

**TOWN OF ALTON
PLANNING BOARD
PUBLIC HEARING MEETING
Tuesday, May 19, 2026, at 6:00 PM
Alton Town Hall**

CALL TO ORDER

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

ROLL CALL OF BOARD MEMBERS

William (Bill) O'Neil (Chair)
Douglas Brown
Jack Sleeper (Selectman's Representative)
Mark Manning
Roger Sample
Dan Pierce
Ava Drost (Alternate)

OTHERS PRESENT

Robin McClain
Richard Shea
Anthony Jones (Jones Beach Engineers)
Dave Fuller

APPOINTMENT OF ALTERNATES

Ava Drost

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chair O'Neil asked if there were any changes to the agenda. Ms. McClain stated there was one change. For the voluntary merger of preexisting lots, there was an incorrect number of #P26-12. She stated it should be #P26-13. Chair O'Neil asked if there were any other changes to the agenda. There were none.

Mr. Brown MOTIONED to APPROVE the Planning Board Agenda. Mr. Sleeper SECONDS. Chair O' Neil asked the Board for a vote. Board voted UNANIMOUSLY.

I. PUBLIC HEARING FOR ADOPTION OF TOWN OF ALTON PLANNING BOARD UPDATED APPLICATIONS

Chair O'Neil stated that the application fees have gone up as was discussed last month. He read through the proposal: "The Alton Planning Department has posted for a Public Hearing for the increase of fees on the Planning Board application. Currently the fees are charging applicants under the actual cost of processing parts and applications. Abutter notification is now higher than the \$6.00 that is currently charged. In efforts to stay ahead of the postal charges staff is proposing increase on the updated fee sheets, (see attached). Abutters fees will increase from \$6.00 to \$10.00. Notification letters will be increased from \$1.00 to \$2.00, and the newspaper

47 notice will be increased from \$75.00 to \$90.00. These increases should provide a greater buffer
48 as the postage rates and service continue to increase.”

49 Chair O’Neil asked if there were any questions or comments from the Board before he opened to
50 public comment. There was no comment from the Board.

51

52 Chair O’Neil opened to public comment on the proposed changes. There were no comments.

53 Chair O’Neil closed to public comment. He stated it was up to the Board to accept the increases.

54 Mr. Manning asked how much the Town got in those proposed fees every year. Ms. McClain

55 stated she did not know. Mr. Manning asked if the newspaper notice was required by the State.

56 Ms. McClain stated that that was correct. Chair O’Neil asked if there were any further questions
57 from the Board.

58

59 Mr. Sample asked if the abutters notices went up \$2.00. He asked if when an application was

60 submitted, it was submitted with a self-addressed stamped envelope. Ms. McClain stated that

61 that was correct. Mr. Sample asked why they would be required to pay more money. Ms.

62 McClain explained that the notices go out certified. They are not stamped; they are self-

63 addressed. The Town must mark it certified, and that is currently above the rate that the Town

64 charges. Chair O’Neil stated it has gone above \$6.00. Mr. Pierce commented that the existing

65 fees don’t cover. Chair O’Neil stated the existing fees are not covering it. Either the Town picks

66 up or the applicant pays for it. The Town is increasing the fees, so the Town doesn’t have to pick

67 up the tab.

68

69 Mr. Sample stated that it was \$6.00 per abutter. Ms. McClain stated that it was, and it is going to

70 be up to \$10.00 per abutters notice. She said at this point the rate was not \$6.00. It has been

71 \$6.00 for a long time and now it is \$6.04. She said they will be raising their rates again. She

72 proposed this increase as a means to avoid continued increase requests every 6 months to offset

73 the rate raise. Mr. Sample stated if they’re self-addressing they should just take them to post

74 office and certify them themselves. Ms. McClain stated that the Town has to do it legally. She

75 stated she did some comparing to one or two other towns and the other towns are charging higher

76 rates. She stated she was trying to come up with something reasonable for the applicants and

77 reasonable for administrative. Mr. Manning asked if the Selectmen have to approve it. Ms.

