



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 Meeting AGENDA

Monday, January 19th, 2026
Town Hall Lower Meeting Room
7:00 PM

Join Zoom Meeting: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87061407427>, Meeting ID: 870 6140 7427 Passcode: 1234

- I. **OPEN MEETING / Pledge of Allegiance**
- II. **ROLL CALL**
- III. **PUBLIC COMMENT**
- IV. **NEW BUSINESS**

- A. **Public Hearing** – Proposed Edits to our Zoning Ordinance as necessary to comply with State ADU requirements:

Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment No. ___ as proposed by the Planning Board for the Town's Zoning Ordinance, as necessary to comply with the new State ADU requirements as follows:

Amendment to Article III Definitions, Article IV General Provisions, Article XIV-B Accessory Apartment, and Table 1 Use Regulations?

- B. **Public Hearing** – Proposed Edits to Site Plan Review Application, Section V

- V. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

- A. Peacock Files

- VI. **REVIEW MINUTES:** January 5th

- VII. **COMMUNICATIONS**

- VIII. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

- IX. **ADJOURN** - Note: Planning Board meetings will end no later than 10:00 P.M. Items remaining on the agenda will be heard at the next scheduled monthly meeting.

ARTICLE III

Definitions

“Accessory Dwelling Unit” means an either attached or detached residential living unit that is appurtenant to a single-family dwelling, and that provides independent living facilities for one or more persons, which includes provisions for sleeping, eating, cooking, and sanitation on the same parcel of land as the principal dwelling unit it accompanies. An accessory dwelling unit may be attached to the principal dwelling unit. [*Amended March 2026*]

ARTICLE IV

General Provisions

F. Use Permit: No permit for the erection, exterior alteration, moving or repair of any building, or accessory dwelling unit, shall be issued until an application has been made for the certificate of zoning compliance, and the certificate shall be issued in conformity with the provisions of this ordinance. [*Amended March 2026*]

ARTICLE XIV-B

Accessory Dwelling Units

[*Updated March 2026*]

Requirements for Accessory Dwelling Units:

- A. The Accessory Dwelling Units shall be clearly incidental to the primary use of the property. [*Amended March 2026*]
- B. Only one Accessory Dwelling Unit may be constructed per single-family dwelling, per lot. [*Amended March 2026*]
- C. Any Accessory Dwelling Unit, whether an addition to or contained within the single-family dwelling or accessory building, shall have an area of no less than 300 square feet and no more than 1,000 square feet. [*Amended March 2026*]
- D. An Accessory Dwelling Unit may be a new build or converted from an existing structure. Such structures shall not increase the nonconformity or introduce new nonconformities. [*Amended March 2026*]
 1. Accessory Dwelling Units shall comply to setback requirements and all applicable regulations for the Town of Warner and the District in which

the lot is located. [*Amended March 2026*]

- E. Conveyance of any Accessory Dwelling Unit separate from that of the primary dwelling unit shall be prohibited. [*Adopted March 2026*]
- F. An Accessory Dwelling Unit shall be allowed by right on any lot where single-family housing is permitted or is already in existence. [*Amended March 2026*]
- G. The owner shall not separately lease both the primary dwelling unit and the Accessory Dwelling Unit at the same time. [*Amended March 2026*]
- H. Accessory Dwelling Units may not be established in association with manufacture housing or townhouse-style dwelling units (i.e., attached single-family dwellings). [*Amended March 2026*]

TABLE 1
Use Regulations

Buildings, structures, or land shall be used as permitted by this ordinance. Any use NOT listed in this ordinance is prohibited. [Amended March 2026]

RESIDENTIAL

USES	R-1	R-2	R-3	B-1	C-1	OC-1	INT	OR
1. One-family detached dwelling [Amended March 2012]	P	P	P	P	S	P		P
2. Two-family dwelling [Amended March 2012]	P	P	S	P	S			
3. Multi-family dwelling [Amended March 2012]	P	P	S	P	S			
4. Conversion of existing dwelling structure to multifamily dwelling	P	P	S	P	P	S		
5. Accessory Dwelling Unit [Adopted March 2012; Updated March 2026]	P	P	P	P		P		P
6. Multi-Family Workforce housing [Amended March 2021]	P	P	S	P	S		S	

