as well as Mrs. Belcastro and her mother the property owner. Tina has owned this property since 2016. She plans to demolish the existing

1 house and replace it with a new house. The new house will be expanded to the back or roadside,
2 not towards the lake within an existing deck area. The roofline will be reconfigured. The
3 expansion is into an existing deck area on the road side of the house that will be converted into
4 living space and an existing deck will be converted to a porous patio. This reduces the building
5 size from 1058 sq ft to 840 sq ft and total lot size coverage from 46.4% to 39%. There is an
6 existing septic system on the property that was installed in 1992. It is State approved so it is
7 going to remain in place even after the new construction. They have obtained a new septic
8 design that is on file that was obtained in 2024 for the event that failure does happen. They are
9 also required to receive the building permit. He stated they had been before the Board for the
10 same exact proposal back in January of 2024 and it was approved with slightly different
11 Variances and Special Exceptions because the Zoning ordinance has changed in the last two
12 years, but they were essentially applying for the same Variances and Special Exceptions and the
13 proposal has not changed. There were photos in the packet as well as architectural renderings of
14 the proposed building. There were also copies of the septic design and shoreland permits.

15
16 He stated that the existing lot is quite small. The lot is 4000 sq ft in area. The existing cottage
17 does meet the 30 ft lakeside setback. It does encroach slightly into the side setback as well as the
18 deck. The septic system is pumped up to a different lot up the road on Boat Cove Rd. They
19 proposed to replace the cottage. The footprint is slightly expanded into the proposed deck area.
20 The slight encroachment of 43 sq ft in the side setback is the reason for the Variance to Article
21 327. The Variance to 320.E.1 is conversion of living space within the setback – expansion within
22 the setback to living space. That was the small corner where the deck was that was beyond the
23 setback that is now becoming building space. The footprint does expand in living space, but it is
24 no larger than the existing structure with the deck. It has reduced slightly. The portion of the
25 deck is cut off. There is a small 3 sq ft encroachment on the side of the property as well. The
26 porous patio will take water from the roof eaves and infiltrate it into the ground. That is their
27 storm water measure for this property. The patio is what was once deck, so it is now porous. He
28 stated that is how they got the reduction in total building size. He stated he could answer any
29 questions that the Board may have.

30
31 Mr. LaRochelle wanted to clarify the fact that it had been applied for two years ago. Mr.
32 Thibeault stated that the Variances have since expired. Mr. LaRochelle asked if anything had
33 been done to the property, if it was exactly as it was in the pictures. Mr. Thibeault stated that the
34 pictures from 2024 could have been used. Nothing had changed. Mr. LaRochelle asked what
35 was different with the new application compared to what was approved before. Mr. Thibeault
36 stated that nothing had changed except the fact that the two-year timeframe for the Variance had
37 expired. He stated that nothing about the proposal had changed. He had hand drafted
38 architectural renderings. There were more complete architectural renderings in the packet but
39 the footprint is the same as what was approved in 2024. Mr. LaRochelle stated it was still a nice-
40 looking house. They did not have a garage. They would probably want the garage underneath.
41 (The party responded from the audience but was indiscernible).

42
43 Mr. Monziona explained that he wasn't present for the case when it was heard previously. He
44 asked if the house that is in the pictures was going to be torn down. Mr. Rich stated he was
45 wondering the same thing. Mr. LaRochelle felt the same way. (The same person spoke off mic

1 from the audience).

2 Mr. Rich stated he noticed they were changing the water runoff. Mr. Thibeault stated that just
3 the color had changed. He showed the plan from 2024. He stated that the plan was dated 2023.
4 Mr. Monziona asked if there was a two-year limit on the Variance. Mr. Thibeault stated that
5 there is. He believed Alton has a provision to extend it but they missed the timeframe.

6
7 Mr. Monziona stated that in Mr. Thibeault's presentation that part of the reason they came back
8 with Variance and Special Exception applications is because the zoning has changed in that two-
9 year period. He asked what has changed that would require the Board to look at that new as
10 opposed to what was already done. Mr. Thibeault stated the setbacks were the same. The
11 Variance for the setback in Section 327. The Special Exception he believed had changed. It was
12 really just renumbering and reordering of the ordinance. It is generally the same but they are
13 different numbers from the 2024 approvals.

14
15 Mr. Monziona asked about the Special Exception that would allow them to expand and the new
16 one doesn't. He was unsure that was the case, but just asking. Mr. Thibeault stated they were
17 essentially the same but have been reworded and renumbered in the past few years. He stated
18 specifically it was the non-conforming section of the Zoning ordinance that has gone through
19 some changes. Mr. Monziona asked if they had seen the Fire Department comments. Mr.
20 Thibeault stated they had. Mr. Monziona asked if it was the same that they wanted them to
21 comply with new life saving – Mr. Thibeault stated the homeowner doesn't have a choice. In
22 order to get the certificate of occupancy they need to have achieved all of the code.

