

**Town of Warner – Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
Monday, July 6, 2009 7:00 PM
Warner Town Hall, Lower Level**

Members Present: Barbara Annis, Paul Violette, Hank Duhamel, David Hartman, Rick Davies, Ed Mical
Members Arriving Late: Dan Watts
Members Excused: None
Members Absent: None
Alternates Present: Harold French
Alternates Excused: Peter Wyman
Alternates Absent: None
Presiding: Barbara Annis
Recording: Jean Lightfoot

Open Meeting at 7:00 PM

Roll Call

Ms. Annis opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. The roll call was taken. Mr. Watts arrived at 7:05 p.m. Mr. Duhamel departed at 8:30 p.m. and Mr. French was asked to sit and vote in his place.

1. CONCEPTUAL CONSULTATION

Property Owners: Paul J. Linehan, Ann M. Linehan, John D. Linehan

Applicants: Aaron and Cynthia Snay

Property Location: 11 East Main Street, Warner, NH
Map 31, Lot 57, B-1 Zoning

Description: Conceptual consultation regarding dividing current streetfront retail space back into 2 units – one for Colby Realty and one for a pharmacy.

Ms. Annis recognized Aaron and Cynthia Snay and asked them to describe their proposal. He said that the building involved is at 11 East Main Street which is currently the Colby-Linehan Realty building. He said the plan is to divide it with an interior partition which would result in two separate commercial spaces inside on the first floor. He said they would add a pharmacy and Ms. Snay is a pharmacist who would run it. Ms. Annis asked if they had a layout and Mr. Snay passed out drawings of the before and after plans. He said that they will add the partition and another door, where there was one before, in the front to access the pharmacy. In addition, he said some of the current partitions and walls will be removed. He said that there would be no change to the exterior of the building, except to add the door on the front. He said that the pharmacy would be in the left hand space – on the right from Main Street. Mr. French asked if there would be two access points for both units or if one would have only one entrance in the front. Mr. Snay said that they both would have two egresses – one in the front and one in the back. Mr. Watts arrived at this point.

Ms. Annis asked if the Board members had any questions. Mr. Duhamel asked what the size of the retail portion would be. Ms. Snay said it's about 500 square feet. Mr. Duhamel asked how the drugs would be protected. Ms. Snay said that the plan is to have a metal partition that can be pulled down to protect the pharmacy. She said that there would also be an alarm system installed. Mr. Snay said that the NH Department of Pharmacy requires an alarm system, but there will also be the metal partition and steel doors to protect it. Mr. Hartman asked what the small room off to the side is. Ms. Snay said it would be a consultation area for her to consult with patients in a separate area about their medications and other items in order to protect their privacy. Mr. Hartman asked about how this pharmacy would compare with other large pharmacies that seem to be the norm today. Ms. Snay replied that she had looked at where a pharmacy makes their profit and it is through the sale of prescriptions. So, she said, with a small area, resulting in lower overhead, she would not have the large inventory of other things that could be purchased

