

**TOWN OF ALTON
PLANNING BOARD
PUBLIC HEARING MEETING
Tuesday, June 16, 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)
Mark Manning
Jack Sleeper (Selectman's Representative)
Dan Pierce
Ava Drost (Alternate)

OTHERS PRESENT

Robin McClain
Peter DeJagar Jr.
Sara McCabe
Richard Shea
Carol Shea
Craig Jenson
Marilyn Jenson
Paul Zuzgo
Chris Boldt
Mary McKenney
William MacDuff

APPOINTMENT OF ALTERNATES

Ava Drost

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chair O'Neil asked if there were any changes to the agenda. There were no changes.

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

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

Case #P26-15 Norway Plains Associates, William Macduff, Agent for the Gwyneth R DeJager 1982 Trust, Peter DeJager, Trustee	Map 18 Lot 26 57 Roberts Cove Road	Final Minor Subdivision Lakeshore Residential Zone (LR)
---	---	--

Proposal: To subdivide a lot of 25.54AC into three (3) lots of record with the parent lot being

11.26AC, lot proposed lot #1 being 8.48AC and proposed lot #2 being 5.79AC.

Mr. Manning MOTIONS to ACCEPT Case #P26-15 as COMPLETE for discussion. Ms. Drost SECONDS. Chair O’Neil asks for Board to vote. UNANIMOUS.

Mr. DeJager stated he was a trustee of the Gwyneth R. DeJager 1982 Trust, the Applicant. He addressed the Board stating that in 1970 Pete and Gwyn DeJager purchased the historic Roberts Family Homestead on Roberts Cove Rd and made it their home for the next 55 years. The property includes a historic farmhouse, open fields, woodland and approximately 300 ft of frontage on Lake Winnepesaukee. Over the years they carefully maintained the fields, stone walls and scenic views that contribute to the character of Roberts Cove Rd. Following their passing the family considered how best to transfer the property while preserving its most significant features. After consultation with surveyors, conservation organizations and legal counsel, and town representatives, we’ve elected to pursue a three-lot minor subdivision. The plan is organized around the property’s three distinct components: the homestead, the waterfront and the upper land. This proposal is not intended to maximize development but rather to balance future ownership with long term preservation. A Central feature of the proposal is the permanent protection of the open field between the house and Basin Rd, which forms a prominent view corridor for Roberts Cove Rd toward Lake Winnepesaukee, recorded open space covenants and restrictions will permanently prohibit future development within the designated protected areas and require maintenance of the field and roadside stonewall. These restrictions will run with the land and be enforceable by future owners, certain abutters and the town. The family also explored conservation easement alternatives with the Lakes Region Conservation Trust. The proposed covenant structure was selected because it provides permanent scenic protection while maintaining private ownership and clear stewardship responsibilities. The result permanently extinguishes the development rights within the protected field area while preserving one of the region’s most visible scenic resources. He stated the family respectfully submits that this proposal protects the public view corridor, preserves neighborhood character and provides permanent open space protection while allowing reasonable use of the remaining property. He appreciated the Board’s consideration and welcomed any questions.

Mr. MacDuff stated that as the Chair had said it is a 25.54 AC lot on Roberts Cove Rd in Wolfeboro and they are proposing to subdivide that into three lots.

Mr. Sleeper stated a correction that the property is on Roberts Cove Rd in Alton. Mr. MacDuff agreed.

Mr. MacDuff stated the first lot on the left being 11.26 AC, proposed lot 26. Proposed Lot 26.1 is 8.48 AC with the existing home in the middle. The proposed lot 26.2 is 5.79 acres which is vacant land and has the Roberts’ family cemetery located on it as well. All three lots exceed 5 AC and do not require NHDS subdivision approval. He stated each lot has at least 400 ft of frontage on Roberts Cove Rd and all have a width to depth ratio better than 2.7 (9 to 1). Proposed lot 18.261 in the middle has an existing dwelling and is serviced by an existing well and septic system. The other two lots are vacant and are to be serviced by private wells and septic systems.

