ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
BELMONT, NH
Meeting Minutes of September 23, 2026
Belmont Mill & Zoom

Members Present: Vice Chairman Mark Mastenbrook; Dana Silcock; Susan Bouthiette; and Dennis Grimes
Members Absent: Chairman Peter Harris
Staff Present: Rod Cameron, Land Use Technician

6:00 Public Meeting
Vice Chairman Mastenbrook opened the meeting at 6:00 pm and welcomed those in attendance and announced that as Vice 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. He also noted that there were only four Board members present, so if any applicants wanted to continue their cases until a meeting with a full Board, they were welcome to do so.

Abutter's Hearing – Brenda Walker: Applicant is proposing to place a 66' x 16' manufactured home closer (21.7 ') to the front lot line than is allowed (50') and is requesting the following relief:

- A Variance from Article 5, Table 2 (Setbacks)

Property is located at 22 Sleepy Hollow Lane, Tax Lot 121-058-000-000, in the Residential Multi Family Zone. ZBA Case # 22-26Z.

Current Considerations:
The application meets the criteria for granting a variance.

Development of Regional Impact
Vice 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: D. Grimes moved that the proposal does not have a potential regional impact.
Second: D. Silcock
Vote: All in favor, motion carried (4/0)

Michael Sharp was present for Brenda Walker to discuss her application. He stated that they would like to replace the trailer that was demolished with a new trailer. The new trailer will be slightly closer to the front setback than the previous trailer.

Departmental Responses:
Fire: ..... No Concerns.
Police: ..... No Concerns.

Public Works/Water/Sewer: ..... No issues or concerns at this time.
Town Administrator: ..... No Concerns.
Building/Code Enforcement Officer: ..... No Concerns.
Conservation Commission..... No Concerns.
Assessing: ……...No Concerns.
Land Use Technician: ……See staff comments

Staff Comments:

Applicant is proposing to place a 66' x 16' manufactured home closer (21.7 ') to the front lot line than is allowed (50'). Lot currently contains a detached garage. Previous manufactured home was demolished in 2025.

Vice Chairman Mastenbrook opened the public hearing.

Tom Reed, who owns the property adjacent to 22 Sleepy Hollow Road, stated that he was against the variance because there is room on that property to meet the code. He stated that if the Board will continue to grant variances for new trailers coming into that park, it's going to stay the same. He stated that his other concern is 15 trees that are between his property and the applicant's property. He would request that the Board make it a condition that they take those trees down. He stated that the limbs are constantly breaking off, the tops of the trees are breaking off. He stated that this would be the time to do it, since there is no trailer on the lot, they can just drop those trees. He stated that the roots are lifting up his driveway as well.

MOTION: D. Silcock moved to grant a variance from Article 5, Table 2 (Setbacks) to place a 66' x 16' manufactured home closer (21.7 ') to the front lot line than is allowed (50'), based on the following criteria

1. The variance will not be contrary to the public interest because: The proposal does not conflict with the explicit purpose of the ordinance. It does not alter the essential character of the neighborhood, if anything it improves the character. It does not threaten health, safety or otherwise injure public rights.

2. The spirit of the ordinance is observed because: The proposal does not conflict with the explicit purpose of the ordinance. It does not alter the essential character of the neighborhood, if anything it improves the character. It does not threaten health, safety or otherwise injure public rights.

3. Substantial justice will be done because: The benefit to the applicant will not outweigh the harm to the general public or to other individuals.

4. The variance would not diminish the value of surrounding properties because: Expert testimony on this question is not conclusive, The Board may also consider other evidence of effect on personal property values, including personal knowledge of the members themselves.

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:

a. no fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purpose of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property;

and

b. the proposed use is a reasonable one because: the property cannot be reasonably used in strict conformance with the ordinance.

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 9/23/28 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.

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

Abutter's Hearing – Shawn and Christy Houde (Clayton Dunn 93 Inter Vivos Trust, owner): Applicant is proposing to build a single-family home and is requesting the following relief:

- A Variance from Article 5, Table 2 (Setbacks): The new house will be closer (23.3') to the front lot line than is allowed (50')
- A Variance from Article 4: Wetland Setbacks) The new house will be closer (38.2') to public waters than is allowed (50')
- A Variance from Article 11.3.f (Non-conforming uses/structures)

Property is located at 43 Breck Shore Road, Tax Lot 114-020-000-000, in the Residential Single Zone. ZBA Case 23-26Z.

Current Considerations:
The application meets the criteria for granting variances.