78 McClain stated that this is a Planning Board (Inaudible) for the Planning Board to do. She stated

79 the Zoning Board had to do the same thing. She stated the rates are the same across the Board

80 for Zoning and Planning. She stated Zoning approved this increase this past month. Chair

81 O’Neil asked if Ms. Drost had a question. Ms. Drost stated something (inaudible). Ms. McClain

82 stated yes. Mr. Sample stated that was certified class. Ms. Drost stated she was just bringing it

83 up (inaudible).

84

85 Mr. Manning stated the change is such small money it’s almost a non-issue. Mr. Brown

86 suggested they just move on. Mr. Sample argued the change being small money at \$6.00. Mr.

87 Manning stated in his mind adding taxes is not a great idea. Mr. Sample stated that it was not a

88 tax. It’s a fee. Chair O’Neil stated either way it needs to be paid. Either the applicant pays for it

89 or the Town pays for it. Chair O’Neil stated that if the Town pays for it, since you pay taxes to

90 the Town, then it would be a tax. Mr. Sample argued calling the money small. He stated that

91 some parcels have many abutters. He stated the Conference Center has 62 abutters. Mr. Manning

92 stated they would have to pay \$600. Mr. Sleeper stated it does vary and there are spots in town
93 that have large parcels and there are others that might only have one or two. Mr. Manning stated
94 that before voting on this perhaps the Board should know how much it is worth. Mr. Sample
95 asked what he was referring to. Mr. Sleeper stated the amount taken in by the Town. Mr.
96 Sleeper suggested throughout the course of a year, through all the fees that are paid in, what is
97 that total number. Mr. Pierce stated that if it is not approved the Town will lose money. Mr.
98 Sample and Mr. Manning disagreed. Mr. Sample stated the applicants are paying \$6.00 to certify
99 a letter. He asked if Mr. Pierce had ever certified a letter. He stated it costs about \$1.50. Mr.
100 Pierce stated that Ms. McClain just stated they're paying more than \$6.00. Mr. Sample asked
101 Ms. McClain if she was paying more than \$6.00 to certify a letter. Ms. McClain stated yes. Mr.
102 Sample asked her what post office she went to. Ms. McClain stated she goes to the one in Alton.
103 Mr. Sample asked her if they are charging more than \$6.00 for a certified letter. Ms. McClain
104 stated yes. She stated it has been that way since last fall. She stated that is why she decided to
105 change the fees. She stated that on top of that the post office will be raising the rate so it will be
106 beyond what she is currently paying. She stated it has been a \$6.00 fee since before she started
107 working there. She stated she does not take lightly charging applicants a higher rate. She stated
108 it is difficult enough and expensive enough.

109
110 Mr. Brown asked if she benchmarked other towns. Ms. McClain stated she had. She stated that
111 she has seen \$10 and \$15. Mr. Sleeper asked if some of that fee was to offset administrative cost
112 of the town employee going to the post office. Ms. McClain stated a portion of it is related to
113 NODs and the abutters notice. She stated there is a little bit of administrative fee into this as
114 well. Mr. Pierce stated according to the post office a certified letter (Inaudible). Mr. Manning
115 stated he would go back to his comment and vote against this. He recognizes it is small money
116 and he's guessing everyone else will vote in favor of it. He stated he was opposed to approving
117 additional taxes or fees without all of the knowledge and in this case it's a moot point to him but
118 he just wanted to make a note of it publicly. Ms. McClain stated if the Board would like to
119 continue it, she could try and do research and find out what the bottom line is.

120

121 **Mr. Brown MOTIONS to APPROVE fee increases for the new applications. Mr. Pierce**
122 **SECONDS. Chair O'Neil asks for Board to vote. Mr. Manning and Mr. Sample oppose.**

123

124 Chair O'Neil stated he needed to recuse himself for the next case since it involved him
125 personally. He gave Mr. Brown power of Chair of the Board for this case.

