

**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**

6 MEMBERS PRESENT

- 7 William O'Neil, Chair
- 8 Doug Brown, Member
- 9 Roger Sample, Member
- 10 Mark Manning, Member
- 11 Christine O'Brien, Member
- 12 Nick Buonopane, Board of Selectman's Representative

14 OTHERS PRESENT

- 15 Jessie MacArthur, Town Planner
- 16 Steven Warren
- 17 Mercades Warren
- 18 Steve Oles
- 19 Alan Roscoe
- 20 E. Storlazzi
- 21 Christine Perella
- 22 Paul Zuzgo
- 23 Lee Hillsgrave
- 24 Dick Shea

26 CALL TO ORDER

27 Chair O'Neil called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM.
28
29 Introductions were made of the Board members. There were no alternates present.

31 AGENDA REVIEW

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

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

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

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

42 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**
O'Neil. Motion passed unanimously.

48

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**
7.F.7.i. Motion by Chair O'Neil. Second by Mr. Brown. Motion passed unanimously.

54

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

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

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 their 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 chuck 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 is 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 used 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

362 problems with wells at the crest of the hill. The State had talked about monitoring the wells and he
363 wanted to know if there was anything in the paperwork about that. He questioned whether there
364 were contingencies for information about whether there is sufficient water to support 38 units.
365 Chair O'Neil replied they are still waiting for the well water tests. Mr. Warren stated he has
366 concerns regarding the quarter acre lots with propane tanks, he has not had a chance to talk to the
367 Fire Department yet regarding the fire issues with these tanks on such small lots. He referenced a
368 fire at the Alton Bay Christian Conference Center that the Fire Department struggled to stop the
369 explosions with all the propane tanks. He asked if this was the lot that Beverly Kempton
370 subdivided before. He referenced rules for subdivided lots as far as access for the State. He
371 expressed concern over the blasting of rock and it being a very dangerous road with the twists and
372 turns with the sight lines. Mr. Sample answered their effort is to hammer.
373

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

376
377 Ms. MacArthur noted that the continuation deadline would be August 5th, which is two weeks prior
378 to the meeting. Therefore, if there is any additional information to be provided, August 5th is the
379 deadline.
380

381 **2. Design Review**

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

382 Proposal: To subdivide a 252.90AC parcel into two (2) lots of record, parent lot of 250.30AC and
383 one (1) lot of 2.59AC.
384

385 Paul Zuzgo, Prospect Mountain Survey and Lee Hillsgrave come to the table to present the case.
386

387 Mr. Zuzgo stated that Mr. Hillgrove would like to take another lot off his 200 plus acre lot. This
388 will be the fourth lot which kicks it into a major. He has requested waivers because this is basically
389 a minor due to two of the lots already having houses on them. The first lot was his mother's lot
390 which was eight acres. The second lot was his son's lot which was five acres. That is the first lot
391 that is going to be vacant and available to build on. He does not have any plans to build on the rest
392 of it right now. He will keep the rest of the 250 acres in current use. Waivers have been requested
393 for topo, wetlands and soils on the remaining land. There are no wetlands on the lot. The steep
394 slopes are shown. There are 200 feet of frontage on both lots since it's a corner lot. The lot meets
395 all State regulations. Because it is a major, they have to do design review first.
396

397 Mr. Sample states the first two subdivisions were shaped like bunny ears, which he found odd.
398

399 Chair O'Neil points to the map asking if he had the right lot. Mr. Zuzgo confirmed it was the
400 proposed lot which is on the corner of 28 and Dudley.
401

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

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