ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
BELMONT, NH

Meeting Minutes of January 28, 2026
Belmont Mill & Zoom

Members Present: Vice Chairman John Froumy; Dana Silcock; & Mark Mastenbrook
Members Absent: Chairman Peter Harris
Alternates Present: Susan Bouthiette
Staff Present: Karen Santoro, Town Planner
Zoom: "Sydney"

6:00 Public Meeting
Acting Chairman Mastenbrook opened the meeting at 6:00 pm and welcomed those in attendance and announced that as Acting Chairman of the Belmont Zoning Board of Adjustment, this public body is authorized to meet using Zoom. He announced that any party experiencing any difficulty in accessing the meeting through Zoom at any point, should call 603-267-8300 x 101, and the meeting will be recessed until access can be restored for all parties.

Acting Chairman Mastenbrook stated that Susan Bouthiette would be seated as a voting member.

Abutter's Hearing: Francis and Sarah Patno: Applicant is requesting a variance from Article 5 Table 1 of the Zoning Ordinance to allow the use of Boat Storage-Exterior on their lot in the Rural Zone. Property is located on Province Road, Tax Lot 211-057-000-000, in the Rural Zone. ZBA Case # 01-26Z.

Development of Regional Impact
Acting Chairman Mastenbrook stated that in order to provide timely notice, provide opportunities for input and consider the interests of other municipalities the Board shall act to determine if the development has a potential regional impact as defined by RSA 36:55. Impacts may include, but are not limited to: Relative size or number of dwelling units as compared with existing stock; Proximity to the borders of a neighboring community; Transportation networks; Anticipated emissions such as light, noise, smoke, odors, or particles; Proximity to aquifers or surface waters which transcend municipal boundaries; Shared facilities such as schools and solid waste disposal facilities.

MOTION: J. Froumy moved that the proposal does not have a potential regional impact.
Second: D. Silcock
Vote: All in favor, motion carried. (4/0)

Francis and Sarah Patno were present to discuss their application. F. Patno stated that they would like to store boats seasonally on their property, from October until May. D. Silcock clarified that the applicant was going to require any boat stored there would be wrapped. F. Patno stated that was correct. S. Patno stated that they plan to have the property surveyed, and that would give them a better idea of how many boats they would be able to store. J. Froumy stated that he felt it was important to point out that they had mentioned in their first application that the lot was not suitable for a house due to the amount of ledge present on the lot. K. Santoro stated that NH DOT has sent an email in response to this application that the applicant might need an updated driveway permit. M. Mastenbrook asked what the hours of operation were going to be. F. Patno stated that once the boats are parked, they don't anticipate customers coming back to the lot until they were ready to take the boats out of storage. They anticipate customers setting up appointments to pick their boats up. D. Silcock asked if they had plans to grade the lot. S. Patno stated that they have graded two areas to make designated lots to put the boats in.

MOTION: J. Froumy moved to grant a variance from Article 5 Table 1 of the Zoning Ordinance to allow the use of Boat Storage-Exterior on their lot in the Rural Zone, based on the following criteria:

1. The variance will not be contrary to the public interest because: The rural neighborhood's character has been defined by previous storage of construction vehicles and perhaps current storage as well. There is no threat to public safety, health or diminishment of property values.

2. The spirit of the ordinance is observed because: The rural neighborhood's character has been defined by previous storage of construction vehicles and perhaps current storage as well. There is no threat to public safety, health or diminishment of property values.

3. Substantial justice will be done because: Approval of this variance will cause no harm to the public, while denial would injure the applicants insofar as the land has an inherent limited use, specifically the difficulty of construction by the residents of the property which is supported by testimony by the applicant.

4. The variance would not diminish the value of surrounding properties because: The area is rural, and the surrounding properties are moderate to substantial sizes, and this lends the area to numerous commercial uses. The proposed use would not reduce the value of any properties in the area.

5. Owing to special conditions of the property, that distinguish it from other properties in the area, denial of the variance would result in unnecessary hardship because of the following: The purpose of the ordinance was not to render the property useless. This property would become useless if we forced residential use on it.

    a) the proposed use is a reasonable one because: The proposed use is similar to the uses of surrounding properties.

Additional conditions:

A. All representations made by the applicant during the public hearing are incorporated as a condition of this approval.
B. The applicant and owner are solely responsible to comply with the approved plan and conditions of approval. Contractors should be sufficiently warned regarding same.
C. Approval expires on 1/28/28 if use is not substantially acted on and if an extension is not granted. Approval also expires if use ceases for more than two years.
D. The applicant will be accepting potentially limited hours.
E. Obtain an updated NH DOT Driveway Permit if necessary.

Second: D. Silcock
Vote: All in favor, motion carried. (4/0)

Minutes of November 19, 2025

MOTION: M. Mastenbrook moved to approve the minutes of November 19, 2025, as written
Second: D. Silcock
Vote: All in favor, motion carried. (4/0)

STAFF REPORT

K. Santoro reminded the Board that the 2026 Deliberative Session was to be held on February 2, at the High School

The Public Hearing for proposed updates to the Zoning Ordinance language will be held on Thursday, January 29.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: M. Mastenbrook moved to adjourn at 6:35 PM
D. Silcock seconded the motion.
Vote: All in favor, motion carried. (4/0)

Respectfully Submitted,

Susan M. Austin
Land Use Assistant