126

127 **2. Voluntary Merger of Pre-existing Lots**

Case #P26-13 William J O'Neil Revocable Trust, William O'Neil, Trustee	Map 22 Lots 28 & 41A 8 O'Neil Road O'Neil Road	Voluntary Lot Merger Rural (RU) Zone
--	--	---

128 Proposal: To voluntarily merge two pre-existing lots of record.

129

130 Chair Brown stated he understood the history on this as back in the 1970s there was an error
131 made by the Town when this was originally listed as a parcel ID. They created lot 41 A in error.
132 He stated this is a request to merge that lot, 41A with lot 28 and bring it back to one lot with that
133 merger. In terms of what is required by the regulations to do this, there's a number of hoops that

134 Mr. O'Neil had to do to do this. He stated that first there was a tax map with a deed check as of
135 April 2026. He understands according to the Town Planner it complies with the standards in the
136 subdivision regulations. He stated there was a timing issue that the application could not be
137 scheduled before May 19, 2026. He stated that was approved by the Assessor and now needs to
138 be approved by the Planning Board. He asked if there was anything Mr. O'Neil wanted to say
139 before they got started.

140

141 Mr. O'Neil stated it goes back to 1976. He explained that his father had purchased two lots
142 behind the current house and he wasn't getting tax bills for them. He reached out to Duncan, the
143 Assessor at the time and he said, don't worry. He stated his understanding was they used to do
144 involuntary lot merges back then. He stated the Assessor put them all on one tax bill and it's
145 merged. He stated Lot 42 A got sent to the registry this 41A never did. He stated that he had it
146 put into a trust and everything, all the lots, all of the property was put into a trust so it was
147 merged with the registry. He stated this is more of a housekeeping thing with the Town to fix the
148 tax map, so it shows just one lot. He stated he wanted to follow the proper procedure to make
149 sure that it went through the Planning Board and everything went the right way.

150

151 Mr. Sample stated that the Board had not accepted the application as complete. Chair Brown
152 asked if there was an application in this. Chair Brown didn't think that there was. Mr. O'Neil
153 stated there wasn't anything that called for completeness on it. Chair Brown stated there's no
154 standard for completeness. He stated it was more that there were mandatory submission items
155 that needed to be put in and from everything he surmised all of those requirements have been
156 met. He told Mr. Sample he did not believe the Board needed to talk about completeness on this.

157

158 Chair Brown asked the Board if there were any questions or open points. Mr. Sample asked if he
159 was merging three lots. Mr. O'Neil stated that it is actually one. He stated the 42A and 28 were
160 already merged and 41A was supposed to have been merged at the time. He stated he's merging
161 41A with 28. Mr. Sample asked if it was across the street. Mr. O'Neil stated it was across the
162 road. Mr. Sample asked if 41 A is on both sides of the street. Mr. O'Neil stated 28 is on the lake
163 and across the private road is 41A and 42 A. He explained that 42A was merged in 1976 per Mr.
164 Raymond Duncan and it was 42 A and 41 A were supposed to have been merged, but it got
165 missed. Mr. Sleeper asked if 42 A was what looks like a sliver to the left. Mr. O'Neil stated it is
166 a half of a lot. He stated he was just trying to get it all to be one lot. Chair Brown asked if this
167 would still need to be recorded in the Registry of Deeds. Mr. O'Neil stated that everything is
168 being sent to them. He stated he had talked to his attorney, and he said because it is all on deed
169 they probably won't change but will probably put a notation in it that the tax map was updated
170 (inaudible). Chair Brown stated the only other question he had was whether there was a
171 mortgage on any of the lots at this point. Mr. O'Neil stated not on the lots on the back. Mr.
172 Sleeper asked if the 41 A lot had not been taxed since 1970s. Mr. O'Neil stated that it had for the
173 last four years. He stated they do not know because (Mr.) Duncan put it on one and his father
174 thought that he was paying taxes on it but he does not think so. Chair Brown asked if Mr.
175 Manning had any questions.

176

177 **Mr. Manning MOTIONS to APPROVE Case #P26-13 to allow the voluntary merger of the**
178 **preexisting lots application from Mr. Bill O'Neil and the Bill O'Neil revocable trust as**

submitted on April 28, 2026. Mr. Sleeper SECONDS. Chair Brown asks for Board to vote.
UNANIMOUS.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Old Business: NONE

2. New Business:

- a. Letter dated March 27, 2026, from Jones & Beach Engineers, Inc., re:
extension request for Route 28 Boat Storage.

