



## TOWN OF WARNER

PO Box 265

Warner, New Hampshire 03278-0265

Telephone: (603) 456-2298 ex. 7

Warnernh.gov email: landuse@warnernh.gov

### Planning Board Work Session Minutes

October 6, 2025 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	✓	

Bob Holmes and Micah Thompson were elevated to voting members.

III. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

None

IV. **NEW BUSINESS**

**Minor Subdivision Application Continuance**

**Applicant:** John Puc

**Owners:** John Puc

**Agent:** S & H Land Services LLC

**Surveyor:** Robert Degan, LLS

**Address:** Map 37, Lot 6, 131 Waterloo Street, Warner NH 03278

**District:** R-2

**Description:** Applicant seeks to subdivide the subject property, creating two additional building lots with frontage on Waterloo Street and the Warner River. No new road is proposed.

Karen Coyne explained that on September 9, 2025, the Planning Board continued their deliberations to ensure that the Planning Board notified the WRLAC and the DES. She stated that both of those notifications have been sent and there has not been a response received.

Karen Coyne reopened the hearing for further Planning Board discussions. Rob Degan recapped the project. Karen Coyne explained that a public comment came in requesting that the Planning Board look at a building permit on Willaby Colby Lane, but no further information was provided.

There were no further comments or questions from the Planning Board. Karen Coyne closed the public hearing. John Leavitt requested that the public be allowed to offer any additional information. Karen Coyne reopened the floor for public comment. No public comment was offered.

Karen Coyne explained that this will be required to go before DES because it is located in the Watershed District. She stated that they will also be required to have a state septic permit and the WRLAC would have to be notified again before a build.

**Barak Greene made a motion, seconded by Pier D'Aprile, to approve the two lot subdivision with the waivers. Motion passed unanimously.**

#### **V. Revision of Section 5 of the Site Plan Procedures**

Barak Greene stated that he received only one edit from the last time he presented this one month ago. He explained that the amendment relates specifically to the time frame between when the application is received and when the Planning Board reviews it. He stated that it is 15 days. Karen Coyne asked if the applications reflect 21 days. She questioned why the site plan requirement would not coincide with the Planning Board calendar or vice versa.

Barak Greene asked if there is a rule for a conceptual consultation because he views them similarly.

Bob Holmes stated that he reviewed the proposal from Barak Greene. Bob Holmes stated that he fundamentally does not like it. He explained that the applicant should have a discussion with the Land Use Secretary to determine if a variance or site plan is needed. He suspects that this would cause more people to come before the Planning Board. He would prefer that the applicant speak to the Land Use office on an informal basis.

Barak Greene spoke about an instance where the applicant came to the Land Use office but the Land Use Secretary was not available so the applicant spoke to the Town Administrator, and the Applicant was told to pull a building permit when they should have filed a site plan review. Bob Holmes does not believe applicants should go to the Town Administrator for planning/zoning guidance. Ian Rogers agrees with Bob Holmes that the original procedure does seem to make this a simpler process.

Karen Coyne spoke about a few instances where an applicant received wrong information from Town Hall. She stated that she believes in the value of conceptual consultations. She stated that she does not feel that one person should be making the determination.

Ian Rogers is in favor of the site plan amendment and believes that it will serve the town in the future. He questions if additional training would reduce the misinformation given out. He is not in favor of putting additional pressure or strain on volunteers. There was a discussion regarding what documents are recorded at the registry of deeds, and the paper records held at the town. Karen reiterated that conceptual consultations serve a valuable purpose.

Barak Greene appreciates that the way this is written, people will come before the Planning Board, creating a record. He questions how many times something changes, and the Planning Board is not aware of it. Ian Rogers wonders if there is a way of doing this that does not involve going to the Planning Board every time. He would appreciate it if the revision was written in a way that the Land Use Secretary could make the determination on clear cut issues. Barak Greene explained that the amendment is written in a way that does not put the Land Use Secretary in an awkward position. He stated that this will also minimize the good old boy mentality.

The Planning Board agreed to continue the discussion until October 20, 2025, allowing Ian Rogers the opportunity to provide additional amendments. Chrissy Almanzar noted that the determination for site plan review form appears that it is meant to come before the Planning Board. She explained that looking at the form, it does not appear that the Land Use Clerk would be making any determination. Bob Holmes agreed. Bob Holmes explained that he began to revise Barak's proposal but there were too many. Barak Greene reiterated the problem that he is attempting to solve. He believes it is currently unclear on the form as to whether a site plan review is needed or just an amendment. He explained that that problem needs to be solved. Karen Coyne stated that this makes the process clear. John Leavitt questioned the scenario when an applicant makes the determination that a site plan review is not needed, but in fact it is. Barak Greene is not aware of anything in their procedures that can stop that.

Barak Greene requested to have the CIP brought back to the Planning Board for discussion and to vote on it before it goes to the Budget Committee. It was agreed to do this at the next meeting.

#### **VI. MINUTES September 22, 2025**

**Ian Rogers made a motion seconded by Bob Holmes to approve the September 22, 2025 Planning Board meeting minutes as amended. Motion passed, Barak Greene abstained.**

#### **VII. COMMUNICATIONS**

None

#### **VIII. REPORTS**

##### **Chair's Report- Chair, Karen Coyne**

None

##### **Select Board – Mike Smith**

None

##### **Regional Planning Commission - Ben Frost, Barb Marty**

Barb Marty has indicated that Thursday will be the first quarterly RPC meeting. Barb Marty will provide a summary before the next Planning Board meeting.

##### **Economic Development Advisory Committee – James Sherman**

None

##### **Agricultural Commission - James Gaffney**

None

##### **Regional Transportation Advisory Committee – Tim Blagden**

None

##### **Housing Committee**

Bob Holmes explained that the Housing Committee reviewed ADU legislature changes, worked on potential community engagement survey questions, reviewed the State changes to the Commercial Zoning, intervale, and commercial districts. There was a discussion regarding impact fees.

#### **IX. PUBLIC COMMENT**

None

#### **X. ADJOURN**

The meeting adjourned at 8:21 PM.

Respectfully submitted by Tracy Doherty

