



TOWN OF WARNER

PO Box 265

Warner, New Hampshire 03278-0265

Telephone: (603) 456-2298 ex. 7

Warnernh.gov email: landuse@warnernh.gov

DRAFT Planning Board Work Session Minutes

August 3, 2026 2026 7:00 PM

Lower Meeting Room Warner Town Hall 5 E Main St

- I. OPEN MEETING:** Chair Karen Coyne called the meeting to order at 7:03 PM. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

II. ROLL CALL

Planning Board Member	Present	Absent
Karen Coyne, Chair	✓	
James Gaffney	✓	
Pier D'Aprile	✓	
Barak Greene, Vice Chair	✓	
Bob Holmes	✓	
Mike Smith – Select Board	✓	
John Leavitt	✓	
Micah Thompson– Alternate	✓	
Vacant – Alternate		

III. PUBLIC COMMENT

Ed Mical requested the Planning Board members to speak up so the audience can hear them.

Ian Rogers addressed comments from a previous meeting relating to two previous housing surveys. He noted that only 2% of responses were in favor of large buildings with 20+ units. Ian Rogers spoke about the fall 2025 survey that reflected a 40% of responses that were in favor of large multi-family housing in the interval district near exit 9.

David Carle spoke about the comments online that Warner does not want commercial development. He explained that the last time a plan was rejected it resulted in an embarrassing court decision. He stated that the commercial development is going to happen and he suggested the Planning Board view this development in the standards that are in place for development in the town center. David Carle urged the Planning Board to update the master plan as it is woefully out of date.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. Holly Riley – Change in use from commercial / industrial to residential

Karen Coyne explained that Holly Riley's request to change the use from commercial / industrial to residential would be referred to the Zoning Board of Adjustment.

B. New Floodplain Map Adoption

Barak Greene made a motion seconded by Pier D'Aprile to discuss the adoption of the new floodplain map at the end of meeting. Motion passed unanimously.

C. Public Hearing – Dollar General

Applicant: Adam Quinn – Comet LLC

Owners: Comet LLC – Adam Quinn

Agent: Ben Osgood Ranger Engineering
Address: Route 103 West, near Route 89 exit 9
Map / Lot: Map 35, Lot 4-1
District: Intervale

Description: Commercial building to be occupied by a Dollar General store

Karen Coyne opened the public hearing. Peg Bastien confirmed that proper notice has been given, all fees have been paid and abutters have been notified.

Ben Osgood of Ranger Engineering presented the proposed Dollar General plan. He explained that this property was previously approved for a 7,200 square foot retail building. Ben Osgood stated that changes have been made eliminating the drive around driveway allowing for a larger building. He explained that the site was improved; utilities, site prep, drainage, catch basins, pavement and gravel. Ben Osgood explained that the underground retention area has been installed and designed to drain in the wetlands at the back of the property. He stated that the two catch basins are adequate for this project. Ben Osgood reviewed the sewer and water line designs. He advised the Planning Board that the Dollar General and the Dunkin Donuts will have their own pump that will pump to the pump station across the street at McDonald's.

Ben Osgood explained the architecture will be a wood frame building with a peak roof. He described the materials and façade. Ben Osgood stated that the current alteration of terrain (AOT) permit is valid until April 4, 2027. He stated that there are 35 parking spaces. He explained the parking lot design for a medium source retail store requires 1 space per every 250 square feet totaling 37 spaces. Ben Osgood stated that there has been a shared parking agreement between Dunkin Donuts and Dollar General allowing for few extra parking spaces. Ben Osgood explained that the lighting has been installed and two additional lights will be installed as per the plan.

James Gaffney asked about snow removal. He expressed concern about where the snow will go. Ben Osgood explained that some snow will be stored between the property line and the parking spaces and on the other side beyond the loading dock. He stated that grading can be done to make sure melt water goes into the storm system. Karen Coyne spoke about a letter from an abutter who advised the Planning Board that there is a restriction meant to prevent direct competition with the business on the Evans property from the adjacent property. Karen Coyne read from the letter; "that the proposed development as presented would violate the deed restriction affecting the subject property with which the restrictions run with the land and remain valid and enforceable." She stated the deed was recorded November 29, 1966 and there is a deed restriction on that property. Adam Quinn explained that the restriction pertains to a gas or service station that sells services to cars or automobiles. Barak Greene explained that Warner's ordinance specifically defines gas stations as something that sells gas.

Adam Quinn explained that the previous proposal that was approved was for a building that would have had seven separate businesses and the abutter did not have any objections. Karen Coyne asked why the proposal has changed from the original 7 business retail space to the Dollar General. He explained that it was due to the retail climate, they could not find 7 business. He stated that they searched for 5 years and this is the best they could do.

