Planning Board Minutes
Town of Belmont

Monday, September 28, 2026 6:00 P.M.
Belmont Mill 4th Floor Tioga Room
14 Mill Street & Zoom

Present:	Chairman Peter Harris; Vice Chairman Ward Peterson; Tyson Morrill; Richard Pickwick; Selectmen's Rep Jon Pike and Michael LeClair.
Members Absent:	Gary Grant
Staff:	Karen Stuyniski, Town Planner
Zoom:	None

Chairman Harris opened the meeting at 6:09 pm and welcomed those in attendance. 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.

K. Stuyniski stated that there would be a slight change to the agenda in order to hear a CIP presentation from Brian Jackes, the DPW Director.

B. Jackes stated that the Department of Public Works is in need of a replacement grader. The grader they have currently is 30 years old, and it's getting harder to find replacement parts for it. It currently has over 7,000 documented hours on it, and the hour meter that is on it is the third one. He has looked into pricing from several vendor, and a replacement would cost around $400,000.

Plan Submission and Public Hearing – Belmont Landing, LLC: (Continued from September) Applicant is seeking Site Plan Approval to construct 36 residential units on the upper floors of an existing mixed use commercial building. Property is located at 171 Daniel Webster Highway, Tax Lot 101-022-000-000, in the Commercial Zone. Planning Board Case # 20-26P.

Chairman Harris detailed what the Board has done so far with this application.

William Philpot and Jaime O'Hara were present to discuss this application. W. Philpot stated that the Memorial Day count that was done by Precision Data reflects that the count again on Wednesday before Memorial Day and went through the Tuesday after Memorial Day. The Fire Chief has been to the site with Laconia and Laconia's ladder truck and did extensive maneuvering and sent an email that indicates that they find the area sufficient to maneuver the truck around. The other issue is the 96 parking spaces versus 104. Mr. Bailey attended a meeting and indicated to the Board that he could not revise the site plan because he had not surveyed the property. But there are other plans certified by surveyors of record, including the plan which was originally approved, but not recorded by the registry of deeds, reflects 104 parking spaces, rather than 96. He stated that the next issue is the Fuss and O'Neill proposal. Fuss and O'Neill propose $6,000 for the work. The procedure outlined in the report is to be done manually, reflecting a cost for a manual account of $5,100. He stated that the problem is that it's far above market costs received by his client, including Precision, which did the original count for Memorial Day weekend and the days before and after. He stated that he and his client don't understand why Fuss and O'Neill wants to do a manual count, because the industry relies on electronic counting, which is accurate and more importantly, makes a

record. The manual process doesn't reflect a record, it's the record keeper keeping their own record. He stated that he would ask the Board to consider the fact that Fuss & O'Neill is priced above the market, with no explanation in a report. Precision charges $900 for the same work and same period of time. Precision has indicated to his client the Precision has worked with Fuss & O'Neill doing traffic counts, so Fuss & O'Neill has confidence that Precision does good work. His thought is that rather than having a manual count, which drives the price up, he'd rather that Fuss & O'Neill hire Precision to do it electronically to bring those costs down, because it gives the same data.

P. Harris stated that he's always felt that the Board should rely on professionals and their concerns for safety. He stated that when the applicant built this property, he came in front of the Board, agreed to the number of spaces as required by the regulations, but now he wants to add 36 units to that building with out any improvements to the property. That number would increase traffic and impact the businesses that are there. The business study won't be exact because the businesses that are supposed to be there aren't there, but the building is.

K. Stuyniski stated that the estimate was sent to the client's attorney on September 30. None of the questions that the client's attorney is asking tonight were asked of Staff so they could have presented them to Fuss and O'Neill and then come to the meeting with answers for the applicant. She stated that she will pose the question to Fuss and O'Neill as to why they are proposing a manual count as opposed to an electronic count. She also noted that she was present while the Fire Chief and Laconia's ladder truck performed the maneuvers around the building. The truck could physically pull into the lot, as they stated in the email. They did not pull it around to the South side of the building because it is a tight turn, and they simply didn't want to risk damaging a curb or anything just to see if it would fit. It was noted in the email. It was noted that the applicant had proposed potentially gating off parking spaces for the tenants. She stated that a gate would pose an additional complication. There is no fire lane, so in the event of an emergency it would probably be chaos anyway. Just to clarify, truck was able to pull in, but it could not turn around. In order to exit the lot, they had to back into the adjoining property.

