



TOWN OF WARNER

P.O. Box 265, 5 East Main Street
Warner, New Hampshire 03278-0059
Land Use Office: (603)456-2298 ex. 7
Email: landuse@warnernh.gov

**Planning Board
Work Session Minutes
Monday, November 20, 2023**

7
8
9
10

I. OPEN MEETING at 7:03 PM.

ROLL CALL:

| Board Member | Present | Absent |
|-----------------------------|---------|--------|
| David Bates | ✓ | |
| Andy Bodnarik (Vice Chair) | ✓ | |
| Karen Coyne (Chair) | ✓ | |
| Dustin Chamberlain | ✓ | |
| James Gaffney | | ✓ |
| Ian Rogers | ✓ | |
| Harry Seidel – Select Board | ✓ | |
| Michael Smith - Alternate | | ✓ |

In Attendance: Janice Loz – Land Use Administration,

11 **II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** None

12 **III. PUBLIC COMMENT:** None

13 **IV. NEW BUSINESS**

14 **A. Master Plan – Chapter 4 Housing** – Review project plan document and set deadlines

15 Janice started the discussion asking the Board they want to set goals for the Housing Advisory
16 Committee. Ian said that once they get the data then the progress will get done in large chunks.
17 Andy mentioned how he has compiled graphs and charts with the help of Matt that help drive the
18 progress of the committee. Janice asked Andy about clarifying the charts and how it pertains to the
19 committee. David asked Andy about the H4 map and how the town of Henniker is not on the map,
20 even though we share a town line with them. Andy responded by saying that is because it is an
21 outdated table, and there is an expanded chart that includes Henniker and other surrounding towns.
22 Andy asked if the data should include 5-year increments or 10-year increment from 2010 to present.
23 Ian said that it was discussed to just update the existing the charts and not expanding all the charts.
24 Andy said that there is a lot of population data to look through and several questions arise from
25 analyzing this data. Andy concludes that this is a work in progress, with analyzing past data and
26 combining it with the needs assessments. David mentioned that he was looking at property tax

UNAPPROVED MINUTES

27 cards and he has a list of tax cards organized by use. Andy said that this could be cross-examined
28 with other data sources. Ian gave background to the board that in the existing Master Plan it has
29 the source of each data, and that Andy's point to include sources is very relevant.

30 Karen mentioned how Matt was supposed to do the data aspect of this project and asked how it
31 changed to Andy and Ian. It was decided to include Andy because the data would then come from
32 two different sources, which would increase confidence of the data, and reduce the likelihood of
33 errors. Andy stated how to best utilize the projection data and if it should be in parallel to the
34 censuses of 2000, 2010 and 2020. David said the projection data in 2020 to now might not be an
35 accurate parallel. Andy believed it might be useful to include the years before 2020 to better capture
36 the progression and examination of data.

37 Karen said the real goal of the workgroup tonight is to set dates and goals for the Housing Advisory
38 Committee. Janice said setting dates might better focus the committee during their meetings. Ian
39 believed working backwards from our overall July deadline might better form due dates. Andy said
40 the start date of projects within the Housing Advisory Committee might differ from the deadline of
41 the projects. David asked the board if they should set a deadline for community engagement to be
42 done by March. Ian said a timeline would be useful. Andy also believed deadlines might help dictate
43 project objectives and better divide labor among the committee. Karen suggested a conversation
44 about deliverables and Matt's lack of effort and motivation on the project.

45 Ian suggested a finished draft of the survey to be completed by January 1, 2024. Karen also
46 highlighted that communication needs to be strengthened within the group, due to meeting only
47 once a month. David said it might be better to meet weekly with a subcommittee that helps
48 implement and move progress forward. It was discussed that surveys need to be out by February
49 with results gathered by April 1, 2024. In depth draft writing would be completed by April and May,
50 and then Planning Board work session completed in June. It is suggested that the committees will
51 be advised to do subcommittees and to go over deadlines.