Karen Coyne explained that the Planning Board received 7 letters that were not in favor of a Dollar General.

Karen Coyne called a ten minute recess. John Leavitt was excused and Micah Thompson was elevated to a voting member.

Barak Greene stated that it would be a good idea to ask Aires Engineering to review the proposed plan. Bob Holmes stated that he looked at the site plan requirements relating to parking and the proposed plan is short by three parking spaces for a medium value and much more if it is a high volume. Ben Osgood reiterated the parking agreement with Dunkin Donuts. James Gaffney expressed concern about the future possibility that Dunkin Donuts is sold and the agreement is over. He inquired about adding a deed restriction to ensure the parking spaces. Bob Holmes explained that the Board needs to make the determination on volume. Barak Greene stated that he does not see the Dollar General as a high volume.

Karen Coyne opened the floor to public comment.

Laura Colburn of Howe Lane stated that regardless of the parking spaces or what the façade looks like this is a store with cheap Chinese junk and she does not believe it is a good fit for Warner.

Barb Marty spoke about the catch basins that will discharge into the wetlands. She asked the Planning Board to consider the conservation easement that abuts the back of this property.

Mary Mead of Pumpkin Hill Road stated that most Dollar General parking lots are empty. She stated that Dollar General Stores are bottom feeder retail with poor wages. She stated that it is a bad image for the Town. She stated that there are 3 stores within 16 miles. She is against a Dollar General in Warner.

Janet Garcia of Kearsarge Mountain Road agreed with Mary Mead. She stated that the area around exit 9 is for the convenience of travelers and residents. She noted the area has gas stations, Market Basket and other convenience stores.

Jim Hume of North Road spoke about his concerns regarding the traffic impacts.

Sara McNeil of Old Main Road asked how many Dollar General Stores closed in the year.

NAME ? of Collins Road stated that the owners have done a nice job with the landscape and the building. She stated that a Dollar General will take away from the Market Basket, the hardware store and both gas stations that are in the area. She does not want the existing businesses to be penalized.

Karen Coyne closed the public comment. The Planning Board began deliberating.

Karen Coyne asked the applicant to address the question regarding the catch basins that will discharge into the wetlands. Ben Osgood explained that this proposed plan has less impermeable surface because the building size was increased and a parking lot has been removed. Ben Osgood stated that the AOT Bureau has approved the drainage system. He explained that the runoff will be collected in the catch basins and then moves into a chamber where it is treated as it is infiltrated through the ground. He assured the Planning Board that the system design is in accordance with the NH Storm Water Manual and has been approved. He stated that the water drains out to the wetlands on the edge of their property not on the conservation easement. Barak Greene asked if the design was updated when the storm water manual was updated in 2025. Ben Osgood stated that the design has not been updated because it is an approved permit.

Barak Greene if a traffic study was done when the traffic circle was constructed. James Gaffney stated that it was a part of the charrette. Ben Osgood stated that as part of their driveway permit, they did a traffic study in 2020 or 2021. Barak Greene suggested the Planning Board and Aires Engineering review the traffic study. James Gaffney suggested the Dunkin Donut drainage plan also be sent to Aires Engineering. Pier D'Aprile

asked if the CATCH project could potentially impact this as well. Ben Osgood illustrated the anticipated flow pattern.

Karen Coyne recapped what is needed; a motion is needed to ask Aries Engineering to review the plan. She asked if the Board wanted to see the previously done traffic study. Ben Osgood explained that he can provide a trip generation memo and the previous traffic study. He explained that knowing what the traffic was under the old conditions he noted that this proposal will be less traffic.

Barak Greene made a motion seconded by Bob Holmes to have Aries Engineering review the submitted changes to the site plan and to monitor the storm water during construction. Motion Passed unanimously.

The Highway Department, Fire Department and Police Department will be asked to provide their input on the proposed plan. Karen Coyne stated this will be continued to the August 17, 2026 Work Session. Karen Coyne inquired about a more subdued sign. Pier D'Aprile suggested reaching out to the Warner EDAC for local community input. Adam Quinn stressed that they spent the last 5 years looking for tenants and worked with a national realtor. He stated that it cost him to hold on to the vacant lot. He stressed that a Dollar General store will pay much higher property taxes which is a benefit to the town.

V. MINUTES – July 20, 2026

Barak Greene made a motion seconded by Pier D'Aprile to table the minutes to the Planning Board Work Session on August 17, 2026. Motion Passed unanimously.