W. Philpot stated that he requests that the email from the Fire Department be added to the record by the Planning Director, and he suggests that the email speaks for itself. K. Stuyniski stated that the email has already been made part of the record, as have all emails and reports. The record is complete.

J. Pike stated that the counting is incorrect all together, whether it's done physically or electronically. It depends on the weekend, or Motorcycle week for instance that count would be doubled. The traffic on that road is very busy. The count should be done on the busiest weekend.

W. Philpot stated that he understands that Fuss and O'Neill prepared the format for the traffic count that was proposed. The dates have been selected by Fuss and O'Neill, and they don't have an issue with the dates. The only problem he has is that Fuss and O'Neill has quoted a price six times the cost of what the market out there is by qualified people that do it electronically.

M. LeClair stated that there is dialogue that needs to happen between Staff, the applicant and Fuss & O'Neill. For the Board to adequately approve, or disapprove this, the Board will need more information.

W. Philpot asked that the discussion with Fuss and O'Neill be a three-way call. K. Stuyniski stated that Staff prefers that the dialogue be in an email, so there is a record of the conversations in writing and there is no misinterpretation.

MOTION: M. LeClair moved to continue this application for Site Plan Approval to construct 36 residential units on the upper floors of an existing mixed use commercial building until the November meeting.

Second: W. Peterson
Vote: All in favor, motion carried. (5/0)

Plan Submission and Public Hearing – Francis and Sarah Patno: Applicant is seeking Site Plan Approval to establish an outdoor boat storage business. Property is located on Province Road, Tax Lot 211-057-000-000, in the Rural Zone. Planning Board Case 24-26P

Chairman Harris stated that unless otherwise determined by the Board, minor projects shall be those projects where:

1. all structure construction or reconstruction does not exceed 600 sq ft - for the purposes of this section, reconstruction is defined as any work for which a building permit is required and/or converting the use of a structure from primary or accessory residential use to non-residential use; and
2. where all disturbed areas do not exceed 20,000 sq ft; and
3. where no significant off-site impacts are generated.

Applicants for a minor project shall be exempt from the following requirements of these Regulations, except in cases where the Board shall determine otherwise during the course of their review of the application.

- Section 5.D.3. - Soils Map and Report.
- Section 5.D.4. - Topographic Plan.
- Section 5.D.5. - Aquifer Plan.
- Section 5.D.7. - Stormwater Management and Erosion Control Plan and Report.

K. Stuyniski stated that after the staff report was sent out for this application, Bailey and Associates responded that the square footage of the disturbance will not meet the requirements for a Minor Site Plan, and will not receive the automatic waivers that come with a Minor Site plan.

Waiver Requests:

- Section 5.D.1-I – Parking space #/on-site occupancy calc. – *Proposed storage is drop off only; customers will not be parking.*
- Section 5.D.5. - Aquifer Plan. – *Property is not located on or near stratified drift aquifer.*
- Section 5.D.6. – Utilities and Fire Protection – *Proposed boat storage area will not have water, electricity, or any structures associated with it.*
- Section 5.D.7. - Stormwater Management and Erosion Control Plan and Report – *There will be no noticeable changes in existing drainage patterns and do not pose any future erosion concerns.*
- Section 5.D.8 – Roads/Sidewalks – *There are no proposed roads*
- Section 5.D.3. - Soils Map and Report.
- Section 5.D.4. - Topographic Plan.

- Section 5.D.5. - Aquifer Plan.
- Section 5.D.7. - Stormwater Management and Erosion Control Plan and Report.