87 He stated the wetlands exist in several pockets shown in green on this plan and have been
88 classified as poorly drained soils by NH Wetland Scientist Dan Coons. The existing proposed
89 driveway access location is also shown on this plan. He stated there were three spots in pink on
90 the plan representing this. The existing dwelling has an existing driveway there. He stated Lot
91 26, which is the 11 AC lot has access off of Basin Rd. He stated it could also have access off of
92 Roberts Cove Rd but there's a pretty big stone wall there that would have to be dealt with. The
93 vacant lot with the Roberts Cemetery has proposed access tucked in on the left because there's
94 wetlands on the right. He stated they were also proposing to set five new monuments as part of
95 this, which will either be capped rebar or drilled holes depending on where they fall on the
96 property. He stated the Planner review had a couple of comments. He stated the wetland
97 scientist stamp had since been added. The wetland subdivision is not located in the aquifer
98 protection overlay district. He noticed on the plans he submitted that he had 30 ft setbacks from
99 the wetlands that was kind of a holdover from Wolfeboro, he stated he corrected that to the 25 ft
100 setbacks. He was also informed this afternoon that one of the heirs of the Roberts family
101 inquired about access to the cemetery. He did some research that afternoon and didn't find
102 anything that showed that the cemetery was accepted or reserved from the property. There was
103 also nothing that showed where they might have access from, so he stated that was something to
104 consider.

105
106 Chair O'Neil stated the Board would suggest a footpath along the property line which is
107 normally what is done. They would put it in as a condition. He stated that they would like it to
108 be recorded whether in the deed or somewhere so the family can access it by way of a footpath.
109 Mr. MacDuff agreed.

110
111 Mr. MacDuff stated that if the Board had any questions, he would try to address them. He had
112 no further comments.

113
114 Chair O'Neil stated the Board received an email regarding the cemetery. Mr. MacDuff stated
115 another email came in prior to the meeting about the open space area and asked for a little
116 clarification on that.

117
118 Chair O'Neil questioned whether the shorefront lot between shoreline and Basin Rd was
119 buildable. Mr. MacDuff stated there is buildable area in that. They had done a test pit in that
120 area and something could be built. He was not sure what. He stated a shoreland permit would
121 be needed and go through that process to determine. He felt the confusion might have been what
122 side of that open space line was being preserved as open space. He had a lot of line types going
123 on and it is tucked right next to that Basin Rd easement as well.

124
125 Chair O'Neil asked Mr. DeJagar if he said that the lot was going to be subdivided off to be left
126 as-is. That is how he understood Mr. DeJagar's opening comments. Mr. DeJagar stated the open
127 space would be left as-is. It would just be fields. Chair O'Neil stated he believed the question
128 was regarding the view going down Roberts Cove Rd as you look and see the lake. Mr. DeJagar
129 stated that that was the main goal of the whole property, to maintain that indefinitely, forever.
130 Mr. Manning asked if that was on all three lots. Mr. DeJagar stated it was on two of the three
131 lots. Two of the three lots are impacted by the open space. Mr. MacDuff stated proposed Lot 26

132 and then a very small portion of 26-1. Mr. DeJagar stated it was basically from just in front of
133 the house towards the lake, down to Basin Rd or just up from Basin Rd about 18 ft. Mr.
134 Manning asked if Lot 26 would have 400 ft of road frontage. Mr. MacDuff stated Lot 26 would
135 have close to 1400 ft of frontage on that road.