Mr. Sleeper asked Ms. McClain if the Board was given info on this case in the last meeting. Ms. McClain stated there was info at the last meeting. She asked if he brought it. He stated he did not. She stated she could go make copies. Chair O'Neil asked if anyone needed copies.

After reviewing the minutes Chair O'Neil stated that it seemed there was some confusion in the last meeting about dates and times and extensions. He asked if everyone had the letter from Tighe & Bond. He asked the Mr. Jones what the timeline was for his extension.

Anthony Jones stated the same two years. He stated they could just do one if that works better for the Board. He stated he believed standard procedure was two years. Mr. Sleeper stated that as he looked at the minutes from the prior meeting it seemed the applicant had already gone past the two-year extension from 2024, to August of 2026. Mr. Brown stated, plus another six months. Mr. Sleeper stated that that is six months over the initial two-year extension that was given in August of 2024. He stated he believed what was discussed at the last meeting was that this was getting stale and how do we proceed from there. He asked if anyone went out to the property. Chair O'Neil stated Tighe & Bond went out. He stated he drove by it, and he saw big rocks, small rocks, sand. Mr. Sample stated the problem is there are two properties there. He stated there are two cases there, a boat storage and one is more of a various storage. He stated that when you see all of gravel, that is the second case. He stated that the boat storage is what he believes is trying to be extended here is right next to the power company road where there's woods. Chair O'Neil asked if that was Emerson Drive. He stated he thought it was all the same property. Mr. Sample said no it is two different lots. He stated that when Tighe & Bond went out there that's what they saw. He said it looked like they're working, but that's not the case.

Mr. Brown said that this statement that there's ongoing construction is not correct by Tighe & Bond. Mr. Sample stated they just didn't know. It looks like work is getting done. Mr. Brown asked if the parties could identify themselves for the record.

Anthony Jones with Jones Beach Engineers representing Dave Fuller, he's the site contractor and the owner of the property.

Mr. Fuller stated they have been working, hammering rocks, processing material. He stated they have a huge import on the site. He stated they have the first building area where there are stockpiles at a subgrade, and they haven't gone down over the top yet for the rest of the project. He stated they are working towards getting that first building started.

223 Mr. Jones asked Mr. Fuller if he was on site with the Town's Engineer when he walked the
224 property. Mr. Fuller said he was. Mr. Jones asked him what part of the site he walked with the
225 engineer. Mr. Fuller stated they walked out back and saw all of the perimeters, the erosion
226 controls. Mr. Jones stated he might have seen this project but he definitely also saw this. Mr.
227 Fuller stated that that one is a different thing. Mr. Jones stated that is what Mr. Sample was
228 saying.

229

230 Mr. Sleeper asked Mr. Fuller if all of the gravel and aggregate that are seen from the road were
231 on the lot that he intends to build on. Mr. Fuller stated yes. Mr. Sample asked which lot. Mr.
232 Fuller explained that it is kind of hard to tell lot lines there. He demonstrated on the site map the
233 area he was talking about. Chair O'Neil asked if the big piles of rocks and stone were his lot.
234 Mr. Fuller stated that is his lot. Mr. Brown asked if that was the 5 AC parcel. Mr. Sample asked
235 where Emerson Rd was. Mr. Fuller demonstrated. Mr. Sample stated that the lot they were
236 discussing goes right along Emerson Road. Mr. Sleeper stated it goes behind it and behind the
237 other lot. There is another lot in the front that is not part of what they're talking about. They
238 own it, but it is not what is being discussed. Mr. Fuller stated they are two separate parcels. Mr.
239 Brown stated that the lot with all the stone on it is the 5 AC parcel. Mr. Fuller stated that was
240 correct and everything is stockpiled in the area where the first building is going. He stated the
241 first building site had a subgrade. He stated they have three inches of crushed material that they
242 made. He stated they have a big import in the back because there's a giant slope in the back
243 because there's a parking area and a big slope and a huge import. He stated they brought in extra
244 materials anticipating that they will be using them.

