

**TOWN OF ALTON PLANNING BOARD**  
**PUBLIC HEARING MEETING**  
**Tuesday, July 15, 2025, at 6:00 P.M.**  
**Alton Town Hall, 1 Monument Square, Alton, NH 03809**

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

William O'Neil, Chair  
Doug Brown, Member  
Roger Sample, Member  
Mark Manning, Member  
Christine O'Brien, Member  
Nick Buonopane, Board of Selectman's Representative

**OTHERS PRESENT**

Jessie MacArthur, Town Planner  
Steven Warren  
Mercades Warren  
Steve Oles  
Alan Roscoe  
E. Storlazzi  
Christine Perella  
Paul Zuzgo  
Lee Hillsgrove  
Dick Shea

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair O'Neil called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM.

Introductions were made of the Board members. There were no alternates present.

**AGENDA REVIEW**

Ms. MacArthur stated the only change is the order in which the cases are listed. She provided the Board with an updated agenda with the correct order of cases. Also under other business, 4A & 4B were added as information for the Board to read at their leisure.

**MOTION: To approve the agenda as presented. Motion by Mr. Brown. Second by Mr. Manning. Motion passed unanimously.**

**1. Acceptance & Review of Application and Public Hearing if Application is Accepted and Complete**

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <b>Case #P25-19</b><br>Norway Plains Associates, Steve Oles,<br>Agent for Jeremiah Taylor, Jillian Cote<br>& Christine and Joseph Perella | <b>Map 25 Lots 31 &amp; 33</b><br><b>29 Franklin Way</b><br><b>and</b><br><b>34 Baxter Place</b> | <b>Lot Line Adjustment</b><br><b>Rural Zone (RU)</b> |
|---|--|--|

Proposal: To adjust lot lines for two (2) lots of record, with Map 25 Lot 31 adjusted from .29AC

43 to .67AC, and Lot 33 adjusted from 16.98AC to 16.60AC.

44

45 Mr. Steve Oles from Norway Plains comes to the table to present the case.

46

47 **MOTION: To accept the application as complete. Motion by Mr. Manning. Second by Chair**  
48 **O'Neil. Motion passed unanimously.**

49

50 Chair O'Neil asked Mr. Oles if the waivers were for the lot line adjustment. Mr. Oles responded  
51 correct, they are for the wetlands.

52

53 **MOTION: To accept the waiver request for Section 7.F.7.g, Section 7.F.7.h and Section**  
54 **7.F.7.i. Motion by Chair O'Neil. Second by Mr. Brown. Motion passed unanimously.**

55

56 Mr. Oles explains this is a simple boundary line adjustment transferring 16,000 square feet, plus or  
57 minus, from the Parella lot to the Vanderneut property. This allows the lot to be larger, more ability  
58 to put septic and a better place to actually build on this lot. The lot will go from a non-conforming  
59 12,000 square feet up to 29,000 square feet. They are taking the 16,000 feet away from the Perella  
60 lot which is over sixteen acres. This makes a better situation with increased road frontage and  
61 creates a better site overall.

62

63 Mr. Sample asked if this lot line adjustment will take road frontage away from the other lot. Mr.  
64 Oles answered no the frontage for the Parella lot is on 28, to Baxter Place and all the way down to  
65 Franklin. Mr. Sample asked if the two lots in question were highlighted. Mr. Oles replied that the  
66 one highlighted orange is taking away from the Parella lot and going to the yellow creating one big  
67 lot. Mr. Sample clarified that the yellow and orange lot will all be orange after the line adjustment.  
68 Chair O'Neil asked if they were merging the two lots. Mr. Oles responded he is taking 16,000  
69 square feet away from the Parella lot and adding it to the other 12,000 square foot lot to make it  
70 29,000 square feet. The Board is confused between lot 31 and lot 33, so Mr. Oles goes to the map  
71 and pointed out where the existing lines are and where the new lines will be.

72

73 Mr. Manning questioned why not make the lot two acres to meet the two acre requirement? Mr.  
74 Oles replied that the variance has already been approved so the landowner does not want to have to  
75 buy any more land than they have to. Mr. Manning asked if that was the variance that was just  
76 approved. Mr. Oles responded yes.