S (Special Exception) P (Permitted)

Section V - Scope of Review

- A. Whenever any development or change or expansion of use of a site governed by these regulations is proposed or whenever any changes are proposed which differ from an existing site plan as previously approved by the Planning Board; and before any construction, land clearing, building development or change is begun; and before any permit for the erection of any building or authorization for development on such site shall be granted, the owner of the property or his authorized agent shall apply for and secure from the Planning Board approval of such proposed site development in accordance with procedures outlined in this Regulation.
1. The following is a list of activities that would trigger a Site Plan Review:
 - a. New construction of non-residential or multi-family development.
 - b. Any change or expansion in use of a site or structure when such change is materially or substantially different from the previous use such that there is an effect on the quantitative or qualitative requirements of these Regulations or the Zoning Ordinance.
 - c. Exterior projects that entail the development, change, or expansion that exceeds 199 gross square feet of buildings, structures, or parking area.
 - d. Internal building modifications to a non-residential use that affect the scale or impact or activity level of the existing use, or
 - e. Modifications to previously approved site plans, or
 - f. A change in the site configuration that generates or increases the potential for adverse impacts to drainage systems, surface waters, groundwater, wetlands, and/or floodplains.
 - g. Development that proposes changes to the landscaping, screening, lighting, driveways, parking lots, architectural appearance or visual appearance of an existing structure or site, or
 - h. Expansion of use that impacts traffic flow and lighting as it relates to pedestrian safety, or that will result in an increase in vehicular traffic entering or leaving the site by more than 50 vehicles during peak hour or 100 vehicles per day based on the most recent edition of the ITE Trip Generation Manual, or
 - i. Vacancies of units within multi-use, commercial buildings, with the exception of residential use, will be considered abandonment of use if they are vacant for more than 3 years.
 - j. When determining if there will be a change of use in an existing multi-use building, the entire building and its current and proposed occupant may be taken into consideration, not just the proposed new occupant.

- k. When applying for a change of use for a project with a previously approved site plan for which construction has not been completed, all previously approved waivers of regulations shall be resubmitted for approval.
- B. If an applicant is asking to make changes to an existing Site Plan, the Planning Board has the responsibility to determine to what degree, if any, a Site Plan Review needs to be completed. The applicant should fill out an Application for Determination of Site Plan Review with the Planning Board at least 5 days prior to the Planning Board Meeting.

Alternately, the applicant may request a Conceptual Consultation with the Planning Board. If during that meeting the Planning Board decides a Site Plan is not required, there is no need to file an Application for Determination of Site Plan Review. If the Planning Board determines a Site Plan Review is necessary, either through a completed application or through a consultation, they may choose to exempt certain elements of the checklist.

Any changes to an existing Site Plan where elements currently required by these regulations shall require those elements to be provided as part the Site Plan Review, unless there is a previous exemption recorded regarding those elements, or the previous Site Plan was approved before 1982. Any changes to existing site plans must have a Site Plan Amendment, describing the changes to the previous site plan, filed with the Property Card at the Town Hall.

1. A full Site Plan Review may not be required if all the following conditions are met:
 - a. Proposed project complies with the Zoning Ordinance.
 - b. Exterior projects of less than (200) gross square feet of buildings, structures, or parking area from the date of the previously approved Site Plan (*) unless it affects the scale, impact or activity level of the existing use.
 - c. Projects that involve a Change in Use for a property that has a previously approved Site Plan by the Board provided the Change of Use does not affect the scale, impact or activity level of the existing use.
 - d. Internal building modifications to a non-residential use that do not affect the scale, impact or activity level of the existing use.
 - e. Any proposed construction on the exterior and/or site of existing buildings if it complies with the approved site plan and it is minimal in nature, maintains the existing appearance and/or function of the building and/or site.

- f. The overall primary use of an existing multi-use building having multiple occupants does not change such that it would affect the scale or impact or activity level of the existing overall use.
- g. An approved project which has changed Ownership without a Change of Use.