23
24 Chair Mankus asked if the Board had any more questions. There were none. He asked if the
25 public had any input for or against the application. There were none.

26
27 Chair Mankus moved to the Variance from Article 300 Section 320.E.1.

28
29 *The Board must find that all the following conditions are met in order to grant the Variance:*

30
31 Chair Mankus stated that the Variance **will not** be contrary to the public interest. Mr. Monziona
32 agreed. Mr. LaRochelle agreed. Mr. Rich agreed. Mr. Lee agreed.

33
34 Mr. Monziona stated that the request **is** in harmony with the spirit of the Zoning Ordinance and
35 the intent of the Master Plan and with the convenience, health and safety and character of the
36 district within which it is proposed. He stated that it was probably for all the same reasons that it
37 was granted the last time. Mr. LaRochelle agreed. Mr. Lee agreed. Mr. Rich agreed. Chair
38 Mankus agreed.

39
40 Mr. LaRochelle stated by granting the Variance substantial justice **will** be done. The building
41 size is being reduced and converting existing decks into porous patios. Mr. Lee agreed. Mr.
42 Rich agreed. Chair Mankus agreed. Mr. Monziona agreed.

43
44 Mr. Lee stated that the request **will not** diminish the value of surrounding properties. If anything
45 it would enhance the surrounding properties. It should only enhance with this building being

1 taken down and the new building being put up. Mr. Rich agreed that even though it was on a
2 very small lot, it is going to be a wonderful architecture. He agreed for that reason. Chair
3 Mankus agreed. Mr. Monziona agreed, but added that the current building is beautiful and
4 probably enhances values. The new one would in no way diminish values. (Mr. LaRochelle did
5 not agree or disagree)

6
7 Mr. Rich stated that for the purposes of sub paragraph unnecessary hardship means that owing to
8 Special Conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, no fair
9 and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the Ordinance
10 provision and the specific application of that provision to the property. He agreed. The proposed
11 use is a reasonable one. Chair Mankus agreed. Mr. Monziona agreed. Mr. LaRochelle agreed.
12 Mr. Lee agreed.

13
14 **MOTION: To APPROVE application #Z26-18 for a Variance from Article 300 Section**
15 **320.E.1. Motion by Chair Mankus. Mr. Monziona SECONDS. Board votes unanimously.**
16

17 Chair Mankus moved on to the Variance from Article 300 Section 327.A.3 for the same Case
18 #Z26-18. He asked if there was any public input either for or against the application. There
19 were no comments. He motioned the Board begin working on the worksheet.

20 *The Board must find that all the following conditions are met in order to grant the Variance:*
21

22 Mr. Monziona stated that the Variance will not be contrary to the public interest. There are a lot
23 of improvements happening with the structure and that is in the public's interest. Mr.
24 LaRochelle agreed. Mr. Lee agreed. Mr. Rich agreed. Chair Mankus agreed.

25
26 Mr. LaRochelle stated that the request is in harmony with the spirit of the Zoning Ordinance and
27 the intent of the Master Plan and with the convenience, health and safety and character of the
28 district within which it is proposed. Mr. Lee agreed. Mr. Rich agreed. Chair Mankus agreed.
29 Mr. Monziona agreed.

30
31 Mr. Lee stated by granting the Variance substantial justice will be done. Mr. Rich agreed. Chair
32 Mankus agreed. Mr. Monziona agreed. Mr. LaRochelle agreed.

33
34 Mr. Rich stated that the request will not diminish the value of surrounding properties. If
35 anything even though there is a nice building there, it will now include a garage and that will
36 increase the value of the surrounding properties. Chair Mankus agreed. Mr. Monziona agreed
37 that it would not diminish the value of the surrounding properties. Mr. LaRochelle agreed. Mr.
38 Lee agreed.

39
40 Chair Mankus stated that for the purposes of sub paragraph unnecessary hardship means that
41 owing to Special Conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area,
42 no fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the Ordinance
43 provision and the specific application of that provision to the property. He agreed. The proposed
44 use is a reasonable one. Mr. Monziona agreed. There's nothing about this proposal that is going

1 to be contrary to the purpose of the ordinance and the proposed use is the same. It is residential,
2 so it's reasonable. Mr. LaRochelle agreed. Mr. Rich agreed. (Mr. Lee did not agree or
3 disagree.)
4

5 **MOTION: To APPROVE application #Z26-18 for a Variance from Article 300 Section**
6 **327.A.3. Motion by Chair Mankus. Mr. Rich SECONDS. Board votes unanimously.**
7

8 Chair Mankus moved to the Special Exception from **Article 400 Section 320.E.2** of the Zoning
9 Ordinance.
10

11 Chair Mankus asked if there was any public input either for or against this application. There
12 were no comments. The Board began working on the worksheet.
13