77

78 Chair O'Neil asked if the intent is not to do any further development on the site? Mr. Oles stated  
79 the intent at this time is to only do the back line adjustment. Chair O'Neil questioned if there were  
80 only one house on the big lot. Mr. Oles stated yes and pointed to where the one house is on the  
81 map. Chair O'Neil stated the potential for more development is there. Mr. Oles responded that  
82 there is potential to do all kinds of things, however at this point in time it is the intent to do the  
83 back line adjustment.

84

85 Mr. Buonopane asked where the septic system is currently located on the lot being adjusted. Mr.  
86 Oles speaks to someone in the audience, the response is inaudible. Mr. Buonopane stated that in  
87 the beginning of the presentation Mr. Oles stated the lot line adjustment would allow a septic  
88 system to be installed. Mr. Oles responded for development of any sort, he could put a garage, he

89 would have to get a building permit for septic, for anything. It's basically increasing from 12,000  
90 to 29,000 increasing his land ability so he can do other things with it.

91

92 Mr. Manning stated the waiver that was approved wasn't for the lot to be less than two acres. The  
93 waiver was that we didn't have to show additional information on the plot, which he agreed with.  
94 Chair O'Neil clarified that the waiver was for not showing the wetlands because they are not  
95 developing the lot at this time, they are just doing the lot line adjustment. Mr. Manning stated that  
96 the Board did not approve it was okay to be below the two acre minimum. Chair O'Neil stated that  
97 the ZBA approved the variance in June.

98

99 Mr. Sample asked if they needed State approval. Mr. Oles answered no because they are enlarging  
100 the lot. If it were being made smaller then it goes to the State. He expressed that the State will be  
101 ecstatic to see a lot for from 12,000 to 29,000. They can put a garage and a septic system on it and  
102 actually be in compliance. Currently the septic is right in front of the house on the lot line. This  
103 change will bump it out an extra 15 feet and give more area in order to do what they need to do.

104

105 Mr. Brown asked if there was any intent to put a larger house on this site. Mr. Oles responded no.  
106 Chair O'Neil stated they can't put another house there. Mr. Manning added there is enough land  
107 there if they were to put two acres they would be in compliance.

108

109 Mr. Buonopane stated that it was earlier stated that they adjustment was needed to increase the  
110 septic, however if the septic is already there then why are they needing to do this? Mr. Oles  
111 answered that the existing septic is currently in the right of way right on the property line. This  
112 adjustment will push it out an extra 15 feet.

113

114 Mr. Brown asked why the intent wasn't to then make it a fully compliant two acre lot? Mr. Oles  
115 responded that the intent is between the two parties. He added that he just did the same thing a year  
116 ago with a neighboring lot and that did not go to a two acre lot either. Mr. Buonopane responded  
117 that was a year ago, not now. Chair O'Neil stated the the adjustment a year ago did not come off a  
118 big lot, it was two lots next to each other. Mr. Oles stated they did come off a big lot. Mr. Brown  
119 questioned if that created a fully compliant lot. Mr. Oles replied no it did not. Chair O'Neil  
120 recalled that that adjustment made the waterfront footage greater. Mr. Sample stated the parent lot  
121 has lots on both sides of the road. Mr. Oles responded the road actually runs through, it is a right  
122 away for everybody to gain access to and from 28. He showed the sections of land involved on the  
123 map.

124

125 Mr. Sample stated the ZBA did not put any restrictions on what they could do with the land,  
126 therefore he feels this is doable.

127

128 Chair O'Neil opened the hearing to input from the public.

129

130 No input was given from the public.

131

132 Chair O'Neil closed the hearing to input from the public.

133

134

135 **MOTION: To accept P25-19 lot line adjustment. Motion by Mr. Sample. Second by Mr.**  
136 **Brown. Motion passed unanimously.**

137

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <b>Case #P25-21</b><br>TF Moran, Inc., Agent for Treasure<br>Coast SPE, LLC, Owner | <b>Map 4 Lot 13</b><br><b>Frank C Gilman Highway</b> | <b>Final Major Subdivision</b><br><b>Rural Zone (RU)</b> |
|--|--|--|

138 Proposal: To construct a 38-Unit Manufactured Home Park to include one (1) site area for a  
139 Single-Family Dwelling.

