



TOWN OF WARNER
Housing Committee
 Meeting Minutes, March 25, 2026

PO Box 265, Warner, NH 03278-0265
 (603) 456-2298 T / (603) 456-2297 F
 WarnerNH.gov

4 **CALL TO ORDER** at 5:01 pm

5 **PRESENT** Committee Members: Bob Holmes, Laura Hallahan, Ruth Roudiez, and Dana Myskowski
 6 Ian Rogers via Zoom from Japan
 7 Central NH Regional Planning Commission Representative Matt Monahan
 8 UNH Cooperative Extension Representative John Christ
 9 Member of the Public: Harry Seidel

10 **ABSENT** Connor Sporn, Ellie Brown
 11 Planning Commission Representative Mike Tardiff

12 **PUBLIC COMMENT** Harry Seidel is here to observe. He stated that housing is one of the most crucial problems in the
 13 Town and in the State. It's complex: involves economic development, schools, housing; they are all linked.

14 **APPROVAL OF MARCH MINUTES**

15 Bob Holmes moved to accept with one edit to Line 25, change *writing* to *written*; Ruth Roudiez seconded.

16 **ALL APPROVED**

17 **WARNER REGULATORY AUDIT (UPDATED DRAFT)**

18 Discussed condos and lot lines, Matt answered Bob's questions.

19 Tiny homes: Debate on chassis and square footage; made the clarification that Tiny Homes need to be built on a
 20 foundation in Warner. This led to a decision to edit so it is more general: A cluster development with small sizes. Maybe
 21 state "notably smaller than an average single-family home" or "It could be Cluster development of homes can be in a
 22 variety of formats."

23 Discussion on minor and major subdivisions led to questioning what Warner residents really want.

24 **PUBLIC COMMENT:** Harry Seidel has experience on two towns' Planning Boards, including Warner's. Observation
 25 that when Planning Boards were first developed, generally they created restrictive ordinances. But community needs now
 26 mean we should work together to see how we can allow sensible & necessary development.

27 **APPENDIX**

28 Each Committee Member chose three top items they'd like to focus on as a committee:

Name	#	#	#	(#)	Notes
Bob Holmes	10	11	12		Page 2 in the table
Laura Hallahan	2	4	9		Pages 1 & 2
Dana Myskowski	10	2	3		
Ruth Roudiez	1	3	15	4	
John Christ	10				Recently implemented in Plymouth, NH & used several times already.
Matt Monahan	7				Density, generally. Clusters should have creative incentives, not penalties.
Ian Rogers	2	7	10		
Ellie Brown	9	10	7		

29
30

31 The overlap results for the items chosen by individuals:

Numbers:	1	2	3	4	7	9	10	11	12	15
Votes:	I	III	II	II	III	II	IIII	I	I	I
Added # of votes:	One	Three	Two	Two	Four	Two	Five	One	One	One

32

33 The Appendix Recommendation for each number raised, listed below in order of overlap:

#	Votes	Recommendation in Appendix
10	Five	Consider revising IV.L to relax requirement of one structure with residences.
7	Four	Revise the Workforce Housing Ordinance to provide clarity on the Planning Board's authority, better clarity on how density is determined, allow for clustering and relaxing of lot sizes for all workforce housing proposals. Also, make the density calculation process in Article XIV, Open Space, easier to apply and ensure that clustering does not result in less [fewer] units than what a conventional subdivision may get.
2	Three	Revise multi-family uses in the commercial zone to be consistent with state law.
3	Two	Change multi-family permissibility from Special Exceptions ZBA o Conditional Use Permits issued by the Planning Board (noting that multi-family does come before the Planning Board as they require site plan review).
4	Two	Consider relaxing some of the larger lot sizes in town to allow for greater density in some areas of town.
9	Two	The ordinance could be improved by relaxing some of the home site requirements for the parks and in the subdivisions. Additionally, a cap of the number of units could be replaced with a simpler density calculation process.
1	One	[from Findings] Warner's Zoning Ordinance is well organized, reasonably comprehensive, and relatively up to date.
11	One	Revise IV.K to eliminate the number of units per building & relax density requirement.
12	One	Revise XIV.C Open Space Subdivisions to allow for density similar to the "zero lot line condo development."
15	One	Consider converting many uses allowed by Special Exception to being allowed by Conditional Use Permit (CUP) by the Planning Board.