MOTION: W. Peterson moved to grant the following waivers:

- Section 5.D.1-I – Parking space #/on-site occupancy calc.
- Section 5.D.5. - Aquifer Plan.
- Section 5.D.6. – Utilities and Fire Protection
- Section 5.D.7. - Stormwater Management and Erosion Control Plan and Report
- Section 5.D.8 – Roads/Sidewalks
- Section 5.D.3. - Soils Map and Report.
- Section 5.D.4. - Topographic Plan.
- Section 5.D.5. - Aquifer Plan.
- Section 5.D.7. - Stormwater Management and Erosion Control Plan and Report.

Second: M. LeClair
Vote: All in favor, motion carried. (5/0)

MOTION: R. Pickwick moved that the application be accepted as complete for the purposes of proceeding with consideration and making an informed decision. However, additional information shall be requested as necessary and must be submitted in a timely manner to complete review and act on the application. The Board shall act on this proposal by 12/30/2026 subject to extension or waiver.

Second: W. Peterson
Vote: Motion carried. (4/0/1 J. Pike abstained)

DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT
Chairman Harris 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: P. Harris moved that the proposal does not have a potential regional impact.
Second: W. Peterson
Vote: All in favor, motion carried (5/0)

DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSE:
Fire: No concerns
Police: No concerns
Water/Sewer: No concerns
Public Works: No concerns
Town Administrator: No concerns
Code Enforcement Officer: No concerns

Conservation Commission: No concerns
Land Use Technician: No concerns
Assessing Administration: No concerns

Notes:

- Lot is a vacant lot abutting applicant's residential lot.
- Privacy fence/screening to be installed along road frontage.
- Driveway, garage and pool encroachment should be resolved (eg: BLA; easement) as noted on proposed conditions plan.
- Confirm second driveway exits onto Class V portion of Hick Road. New driveway will need driveway permit.
- Set a limit on number of boats permitted to be stored at one time?
- Label on site plan Phase 1 section to be corrected to "Gravel lot" (cut off on print to "el lot")
- Will boats be wrapped prior to being brought on site?
- NH DOT Driveway permit received 3/2026
- Hours of Operation?

Fran and Sarah Patno were present to discuss their application. F. Patno stated that the hours will be Monday through Friday, 9 am to 4 pm. These will be seasonal hours, so from November 1 until the end of Memorial Day weekend. S. Patno stated that they have been in contact with different marinas to work with. The marina will be responsible for bringing the boats in and removing them.

Chairman Harris opened the Public Hearing. There was no public comment.

M. LeClair asked how many boats they were proposing. F. Patno stated that they would like to fit as many boats as they could. K. Stuyniski stated that it is noted under the proposed conditions that the two proposed parking areas can accommodate 60 to 65 boats. M. LeClair asked if there was any screening being planned. F. Patno stated they were planning on screening the area. He stated that they are still discussing their options for screening. M. LeClair stated that as part of any potential approval, everything they say in this meeting becomes a part of the record, and they will need to hear a better landscape plan than what they have said. K. Stuyniski stated that there is a proposed privacy shrub shown on the plan.

T. Morrill asked if there would be a 911 address associated with the address. K. Stuyniski stated that they would probably need to fill out a form to have a 911 address assigned, but that can be done later as part of the process.

P. Harris noted that there were 8 abutters notified about this project, and there were no abutter comments or concerns brought forth about this project, which is a good sign.

K. Stuyniski stated that Staff had one concern about the second driveway exiting off of the Class IV portion of Hicks Road. It appears to be, but she suggests that one of the conditions of approval that the second driveway be required to exit off of the Class IV section of the road. S. Patno stated that the first phase of this project is on the flat surface right off of Province Road. To build a road that goes back to Hicks Road will take a lot of construction. The second driveway will be part of phase two and connect the first parking location to the second flat area. K. Stuyniski stated that there was a question about whether or not the boats would be wrapped. F. Patno stated that they would.

MOTION: M. LeClair moved that the application be granted Final, conditional approval as it appears

to meet all of the technical requirements of the Ordinances and Regulations of the Town of Belmont with the following conditions:

Conditions (precedent) to be complied with or secured (as appropriate) prior to plan being signed and decision recorded. No site improvements or approved uses shall commence and no building permit shall be issued until plan is signed and decision recorded.