140

141 Mr. Alan Roscoe from TF Moran came to the table to present the case.

142

143 **MOTION: To accept the application as complete. Motion by Mr. Brown. Second by Mr.**  
144 **Buonopane. Motion passed unanimously.**

145

146 Mr. Brown stated the waiver is for the soils report. In terms of the proposed number of sites in this  
147 development, it raises the question whether the soils can support the septic systems that will be  
148 required. Ms. MacArthur suggested the waiver request be pending they provide a full report prior  
149 to the approval. Mr. Roscoe responded the request for a waiver was procedural to get the  
150 application complete and in for the hearing and start the review process. He added they wouldn't  
151 leave that off and obviously they have to have a design that fully supports the septic system design.  
152 It is not his intent to skirt providing the information, only to delay it.

153

154 Mr. Sample asked if there is such a thing as a temporary waiver. Chair O'Neil replied there should  
155 not be any waiver at this point because he doesn't want it to be interpreted as a waiver where they  
156 don't have to do the soil test. He suggests that whether the application gets accepted or continued  
157 to next month, the Board should make sure the soils are tested.

158

159 Mr. Roscoe stated this is more of a procedural waiver due to the application checklist having a  
160 column for waiver or not applicable, therefore they requested the waiver. Chair O'Neil asked if the  
161 soils testing was underway now. Mr. Roscoe responded they have staff scheduled for next week  
162 and will provide a full report prior to coming back.

163

164 Chair O'Neil stated the soils test could be a condition if they were to accept the application, or they  
165 can continue to next month when hopefully they'll know more.

166

167 Mr. Buonopane questioned if the soil analysis came back with poor results would the layout of the  
168 homes need to be completely redesigned? Mr. Roscoe responded it would be up to him to do that  
169 if. Chair O'Neil added for now he would like to do a waiver for it so that they can review the rest  
170 of the application since it contains lot of information that hasn't been touched on yet. Mr.  
171 Buonopane asks if they should deny the waiver. Ms. MacArthur explained if the waiver is denied it  
172 will require them to do the analysis right now. Chair O'Neil stated that they would not give the  
173 waiver because they want to make sure the testing is done. Mr. Roscoe agreed and clarified that  
174 they only applied for the waiver so that they application would be seen as complete.

175

176 Chair O'Neil requested Ms. MacArthur go over the plan review. She began on page four under the  
177 section plan review, the first bullet item, her main concern is that she was not able to find any

178 revision dates on the plan or any notes indicating what revisions have been made. That makes it  
179 difficult to say whether the items by the Town engineer, Fire Department or any other plan review  
180 items that were listed in the plan review during the design review phase have been implemented.  
181 Mr. Roscoe responded they did address them to the extent they could. It is customary if it is a new  
182 application to redate the plans so that it is easier to follow. If they provide a plan originally dated  
183 2023 and there are ten revision dates then you can think you haven't seen this before. Since design  
184 review any revisions to the plan have a fresh date on them however all those changes have been  
185 incorporated. Ms. MacArthur said that means she would literally have to pull out all the documents  
186 and go through each sheet to ensure the changes have been made because there is nothing telling  
187 her they have been made other than what he had just stated. Normally revisions are seen on plans.  
188 Mr. Roscoe replied if it is easier for him to change the date on the drawing he will put it back to the  
189 way that it was. Ms. MacArthur deferred to the Board. Chair O'Neil looks for clarification on what  
190 Ms. MacArthur is looking for, such as road frontages and setbacks. Ms. MacArthur states all of the  
191 changes or would it become a brand new application. Mr. Roscoe stated that it is important to have  
192 the history but questions whether the new comments were fresh. There shouldn't be anything that  
193 hasn't been addressed or is ongoing from the design review phase. Several of the items are in the  
194 drawings and he offers to point them out. Mr. Buonopane stated Ms. MacArthur needs the  
195 revisions. Mr. Roscoe added she would like them. Ms. MacArthur responded it is not that she  
196 would like them, it is just normally what takes place. Mr. Buonopane states yes, we want to see the  
197 revisions. Mr. Roscoe replied he can cloud all the items since the design review phase with a  
198 revision block to simplify the review if that would help. Mr. Buonopane asked if that would make  
199 it easier. Ms. MacArthur responded yes. Mr. Roscoe stated they have added road frontages,  
200 setbacks, and driveways. They are zoning items but they are not subdividing. It is to show density  
201 and that they are being cognizant of separation between the home sites. All those items have been  
202 added under the sheet C3 series. He stated again that he will go through and provide a revision  
203 cloud version for review.