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Public Hearing Continued – Site Plan Review

Applicant: CATCH Neighborhood Housing

Owners: Commet LLC – Adam Quinn

Agent: Tom Frutado, CATCH

Address: Route 103 West, near Route 89 exit 9

Map / Lot: Map 35, Lot 4-3

District: Intervale

Description: Site plan review for 34 unit workforce housing

Karen Coyne stated that the feedback from Aires Engineering and WRLAC should be addressed.

Aries Engineering Report:

Ben Osgood addressed the Aires Engineering report and the recommended plan edits. He spoke to recommendation that the fire access road be extended around the entire perimeter of the site. He advised the Planning Board that the fire code is for sprinkled building and that a fire truck needs to get to 140 feet away from all points. Ben Osgood assured the Planning Board that they will demonstrate how they will meet that requirement. He stated that they can extend the gravel road to alleviate concerns. He stated that the gravel road cannot go around the back of the building because it is too steep but it extended to meet the requirement of 140 feet from all points. James Gaffney stated that it should be constructed to accommodate the heaviest fire truck. Ben Osgood advised the Planning Board that the retaining walls will be shown in detail on the plan. He stated that Aries Engineering recommends 6" perforated drains behind the wall.

Ben Osgood explained that Aries Engineering recommends that a project monitor be named to ensure compliance with the plan specifications during post construction work. He stated that it is a typical condition when working with the AOT. Ben Osgood explained that they did have a habitat evaluation done by West Environmental and steps have been taken to keep the box turtles out of the site.

1
2 Ben Osgood noted that the site plan shows a buildable area equal to 2.6 acres of the total 13.8 buildable
3 outside the New Hampshire Shoreline Protection Zone. He explained that the wetland are not within the
4 devolved area of this site. Ben Osgood explained that the building does not include a basement, the building
5 is 11 feet above the current flood plain. He stated that the building elevation is 432. Mike Smith stated that
6 the new flood plain will be adopted in the near future. Karen Coyne stated that the new flood plain is
7 retroactive to the date of notification and should be considered for this project.

8
9 Ben Osgood spoke to the Aries Engineering notation that weather impacts are not depicted and that the
10 proposed water and sewer lines are to cross the wetlands in the northeast portion of the site. He informed the
11 Planning Board that it is their intention to do directional drilling to avoid any disturbance to the wetlands.
12 Ben Osgood stated that they do agree with Aries comments regarding storm water, assuring the Planning
13 Board that the final storm water report will be filed with their AOT application.

14
15 Ben Osgood explained that the storm water results will be provided when it is finalized. He explained that
16 the existing 18" drainage culvert needs to be replaced. He addressed Aries Engineering's recommendation
17 that the applicant prepare a storm water management plan to outline the maintenance plan. Ben Osgood
18 stressed that is part of the AOT permit.

19
20 Ben Osgood addressed Aries Engineering comment that the plan does not address managing storm water
21 from the catch basin located in the State's right of way discharging into the proposed site development area.
22 He explained that there is a driveway easement over their property and the catch basin is in the driveway. He
23 explained that it does not carry a lot of water and he stated that it will not have any effect.

24
25 Ben Osgood spoke about the storm water treatment practices. He stated that Aries Engineering recommends
26 installing a hydrodynamic separator in the storm water grade system prior to the discharge in the pond. He
27 informed the Planning Board that their plan is to install a treatment recharge pond. He indicated that has not
28 been finalized.

29
30 Ben Osgood explained that there is a utility easement over the property but there are no restrictions.
31 Ben Osgood addressed other drainage comments pertaining to Route 103 and North Road as reflected in the
32 report from Aries Engineering. James Gaffney suggested that the Warner Public Works Department review
33 the proposed drainage plans in relations to roads.

34
35 Ben Osgood spoke about the reference to the cross culverts that are present and discharge on the site. He
36 reiterated that this does not flow on their property and he is willing to do a site visit to review this in detail
37 and determine where the storm water is going. James Gaffney reiterated that Herm Blanchette should be
38 involved in that discussion. Ben Osgood spoke to the concern Aries Engineering raised about the routing of
39 the storm water conveyances as undefined. He explained that the roof drains are shown on the plan. He
40 stated that the roof drains down on to stone filtration trenches and then into the drainage pipe.

41
42 Ben Osgood stated that they did previously submit a lighting plan and he will add the fixtures to the plan. He
43 explained that snow storage is depicted on the plan. He advised the Planning Board that it is their intention to
44 direct melting snow and run off to the closed drainage system. Ben Osgood explained that he has spoken to
45 Chuck at the water department who advised him that there is plenty of soil and water capacity but the Warner
46 Village District would need to discuss it. Ben Osgood stated that he has not heard the result of that
47 discussion.