Review of Revised Stormwater Management Plan, Peacock Hill Rd LLC

From George Holt <gholt@aries-eng.com>
Date Mon 12/1/2025 8:59 AM
To Landuse Secretary <landuse@warnernh.gov>

This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you are 100% sure that it is safe.

Chrissy,

I reviewed the revised "11-20-2025 Full Drainage Report" prepared by Keach-Nordstrom Associates, Inc. (KNA) for the pre-development and post-development 50-year storm events.

From Page 77 of 145 – 11-20-2025 Full Drainage Report, the pre-development stormwater flows are as follows:

Link 60L: Flow from Site to Abutter Map 7 Lot 36-1

Inflow=2.37 cfs 0.276 af
Primary=2.37 cfs 0.276 af

From Page 88 of 145 – 11-20-2025 Full Drainage Report, the post-development stormwater flows are as follows:

Link 60L: Flow from Site to Abutter Map 7 Lot 36-1

Inflow=2.26 cfs 0.493 af
Primary=2.26 cfs 0.493 af

Link 60L is a model node that sums the total stormwater flow from the site property to the off-site northerly abutting property. For the 50-year storm event, the stormwater flow rate (velocity), measured in cubic feet per second (cfs), decreases from 2.37 cfs to 2.26 cfs, which represents an approximate decrease of 4.6% in stormwater runoff velocity. However, the stormwater runoff volume (runoff), measured in acre-feet (af), increases from 0.276 af to 0.493 af, which represents an approximate 78.6% increase in runoff volume. This increase in stormwater runoff volume to the northerly abutting property does not meet the requirements of Section XVIII - Erosion/ Sedimentation and Storm-Water Control of the Warner Site Plan regulations, which require that, "... development of the site shall not result in increased runoff or velocity of surface runoff onto adjacent properties or surface water bodies." Further, the increase in runoff volume to the northerly abutting property does not meet Conditions #6 of the 11/17/2025 Conditional Approval by the Planning Board, which requires, "Confirmation that the new proposed pond control mitigates the 50-year flood runoff issue on neighboring property."

Please contact me if you need further assistance. Thanks,

George



George C. Holt, P.G.
Principal Hydrogeologist
Aries Engineering, LLC
104 Pleasant Street
Concord, NH 03301
Phone (603) 228-0008
Fax (603) 226-0374
Cell (603) 344-2511
www.aries-eng.com

This e-mail and attachments (if any) are intended only for the addressee named above, and may contain privileged or confidential information. If you are not the intended message recipient, please do not use, copy, or print this information. Also, please do not

forward or disclose this information to others. If you have received this communication in error, please notify this message sender by replying to this message and then delete this e-mail and attachments (if any) from your e-mail system. Thank you.

Statement
Invoices Attached

Aries Engineering, LLC
104 Pleasant Street
Concord, NH 03301
603-228-0008

Town of Warner
Planning Board
5 East Main Street
PO Box 265
Warner, NH 03278

Statement date: 1/8/2026

	Invoice Number	Invoice Date	Amount
--	----------------	--------------	--------

Town of Warner

2025-085 Map 7, Lot 39 and 39-1, Warner, NH - Technical Assistance

	38634	10/27/2025	3,518.75
	38726	11/30/2025	<u>2,151.60</u>
	Client Outstanding		5,670.35

Town of Warner						
Outstanding	Current	31-60 Days	61-90 Days	91-120 Days	121+ Days	Prepayment
5,670.35	0.00	2,151.60	3,518.75	0.00	0.00	0.00



ARIES ENGINEERING, LLC

104 Pleasant Street
Concord, NH 03301
(603) 228-0008
www.aries-eng.com
Tax ID: 02-0410989

INVOICE

Town of Warner
Chrissy Almanzar
landuse@warnernh.gov
5 East Main Street
PO Box 265
Warner, NH 03278-0059