elsewhere in town. She said it's considered a professional pharmacy. Mr. Hartman asked if the Colonial Market pharmacy in Contoocook is a similar size to the planned one. Mr. Snay said that that pharmacy is quite a bit larger than the one they have planned. Mr. Davies asked if there are any ADA requirements for access to the pharmacy. Mr. Snay said that the building has an exterior entrance at the back which can be made ADA accessible fairly easily and that is being looked at right now. Mr. Davies asked if there is parking in the back that is designated to their building. Mr. Snay said there is parking in the back where there are 6 or 7 spaces. He said that they would have Ms. Snay and one tech working at the pharmacy, so it is not an employee-heavy type of business. He said that the type of customer activity would not create large numbers of people at one time taking up parking spaces. Mr. Davies asked if there were any concerns that Mr. and Ms. Snay had coming into the Planning Board that may not have been addressed. Ms. Snay said that they had come in to find out if there was anything that they should be thinking about that they were not aware of. She said she knew that the space had been two separate businesses before so she thought that was not going to be a problem. Ms. Annis said the one concern she has is the protection of the drugs from theft. Mr. Snay said the State mandates a security system and the Town of Warner has 24-hour police service. Ms. Annis said that that is not true. She said that the State Police provide the overnight coverage. Mr. Snay said that the census data, then, is incorrect. He said that there will be the steel partition that will open during business hours and be closed at night. He said the idea is that that will be primarily a deterrent because the thought is that people won't break a window if they see that and realize that the drugs are in a safe, which is where they would be. He said the goal is to secure the actual pharmacy space. Mr. Violette said that he sees no windows on that side of the building. Ms. Snay said that there is one in the small consultation area, which will be protected by a curtain, but there are none in the rest of that side of the building. Mr. Snay added that they will also be adding an architecturally-appropriate steel bar across that window that is lived into the studs and attached to the alarm system and this would be an additional deterrent. He said that there are also residential units upstairs and it would be hoped that if they heard someone trying to break in, they would notify the police. Mr. Mical asked what the hours of operation would be. Ms. Snay said it would be from 9:00 to 6:00 Monday through Friday and 9:00 to 1:00 on Saturday. She added if it turned out they needed to increase the hours, they would. Mr. Snay said that they would be open during special days when there were downtown activities going on. Mr. Duhamel asked what type of signage they were considering. Ms. Snay said she likes the Colby sign and they would probably have something like that and would be similar in size, and would probably be a green background with gold lettering. She said they would like to maintain the outside of the building since they consider it to be appealing. Ms. Annis asked if there were any other questions. Mr. Hartman asked what would trigger a site plan review. Mr. Violette commented that he thought there is nothing here that would require it. He said that the questions about the building access were for the Building Inspector to consider. Mr. Duhamel said that this has been a retail location for many years and the change is primarily a tenant change.

Mr. Violette MOVED that the decision be that no full site plan review is necessary. Mr. Davies seconded. Mr. Davies commented that any parking or access questions seem to be more of a Code issue and the type of business proposed does not really change things, so he thought there is no site plan review necessary. Mr. Mical said that there is a nice downtown business section area and he said it appears that the Snays do not have plans to make a lot of changes to the front of the building. He said he would like to confirm that. Ms. Snay said that she likes the exterior and has no plans to change the character of it. The vote was taken and the motion was PASSED unanimously.

Ms. Annis thanked the Snays and they departed.

2. CONCEPTUAL CONSULTATION

Property Owners: Alfred Hanson and Gail Hanson

Applicants: Tom Fenton, Alfred Hanson and Gail Hanson

Property Location: 252 Pumpkin Hill Road, Warner, NH
Map 15, Lot 3, R-3 Zoning

Description: Conceptual consultation regarding a proposed request to sell vegetables on a movable (on wheels) stand.

Ms. Annis recognized Alfred Hanson and Tom Fenton. Mr. Hanson handed out a drawing of the plan for where the vegetable stand would be placed. He said they would like to sell vegetables at the residence at 252 Pumpkin Hill Road. He said they would be on a movable stand. He said the stand is made of an old wagon that would be wheeled in during vegetable season and wheeled out after vegetable season. He said that the stand would be just before the entrance to C&M Auto. He said directly in front of that is the parking area for the stand. He said that the house is at 250 Pumpkin Hill Road and C&M Auto is at 252 Pumpkin Hill Road.

Ms. Annis asked if there were any questions. Mr. Davies said that he believes it is a permitted use since it's a three-month operation in the R-3 zone. He asked how many cars can be parked there at one time. Mr. Hanson said there are eight spots. He said that he pays for 16 parking spots for the garage area on his liability insurance and there are eight in front of the garage. Mr. Davies asked what would be different from what is there today. Mr. Hanson said they would just roll the stand out. Ms. Annis said that she realizes that this procedure may be a bother, but she said that a site plan review is required for all proposed commercial development. She said that commercial, according to the dictionary, is making money. She said that is the only reason that they would be required to come to the Planning Board.