136
137 Mr. Sleeper asked for clarification of whether the northern limit of the open space leaves the
138 shorefront lot so that it couldn't have a house on it that does not obstruct the view. Mr. MacDuff
139 stated that was correct. Mr. Manning asked if the plan was not to build anything on the left at all,
140 on 26. He asked if that was the plan or if they were splitting it up so they could build on it. Mr.
141 DeJagar stated that the open space will have nothing built on it. He stated the open space goes
142 from just in front of the existing house almost down to Basin Rd. He stated that whole field will
143 be left open in perpetuity. Mr. Manning asked for clarification. Mr. DeJagar stated it would not
144 be down to the waterfront, but to Basin Rd. He believed it was about 18 ft above Basin Rd is
145 where the limit would be. Mr. Manning asked if that was because it was not buildable or because
146 that is what the family's interest is. Mr. DeJagar stated it would probably be buildable, but the
147 family has been passionate about that view forever and they know a lot of people appreciate it
148 and they want to honor that. He stated they want to honor the benefit of the public as well as
149 their parents' wishes all those years they wanted to preserve this property.

150
151 Mr. Sleeper stated it is a very iconic view. Part of many pictures and postcards. Mr. Pierce
152 asked if the only existing driveway is on the middle parcel. He stated the other two were just
153 potential for a new driveway. Mr. MacDuff stated that was correct. He said there was pseudo
154 access to the lake portion of that lot off of Basin Rd. He stated there's no formal access off of
155 Roberts Cove.

156
157 Chair O'Neil asked if the Board had any further questions. He opened the meeting to public
158 input and asked if the public had any questions or concerns.

159
160 Sara McCabe stated that she was part of the Roberts family. She asked with regards to the
161 cemetery with a footpath as a condition, if that also gave the family the designated access status.
162 Chair O'Neil stated that it would be put in the conditions, and it would give the family access,
163 which is the whole point of the footpath so the family would have access. He stated that is why
164 he wanted it in condition precedent, but also want it put onto the deed so it is recorded so that the
165 family will have access to that. He stated that is what the Board asks of the applicant so that the
166 family can have access to the cemetery. Ms. McCabe stated her understanding was that there
167 was a difference between designated access where her family would not have to request
168 permission every time.

169
170 Chair O'Neil stated he was unsure if that was a legal question. He stated his understanding, not
171 being a lawyer, the way that it has been done in the past is the Board has granted access usually
172 along a property line and then have it recorded. He stated it is just a footpath, so it is not that you
173 need permission, it's access to the cemetery. He stated the Board could check with the legal
174 department just to verify that to make sure. Mr. MacDuff stated that he knew it was a stated
175 statute that you have to provide access forever and always. Chair O'Neil stated Ms. McCabe's
176 question was whether they had to ask permission. Mr. MacDuff was unsure of whether that was

177 the case. Chair O’Neil stated the same.

178 Mr. DeJagar stated he had researched the state statute, he stated he also is not a lawyer, but that
179 was a condition that it is done in a respectful manner with pre notice, letting people know why
180 you’re walking across their property, with permission. He stated that the Roberts family
181 certainly do have legal access to visit the cemetery. He stated they also have the right to
182 maintain the cemetery. They don’t necessarily have a right to add additional bodies to the
183 cemetery from what his understanding is.

184

185 Chair O’Neil stated the Board could check with the Town Attorney just to make sure and get an
186 answer for Ms. McCabe Ms. McCabe stated that satisfied her for the moment. Chair O’Neil
187 stated she just wanted to have access to it. He asked if anyone else had any other comments.

188

189 Richard Shea stated as a resident of Alton and more specifically a resident of Roberts Cove Rd
190 he appreciated the effort on the part of The DeJagar’s to preserve a view in an area that is really
191 quite breathtaking and is well enjoyed by many. He had one question and that is do the
192 covenants the continue the maintenance and all on that parcel, which he believed was Lot 26, are
193 they part of the Board’s approval and do they then become enforceable by the Town. He asked if
194 there were other avenues to enforcement if 30 years from now ownership changes and issues
195 change.

196

197 Chair O’Neil stated the covenant that was given is what was read, so he assumed that upon
198 approval this was all part of the acceptance. Mr. DeJagar offered to speak to the question. He
199 stated that the Town has the right to enforce, but not the obligation to enforce. He stated the
200 covenants would be recorded along with the approved subdivision plan. Chair O’Neil stated the
201 Board had a copy of it and it would all be part of the package.