245

246 Mr. Sleeper asked if on the map there were any current pictures of the areas Mr. Fuller had said
247 were being prepared to show their preparedness. Mr. Fuller stated he had no pictures with him.
248 Mr. Jones did not have any pictures either. Mr. Brown stated that at the last meeting he raised the
249 point about having a road map for what the timing would be for construction and completion.
250 He asked if anything had been done in that context. Mr. Fuller stated he spoken with the Town
251 Engineer on it. He stated between getting AOT work done which would be the pond and all the
252 erosion control, storm water facilities all set, so they can satisfy AOT, they're looking to pour
253 concrete next spring for the building, because it's a big site. He stated there's a lot of drainage
254 work. He stated the cuts and fills are huge. Mr. Pierce asked what the reason was for the delay.
255 He stated they had already received one extension. Mr. Fuller stated when it was approved, they
256 were just coming out of COVID. It was hard to get steel; the prices were high. He stated they
257 sat on it waiting to see what was going to get done and then they ran out of time. Mr. Brown
258 stated he had sympathy for the inflation areas he mentioned but the reality is there's a high
259 probability it is not going to change in the next year or two as well. Mr. Sample stated he would
260 like to see something that showed just where those lots were. He stated that it seemed like the
261 gravel was far away from Emerson Road. Mr. Fuller explained that there is a patch of woods in
262 the front and demonstrated on the map. Mr. Jones stated that the drawing could be somewhat
263 deceptive because it was 60 scale. Mr. Sleeper stated he could visualize driving by the trees cut
264 out and he can see gravel behind it to understand it is the area that they were discussing.

265

266 Chair O'Neil stated that the last extension request was Tuesday, February 20th 2024. He read
267 (from the extension): Within 24 months of the date of approval, the following items must be

268 completed in order to constitute active and sustainable development or building: Install erosion
269 control and sedimentation upon/clearing and grubbing. The following items to be completed in
270 order to constitute substantial completion of improvements, obtain a certificate of occupancy.
271 Mr. Brown stated that was all supposed to be in place by August 2024. Mr. Sleeper stated that as
272 he was rereading this, what he recalled was there was a six-month extension that seemed to have
273 surpassed in 2024 and the application for this two years was supposed to get through August of
274 this year but it is already almost two years out of date considering the information that the Board
275 has. Mr. Jones stated to clarify that they were seeking extension to the CO requirement not the
276 initial construction. He stated his understanding was that it meets the current requirements of
277 being vested. The work was started prior to the initial expiration which was what the six-month
278 extension was originally for. He explained that this extension would be to CO. Mr. Sample
279 asked if he was referring to Certificate of Occupancy. Mr. Jones stated that was correct. He
280 stated that on the original approval there were two kinds of goalposts that were outlined in the
281 approval, one is within 24 months construction needed to begin. He stated that there didn't seem
282 to be any dispute for the Town's Engineer. He stated he was happy to hear from the Board. He
283 stated however, that that goalpost has been past in his view. He stated that they are only seeking
284 an extension for the Certificate of Occupancy requirement which was supposed to be done a year
285 after construction begins. He stated that every commercial project he had ever gotten approved
286 has required extensions from that type of requirement. He said the State gives five years for all
287 sorts of land use permits. He stated that the Town tries to keep that tight to the vest. He stated
288 obviously, regulations change. In this case he did not believe any regulations had changed. He
289 stated if this were to come back in front of the Board, he thought it would be approved again. He
290 stated that one year for CO was really what they were requesting from the Board.

291
292 Mr. Sleeper said the CO was supposed to be for one year after the drop started. Mr. Jones
293 agreed. He stated that would be August 2026 was the expiration including the six months from
294 the initial extension. Mr. Sleeper stated without his notes he was getting lost in the information.
295 Mr. Jones agreed that it was a lot. Mr. Sleeper stated as he recalled, what he remembered of the
296 discussion was that there was an extension to start the project. Mr. Jones agreed. Mr. Sleeper
297 stated six months and then two years. Mr. Jones agreed. He stated that once a project is started
298 that's one goalpost done. Mr. Sleeper asked when the project started. Mr. Fuller agreed that it
299 was sometime after a construction meeting in 2023. Mr. Sleeper stated it seemed like they were
300 well beyond the one year after the start, from what he understood. He stated he was new to this
301 and was just trying to understand. Mr. Jones stated that he was following the dates. He stated he
302 sees the August 2026 date and trying to make sense of that along with the requirements that were
303 put in the approval. He stated as they understood it the construction started, so that goalpost was
304 past. He stated it was really just the CO requirement. He stated that it puts the Board in an
305 awkward spot.