Mr. Violette MOVED that a full site plan review is not required. Mr. Watts seconded. There was no further discussion. The vote was taken and the motion was PASSED unanimously.

Mr. Hanson asked how the Town is notified about the decision. He said that he wanted to be sure that Mr. Fenton's name is associated with it for the decision. Ms. Annis said that both names are on the application.

Ms. Annis thanked Mr. Fenton and Mr. Hanson and they departed.

3. DISCUSSION OF PLANNING BOARD CIP REQUEST

Ms. Annis asked the Board what they would like to consider for this year's request for the Capital Improvements Program (CIP). Mr. Hartman commented that last year it ended that \$5,000 was added to the Capital Reserve Fund for Exit 9 Improvements. Ms. Annis said that the planning and feasibility has been completed, so the \$15,000 from last year is no longer necessary. She said that the people from the State said that a working engineering drawing was necessary, and that was probably going to cost about \$150,000. However, she said, if the grant was received from the State, the town would be reimbursed 80% of the cost of doing the drawing. She asked the members if they thought that this estimate was high for a working drawing. Mr. Mical said he thought so, but he didn't know what the State would want on the drawing since they haven't responded to any of our requests. Ms. Annis said she had sent the letter on June 11 to them stating that we are in the process of preparing our request to the CIP but has received no response about any availability of any State funds to assist with the project. Mr. Hartman said that the engineering drawings for Connors Mill Bridge, for example, cost about \$150,000. He said that the Mill Street project drawings cost over \$100,000. He said he would not be surprised if an engineering drawing for a major improvement in the Intervale Area would be around \$150,000. Mr. Davies said it would be consistent with what other engineers have estimated. He agreed that part of the issue is what scope is needed, and wondered if the proposed plans could be scaled down, thus reducing the potential cost of the engineering drawings. Ms. Annis said that there is a verbal agreement from the State that any of the three Hoyle & Tanner proposals would be acceptable. However, she said, the individual from the State then started asking specifics and wondering why certain things were included which, if removed, would reduce the cost.

There was a further discussion about how to find the lowest cost solution that would still be acceptable to the State. It was agreed that it was still not going to be a small amount of money.

Mr. Hartman said that some engineer signed off on the current design of the intersections. He said that without some real need that it must be done now, then the Board is going around in circles. He said that he doesn't think that it has to be done now. He said to spend \$1 million to fix that intersection is premature,

considering the many other projects in town that are needed and are more important to fix. He said that the intersection benefits commercial properties. He said that he understands there are traffic flow problems, but he said he has seen no problem in getting through that intersection. He said that he thinks that if this is a problem, then Demoulas, Evans, and the others ought to be interested in solving it because people can't get to their businesses or out of their businesses. Mr. Violette said the biggest problem is getting out and trying to head east. Mr. French suggested significantly reducing the speed limit through the area and wondered if that would help to solve it. He agreed that he has not had a big problem getting out of the driveway heading east. He said that he knows that some of the older people in town have a problem. Mr. Hartman said there are probably some simpler things to do that don't cost \$1 million. He said that perhaps the Board should concentrate on those simpler things. He said, for example, Evans has two major driveways and they only need one major driveway. He said if it were designed so that the one directly across the street from the Market Basket driveway remains and the other is closed, that might help a lot. He asked why we can't pressure the State to cut out one of the driveways to solve a problem. He said that the other driveway out of the Park and Ride could be removed and still have the area work. Mr. Violette said that that is a problem for the State because they were told by the State that they need to be able to get a bus through the lot and to close off that one exit, significant reconstruction would have to take place to create a turnaround for a bus. Mr. Hartman said that he thinks that the Planning Board has a lot more important things to solve than to worry about that intersection anymore.