202

203 Carol Shea, Roberts Cove Rd. She stated she had a question in terms of maintenance of the field
204 and the stone wall. She stated she read about it a while ago and her impression was that it was
205 the responsibility of the Town. Chair O’Neil asked if she meant the Town would maintain the
206 field. Ms. Shea asked who maintains the field. Mr. DeJagar stated whoever owns that property
207 that is covered by the covenants is responsible to maintain. If they don’t maintain it for some
208 reason certain abutters have the opportunity to force that these covenants, as well as the Town.
209 Chair O’Neil stated the Town wouldn’t maintain the property. He stated whoever owns the
210 property would maintain it. The Town could just enforce it via the covenant.

211

212 Ms. Shea stated that grass grows, and trees pop up and the stone wall every year tumbles down in
213 places. She stated it is a maintenance issue. Mr. Manning asked if the maintenance is well
214 defined as to what it needs to be because it sounded like it just needs to be mowed at some point
215 and to periodically control woody vegetation and the maintenance of the wall. Mr. DeJagar
216 stated the field, the wall and any brush growing up along the wall are all part of the responsibility
217 of the owners of that property. Mr. Manning stated it is not stated how often it would need to be
218 mowed or when rocks need to be replaced. Mr. DeJagar stated that it says periodically. He
219 stated the reason for the mowing is to cut down saplings or anything that’s starting to grow,
220 anything that’s starting to take root. He stated his family has always mowed it once a year. He
221 stated he would expect that someone would keep up with that as well. Mr. Manning stated there

222 was a valid concern if the property got sold 30 years down the road. He stated that what Mr.
223 DeJagar was saying is that for the next 30 years plus his family would own it and are committed
224 to keeping it. Mr. DeJagar stated that whoever owns the property has that responsibility and the
225 abutters have the legal right to enforce it, as well as the Town if the Town chose to, but they're
226 not obligated.

227

228 Craig Jenson stated he and his wife live across the road from the field. He stated he has lived on
229 Roberts Cove since 1992 and very much appreciates the DeJagars in what they've chosen to do
230 with this. Gwen and Pete Sr were very good friends, and they had a great desire to keep that as
231 an iconic view. He stated they very much appreciate that as well. He stated he had a question
232 regarding maintaining the field. He stated that Peter DeJagar Sr trimmed back a bunch of trees
233 years ago, maybe five years ago. He stated they cut back along the border back on the other side.
234 He asked in terms of the field when the covenant say that it needs to be maintained, would they
235 have the freedom to trim those back way on the other side of the field, all the way down. Do the
236 people who will own it have the obligation to take those down or will they have the freedom if
237 they would like to to take those down. He stated some are dead. He asked if anybody had any
238 idea about that.

239

240 Mr. DeJagar responded that the covenants are written such that it is to be maintained as it is and
241 there's not to be new growth growing up. He stated there's no obligation to take down trees. Mr.
242 Jenson asked if they could if they chose to. Chair O'Neil asked what about the statement that
243 read no reconfiguration of open space. He stated he felt that covered it. He read it out loud: The
244 open space shall not be relocated, reduced, or reconfigured". Mr. DeJagar stated the open space
245 is a defined area. Chair O'Neil stated that it would stay the way it is.

246

247 Mr. Jenson stated his other question was regarding the beach lot which can be built on. He stated
248 the people that purchase the homestead, are they purchasing all three pieces at this point or
249 would that be sold separately. Mr. DeJagar stated they did not have a buyer for the homestead
250 yet. He stated all three lots could be sold separately.

251

252 Marilyn Jenson stated that this was probably answered before, but the middle lot is preserved
253 correct. No matter who owns it. She could not see the diagram. Mr. Sleeper stated it was the
254 middle lot that had the existing home. Mr. MacDuff demonstrated where everything was. Ms.
255 Jenson asked what that area was protected by. Mr. MacDuff stated restricted covenants.