306
307 Mr. Brown stated he felt a little dubious of the explanation given based on the prior meeting
308 where there was an open debate whether the project had actually started. He stated at this point,
309 before he would be comfortable he would like to see a defined game plan for when this will
310 really be completed. He stated for all the Board knows it could be another two years from now
311 and still having the same type of discussion again. He stated he felt there had to be some
312 meaningful intent to show progress on this and really define that you're going to go ahead and do

313 the project, in light of all the inflationary pressure that's out there. He stated he understood fully
314 the reluctance on that basis.

315

316 Mr. Jones asked what markers the Board would want to see. He stated he didn't feel it was
317 reasonable for them to get (scale) for both structures within a year from now. Mr. Brown stated
318 he didn't believe that either. Mr. Sample stated he agreed with Mr. Brown that it should be
319 reviewed for any changes. He stated if there haven't been any changes in regulations since it
320 was originally approved then it would be easier to bump it along. He stated if there were some
321 changes to zoning then they should probably have to go with that because it didn't get extended.
322 He said as Mr. Brown had already stated the Board needs something solid that this is what you're
323 doing. Mr. Brown added what their plan is and when the final construction will be completed
324 and the CO issued basically. Mr. Sample stated that as long as there haven't been any zoning
325 changes, then that's okay. He stated if zoning changed then they have to come back and start
326 over again.

327

328 Mr. Jones stated that Mr. Sample raised a great point. He stated that that's basically how local
329 government in New Hampshire runs. He stated the approvals are kept tight to the Town's vest
330 with the one-year expirations. He stated that he felt the assumptions that projects will require
331 extensions prior to getting to the finish line, but if at any point your regulations change you have
332 the right to rescind that approval and not grant that extension when that expires. He stated the
333 only question was would the Board be willing to grant an extension or make them come back
334 through for a more formal public hearing again when none of the regulations have really
335 changed. Mr. Sample stated they have always granted extensions, but people came back in time.
336 He stated that was the big issue. It was past the extension time. He agreed with Mr. Brown that
337 they should see what they are going to do and when they're going to do it and hold that goal
338 post. He stated also take a review of the project and see if there was anything that would have
339 preempted that from happening that they have to jump through a little hoop. He stated chances
340 are it probably hasn't. Mr. Sleeper asked if construction had broken ground on the lot or has the
341 actual construction of the building begun (that they've started seeking a certificate of
342 occupancy). Mr. Sample stated that they always put perimeters in of what is vested. He stated if
343 it is land it usually is just the boundary lines.

344

345 Mr. Jones stated that it is defined in the condition as installation of erosion control and clearing
346 and grubbing. Chair O'Neil stated that on Tuesday, February 20, 2024, extension request, page
347 two at the top it reads: The Planning Board on February 20, 2024 voted to grant an extension to
348 start construction by August 20, 2024, a six-month period. This would also extend the date to
349 complete construction to August 20, 2026. All other conditions are still enforced and the effects
350 as previously approved on March 1, 2022.

351

352 Mr. Jones stated that their understanding was that the permit would expire in August, but he was
353 happy to hear any opinions otherwise. Mr. Manning stated they want one more year. Chair
354 O'Neil stated that is what it seems like from what he reads from the prior extension request. Mr.
355 Jones disagreed and stated that they would be back for another extension in the spring. He stated
356 they are happy to do that process that way the Town can keep it in their court. Mr. Pierce stated
357 that what Chair O'Neil is saying is that the project should be done in August of 2026. Mr.

358 Sleeper stated that was why they want to extend this one year. Chair O'Neil stated that it should
359 be done this coming August. He stated they're looking for an extension prior to August to
360 complete construction. Mr. Jones stated that was correct. He stated they want to push the date
361 out for completing construction out another year. He stated they would probably be back next
362 year for another extension realistically. He stated at that point hopefully they could show
363 pictures of foundation in the ground. He stated that he didn't expect a CO to have been issued by
364 August 2027.