Mr. Violette asked if Mr. Hartman would give a decision to that effect from the Board of Selectmen because it was handed to the Planning Board by them. Ms. Annis said that from the Charrette and the Corridor Study, the Planning Board was asked by the Selectmen to try to solve the problem. Mr. Duhamel said that Mr. Hartman has left out the safety factor in his comments. Mr. Hartman said that most of the accidents happen at the I-89 intersection. He said they don't happen at the intersection of Market Basket Plaza, but they happen inside the parking area. He said that they happen when people are coming in and out of McDonalds and in and out of Irving. He said there have been a couple of accidents at that intersection with Route 103. Mr. Duhamel said that the intersection is confusing and the speeds that are driven can make it more dangerous. Mr. Davies asked about the lots that have been approved and have not yet been built on. He said that the future could result in double or triple the flow of traffic when those lots are developed. He said that what the Planning Board is trying to do is plan ahead so that when it does occur, there will be a plan where the parties involved will have to allocate the responsibility. Mr. Watts said that it does benefit the businesses that are now there. He said that he sees no money coming right away, so he suggested asking the Selectmen to say that they don't need to solve this yet. Ms. Annis said that once development starts, in six months, things could be up and running. She said if that happens, then we will not have a plan in place to handle it. There was a discussion about the exaction fees and driveway permits and the state of the economy.

Ms. Annis asked if the Board wanted to add money to a capital reserve fund for this purpose. She said that she thought that \$10,000 should be requested to add to the fund. Mr. Watts suggested that another \$5,000 be added. There was a discussion about timing of the request for money. Mr. Mical said that part of the purpose of the CIP is to plan and prepare for a project over future years. He said if it is in the CIP, then, at least it's listed and when it's needed, even if it hasn't been approved by the Selectmen, it can be shown that there was an attempt to plan for it. Ms. Annis said that, in order to get matching funds, the State requires that we have at least initiated a fund, and, even then, the matching funds may not be available for two years. Mr. Duhamel said that setting money aside shows the good faith that they require for the matching.

There was a discussion about whether or not putting \$5,000 in for this year's contribution would qualify for the CIP criteria. Mr. Davies commented that the bottom line total cost estimate would have to be changed, too. There was a discussion about what to call the request. It was decided that it would be to add to the \$5,000 from last year which is in the existing Capital Reserve Fund for Exit 9 Improvements. It was agreed to clarify the purpose of the fund by adding Intervale Area in parentheses in the CIP request. Finally, it was agreed that the requested addition would be \$10,000 and it would be for one year and then look at it again next year because the CIP is revised every year. Ms. Annis said that there is no known source of funding right now. The total cost would be \$150,000 and will be identified as Total Estimated Cost.

4. REVIEW OF 2008 WARRANT ARTICLES – DAVID HARTMAN

Mr. Hartman said he had nothing to hand out but thought this would be an excellent time to discuss whether or not the Board wants to re-submit the proposed changes to the Zoning Ordinance from last year. He said they were narrowly defeated and if 10 people had voted differently, almost all of the articles would have passed. He said he would be willing to re-work the articles so they're not so cumbersome. He said that many people said they did not understand what they were voting on. He said that the Building Code needs to be passed in total because the existing one is out of sync with the State Building Code. He said that the Selectmen have to enforce the State law which was incorporated in the proposed new Town Building Code. He asked the Board what they thought would make things go better next year. He said that he did not think that the articles should be set aside and not re-presented, especially when some of the changes represented inconsistencies in the Zoning Ordinance. There was a discussion about how simply a warrant article could be worded and still be legal. The consensus was that the Local Government Center will be asked for advice on this issue and to try to come up with wording to explain the rationale behind the articles being proposed.

5. CONCLUDE SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS ON ROADS – RICK DAVIES

Copies of the proposed changes to the regulations and the suggestions from Allan Brown are attached as Attachment A and Attachment B, respectively.