1 Ben Osgood explained that the proposed water and sewer piping will connect to the existing lines on the
2 adjacent properties. He noted that Aries Engineering recommends that a utility easement be provided to
3 allow access to the utility lines across the adjacent property. He stated that the easements will be provided.
4 Ben Osgood stated that he will contact NH DES regarding the drilling beneath the wetland. Karen Coyne
5 requested a written response to the Aries Engineering report. Ben Osgood confirmed that he would submit a
6 written response. James Gaffney asked if would be appropriate for the drainage systems that handles the site
7 runoff to be reported in detail or by deed. Barak Greene stated that would be part of the site plan review.
8 James Gaffney clarified that his concern is determining who has the responsibility for upkeep. George Holt
9 from Aries Engineering explained that relating to storm water management they typically recommend that a
10 storm water management plan be prepared and it would detail the inspection schedule and maintenance
11 schedule.

12
13 George Holt stated that he did a site walk and he noticed the road rises to the east from the job site and
14 drainage (the entire surface of that road) drains towards the property and that should be included. Ben
15 Osgood stated that there can be a discussion on that and determine if that is the case. George Holt feels that
16 the 1.53 parking spaces is not adequate. George Holt expressed concern regarding site access for fire trucks
17 to the rear of the building and turn radius.

18
19 Karen Coyne recapped that the Planning Board is expecting a new storm water plan, traffic study, new wall
20 details, a review of the new flood map, elevations, consultation with road agent and ask the fire marshal to
21 weigh in on having no back access.

22
23 Warner River Local Advisory Committee

24 Ben Osgood addressed the general observations made by the WRLAC. He stated that he is unsure if this is in
25 the well head protection area but that should be verified through the AOT process. Ben Osgood stated that a
26 wildlife study has been submitted. Ben Osgood explained that the WRLAC's concern about invasive species
27 is also addressed through the AOT permitting process. Ben Osgood spoke to their concerns regarding
28 drainage, test pits. He stated that they do not anticipate the need for blasting or jackhammering. Ben Osgood
29 disputed the opinion that there is only 1.5 acres of buildable area. He asserted that the Planning Board
30 determined that the actual buildable area is 2.6 acres.

31
32 Ben Osgood noted that the WRLAC recommends a review of the conservation easement for the area down
33 gradient of the site be completed. Ben Osgood stated that the AOT permit process will address the concern.
34 He addressed the comment about topographic contours to the south. Ben Osgood explained that the contours
35 provided are within the buildable area which includes some of the wetlands. Ben Osgood explained that an
36 existing retaining wall will remain in place and other areas will be rebuilt. He explained that there will be a
37 new wall constructed along the side of the wetland area and it will not disturb the wetlands.

38
39 Ben Osgood explained that snow storage is proposed adjacent to the wetland along the southern edge of the
40 site and another along the north edge of the storm water pond. He stated that the melting snow from the two
41 areas will be treated as part of the drainage system.

42
43 Ben Osgood addressed the concerns about the playground area. He informed the Planning Board that they
44 are willing to put up a 4 foot chain link fence to separate the site from the wetlands. Barak Greene asked
45 about identifying the marks of the conservation land. Nancy Martin explained that the Conservation
46 Commission monitors the town's easement. She stated that no markers were put in.

47
48 Ben Osgood spoke about the utilities that cross the wetlands. He reiterated that they would be directionally
49 drilling for the utilities. He stated there will be no impact to the wetlands. He reiterated that the AOT report

1 will address the proposed storm water pond and the seasonal high ground waters. Ben Osgood reiterated that
2 the questions relating to the building structure and hvac system will be addressed in the building permitting
3 process.

4 Karen Coyne advised the applicant that a written request for an extension will be needed. Barak Greene
5 asked about a sidewalk in the area. Ben Osgood explained that a sidewalk would alter the drainage unless
6 the sidewalk is away from the road. Barak Greene referred to the zoning ordinance "accommodations shall
7 be provided within and between developed parcels."

8
9 **James Gaffney made a motion seconded by Pier D'Aprile to continue the meeting to September 14,**
10 **2026. Motion passed unanimously.**

11
12 Nancy Martin asked if the Conservation Commission could be included on the site walk. Ben Osgood
13 clarified that there will be a site visit relating to storm water and a separate site visit for the Conservation
14 Commission. Nancy Martin asked if the public is allowed to attend. James Gaffney explained that the site
15 visit pertaining to the site plan is primarily for the Planning Board and the related entities. He encouraged
16 anyone with questions to bring those questions to the next public Planning Board meeting.