204

205 Mr. Buonopane asked if they fixed everything else, such as site 36 not being attached to the sewer  
206 system and the square footage for the developed recreation area. Mr. Roscoe responded yes, on  
207 home site 36 there is a pipeline with an invert on it which is the sewer.

208

209 Mr. Buonopane asked if the big home will have its own septic and water supply. Mr. Roscoe  
210 replied yes, that will be a private water supply and septic system. It is not shown because it is  
211 essentially a separate home site from the manufactured portion of the project. That will be done at  
212 a later date. Ms. MacArthur explained the significance of that is in the ordinance it talks about  
213 utilities and facilities having to stay in the same ownership. Therefore, if at some point they wanted  
214 to sell the house, it would have to be separate from the manufactured mobile home park. Mr.  
215 Roscoe stated he thought the whole point of having manufactured homes as one lot is it would  
216 never have to be subdivided. Ms. MacArthur responded that she is only referring to the single  
217 family home. Mr. Manning added the single family home cannot be split off. He told Chair O'Neil  
218 they should be clear as in other cases, the single family home cannot be split off and sold. Mr.  
219 Roscoe added it is in the ordinance.

220

221 Ms. MacArthur stated another item that wasn't addressed during design review is the submission  
222 of some type of association documents. Someone clarified that means the legal documents. Mr.  
223 Roscoe asked if that is customarily a condition of approval or if it has to be provided for review.

224 Ms. MacArthur responded that it needs to be provided to Town counsel for review.

225

226 Mr. Manning asked if there were any issues where it enters on the highway and the curve to the  
227 left. Ms. MacArthur replied they have submitted a traffic study they had performed themselves.

228 Mr. Manning questioned if they found any issues. Ms. MacArthur responded she wasn't sure since  
229 they did their own study. Mr. Roscoe stated they choose the absolute worst spot to put in the new  
230 road from an engineering or construction point of view. It is right at that rock outcrop from a  
231 construction point, but they are trying to emphasize safety. They placed it right at the crown, the  
232 crest of the road in the center of the property, maximizing sight distance right along the  
233 topographic spine that runs up the hill. It is in the perfect spot for safety, access and maximizing  
234 separation to neighbors. The DOT has the information and just elevated their review level  
235 yesterday, they are well on their way to final review. Sight distance is adequate for the posted  
236 speed limit. They are going to take down a 16 foot piece of rock to get to the right road elevation.

237

238 Mr. Manning asked if the goal was to get the concerns down as conditions. Chair O'Neil  
239 responded that they can either put the concerns as conditions or ask them to continue until next  
240 month and a lot of this can be taken care of by then.

241

242 Chair O'Neil stated they received a response from the Fire Department regarding their extensive  
243 review. They are requesting a 10,000 gallon cistern. Mr. Roscoe spoke with the Fire Chief in the  
244 middle of June and adapted to a 30,000 gallon cistern. He intends to check back in with the Chief  
245 in a few weeks.

246

247 Mr. Roscoe stated it is his inclination to request a continuation obviously given the timing. He  
248 wanted to make sure the public had an opportunity to be heard and then he would be happy to  
249 adapt the drawings to their comments if needed.

250

251 Chair O'Neil discussed the letter from the Conservation Commission. There is a good chunk of  
252 this to remain undeveloped and they asked if it were going to be put in current use. Mr. Roscoe  
253 replied that is an option given that it is an approved manufactured home park and it has to stay.  
254 Chair O'Neil asked how much land will be left over. Mr. Roscoe replied 30-40 acres. Chair O'Neil  
255 read a statement from the Conservation Commission stating given the remaining undeveloped land  
256 is being held as a benefit for Alton, we would encourage the Planning Board to at a minimum have  
257 the remaining land put in current use. Ideally, they ask if the Planning Board could require the  
258 remaining land be placed under conservation easement with a qualified conservation organization.  
259 Mr. Roscoe reiterated the current plan is not to do a subsequent subdivision and could not do so  
260 without attempting a ton of approvals.