Mr. Davies asked about going through the proposed changes line by line in conjunction with Allan Brown's latest comments. It was agreed to proceed in that way. Ms. Annis confirmed that whole new sections are being proposed to the Subdivision Regulations, resulting in having to re-number the subsections. Mr. Davies agreed. He said that the number 1 should be added before the small a. under Streets, which is Subsection A. under Section VI of the Subdivision Regulations. He noted that there were numerous formatting problems that would have to be corrected in the final version. There was a discussion about how to insert and whether to insert sections based on Allan Brown's suggestions. Mr. Violette asked about the 4" heavy-duty pavement system mentioned in subsection A.8.c. and wondered if the wording could be changed so it would not seem to be required. Mr. Davies said it is theoretically to apply to someone who is building something that the Town will be acquiring. There was no change agreed to on this item.

Ms. Annis asked about Section A.1.b. referring to the Professional Engineer. She said that the Planning Board has the right to require a Professional Engineer. She said that it is not just the Selectmen. Mr. Davies said that the word Selectmen was included because of the definition of the word Selectmen which includes the Selectmen, the Planning Board acting as their agent, or another agent designated by the Board of Selectmen.

Mr. Duhamel departed at this point and Ms. Annis asked Mr. French to act in Mr. Duhamel's place.

There was a discussion on the issue of who could require the professional engineer and it was agreed to refer back to Section 3.(b)(2) of the Subdivision Regulations where the Planning Board has the authority to require the involvement of a professional engineer. The wording would be: "b. Professional Engineering shall be required as per Section 3.(b)(2)." Mr. Davies said he would do some more research on the definition of Selectmen and come up with a scenario for the Board.

During the discussion it was noted that there is a difference in numbering which in the Subdivision Regulations under Section III B. Fees between the copy that is on the Town website and what some of the members have as official copies. It was agreed that this is a formatting correction and it will be made when the new copy of the Subdivision Regulations is prepared.

It was agreed that the following wording will be added to VI A.1.e.: "Warner requirements shall govern; however, if not indicated specifically herein, current NHDOT Standard Specifications shall be adhered to unless otherwise approved by the Public Works Director."

It was agreed to remove the word "rubbish" from VI A.6. since it would be included in "other unsuitable materials."

Under item 12, of VI A., it was agreed to change 2" of stone dust to 1" of stone dust.

Under item 13, it was agreed to change the wording to read as follows: "Guardrails: Guardrails shall be required to comply with NHDOT slope requirements; or where the slopes are excessive or the situation warrants guardrails in the opinion of the Director of Public Works after consultation with the engineer."

Mr. Davies commented that Drainage has been crossed off but it is due to the formatting problems and should not be deleted at VI B. He noted that a new section was added to VI E. to comply with the Warner Village Water District. He noted that the street type, Arterial had been deleted since, if one is to be constructed, the Public Works Director will be thoroughly involved with a lot of construction and a lot of engineering, so the requirements in this document would not be applicable. Mr. Watts suggested deleting the column with Class A, as well, and that was agreed to.

It was agreed to change VII A. 7. a. to read "Hammerhead Turnaround" and change all "T" type references to "hammerhead." Subparagraph b. was agreed to read "Rounded Turnarounds."

Mr. Davies said that Mr. Brown wanted to include an additional comment under the "All Roads" section. After some discussion, it was agreed not to add the comment about the 60' right of way varying. The other item that Mr. Brown requested, number 2 on Attachment 2, was added to subparagraph 9 (Shoulders and Slopes) in Section VI A, as follows: "On all the road sections the minimum depth of drainage swale on both sides is three feet below the top of finish Surface Treatment or as agreed to in consultation between the engineer and Director of Public Works."