256

257 Chair O'Neil stated it is in current use. Mr. DeJagar stated it is in current use. He stated the
258 whole parcel is in current use. Mr. Sleeper stated that if nobody else had a question he had one
259 more. He stated he was looking through it and it talked about alteration of land and the sub
260 surface septic system components may be permitted only if section. He asked if something
261 should be included in there to ensure that if that was the only place a septic could go they would
262 have to use a septic system that would not require candy canes (white PVC pipes sticking up) in
263 that field. Mr. DeJagar agreed. Mr. MacDuff stated they spoke about that a little bit and the
264 thought process was that installation doesn't material impair scenic or natural conditions. He
265 stated it would likely be a pump system on that side of the road. He stated if you had a daylight
266 or vent pipe or something like that, potentially running it out closer to some big oaks there,

267 maybe running it up beside an oak or something, people have painted them brown before. He
268 stated 96% of the people going through there are going through at 30 MPH.

269

270 Mr. Manning stated that if someone were to be opposed to it there would be a pretty good
271 argument to come back and say it does impair. He stated you could end up in a lot of mess, but
272 for now he is in agreement with what the proposal is seeking. They are proposing to preserve the
273 land as is. He stated if it gets to the point where a septic pipe is needed and someone is opposed
274 to it, he could see where that could become a problem. Mr. MacDuff stated he was sure they
275 would hear about it. Everyone agreed that the matter would be figured out if it came up.

276

277 Chair O’Neil asked if there were any more questions or comments from the public. There were
278 none. He closed the meeting to public input. He asked if the Board had any more questions.
279 Chair O’Neil stated that regarding the matter of thresholds, monuments were mentioned. Mr.
280 MacDuff agreed. He stated he was pretty sure he counted five. He stated they were a different
281 color so there could be another one or so. Mr. Manning stated that the second issue was to add
282 some language to ??? right away or ???. Chair O’Neil stated he would like to make it a
283 conditions precedent when they do the Motion.

284

285 **Mr. Manning MOTIONS to ACCEPT Case #P26-15 as submitted with the two conditions,**
286 **one being that the monuments be added to the plan and the second being that the deed**
287 **reflect the access to the cemetery and that it is recorded. Mr. Pierce SECONDS. Chair**
288 **O’Neil asks for Board to vote. UNANIMOUS.**

289

Case #P26-16 Prospect Mountain Survey, Paul Zuzgo, Agent for Right Field Development, LLC, Owner	Map 8 Lots 44 & 45 Wolfeboro Highway 166 Wolfeboro Highway	Lot Line Adjustment Residential Rural Zone (RR) Residential Commercial Zone (RC)
--	---	---

290 Proposal: To adjust lot lines for two (2) lots of record, with Map 8 Lot 44 (RR Zone) adjusted
291 from 35.1AC (1528884.11SF) to 35.1AC (1528813.22SF), and Lot 45 (RC Zone) adjusted from
292 2.7AC to 2.8AC.

293

294 Chair O’Neil opted to do the waivers before making motions for completeness. Mr. Manning
295 stated he could not speak to 7.F.7.G because he did not have an understanding of whether or not
296 there was a requirement that showed wetlands on a plan he thought there was. If there isn’t he
297 did not know.

298

299 Mr. Zuzgo asked what he had said. Chair O’Neil stated that usually it is on a different piece of
300 property. He asked where the wetlands were. Mr. Zuzgo stated that they hadn’t delineated any
301 wetlands. He stated it is an equal area. He showed a larger plan of the lot that surrounds the car
302 wash lot. He stated they were doing an equal area. Chair O’Neil asked if this was to separate the
303 garage. Mr. Zuzgo stated it was to separate the garage. The applicant wants to sell the car wash
304 but wants to keep the garage. The applicant has future plans for the big lot and that would
305 possibly become a maintenance building. He stated that is why he did an equal area. He
306 explained that is why there’s a little strip behind the legion. He stated the dash lines are the ones