14 *The Board must find that all the following conditions are met in order to grant the Special*
15 *Exception:*
16

17 Mr. Lee stated that a plat/plan has been submitted in accordance with the appropriate criteria in
18 the Zoning Ordinance, Article 500, Section 520.B. The Board agreed.
19

20 Mr. Rich stated the specific site is an appropriate location for the use. Chair Mankus agreed. Mr.
21 Monzione agreed the use is residential. It remains the same in a residential area. Mr. LaRochelle
22 agreed. Mr. Lee agreed.
23

24 Chair Mankus stated that factual evidence is not found that the property values in the district will
25 be reduced due to incompatible land use. Mr. Monzione agreed. Mr. LaRochelle agreed. Mr.
26 Lee agreed. Mr. Rich agreed.
27

28 Mr. Monzione stated there is no valid objection from abutters based on demonstrable fact. No
29 abutters spoke in objection to this application. Mr. LaRochelle agreed. Mr. Lee agreed. Mr. Rich
30 agreed. Chair Mankus agreed.
31

32 Mr. LaRochelle stated there is no undue nuisance or serious hazard to pedestrian or vehicular
33 traffic, including the location and design of access-ways and off-street parking. He stated nothing
34 is changing. Mr. Lee agreed. Mr. Rich agreed. Chair Mankus agreed. Mr. Monzione stated he
35 agreed there was nothing about this project that is going to in any way affect vehicular or
36 pedestrian traffic.
37

38 Mr. Lee stated adequate and appropriate facilities and utilities will be provided to ensure the
39 proper operation of the proposed use of the structure. Mr. Rich agreed. Chair Mankus agreed.
40 Mr. Monzione agreed. Mr. LaRochelle agreed.
41

42 Mr. Rich stated there is adequate area for safe and sanitary sewage disposal and water supply.
43 He stated the applicant had told the Board that the septic system has been approved so there are
44 no issues. Chair Mankus agreed. Mr. Monzione agreed. Mr. LaRochelle agreed. Mr. Lee
45 agreed.

Chair Mankus stated the proposed use or structure is consistent with the spirit of this Ordinance and the intent of the Master Plan. Mr. Monziona stated he agreed the structure had been previously approved and the use of it is residential all of which is consistent with the ordinance and the Master Plan. Mr. LaRochelle agreed. Mr. Lee agreed. Mr. Rich agreed for all the same reasons.

MOTION: To APPROVE Case #Z26-18 for a Special Exception Article 400 Section 320.E.2. Motion by Chair Mankus. Mr. Monziona SECONDS. Board votes unanimously.

1. Previous Business: NONE

2. New Business: Discussion of resignation of Board member.

Mr. Rich stated that Mr. Tim Morgan resigned so that leaves a vacancy for the Board to consider how to proceed. He stated maybe Mr. Monziona would consider taking on Mr. Morgan's role as a permanent Board member for at least the term time being if he chooses to. He discussed that with Mr. Monziona and Mr. Monziona had some concerns. He felt the Board should have a discussion.

Mr. LaRochelle stated before the Board discussed that he would like to thank Mr. Morgan for his service for as long as he had been on the ZBA Board. He wished him well for his future. He stated Mr. Morgan did a marvelous job. He stated that he was a major asset to the Zoning Board and he hated to see him go. The Board agreed. Mr. Rich stated perhaps the Board could put that in a letter to him. He asked Mr. Monziona to draft that letter for the Board. Mr. Monziona agreed. Mr. LaRochelle stated that it needed to be made known that the Board needs alternates. Mr. Rich stated that by the next ZBA meeting Mr. Monziona would make a decision. Chair Mankus reaffirmed that Mr. Monziona would draft a thank you letter to former Board member Tim Morgan. Mr. Monziona stated he would do it and send the draft to the Board. The Board agreed they had high regard for Mr. Morgan.

3. Approval of Minutes: ZBA meeting minutes of July 9, 2026.

Mr. Lee commented that there were no concerns and that the minutes were very well done. The Board agreed.

MOTION: To APPROVE ZBA Meeting Minutes for July 9, 2026. Motion by Mr. LaRochelle. Mr. Lee SECONDS. Board votes unanimously.

4. Correspondence: NONE

MOTION: To ADJOURN. Motion by Mr. Rich. Mr. Monziona SECONDS. Board votes unanimously.

*TOWN OF ALTON - ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES
August 6, 2026*

APPROVED 09-03-2026

1 *ADJOURNMENT*

2 Chairman Joseph Mankus

3

4 Respectfully Submitted,

5

6 Sandra Monaco, Recording Secretary

7

8 *If there is foul weather or lack of a quorum, the public hearing will be continued to Thursday,

9 September 3, 2026, starting at 6:00 P.M. at the Alton Town Hall, and a notice shall be posted stating

10 same.