261

262 Mr. Sample asked if the existing walking trail is located on the remaining area. Mr. Roscoe replied  
263 yes. Mr. Sample added that is why he feels the soils are so important.

264

265 Ms. MacArthur reminded the Board they are still waiting for comments from the Town engineer  
266 for their second review as well. Chair O'Neil expressed the intent to get through as much of the  
267 application as possible.

268

269 Mr. Brown questioned if all the electric is supposed to be overhead at this time. Mr. Roscoe

270 answered it is shown that way on the drawings, they may shift a portion of it to underground along  
271 140. Chair O'Neil asked if it would be underground within the development itself to all the  
272 different units. Mr. Roscoe replied it may change later on, however as of right now it is all  
273 overhead. The utility company is suggesting they could go underground.

274

275 Ms. MacArthur asked if there were any photos or drawings of the proposed community area  
276 building. Mr. Roscoe asked if were a condition. Ms. MacArthur replied no, just asking if you had a  
277 design drawing. Mr. Roscoe answered not of the structure itself, it could be provided.

278

279 Chair O'Neil questioned if the new units were all the same. Mr. Roscoe replied yes. Mr.  
280 Buonopane asked if they were all going to be identical or will there be some two and some three  
281 bedrooms. Mr. Roscoe answered they can opt for a two bedroom version but it is the same  
282 footprint. They will be designed for the maximum water use sanitary flow. Mr. Buonopane stated it  
283 is a little dicey when it maybe two or it maybe three and the Board has to approve an entire  
284 subdivision. Mr. Roscoe replied we can approve it for a maximum of three if that helps.

285

286 Mr. Brown asked Ms. MacArthur if she was asking for the clubhouse design and not the  
287 manufactured homes, she responded right. Mr. Brown asked Mr. Roscoe if he could provide that,  
288 he responded sure.

289

290 Chair O'Neil stated the footprint of each one will be 52' by 26'8" on each lot regardless of which  
291 one you choose. Mr. Roscoe confirmed that is correct.

292

293 Mr. Brown asked if they have tested for well water yet. Mr. Roscoe responded that is still to be  
294 done in the planning stages. They have a well designer on board and are starting that process.

295

296 Ms. MacArthur questioned if the buildable area allows for a potential garage if people want one, is  
297 there enough space to have one without having to apply for a variance to be within the setback. Mr.  
298 Roscoe said he will have to review the code again, he is not sure if it is disallowed with 10,000  
299 square foot lots. He states it is a question to create something that doesn't even exist. He read from  
300 the code that accessory structures that are detached shall also meet these setbacks, therefore it  
301 would be very difficult to build a two foot wide garage. Mr. Brown requests to capture there is to  
302 be no garages in the conditions. Mr. Roscoe added this in not subject to zoning because there are  
303 no lot lines. Mr. Buonopane expressed displeasure with Mr. Roscoe's mannerisms.

304

305 Mr. Sample questioned whether some homes are narrower than others. Mr. Roscoe answered no.  
306 Chair O'Neil stated his map shows 28'6" wide by 52' long. Mr. Sample stated he is looking at one  
307 that is 26' wide. Mr. Roscoe replied maybe the foundation is a little bit oversized.

308

309 Mr. Brown asked if the cable service were like the electric and still open for discussion. Mr.  
310 Roscoe answered that is correct. Mr. Sample questioned when a decision will be made regarding  
311 the electric. Mr. Roscoe replied very soon, they are speaking with the provider and will be making  
312 a final decision whether it is underground or overhead inside and outside of the project. Chair  
313 O'Neil stated Mr. Roscoe will need to speak to the utilities, electric, internet and cable, and it all  
314 has to be the same either under or above ground. It will need to be on the plan. Mr. Brown added  
315 that includes the propane tanks as well. Mr. Roscoe replied we have shown them as above ground.

316 Mr. Sample asked if each unit has its own tank. Mr. Roscoe responded yes.

317

318 Mr. Manning stated the comment Mr. Roscoe made that the lot lines for the manufactured homes  
319 are not defined. He believes they need to be defined under the zoning bylaws. Mr. Roscoe  
320 explained he meant they are required to show the lot lines as they are, but they are not subdividing.  
321 He believes Ms. MacArthur came up with the idea to use the term home site. Mr. Manning stated  
322 the term is sites and they do need lines, it is in the requirements. Mr. Roscoe reiterated it is not the  
323 intent to subdivide. Mr. Manning responded the site for each of the mobile homes have to be  
324 defined. Ms. MacArthur replied the plan in the design review did not have that, however the  
325 current set shows all the homes and the setbacks. Mr. Manning wasn't aware of that and withdrew  
326 his question.