There was a short discussion about adding verbiage related to Class VI roads at Mr. Brown's request and it was agreed not to add anything about Class VI roads because the Planning Board does not deal with Class VI roads; the agreement was it is the Selectmen who deal with them and their upgrades.

It was agreed that Ms. Lightfoot will proceed to add the changes as discussed and Mr. Davies will review the definition of Selectmen and determine whether to change other references to the Board of Selectmen in this section. Mr. Davies will communicate with Ms. Lightfoot about these items before the additions are made and sent out again to the Board members.

6. MINUTES

Mr. Hartman MOVED to approve the minutes of the June 1, 2009 meeting. Mr. Mical seconded. There was no discussion. The motion was PASSED.

Mr. Mical MOVED to approve the minutes of the June 15, 2009 work session. Mr. Hartman seconded. Mr. Davies requested that a correction be made to page 6 where he is quoted as saying driveways to change the reference to roads. The motion was PASSED as amended.

7. SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

Ms. Annis said that Mr. Duhamel had had to leave, so there is no report on the conversation with the Energy Committee. She asked Mr. Mical for a report on the CIP Committee. Mr. Mical said that the CIP Committee met for a second time at the request of the members. He said that the form has been modified to include a couple of other items and it was mailed with a memo, a list of the CIP Committee members and a copy of their prior year's requests to all the departments and organizations. He said that the CIP Committee members are supposed to meet with their designated Departments or Organizations soon and it is hoped that the majority of the things will be returned by August 3.

To follow up on the last meeting's discussion on the CIP Committee members, Mr. Mical MOVED to appoint the following members to the CIP Committee: Barbara Annis, Peter Wyman, David Karrick, Martha Bodnarik, Laura Buono, Jeanne Hand and Ed Mical. Mr. Hartman seconded. The motion was PASSED unanimously with no discussion.

8. COMMUNICATIONS AND MISCELLANEOUS

Ms. Annis said that the Local Government Cluster Workshop is having an "Affordable Housing Workshop" in Dunbarton on July 22 and asked if anyone wanted to attend. Mr. French said he would like to attend and took the information. She said that there is a request for nominees for a Municipal Volunteer Award from the Local Government Center and asked if anyone had any nominations. There were none.

Mr. Davies added that he had received an e-mail today from the Central NH Regional Planning Commission that Sharon Wason is no longer in their employment. He said that Michael Tardiff will be the interim director. Mr. Violette said that the contracts for Phase II of the Master Plan have been received and will be forwarded to the Selectmen's Office for their signatures. He said that Mr. Tardiff signed those.

Mr. Davies asked if the two driveway permits that are outstanding for Warner Aggregates and the Akins property have been received. Ms. Lightfoot said no.

9. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Carolyn Stoddard requested that copies of documents being discussed be distributed to those interested at the meetings. It was agreed that an extra copy would be made for each meeting and given to her or other interested members of the public at the meeting.

10. SUMMARY OF NECESSARY CHANGES TO ORDINANCE AND REGULATIONS AS RESULT OF CNHRPC AUDIT 2008 – RICK DAVIES AND BARBARA ANNIS

Ms. Annis said that neither she nor Mr. Davies could find anything that needed to be addressed in the Ordinance and Regulations. She said that all changes would be items that are missing in the Master Plan but that are in our Ordinance and Regulations. So, she said, they decided that there is no action necessary from this for the Ordinance and Regulations.

11. DEFINITIONS AND CONFLICTS – RICK DAVIES

Mr. Davies reviewed his listing of conflicts that he had noted. This listing is included as Attachment C. Where the alphabetical order is off in the Zoning Ordinance, he said he thought it could be left as it is, although, when it is changed, it could be put in as a clerical correction in the warrant article.