Invoice number 38634
Date 10/27/2025

Project **2025-085 Map 7, Lot 39 and 39-1,
Warner, NH - Technical Assistance**

For Professional Services Through: 10/24/2025

Warner, NH

SITE PLAN APPLICATION REVIEW & REPORT PREPARATION

Professional Fees

	Hours	Rate	Billed Amount
Principal Engineer <i>Review and assess report.</i>	0.75	200.00	150.00
Principal Hydrogeologist <i>Review letter (2 hrs)</i> <i>Review letter (2 hrs)</i> <i>Engineering Review Report preparation (8 hrs)</i>	12.00	200.00	2,400.00
Sr. Hydrogeologist III <i>Document review, GIS plan preparation (5 hrs)</i>	5.00	175.00	875.00
Clerical <i>Format Engineering Review report</i>	1.25	75.00	93.75
Professional Fees subtotal	19.00		3,518.75
Phase subtotal			3,518.75
Invoice total			3,518.75

ARIES ENGINEERING APPRECIATES YOUR BUSINESS!
All invoices are due upon receipt. A late charge of 1.5% may be added to any unpaid balance after 30 days.
We accept checks or electronic fund transfers.



ARIES ENGINEERING, LLC

104 Pleasant Street
Concord, NH 03301
(603) 228-0008
www.aries-eng.com
Tax ID: 02-0410989

INVOICE

Town of Warner
Chrissy Almanzar
landuse@warnernh.gov
5 East Main Street
PO Box 265
Warner, NH 03278-0059

Invoice number 38726
Date 11/30/2025
Project **2025-085 Map 7, Lot 39 and 39-1,
Warner, NH - Technical Assistance**

For Professional Services Through: 11/30/2025

SITE PLAN APPLICATION REVIEW & REPORT PREPARATION

Professional Fees

	Hours	Rate	Billed Amount
Principal Hydrogeologist	10.25	200.00	2,050.00
<i>Prepare for and attend Warner PB meeting (4 hrs)</i>			
<i>Review KNA letter (0.5 hrs)</i>			
<i>HydroCAD model development and letter report (4 hrs)</i>			
<i>Drainage report review (1 hr)</i>			
<i>Finalize email (0.75 hrs)</i>			
Clerical	1.00	75.00	75.00
<i>Format Engineering Review update</i>			
Professional Fees subtotal	11.25		2,125.00

Expenses

	Units	Rate	Billed Amount
Miles	38.00	0.70	26.60
Phase subtotal			2,151.60

Invoice total 2,151.60

ARIES ENGINEERING APPRECIATES YOUR BUSINESS!

All invoices are due upon receipt. A late charge of 1.5% may be added to any unpaid balance after 30 days.

We accept checks or electronic fund transfers.



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 Notice of Decision

Date of Decision: Monday, November 17th, 2025

Site Plan Review Application

Applicant: Peacock Hill Rd LLC
Owners: Peacock Hill Rd LLC
Agent: Keach-Nordstrom Associates
Surveyor: Jacques E. Belanger Land Surveying PLLC
Address: Map 07 Lot 039 and 39-1 Route 103 East, Warner, NH
District: R-2 and R-3
Description: Two buildings with four units each to be used as multi-family housing with a shared driveway.

On November 17th, 2025, the Warner Planning Board voted to **APPROVE** a Site Plan Review for Peacock Hill Rd LLC for Map 07, Lot 039 & 039-1, under the following conditions:

1. Septic approval
2. Well Approval
3. Alteration of Terrain approval
4. A reclamation bond
5. An "as built" of the approved driveway permit on Map 07, Lot 039, prior to occupancy
6. Confirmation that the new proposed pond control mitigates the 50-year flood runoff issue on neighboring property

The vote tally was 7 to 0 in favor of approving the Site Plan Review. The Planning Board's decision may be appealed to superior court pursuant to RSA 677:15 or, if it has jurisdiction, to the Housing Appeals Board pursuant to RSA Ch. 679.