365

366 Mr. Jones stated they were happy to have that conversation. He stated the Board holds the cards
367 with one-year extensions. He stated they could refuse to grant it anytime they wish. Mr. Brown
368 said that in case Mr. Jones didn't sense it, he was skating on thin ice in terms of the request for
369 the extension. It has been out there with repetitive requests on it. Mr. Sample asked if the Board
370 hadn't given longer extensions. Chair O'Neil stated that the last one was two years. Mr. Sample
371 asked why they don't just give them two years now. He stated that he felt they missed the boat
372 on coming in for an extension. He stated as long as everything was kosher, give them two years
373 for completion. He stated it was not to come back in another two years. Mr. Jones stated they
374 were happy with that. He stated the only thing he would refute was that they missed the boat.
375 He stated he saw on the extension that the approval would expire August 20th.

376

377 Mr. Sleeper stated he believed there was some confusion about the construction start versus –
378 Mr. Jones stated the additional six months confuses the calendar for sure. Mr. Manning asked if
379 the work would be done in two years. Mr. Fuller stated that it would have to be. Mr. Brown
380 stated there was a big difference between grubbing the site and putting concrete and steel on the
381 ground. Mr. Jones stated he agreed. Mr. Sleeper asked if it was appropriate to do a one-year
382 extension. Mr. Brown stated that was where he was at, to see some good faith. Mr. Sleeper
383 stated if he heard correctly what had stemmed the beginning of this project and getting concrete
384 poured and moving forward was the cost of steel and other costs that have risen sharply. Mr.
385 Fuller stated that back when COVID was finishing up, supply and demand was a big problem.

386

387 Mr. Sleeper stated that he was aware that there's another storage facility that is currently under
388 construction and breaking ground and planning to build. Chair O'Neil stated the Board had
389 approved numerous storage facilities. Mr. Sleeper stated that other storage facilities are moving
390 forward but this one is not. He stated he would be on Board with going with a year to see some
391 progress. Mr. Pierce stated if the Board did not see progress, not to expect another year. Mr.
392 Sleeper asked the parties if it seemed reasonable. Mr. Jones stated he would ask the Board to put
393 that in the motion, some sort of goalpost, like concrete work has been done, that way when they
394 come back in a year with different heads, we remember where we left off. Mr. Brown asked if
395 they were comfortable with one year. Mr. Jones stated that would be August 2027. Mr. Brown
396 stated a completion by the following year of 2028. Mr. Fuller stated yes. Mr. Manning asked if
397 Mr. Brown was giving the parties a two-year extension. Mr. Brown stated he felt there's a
398 milestone to demonstrate to construction. Chair O'Neil stated, one year to concrete for
399 substantial development for this extension. Mr. Brown stated concrete in the ground August
400 2027, CO by August 2028. Mr. Manning asked if they should write into the motion that if it
401 doesn't happen next August, the cement isn't in the ground, or however they word it that the
402 parties would need to go back and reapply and start over. Chair O'Neil stated that could be put

into the motion. Mr. Manning stated that they knew they were going to ask for another year extension. Chair O'Neil stated that the subsequent condition is what they put in there. He stated they put in there that concrete is there. Mr. Manning stated otherwise they would be debating the same thing. Mr. Brown agreed. Mr. Sample asked if this was multiple buildings. Mr. Jones stated that what they would like to avoid is if they come back next year for an extension sometime in the summer and the concrete work has been done, their side of the bargain has been fulfilled and they come in for the one year extension, the only thing they wouldn't want was short of any large site plan changes that would affect this project, they wouldn't want to get the rug pulled out and have to come back in for a new approval just to hit the CO mark, when buildings are being erected and finished grading is being done, assuming they get that far. Mr. Manning stated that in his thinking what he understands that to mean why doesn't the Board just grant two years and if it doesn't get done, they go back and start over. Mr. Jones stated he deferred to the Board.