There was a discussion about making the placement of the definitions sections in the various sets of regulations consistent. It was discussed and the suggestion was made and agreed to that the definitions sections should probably all be in Section II, as they are in the Zoning Ordinance. Ms. Annis asked about making one list of Definitions to be referred to by all regulations. Mr. Watts suggested making a document called "Definitions." Mr. Davies said that there are items that are referred to in the regulations that are not referred to by the Ordinance which would make it awkward, and changing it would require a warrant article. He suggested putting the definitions in one set of regulations and then refer back to that in all others. Mr. Violette suggested preparing a checklist where all the references are listed and then when things change, that would be referred to and follow to be sure that all changes are made where they need to be.

Mr. Davies said that the proposal is to change the Site Plan Review Regulations definition of abutter to be the same as the Subdivision Regulations since those include the 200 foot requirement for inclusion as an abutter. The other members agreed. Other items were reviewed and agreed to by the Board, except for number 11, which will include the first sentence, but not the second part after the word, "OR." Under the Site Plan

Review Regulations issues section, it was agreed under number 3, not to change "floodplain regulation" to "Flood Plain Ordinance."

Mr. Davies said that the proposed changes to the Building Code on the list have already been proposed in the changes made last year, so there is no additional change to be suggested from the Site Plan Review Regulations related to the Building Code. The members agreed.

There was a discussion about using the words "flood prone" and it was agreed to use "flood plain" in the definitions and in the two references in Section XV of the Site Plan Review Regulations.

Under the Zoning Ordinance issues section, it was agreed that number one has already been done in the Subdivision Regulations. It was also agreed that separate work sessions will be needed for the Shoreline Protection Act issues. Mr. Davies said he would work on preparing a short write-up on this issue. It was agreed that the façade definition issue will be covered at a separate work session item by Mr. Violette, Mr. Duhamel and Mr. French.

In regard to the Wireless Telecommunication issue, it was agreed to make the Wireless Telecommunications Site Plan Review be formatted more like the Site Plan Review Regulations.

Ms. Annis said that the Energy Committee will be meeting with the Board at 7:00 p.m. on July 20th. She said that Mr. Violette, Mr. Duhamel and Mr. French will also be presenting a summary report on Height Regulation, Area Regulation, and the Area B-1 Shops. She said that Mr. Violette will be covering the Davisville Commercial area. She said that she will be covering Multiple Buildings. Finally, she said that Mr. Davies will be covering Work Force Housing. She asked the members to provide copies of items to be distributed to the members before the meeting to the Planning Board office no later than Monday, July 13th, at noon. Ms. Lightfoot added that 8:00 am on July 15th would also suffice. She said she will e-mail the members to remind them. Mr. Davies suggested preparing a short discussion of what the issues are for each item, discuss them and then plan on fleshing out proposals with specific suggestions from there.

There was no further discussion. Mr. Mical MOVED to adjourn. Mr. Watts seconded. The motion was PASSED unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