52 **B. Discuss Zoning Ordinance Potential Modifications**

- 53 1. Review Article XV. A & B. Non-conforming Use. Expanding definition to possibly include:
- 54 a. Distinction between a non-conforming use, a non-conforming structure, and a non-
55 conforming lot.
 - 56 b. Possible limitation on expanding an existing structure.
 - 57 c. Determining lot setbacks on a non-conforming lot.

58 Harry stated after reviewing the Zoning Ordinances, the Planning Board should look at these
59 two ways. First, the Board, could say we do not encourage nonconforming lots. However, an
60 alternate way of thinking about this may be to allow smaller more dense lots. Specifically, maybe
61 allowing a reduction in setback but require more variances being sent to the Zoning Board.
62 Harry also suggested changing the frontage requirement from at least 50 feet to at least 100
63 feet.

64 Andy referenced the lot of record language and how it requires a separate and distinct parcel.
65 Andy said this change needs to be tied into legal definitions, legal report of deed or filed in the
66 state or county record. Andy wanted to change the verbiage to add a reference to the lot of
67 record definition.

68 Ian asked for some clarifying background information about nonconforming lots. Janice
69 provided background information and other resources that he could utilize to help understand
70 the ordinance. David added to the conversation and the history of how the Planning Board came
71 about reviewing the non-conforming use. David concluded with saying that he was very
72 skeptical about adding new definitions and altering any zoning ordinances.

UNAPPROVED MINUTES

73 Janice said the language needs to change to help the public better understand what a non-
74 conforming lot is and what is not. Janice also mentioned that adding the restriction of 100 feet
75 frontage might make it harder for non-conforming lots to sell. These changes will be discussed
76 further at the next Planning Board meeting on December 4.

77 2. Review language in Articles VI, VII, VIII, IX, C. Frontage, lot and yard requirements: 1. "Lots
78 created by Minor Subdivision". The town lawyer asked why only lots created by minor
79 subdivisions are subject to setback requirements for those districts.

80 It was suggested by the Lawyer that "Lots created by Minor Subdivision" be removed and
81 instead say "Lot." Karen suggested discussing this change at the next Planning Board meeting
82 in December.

83 3. North Road is zoned C-1 requiring a Special Exception to build a house.

84 North Road is mostly commercial zoned, and if anyone wants to build residential then they have
85 to get Special Exceptions. Janice clarifies that she is not proposing taking away the commercial
86 designation, but making this area a mixed-use zone, or a separate zone completely. Andy
87 believed it should be kept as a Special Exception. However, David was wondering if we should
88 be expecting a lot more commercial development up North Road. Harry believed it should just
89 be left as is, and shelf the topic for now. Janice suggested tabling this discussion until after the
90 Master Plan is completed. The Board agreed that it was best not to make a decision just yet
91 until more development has been made on what the future of Warner entails.

92 V. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

93 A. Capital Improvement Program – Presentation to Budget Committee update

94 Karen and Andy mentioned that they presented the CIP to the Budget Committee and it was an
95 overall positive experience. Karen said that she is up to working with Michael earlier in the process.
96 The other suggestion was to form a committee to work on CIP. Ian mentioned at a recent Planning
97 Board Workshop seminar where it was suggested that a CIP subcommittee can help streamline the
98 CIP process and lessen the burden on the Planning Board.

99 B. Revisions to Development Applications and Regulations – Site Plan Application and 100 Regulations

101 [Subdivision](#), [Site Plan Regulations](#), [Site Plan Review](#), [Voluntary Merger](#), [Driveway](#), [Home](#)
102 [Occupation](#), [Lot Line Adjustment](#)

103 The Board reviewed the revisions to the Development Applications and Regulations. It was
104 suggested to bring these revisions to be approved during the next December meeting.

105 VI. COMMUNICATIONS – Information on Class VI roads and frontage.

106 Janice informed the board about how Allan Brown help by speaking with a potential applicant about
107 going before the ZBA prior to doing a minor subdivision of the property.

108 VII. PUBLIC COMMENT – None.

109 VIII. ADJOURN

110 The meeting was adjourned at 9:16 PM.

/mbl