Mr. Sleeper asked if the CO was for the one building. Or was the total job supposed to be complete as of August of this year. Mr. Jones quoted the wording as "obtain a certificate of occupancy". He stated reading between the lines and interprets that to mean all structures on the site, given that they're looking for completeness. He stated if you read just the strict lettering it would just be one. Mr. Manning stated the Board could change that now anyway. Mr. Jones stated that it could all go in the motion. Mr. Sleeper stated realistically, if the Board was able to ask for total completion, what would the timeline be. Mr. Fuller stated two years. Mr. Manning stated three years. He stated it was two years a second ago. Mr. Sleeper asked if it was two years, both buildings done, COs for both. Mr. Fuller stated yes. Mr. Jones stated from August 2028, you've got grass growing and you're out. Mr. Fuller stated yes. Mr. Manning stated to be clear about the alternative. If it is not there, they start over. Chair O'Neil stated that was fine. Mr. Sample stated the Board was not trying to make things difficult. They just want to make sure the project is going and hasn't dragged out past zoning changes. He stated it hasn't started yet and everything changed, which could say you couldn't even do it, that's why the Board gives extensions so they can look back. He stated give the two years and then it's easy. You don't have to come back in a year.

Mr. Sample MOTIONS to APPROVE the extension of two years to complete both buildings with COs and (DOB) complete. Mr. Manning SECONDS. Chair O'Neil asks for Board to vote. UNANIMOUS.

- b. Case #P26-12: Building Permit Permission Request/STR for Private Roads, Seeblick, LLC, Hans & Elizabeth Beimann, Map 18 Lot 7, 174 Fort Point Road, Lakeshore Residential Zone (LR)

Ms. McClain stated, for clarification these are two different for the same people because it is technically on the same property. Chair O'Neil stated it was confusing to him. Ms. McClain stated they are right by each other. She stated this one has been a confusing one and it has taken a whole lot to get this to the Board. Mr. Manning asked if the Board typically moved these through to the Selectmen. Ms. McClain stated that would be the next step, it would go to the Selectmen. Mr. Brown asked if any of them ever got challenged by the Selectmen. Mr. Sleeper

stated he had not been there long enough to know. Chair O’Neil stated they were getting a permit to do the short-term rental. He stated the Board didn’t want them not to get it.

Mr. Manning MOTIONS to APPROVE Case #P26-12 as submitted. Mr. Brown SECONDS. Chair O’Neil asks for Board to vote. UNANIMOUS.

- c. **Case #P26-14:** Building Permit Permission Request/STR for Private Roads, Seeblick, LLC, Hans & Elizabeth Beimann, Map 44 Lot 1, 38 Bickford Lane, Lakeshore Residential Zone (LR)

Mr. Manning MOTIONS to APPROVE Case #P26-14 as submitted. Mr. Brown SECONDS. Chair O’Neil asks for Board to vote. UNANIMOUS.

- d. **Approval of Minutes:** Planning Board meeting minutes of Tuesday, April 21, 2026

Chair O’Neil asked if there were any changes to the April minutes. Mr. Brown stated a couple of minor changes. Line 73 under 108,000 square feet and line 75 should say 174,000 to 40 square feet. Line 183, he did not recollect what exactly was said by Mr. Hoopes, but it was in the record as (Clough/cloth) referring to a book. He asked if anyone recollected what he was referring to. Mr. Pierce asked what line that was. Mr. Sample was not in attendance so he couldn’t comment on it. Mr. Brown suggested striking that and just have it read “in the book”. Chair O’Neil asked if there were any other changes. There were none.

Chair O’Neil MOTIONS to ACCEPT April 21, 2026 meeting minutes as amended. Mr. Brown SECONDS. Chair Brown asks for Board to vote. UNANIMOUS.

3. **Correspondence for the Board's review/discussion/action: NONE**
4. **Correspondence for the Board's information: NONE**
5. **Correspondence for the Board’s information on State Permit Applications: NONE**

Public Input on Non-Case Specific Planning Issues: NONE

ADJOURNMENT

Planning Board Chair, Bill O’Neil

Mr. Brown MOVED to ADJOURN the meeting. Mr. Sample SECONDS. Chair O’Neil asked the board for a vote. Board voted UNANIMOUSLY.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:50 PM.
Respectfully Submitted,
Sandra Monaco, Recording Secretary