1. This action is based on a plan dated 6/2026.
2. Submit final plans (6 paper, 1 reduced, 1 pdf). Submit one copy for approval prior to submitting all required copies. Add/identify/include note on plan:
    a. Label on site plan Phase 1 section corrected to "Gravel lot" (cut off on print to "el lot")
3. Payment of decision recording fee. Check made payable to BCRD in the amount TBD.
4. Evidence of any other agency permits obtained as applicable.
5. Conditions precedent shall be completed no later than 10/26/27. Active and Substantial development of the approved improvements shall occur no later than 10/26/28 and improvements shall be substantially completed by 10/26/30.
6. Compliance hearing shall be held by Board as necessary.

APPLICANT SHALL TAKE SPECIAL NOTICE: <u>NO USE/WORK</u> MAY COMMENCE UNTIL ALL PRE-CONDITIONS ABOVE HAVE BEEN SATISFIED. CONTACT THE LAND USE OFFICE WITH ANY QUESTIONS. COMMENCING WORK OR USE PRIOR TO TOWN AUTHORIZATION SUBJECTS THIS APPROVAL TO REVOCATION, OTHER ENFORCEMENT ACTION AND DAILY FINES.

7. Construction conditions to be complied with once plan has been signed and decision recorded (shall comply with full standards of the Town's Project Security/Construction Process):
8. Submission of building plans (if applicable), approved by Building Inspector & Fire Department.
9. Underground utilities (telephone, electric, etc.) required from the ROW if applicable.

General conditions to be complied with subsequent to plan being signed and decision recorded:

10. Approved use: Boat storage - Exterior; any expansion of use will require further review from the Planning Board. Limited to 65 boats.
11. Occupancy/use of improvements requires submission of 2 paper original record (as-built) site plans including structures, utilities, roads, drainage and other site improvements. Plans shall be reproducible in black/white.
12. All representations made by the applicant during the public hearing are incorporated as a condition of this approval.
13. Landscaping shall be maintained, shall be kept in a sightly manner and not allowed to deteriorate.
14. All exterior lighting shall be downcast and shielded from abutters and traffic. (If applicable.)
15. No changes shall be made to the approved plans unless application is made in writing to the Town.
16. The Planning Board shall have the power to modify or amend its approval upon its own motion to do so.
17. Approval is subject to expiration, revocation, and changes in the Ordinances. This conditional approval shall expire on 10/26/27 unless all conditions are met or an extension is applied for and granted in accordance with the Regulations. Notice to the applicant and/or a public hearing are not required for the Board to determine that a conditional approval has expired. Reapplication in the case of an expired conditional approval requires a new application meeting all applicable Regulations.

18. Where there is a conflict within the information submitted by the applicant, the town shall determine the correct information to be applied.
19. Operational conditions of the Town and other agencies shall be met.
20. Hours of Operation will be October 1 until May 30, Monday through Friday 9 am to 5 pm.
21. Confirm the exit of the second driveway is on the Class IV portion of Hicks Road.
22. All boats will be wrapped.
23. The screening shrubs will be evergreens.

Second: R. Pickwick
Vote: All in favor, motion carried (5/0)

K. Stuyniski stated that Tyson Morrill was sworn in and is now a full member of the Board.

Proposed Amendments
K. Stuyniski stated that they will be holding the first public hearing in November.

K. Stuyniski stated that there were only a few minor modifications made to the amendments she presented to the Board last month. There were no changes to the amendment pertaining to multifamily housing.

The second proposed amendment that pertains to short term lodging only had the change to add no on street parking allowed. She also removed "f" because it was redundant.

Minutes of August 24, 2026 and September 28, 2026

MOTION: M. LeClair moved to approve the minutes of September 28, 2026.
Second: R. Pickwick
Vote: Motion carried (4/0/1 J. Pike abstained)

The August minutes were tabled until November.

Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)
K. Stuyniski stated that she will get the numbers updated and in November they will look at the whole CIP.

ADJOURNMENT
MOTION: On a motion made by M. LeClair, seconded by G. Grant, it was voted unanimously to adjourn at 7:14 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,



Susan M. Austin, Land Use Assistant