Development of Regional Impact
Vice 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: Vice Chairman Mastenbrook moved that the proposal does not have a potential regional impact.
Second: D. Grimes
Vote: All in favor, motion carried. (4/0)

Shawn Houde and Clay Dunn were present to discuss this application. S. Houde stated that this was a unique property where there is a right of way that goes through the property. On the lake side there is a camp and a shed, and on the upland side, there is a house that was built in 2004. He stated that they are proposing to demolish the single-family camp and shed, and construct a new single-family home in the same location. The new home will connect to Town sewer. The new house will be more conforming than the existing camp.

Vice Chairman Mastenbrook opened the public hearing.

MOTION: D. Silcock moved to grant a Variance Article 5, Table 2 (Setbacks), to build a new house closer (23.3') to the front lot line than is allowed (50'), based on the following criteria:

1. The variance will not be contrary to the public interest because: The proposed use must not conflict with the explicit or implicit purpose of the ordinance and must not alter the essential character of the neighborhood, threaten public health, safety, or welfare or otherwise injure public health.
2. The spirit of the ordinance is observed because: The proposed use must not conflict with the explicit or implicit purpose of the ordinance and must not alter the essential character of the neighborhood, threaten public health, safety, or welfare or otherwise injure public health. This proposal does the opposite.
3. Substantial justice will be done because: The benefit to the applicant should not be outweighed by harm to the general public or to other individuals.
4. The variance would not diminish the value of surrounding properties because: If anything, it will increase the value of the surrounding property values.
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:

    a. no fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purpose of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property because: The purpose of the zoning restriction in question, the applicant must establish that because of the special conditions of this property, the restriction as applied to the property does not serve that purpose in a fair and substantial way. This lot is non-conforming, so relief is needed.

    and

    b. the proposed use is a reasonable one because: This proposal is improving the property. It will be a beautiful addition to the neighborhood.

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 9/23/28 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.

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

MOTION: D. Silcock moved to grant a Variance from Article 4: Wetland Setbacks) to build a house closer (38.2') to public waters than is allowed (50') based on the following criteria:

1. The variance will not be contrary to the public interest because: The proposed use must not conflict with the explicit or implicit purpose of the ordinance and must not alter the essential character of the neighborhood, threaten public health, safety, or welfare or otherwise injure public health.
2. The spirit of the ordinance is observed because: The proposed use must not conflict with the explicit or implicit purpose of the ordinance and must not alter the essential character of the neighborhood, threaten public health, safety, or welfare or otherwise injure public health. This proposal does the opposite.
3. Substantial justice will be done because: The benefit to the applicant should not be outweighed by harm to the general public or to other individuals.

4. The variance would not diminish the value of surrounding properties because: If anything, it will increase the value of the surrounding property values.
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:

    a. no fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purpose of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property because: The purpose of the zoning restriction in question, the applicant must establish that because of the special conditions of this property, the restriction as applied to the property does not serve that purpose in a fair and substantial way. This lot is non-conforming, so relief is needed.

    and

    b. the proposed use is a reasonable one because: This proposal is improving the property. It will be a beautiful addition to the neighborhood.

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 9/23/28 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.

Second: S. Bouthiette
Vote: All in favor, motion carried. (4/0)

MOTION: D. Silcock moved to grant a Variance from Article 11.3.f (Non-conforming uses/structures) based on the following criteria:

1. The variance will not be contrary to the public interest because: The proposed use must not conflict with the explicit or implicit purpose of the ordinance and must not alter the essential character of the neighborhood, threaten public health, safety, or welfare or otherwise injure public health.
2. The spirit of the ordinance is observed because: The proposed use must not conflict with the explicit or implicit purpose of the ordinance and must not alter the essential character of the neighborhood, threaten public health, safety, or welfare or otherwise injure public health. This proposal does the opposite.
3. Substantial justice will be done because: The benefit to the applicant should not be outweighed by harm to the general public or to other individuals.
4. The variance would not diminish the value of surrounding properties because: If anything, it will increase the value of the surrounding property values.
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:

    a. no fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purpose of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property because: The purpose of the zoning restriction in question, the applicant must establish that because of the special conditions of this property, the restriction as applied to the property does not serve that purpose in a fair and substantial way. This lot is non-conforming, so relief is needed.

and

b. the proposed use is a reasonable one because: This proposal is improving the property. It will be a beautiful addition to the neighborhood.

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 9/23/28 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.

Second: S. Bouthiette
Vote: All in favor, motion carried. (4/0)

Minutes of August 26, 2026
MOTION: D. Silcock moved to approve the August 26, 2026 minutes.
Second: S. Bouthiette
Vote: All in favor, motion carried. (4/0)

ADJOURNMENT
MOTION: S. Bouthiette moved to adjourn at 6:37 PM
Second: D. Silcock
Vote: All in favor, motion carried. (4/0)

Respectfully Submitted,

Susan M. Austin
Land Use Assistant