327

328 Mr. Sample asked what the Board is looking to do today, stating there is a lot of information here.  
329 Chair O'Neil replied they can either accept it with conditions or continue until next month. He  
330 suggested they continue until next month since there are a lot of things missing. Mr. Sample talked  
331 about the volume of information, some of it such as how often the gutters must be cleaned, seems  
332 irrelevant. He is looking for big items such as drainage and soil. He would like to continue to allow  
333 time to complete the missing items.

334

335 Chair O'Neil opened the hearing to input from the public.

336

337 Ernati Storlazzi, 685 Frank Gilman Highway, asked since this property is not subdividable, is the  
338 87 acres taxed as 87 acres or is it 38 houses on 10,000 square feet and the rest is in land use. If the  
339 later is the case, the Town will lose seventy acres of prime taxable land and the taxpayers will have  
340 to make up the difference. Mr. Sample started to explain how the lot would be taxed and Mr.  
341 Storlazzi got up and left the table stating he didn't have a question.

342

343 Diana Cucha, an abutter, asked if there had been anything done from the State. She had spoken to  
344 the State and they did not know anything about this whole development. When talking about soil  
345 testing, who is doing it, is it someone the Board knows or is it the State. Mr. Sample explained it is  
346 someone they hire and then the Town's engineer will review the results. Chair O'Neil added that  
347 under plan review, part of the conditions are to submit a copy of the NHDES alteration of terrain  
348 permit, subdivision approval, there is a whole list that has to be complied with. Ms. Cucha added  
349 she doesn't not know anything about the process and wanted to make sure the Board has all the  
350 information. Chair O'Neil explained that is the reason they want to continue because they do not  
351 have everything they need to make a decision.

352

353

354 Chair O'Neil closed the hearing to input from the public.

355

356 Steve Warren, 469 Dudley at the cul-de-sac, had questions regarding the contingencies that were  
357 promised two months ago regarding no access to Dudley Road and Tibbetts Road as a back  
358 entrance. He wanted to know if that was still a part of this. Mr. Buonopane replied those  
359 contingencies will never go away. Mr. Warren stated he talked to the State today regarding the  
360 State access permit and was told they are waiting for information from TF Moran about soils,  
361 drainage and one other item. He asked if the well situation has been addressed since people have

APPROVED

problems with wells at the crest of the hill. The State had talked about monitoring the wells and he wanted to know if there was anything in the paperwork about that. He questioned whether there were contingencies for information about whether there is sufficient water to support 38 units. Chair O'Neil replied they are still waiting for the well water tests. Mr. Warren stated he has concerns regarding the quarter acre lots with propane tanks, he has not had a chance to talk to the Fire Department yet regarding the fire issues with these tanks on such small lots. He referenced a fire at the Alton Bay Christian Conference Center that the Fire Department struggled to stop the explosions with all the propane tanks. He asked if this was the lot that Beverly Kempton subdivided before. He referenced rules for subdivided lots as far as access for the State. He expressed concern over the blasting of rock and it being a very dangerous road with the twists and turns with the sight lines. Mr. Sample answered their effort is to hammer.

**MOTION: To continue this application until the August 19<sup>th</sup> meeting. Motion by Chair O'Neil, second by Mr. Manning. Motion passed unanimously.**

Ms. MacArthur noted that the continuation deadline would be August 5<sup>th</sup>, which is two weeks prior to the meeting. Therefore, if there is any additional information to be provided, August 5<sup>th</sup> is the deadline.

## **2. Design Review**

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <b>Case #P25-20</b><br>Prospect Mountain Survey, Paul Zuzgo,<br>LLS, Agent for Lee Hillsgrove 2022<br>Revocable Trust, Lee Hillsgrove, Trustee | <b>Map 2 Lot 13</b><br><b>Dudley Road</b> | <b>Design Review-Major Subdivision</b><br><b>Rural Zone (RU)</b> |
|--|---|--|

Proposal: To subdivide a 252.90AC parcel into two (2) lots of record, parent lot of 250.30AC and one (1) lot of 2.59AC.