17
18 *Audience member not identified* questioned if the site visit could be properly noticed to allow the public to
19 attend and hear the questions/answers. Bob Holmes explained that the conservation easement is open to the
20 public and cannot be posted. Karen Coyne stressed that the public hearing is still open, she clarified that
21 there will be two site visits; #1 for Road Agent, and #2 for the Conservation Commission. Karen Coyne
22 stated that the conservation easement is open to public access. She stressed that the site walk will not be
23 recorded, there will not be site plan discussions.

24
25 Karen Coyne continued the public hearing and opened the floor to public comment.

26
27 *Audience member not identified* stated that she needs more of a visual concept of how the project will be laid
28 out. She wants some to show her at the property. Micah Thompson stated that is not within the Planning
29 Boards purview. Barak Greene inquired if the foundation could be staked out. Tom Frutado suggested
30 visualizing where the driveway will be gives a good sense of where the building will be. Micah Thompson
31 stressed that there will be a tremendous amount of site work that needs to be done. Tom Furtado referred to
32 the plan to illustrate the building design.

33
34 Sara McNeil stated that she attended the meeting because it was noticed as a public hearing but it is a work
35 session. She stated that people left when the Board decided on the next meeting date. Sara McNeil outlined
36 her expectations of a public hearing. Karen Coyne explained that a public hearing is required by law when
37 there is any conversation that occurs regarding an application and site plan. Pier D'Aprile explained that in
38 order to accommodate the applicant and the Town the Planning Board schedule a public hearing because of
39 the 65 day window. He stressed that if the Planning Board does not make a decision within the 65 day
40 window the application would automatically be approved. Pier D'Aprile explained that to speed things
41 along and receive as much community input as possible the Board decided to use their work session for this
42 discussion. James Gaffney explained that because a public hearing is noticed it does not mean the entire
43 meeting is open for public comment. He stated that the agenda will reflect when public comment is
44 accepted. James Gaffney stressed that public comment must be directed to the Chair.

45
46 Ed Mical stated that the Chair did not open the floor to public comment. He stated that the public hearing
47 was opened but not the public comment. Karen Coyne assured him that she did open public comment.

48
49 James Gaffney question if the Board should bring back microphones.

1
2 *Audience member not identified* asked if there are statistics on how much affordable housing is in currently
3 in Warner. Karen Coyne stated that a few years back there was analysis done by Andy Bodnarick. The
4 audience member asked what is the justification for a 34 unit to come to town. James Gaffney explained that
5 there is not a justification they are property owners. He stated that in accordance with State Law and
6 Warner's Zoning Ordinances an applicant that comes to the Planning Board with a plan that is in compliance
7 the Planning Board is obligated under the law to approve it. He stressed that is the only criteria the Planning
8 Board can use to make a determination for or against.

9
10 Janet Garcia of Kearsarge Mountain Road stated that she is opposed to this development. She spoke about
11 the cost to the residents who will pay the school tax for the students that live in the building. She stated that
12 there are enough apartments in Warner.

13
14 Karen Coyne recapped two online comments about publicly noticing site walks and the ability for the public
15 to ask questions regarding new information submitted.

16
17 Nancy Martin stated, if there are four or more members that attend the site walk that is considered a public
18 meeting. She asked if the public could attend. Karen Coyne that it is complicated because at town meeting it
19 was voted that all Planning Board meetings would be on Zoom. She stated that they are darned if they do
20 and darned if they don't.

21
22 Online question; about the tax rate for the property. Tom Frutado stated that it is estimated that the owner
23 will \$60,000 in property taxes.

24
25 Online question; why doesn't the Board asked the Police Chief and Fire Chief to attend the meeting to
26 answer resident questions. Karen Coyne explained that they were offered to attend, they were asked to
27 provide their feedback and they did submit feedback into the record.

28
29 *Audience member not identified* questioned the need for additional parking. Karen Coyne explained the
30 applicant has the average at 1.2 vehicles. Audience member stressed that average is for the city where you do
31 not need a car. Pier D'Aprile explained that last year the state overrode local ordinances saying that
32 workforce housing of 10 or more units it can increase to 1.5. Pier D'Aprile stressed that the state law
33 supersedes local ordinances.

34
35 Karen Coyne closed the public comment.

36 Karen Coyne closed the public hearing.

37 38 **VII. REPORTS**

39 **A. Chair's Report- Chair, Karen Coyne**

40 **Karen Coyne stated that she has the CIP and asked the Planning Board members to review it.**

41 42 **X. ADJOURN**

43 The meeting adjourned at 9:51 PM

44 Respectfully submitted by Tracy Doherty