that will go away. He moved it on the side so that the riprap, the slope crossed the line so he moved that line so that it becomes part of the car wash. There are three different parcels that are being conveyed, Parcel A and Parcel C will be conveyed to the car wash, whereas Parcel B with the garage will become part of the lot in the back. He stated that on the original subdivision plan it showed a 50 ft wide right-of-way going along the property line between the car wash and the legion. He stated you can see it leads right into the wetlands. It is quite useless. The purpose of the right-of-way is to access the backlot. He stated that is why the right-of-way is rearranged now so that it follows the drive that goes up to it, up to the garage now. He stated that will still be a deeded right-of-way to the back lot.

Chair O'Neil MOTIONS to GRANT the Waivers Article 7.F.7 and Article 7.F.8 for the subdivision regulations. Mr. Manning SECONDS. Chair O'Neil asks for Board to vote. UNANIMOUS.

Chair O'Neil MOTIONS to determine the application is COMPLETE. Mr. Sleeper SECONDS. Chair O'Neil asks for Board to vote. UNANIMOUS.

Chair O'Neil stated there are three lots. There's a lot where the Post is and then there's the other one with the garage and the car wash and then there's the big one in the back and what Mr. Zuzgo is proposing is they're slicing off where the garage is and making it part of the back. Mr. Zuzgo stated he added the triangle. Chair O'Neil stated they're not touching Post 72's lot at all. Mr. Zuzgo stated no. It is actually probably going to give them a little buffer in the back lot. Mr. Sleeper asked if this was adding a second or moving a right-of-way. Mr. Zuzgo stated it was adding. He stated it is up to the two parties that have access to that. He stated the Legion has access to it because they access part of it coming off of the highway. He stated they probably have access to the back of the property. They could give that up if they want but they don't have to. Mr. Sleeper stated that they were just adding a new one. Mr. Zuzgo agreed. He explained that if the car wash was sold there would still be access to the back lot. If by chance DOT doesn't give him a driveway permit for the big lot. Chair O'Neil asked if that would be reflected on the deeds. Mr. Zuzgo agreed.

Mr. Manning stated he missed a piece of that. Mr. Zuzgo asked what part he missed. Mr. Manning stated he understood about the right-of-way and moving it, but when he said there was a second right-of-way that has to be cutting into the parking lot for the legion. Mr. Zuzgo demonstrated and explained it to Mr. Manning. Mr. Manning stated it was not going on the Legion property at all. Mr. Zuzgo agreed that it was not. Mr. Manning understood.

Chair O'Neil stated that it was strange the way they did the lot lines on the site map. Mr. Zuzgo stated they were on an angle and he didn't know why people did that.

Mr. Sleeper asked if Parcel C was adding a third lot it was adding. Mr. Zuzgo stated that they were not creating any lots. He stated there were three parcels. He explained the site map to Mr. Sleeper. He stated the Parcel A was going to be conveyed from the back piece to the car wash. Parcel B, the triangle in the back with the garage that will be coming from the car wash to the lot in the back. He explained that the piece behind the legion will be from the back lot to the car

352 wash lot so there will be equal area swapped. Mr. Sleeper understood. Chair O'Neil asked if
353 that was the 70 Sq ft. Mr. Zuzgo stated it was.

354

355 Mr. Manning asked if the garage covenants were going to be the same as the car wash covenants
356 going forward. Mr. Zuzgo asked him to explain what he meant. Mr. Manning said in terms of
357 managing run-off or other things like that. Mr. Zuzgo stated that they were not altering anything
358 so whatever run off now is not going to change. Mr. Manning stated that when they did the one
359 on 28 going out the other way there were limitations on what could be done on the lot, so the
360 garage would fall under the same limitations that the carwash does. He asked how long ago the
361 car wash was built. He stated it looked relatively new. He stated there would have been
362 limitations to allow the car wash – Mr. Zuzgo stated that it went through site plan approval. He
363 stated that the garage was added after. He stated that the applicant had to get a building permit.
364 Mr. Manning stated that the existing garage was on a different lot. Mr. Zuzgo stated that the
365 garage was always on the car wash lot. Mr. Manning understood. Chair O'Neil stated that it is
366 getting moved to another lot. Mr. Zuzgo stated that it would now be transferred over to the big
367 lot. Chair O'Neil stated that the applicant wanted to sell off the carwash, but he wants to keep
368 the garage.