Paul Zuzgo, Prospect Mountain Survey and Lee Hillsgrove come to the table to present the case.

Mr. Zuzgo stated that Mr. Hillgrove would like to take another lot off his 200 plus acre lot. This will be the fourth lot which kicks it into a major. He has requested waivers because this is basically a minor due to two of the lots already having houses on them. The first lot was his mother's lot which was eight acres. The second lot was his son's lot which was five acres. That is the first lot that is going to be vacant and available to build on. He does not have any plans to build on the rest of it right now. He will keep the rest of the 250 acres in current use. Waivers have been requested for topo, wetlands and soils on the remaining land. There are no wetlands on the lot. The steep slopes are shown. There are 200 feet of frontage on both lots since it's a corner lot. The lot meets all State regulations. Because it is a major, they have to do design review first.

Mr. Sample states the first two subdivisions were shaped like bunny ears, which he found odd.

Chair O'Neil points to the map asking if he had the right lot. Mr. Zuzgo confirmed it was the proposed lot which is on the corner of 28 and Dudley.

Mr. Brown questioned the difference between a major and minor subdivision. Mr. Zuzgo explained that a minor subdivision is three lots or less, since this is the fourth lot it is a major subdivision.

APPROVED

404 Chair O'Neil added there is a timeframe, he believes to be five years. Mr. Zuzgo stated this could  
405 have been a minor subdivision then. Mr. Brown questioned from a legal standpoint, since this was  
406 originally approved as a minor subdivision, is there anything that precludes it from becoming a  
407 major subdivision. Mr. Zuzgo stated he originally applied for a minor and was told he had to apply  
408 for a major. Ms. MacArthur answered that legally it is allowed to apply for a major after a minor.  
409 Mr. Zuzgo states that with the five year rule this should still only be a minor.

410

411 Mr. Brown questioned if the proposed lot was originally part of lot 13-2. Mr. Zuzgo responded no  
412 it will be cut off from lot 13.

413

414 Chair O'Neil asked which waivers were being sought. Mr. Zuzgo replied everything, including the  
415 major subdivision studies typically required, however they are all for the remaining land.

416

417 Chair O'Neil opened the hearing to input from the public.

418

419 No input was given from the public.

420

421 Chair O'Neil closed the hearing to input from the public.

422

423 **Other Business**

424 **1. Old Business:** None

425

426 **2. New Business:**

427 **a. Approval of Minutes:** Planning Board meeting minutes of Tuesday, June 17,  
428 2025

429

430 **MOTION: To approve the Thursday, June 17, 2025 minutes. Motion by Mr. Buonopane.**

431 **Second by Mr. Brown. Mr. Buonopane amended the motion to approve the Tuesday, June 17,**

432 **2025 minutes. Second by Mr. Brown. Amended motion passed unanimously.**

433

434 **3. Correspondence for the Board's review/discussion/action:** None

435

436 **4. Correspondence for the Board's information:**

437

438 **a.** Memo dated May 27, 2025, from Mike Vignale, P.E., Town Engineer, re:  
439 Ridgewood Subdivision Site Visit.

440 Ms. MacArthur stated this is for the Boards information only.

441

442 **b.** Letter dated June 3, 2025, from Norma Ditri, Code Official, re: Bucky & Joey  
443 Holdings, LLC's ZBA approval on Map 26 Lot 4.

444 Ms. MacArthur explained they have an outstanding site plan approval with this Board, the Code  
445 Official is navigating that process. This letter is to keep the Board informed of the status.

446

447 **5. Correspondence for the Board's information on State Permit Applications:** None

448

449 **Any Other Business to Come Before the Board:** None

450

451 **Public Input on Non-Case Specific Planning Issues:** None

452

453 **MOTION: To adjourn the meeting. Motion by Mr. Brown. Second by Mr. Sample. Motion**  
454 **passed unanimously.**

455

456 The meeting adjourned at 7:26 PM.

457

458 Respectfully submitted,

459

460 Carol Long, Recording Secretary

461

462 Minutes approved as presented: August 19, 2025