34

35 Discussed: bigger buildings need to be added to Workforce Housing, need to decide how to respond to potential
 36 pushback, and, John added: decide on how to hold engagement and listening sessions with the public so it's not just the
 37 Housing Committee or the Planning Board's push, but it's the public wanting the changes.

38 Matt shared anecdotes in the real world: One town looked at the data and found housing prices went up 86%, while
 39 another one went up 34% and saw a decrease in their rent all because the second town did a mill renovation with 100s of
 40 new units. In another town, the want is to redevelop town-owned property along a river where they want a restaurant and
 41 shops but realized they needed mixed-use with housing so there would be enough people to support the retail and
 42 restaurant. Now that town is building that mixed use space. So, Harry Seidel's comment that residential tis linked to
 43 economic growth is proven here.

44 **ACTION ITEMS**

45 Discussion on when to present the documents, with an attached Executive Summary/cover letter. The committee talked
 46 about how and when to present to the Planning Board and the Select Board. Slightly different presentations can be
 47 shared with each, given the nature of their planning knowledge. At the end, the most equitable solution may be to reach

48 out to both boards at once and ask when a couple of Housing Committee spokespeople may attend the Board's meetings
49 to present our current notes.

50 Next will be to present findings to citizens of our Town. We will hold listening forums with a chance for residents to
51 express their opinions on the information.

52 We also want to address things like density, multiple housing (such as on farms that house extended family members,
53 grown children, and farm workers), and share stories about how the condo complex is coming to be in our town, and
54 other towns' experiences with subdivisions.

55 There were some questions about rolling out the information - whether to share with Boards first or to share it all with
56 everyone in town at the same time. We will place the documents together and post them, talk to the Planning and Select
57 Boards, hold resident listening forums, and regroup. We will also present the proposed language for changes to
58 ordinances that will bring the town in alignment with RSAs, while mapping out a plan for the 2026 and 2027 ballot items.

59 Matt shared an additional example of the RSA changes on various towns' housing. It is one where a proposal from a
60 developer to place a 50-house development on a Class 6 road led to its failure since the select board and the abutters did
61 not want. Then the developer created a plan to make 5-intersection connector at the Class 6 road start, with 56-housing
62 units, and it passed.

63 The committee discussed various RSA compliance needs, some of which are "low-hanging fruit" since the RSAs do not
64 seem to clash with the desires of Warner residents and the Planning Board. Some loftier goals may be manufactured
65 housing, which current design and build technology means production of beautiful and structurally sound housing; it
66 would have a positive impact on Warner's housing. A more difficult reach is to bring the Town in compliance with
67 workforce housing RSAs.

68 Further discussion included adding extra incentive for allowing more than three units. There could be a "menu" to
69 choose from of things that will help Warner. Also discussed were building costs of a cluster of tiny homes vs. a cluster of
70 apartments, with each being circled around a common green.

71 **PUBLIC COMMENT:** Harry noted what's missing is the developer's POV. But if you look at the economy of creating
72 housing, you need to cluster things like heating, plumbing, etc. It's not easy to create energy efficiency in individual tiny
73 homes or cottage developments. The survey seems like we do not want apartment buildings. But we could have a variety
74 of builds.

75 Bob noted that the Peacock project is the first condo project that's been approved. Also: the court found in favor of
76 CATCH housing. It will go before the Planning Board.

77 **TO DO FOR NEXT MEETING**

78 Make final changes by next meeting and release the documents, including posting the latest Housing Survey Results.

- 79 • Committee members: review documents for typos and nuanced language that can be clearer.
- 80 • Get rid of "may" statements and replace by stating facts.
- 81 • Laura Hallahan will write the summary of the Appendix.
- 82 • Matt Monahan will write the summaries for The Housing Needs Assessment and the Survey.
- 83 • Matt and Laura will send their summaries to Dana by May 10.
- 84 • Dana Myskowski will edit as necessary and send to Ian by May 12.
- 85 • Ian Rogers will post the summaries to the Google Drive folder by May 15.
- 86 • The Committee will discuss these at its May meeting.

87 **THERE BEING NO OBJECTIONS, THE COMMITTEE DECIDED TO ADJOURN AT 6:44 p.m.**

88 **NEXT MEETING:** May 27, 2026, 5 p.m. at the Pillsbury Free Library meeting room.

89
90
91

2026.04.22HousingMinsDRAFT
Noted by Dana Myskowski