

September 7, 2026

Dear Neil Faiman and ZBA members,

I am writing in regard to case 9/8/26-2. I wish to give full disclosure that Dawn Ryan has once again filed suit and this time it is against us.

We understand that Dawn has been using the supreme court case decision as a basis for her need to build the proposed bridge, road, and driveway through the wetlands because she cannot access Parcel B (Refer to answer for 5(b) in application). In case 226-2026-CV-00403, which is public information, the following statement is made by Dawn/her legal representation:

53. The Final Order in this respect was and remains effectively moot or unenforceable from its inception, since the Easement itself does not physically provide access to Parcel B. Lot 47-1 is divided by a stream into an Easterly side and Westerly side. The Easement provides access from the Western portion of Lot 47-1 which is closest to Stage Coach Road, to the Eastern portion of Lot 47-1, which is on the other side of the stream – that divides Lot 47-1. The Easement does not abut Parcel B. It was held lawful to use the Easement to access the Easterly portion of Lot 47-1 from the Westerly portion of Lot 47-1. Using the Easement to access Parcel B without first accessing the Easterly portion of Lot 47-1 is both legally and physically/factually impossible. Once on the Easterly portion of Lot 47-1, there is no legal restriction to access Parcel B, which Dawn also owns.

*Figure 1 - Snippet from case 226-2026-CV-00403. Dawn Ryan, Plaintiff*

You may wish to consult with Town Council to determine which of the two claims by Dawn is true before making a final decision on granting a variance.

I feel the use of the word “decades” in the following statement is misleading:

3. Granting the variance would do substantial justice: by allowing the Applicant reasonable access to the rear portion of the property, which is currently separated by the water body. Without the proposed bridge, access to the rear portion of the lot would be impossible due to the abutter preventing access through the existing bridge which has been used for decades to access Parcel B.

Dave Deysher purchased Parcel B. Dave Deysher told us about the access issue with the easement and made a handshake deal with us for walking access to B in exchange for our access to the snowmobile trails via his land. We have tried to make similar agreements with Dawn through mediation, but she would not agree to anything and suggested nothing in return. Also note that the smaller bridge that existed during that time was not built for heavy machinery like the new larger one that Dawn built.

Lastly, EX-100 still is not showing the 150’ buffer from the wetlands on the Blackmer Trust property. It is my understanding that Heidi has provided drawings via the Planning Board and later provided dimensions from the corner of the property to the wetlands from a certified surveyor. I believe that is enough information to draw the 150’ buffer. I request that EX-100 be updated before a variance is approved. Because this entire case is about building a second bridge to access Parcel B, it is important that Parcel B is accurately represented in EX-100.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Cori Ryan

54 Stagecoach Road

Wilton, NH 03086