Karen Coyne
Planning Board Chair



TOWN OF WARNER

PO Box 265
Warner, New Hampshire 03278-0265
Telephone: (603) 456-2298 ex. 7
Email: landuse@warnernh.gov

Planning Board Work Session Minutes

January 5, 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 7:00 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	✓	
Ian Rogers	✓	
Mike Smith – Select Board		✓
John Leavitt	✓	
Bob Holmes – Alternate	✓	
Micah Thompson – Alternate	✓	

III. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

IV. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Proposal for Accessory Dwelling Unit

James Gaffney explained that it is his opinion that the only reason that the Planning Board is addressing the ADU ordinance is because the state law changed. He explained that he has submitted a starting point for the discussion. He stated that he would like to keep the edits concise and follow the state law. He suggested eliminating the current section on ADU's and replacing it with something that follows a format similar to what he submitted. Barak Greene explained that Warner has an accessory apartment previously voted on by the Town. He stated that if it were to be completely rewritten it would require a larger discussion. Barak Greene stated that the better stance would be to modify the existing ordinance to be in compliance with the state law. James Gaffney clarified that the state has rewritten the statute such that it overrides much of Warner's existing ordinance and he does not see the value in keeping what is currently in place. There was a discussion regarding the need to specify that only one ADU is permitted, and the minimum/maximum square footage for an ADU.

Ian Rogers appreciates Barak Greene's point that the voters voted on this. He stated that the language from the December 1st edit integrates the state changes but also standardizes some language. He advised the Board that the language was approved by NHMA. Bob Holmes clarified that the existing ordinance says an ADU cannot be less than 300 square feet and not more than 1000 square feet. He explained that the new state statute says the Town can make the maximum 750 square feet. He stated that proposed language does not include the minimum of 300 square feet. Karen Coyne questioned why anyone would care how small an ADU is. Bob Holmes explained that the building code says that a building permit cannot be issued for anything smaller than 500 square feet. James Gaffney stated that he does not see the value in a minimum requirement. James Gaffney asked for the opinion of Board regarding simplifying the ADU ordinance.

43 Barak Greene stated that it is the Planning Board’s responsibility to respect what the town has previously
44 voted on. Ian Rogers agreed with Barak Greene and reiterated that the previously proposed language has
45 been reviewed and approved by NHMA. John Leavitt feels the existing ordinance should be edited to
46 comply with the state law. He stated that RSA 674 is confusing. He expressed his disappointment with the
47 State dictating what the town’s ordinance should be. John Leavitt explained that the ordinance should be
48 customized and kept as much like Warner as possible. He stated that the proposed language is good and
49 much clearer. Pier D’Aprile stated that if the Board wants to bring this into compliance with the RSA the
50 Board should review the ordinance so that it meets with all the changes, not just some of the changes. James
51 Gaffney feels the ordinance needs to be streamlined. He stated that the reason for an ordinance is to provide a
52 format for people to follow. James Gaffney stated that regurgitating what is in the current RSA does not
53 really help. Karen Coyne stated that she is in the middle on this issue. She explained that she does not like
54 regurgitating what is in the RSA. Karen Coyne opened the floor to public comment.

55
56 Ruth Rudiez (sp?) echoed the comments of John Leavitt. She supports streamlining it while keeping it in line
57 with what Warner has expressed they want. She does not want it to be complicated.

58
59 The Planning Board began to review the proposed edits. James Gaffney pointed out the need to add
60 language that clarifies that an ADU may be a new build or converted from an existing structure. The Board
61 debated and agreed to keep the following *language* “*such structure shall not increase the nonconformity or*
62 *introduce new nonconformities*”. The Board agreed to remove section a.

63
64 **James Gaffney made a motion seconded by Barak Greene to adopt E as amended (Accessory Dwelling**
65 **Unit may be a new build or converted from an existing structure. Such structure shall not increase the**
66 **nonconformity or introduce new nonconformities). Motion passed.**

67
68 Barak Greene suggested adding the following language; “*The following definitions are being added to and*
69 *edited in Article III of the current Zoning Ordinance*”. The Board agreed that the adopted and amended dates
70 should also be included. The Board agreed to condense the definition of Accessory Dwelling Unit to read as
71 “*Accessory Dwelling Unit means an either attached or detached residential living unit that is appurtenant to*
72 *a single-family dwelling and that provides independent living facilities for one or more persons, which*
73 *includes provisions for sleeping, eating, cooking, and sanitation on the same parcel of land as the principal*
74 *dwelling unit it accompanies. An accessory dwelling unit may be attached to the principal dwelling unit. ...*”

75
76 **James Gaffney made a motion seconded by Barak Greene to adopt the Accessory Dwelling Unit**
77 **definition as amended. Motion passed.**

78
79 Barak Greene explained that the existing zoning ordinance Article IV, F needs to be amended to;
80 Use Permit: No permit for the erection, exterior alteration, *moving or repair of any building, or accessory*
81 *dwelling unit*, shall be issued until an application has been made for the certificate of zoning compliance, and
82 the certificate shall be issued in conformity with the provisions of this ordinance.