369

370 Chair O'Neil asked if the board had any further questions. There were none. Chair O'Neil
371 opened to public input. There were no public comments. Chair O'Neil closed the meeting to
372 public input.

373

374 **Mr. Manning MOTIONS to ACCEPT Case #P25-16 (notation by minute taker: should be**
375 **P26-16?) approved as submitted. Mr. Pierce SECONDS. Chair O'Neil asks for Board to**
376 **vote. UNANIMOUS.**

377

378 **OTHER BUSINESS**

379 **1. Old Business: NONE**

380 **2. New Business:**

381 **a. Letter dated May 20, 2026, from Christopher Boldt, Esq., re: extension**
382 **request for Case P25-15, Nicastro & Goodrich, Minor Site Plan.**

383

384 Chair O'Neil stated that the Board approved this case a year ago, last June. The applicants are
385 looking for an extension because they haven't been able to do anything because of a court case.
386 Ms. McClain stated that Mr. Boldt was present and could explain.

387

388 Chris Boldt of Donahue, Tucker & Ciandella, in Meredith. He stated the case is still pending.
389 Judge Klass issued an order in his client's favor on May 22. Mr. Monziona filed a motion for
390 reconsideration on June 3rd. He did a two-sentence objection on June 5th and he did a four-page
391 reply on June 6th. While he and his client have done everything the Planning Board asked them
392 to do, give a revised plan and plant the trees, they just wanted to make sure because the plan
393 hasn't been signed by the Board if they needed this extension they were coming in prior to. He
394 stated his argument is that he doesn't need it because they have this ongoing litigation. He stated
395 that the ongoing litigation was because of not asking for an extension to the ZBAs approval
396 when the first case was brought by Mr. Monziona. He stated he has learned, and he is seeking

the extension. He stated he has done a couple of these since this statute has come into play because of litigation. He stated in one case in Exeter they said you have a year from the time the litigation finally has concluded. He stated he was asking for two years in this case. He thinks that will be enough.

Chair O’Neil asked if he was looking for June 17th, 2028. Mr. Boldt agreed. Mr. Manning asked if the lot was already being used as a work yard. Mr. Boldt stated it always has been since 2015. Mr. Manning stated he remembered from the Zoning Board there were limits to the number of cars or trucks that could be there. Mr. Boldt stated that they are complying with all of that and always have been. Mr. Manning understood. Chair O’Neil asked if there were any other questions from the Board.

Chair O’Neil MOTIONS to EXTEND decision of approval due to litigation circumstances to June 17m 2028. Mr. Manning SECONDS. Chair O’Neil asks for Board to vote. UNANIMOUS.

b. Approval of Minutes: Planning Board meeting minutes of Tuesday, May 19, 2026 & October 21, 2025.

Mr. Sleeper MOTIONS to ACCEPT the minutes of the May 19th Planning Board meeting as is, with the small adjustment of Lot 20 A to Lot 28. Mr. Pierce SECONDS. Chair O’Neil asks for Board to vote. UNANIMOUS.

Chair O’Neil stated regarding the approval of the October 21, 2025 minutes there were not enough Board members present at this meeting to approve the minutes. The decision was made to continue it until next month’s meeting.

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. Sleeper MOVED to ADJOURN the meeting. Ms. Drost SECONDS. Chair O’Neil asked the Board for a vote. Board voted UNANIMOUSLY.

The meeting was adjourned at ???.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sandra Monaco, Recording Secretary