83
84 **Barak Greene made a motion seconded by Ian Rogers to adopt Article IV as amended. Motion passed.**

85
86 Article XIV-B, item A: The Board discussed revising the requirements for accessory dwelling units, item A
87 to read as; “*The Accessory Dwelling Units accessory apartment shall be clearly incidental to the primary*
88 *use of the property*”.

89 **James Gaffney made a motion seconded by Ian Rogers to adopt the amendment to the requirements**
90 **for accessory dwelling units item A. Motion passed.**

91 Item B: The Board discussed amending item B to read as “Only one accessory dwelling unit may be
92 constructed per single-family dwelling, per lot.

93 **Barak Greene made a motion seconded by Ian Rogers to adopt the amendment to item B. Motion**
94 **passed.**

95
96 Item D: The Board discussed amending item D. All Accessory Dwelling Units shall comply to setback
97 requirements for the district in which the lot is located, *subject to E below*. The Board discussed combining
98 Item D and E. James Gaffney spoke in support of combining the two for streamlining and clarity. Karen
99 Coyne suggested the following amendment to combine item D and E.

100 D. Accessory Dwelling Unit may be a new build or converted from an existing structure. Such structure
101 shall not increase the nonconformity or introduce new nonconformities

102 a. *All Accessory Dwelling Units shall comply to setback requirements for the district in which the lot*
103 *is located.*

104 James Gaffney suggested the following language: ADU’s created from an existing structure shall not
105 increase the nonconformity or introduce the new nonconformities. He feels that his proposed language is
106 specific and reads clearer.

107
108 Barak Greene made a motion seconded by Ian Rogers to accept the amendment put forward by Karen Coyne.

109
110 *Discussion on the motion:* James Gaffney stated that he does not like the term such structures.
111 Motion withdrawn.

112
113 The Board discussed adding “all applicable regulations of the Town of Warner” to item D section a.
114 *All Accessory Dwelling Units shall comply to setback requirements and all applicable regulations for the*
115 *Town of Warner and the district in which the lot is located.* The Board agreed to add all applicable
116 regulations.

117
118 **Barak Greene made a motion seconded by Ian Rogers to accept Item D as amended.**

119
120 *Discussion on the motion:* John Leavitt asked for the amendment to be read, Barak Greene read the
121 amendment.

122
123 **Barak Greene made a motion seconded by Ian Rogers to amend the amendment of item D.**
124 **Amendment passed.**

125
126 Amended motion: Item D to read as follows:

127 D. Accessory Dwelling Unit may be a new build or converted from an existing structure. Such
128 structure shall not increase the nonconformity or introduce new nonconformities.

129 a. All Accessory Dwelling Units shall comply to setback requirements and all applicable
130 regulations for the Town of Warner and the district in which the lot is located.

131 **Amended motion passed.**

132
133 Item E: James Gaffney suggested individual ownership of accessory dwelling units shall not be permitted.
134 The title shall be inseparable from the primary dwelling. Barak Greene offered “Conveyance of any
135 accessory dwelling unit separate from that of the primary dwelling unit shall be prohibited”.

136
137 **Barak Greene made a motion seconded by Ian Rogers to adopt the amendment to item E. Motion**
138 **passed.**

139

140 Item F: the Board discussed the following revision to item F. Accessory Dwelling Units may only be located
141 on a lot where a single-family home is the sole use of the lot as permitted where allowed in TABLE 1 – USE
142 REGULATIONS of this Zoning Ordinance. James Gaffney and Barak Greene offered the following;
143 Accessory Dwelling Units shall be allowed by right on any lot where single-family housing is permitted or is
144 already in existence.

145
146 **Barak Greene made a motion seconded by James Gaffney to accept the amendment of item F. Motion**
147 **passed.**

148 John Leavitt was not present for the vote.

149
150 Item G: The owner shall not separately lease both the primary dwelling unit and the Accessory Dwelling
151 Unit at the same time, nor shall an Accessory Dwelling Unit be permitted on leased land. Karen Coyne
152 questioned if leased land can be built on by the lessee. Barak Greene supports removing this because Warner
153 has a community land trust who exists to provide housing for people in the missing middle. Bob Holmes and
154 Ian Rogers explained that that was added at the recommendation of the CNHRPC. Ian Rogers acknowledged
155 that the committee did not discuss the ramifications to the community land trust. Ian Rogers explained that
156 he is fine with removing it.

157
158 **Barak Greene made a motion seconded by Ian Rogers to accept the amendment of item G.**

159
160 *Discussion on the motion:* James Gaffney questioned if the word lease covers enough, he asked if *lease*
161 covers the options of renting or gifting the use of. He explained that item G should specify that the owner
162 must reside in the primary dwelling or the ADU. Barak Greene stated that would require an owner
163 occupancy certification.

164 Barak Greene withdrew the motion to further discuss item G.

165
166 Bob Holmes stated that the Town should not require property owners to live in town. He spoke about those
167 who have a vacation home and have an ADU. The Board discussed the enforcement of item G. Bob Holmes
168 stated this would make the town's ordinance more restrictive than the RSA. Barak Greene agreed. He stated
169 that there would need to be more discussion with the residents.

170
171 **Ian Rogers made a motion seconded by Barak Greene to accept the following amendment of item G;**
172 ***“The owner shall not separately lease both the primary dwelling unit and the ADU at the same time.”***
173 **Motion passed, James Gaffney voted in the negative.**

174 *Discussion on the motion:* James Gaffney questioned the possibility of sub-leasing.

175
176 Item H: Accessory Dwelling Units may not be established in association with manufactured housing or
177 townhouse style dwelling units.

178
179 **James Gaffney made a motion seconded by Pier D’Aprile to accept the revision of Item H. Motion**
180 **passed.**

181
182
183 The Board reviewed the amended Use Regulations table.

184 **James Gaffney made a motion seconded by Barak Greene to accept the amended Use Regulations**
185 **Table. Motion passed, Ian Rogers abstained.**

186
187 **Barak Greene made a motion seconded by Ian Rogers to accept all of the amendments to the ADU**
188 **ordinance and to take it to public hearing.**

189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233

Discussion on the motion: John Leavitt stated that the title of the ordinance is Warner ADU Ordinance but throughout the document it is referred to as accessory dwelling unit. Barak Greene withdrew the motion.

Barak Greene made a motion seconded by Ian Rogers to revise the title of ordinance to reflect Warner Accessory Dwelling Unit Ordinance and to all of the amendments to the ADU ordinance and take it to public hearing. Motion passed.

Public hearing will be scheduled.

VI. REVIEW MINUTES December 15, 2025

Barak Greene made a motion seconded by James Gaffney to approve the Planning Board meeting minutes of December 15, 2025, as amended. Motion passed, Pier D’Aprile abstained.

VII. COMMUNICATIONS

VIII. REPORTS

Chair's Report- Chair, Karen Coyne

None

Select Board – Mike Smith

None

Regional Planning Commission - Ben Frost, Barb Marty

None

Economic Development Advisory Committee – James Sherman

New member of the EDAC is Micah Thompson.

Barak Greene made a motion seconded by Pier D’Aprile to replace James Sherman with Micah Thompson as the Economic Development Advisor. Motion passed

Agricultural Commission - James Gaffney

None

Regional Transportation Advisory Committee – Tim Blagden

None

HOP II Update – Bob Holmes

Bob Holmes stated that HOP II Committee received preliminary summary of the survey from 100 participants. He briefly summarized the results.

IX. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

X. ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 9:04 PM.

Respectfully submitted by Tracy Doherty