ATTACHMENT A

Section VI Required Improvements

A. Streets

- a. Design conform to current Town of Warner Subdivision Regulations. These are the minimum design requirements.
 - b. Professional Engineering shall be required at the discretion of the Selectmen.
 - c. All design, testing, inspection, investigation, and other costs shall be borne by the applicant.
 - d. Road cross-sections, cul-de-sac design options, and design requirements shall be followed as summarized in the Town of Warner Subdivision Regulations (also see Appendix B).
 - e. If not indicated specifically herein, current NHDOT Standard Specifications shall be adhered to unless otherwise approved by the Public Works Director.
2. Subgrades: All topsoil, trees, stumps, brush, roots, boulders, rocks, ledge, unsuitable soils, and other deleterious materials shall be stripped and removed to provide proper subgrade area, proper slopes, and good visibility. Ledge, boulders, and rock shall be removed to flush or below bottom of subgrade. Minimum tree clearing width will be determined following consultation with the Director of Public Works. The subgrade shall be shaped and compacted evenly in 12" layers as shown on the profile (see Appendix B). All soft and spongy places (unsuitable soils) shall be excavated to such a depth as shall be necessary to stabilize the foundation of the road and refilled solidly with proper subbase material (bankrun gravel NHDOT 304.2) as directed by the Selectmen. An appropriate stabilization fabric may be considered by the design team in certain conditions to stabilize a subbase subject to approval by the design engineer and the Selectmen or as deemed necessary by the Selectmen. Other proper subgrade fill material may be proposed by the applicant's engineer subject to the approval from the Selectmen. Compaction is to be obtained by use of approved rollers and equipment, to at least 95% of the Standard Proctor Density (ASTM-698). Said density to be checked by an approved Testing Service (using nuclear testing equipment) and the results of all tests are to be provided to the Selectmen for incorporation into the proper records. All costs incurred for the conduction of such tests, shall be the responsibility of the Developer/Contractor.
 3. Before any clearing has started on the right-of-way, the center line of the new road shall be staked and side-staked at 50 foot intervals. Sidestakes to be set back off the right-of-way at right angles from the centerline so as to be out of the construction area and with stationing and distances to the centerline of the road.
 4. Limits of clearing shall be marked by stakes or flagging. Distance from the centerline to be obtained from the cross-section.
 5. After clearing is done and before excavation is started, elevations shall be taken on the tops of sidestakes. Cuts and fills shall be marked on sidestakes.
 6. Embankments: Embankments shall be formed of suitable material placed in successive layers of not more than twelve (12) inches in depth for the full width of the roadway cross-section and shall be compacted uniformly and sufficiently to prevent settlement. Stumps, trees, rubbish, and other unsuitable materials of substance shall not be placed in the fill. The fill shall be ~~allowed to~~ thoroughly compacted ~~settle~~ before applying gravel. Compaction is to be obtained by use of approved rollers and equipment, to at least 95% of the Standard Proctor Density (ASTM-698). Said density to be checked by an approved Testing Service (using nuclear testing equipment), and the results of all tests are to be provided to the Selectmen for incorporation into the proper records. All costs incurred for the conduction of such tests shall be the responsibility of the Developer/Contractor.

7. Slopes: The Public Works Director after consultation with the engineer shall determine the grade of slopes and set-back of ledge faces. Stone, rip-rap, jute mat, mulch, or other appropriate material shall be used to control erosion.
8. Base and Subbase Course: The base course shall not be laid until the subgrade has been proof rolled and inspected by the Selectmen. The base course shall conform to the typical sections. Base course shall be laid in layers not to exceed twelve inches. Compaction is to be obtained by use of approved rollers and equipment, to at least 95% of the Standard Proctor Density (ASTM-698). Said density to be checked by an approved Testing Service, and the results of all tests are to be approved by the Town for incorporation into the proper records. All costs incurred for the conduction of such tests, shall be the responsibility of the Developer/Contractor. Subbase layer shall be bank run gravel (NHDOT item #304.2) for a minimum depth of 18". The base layer shall be crushed gravel (NHDOT item #304.3) for a minimum depth of 12". ~~Crushed gravel depth shall be a minimum of 18" of bank run gravel, no stone larger than 5". Gravel on top layer shall be a minimum of 6" of 1.5" crushed bank run gravel.~~

Hot Bituminous Concrete Pavement: 3" minimum N.H. per NHDOT Standards for road and bridge construction.

- a. Base Course = 2" (after compaction) Type "B"
- b. Wearing Course = 1" (after compaction) Type "E"
- c. A 4" heavy-duty pavement system should be considered where heavy commercial traffic is expected.
- d. All utility trenching in existing paving shall be backfilled with appropriate gravels and compaction. Pavement patching shall have edges sawcut, edges covered with liquid asphalt emulsion, and a full depth patch installed. Complete removal and installation of another patch may be required at the discretion of the Director of Public Works.
9. Shoulders and Slopes: Shoulders and slopes shall be constructed in the same manner as described above as noted on the typical cross sections or as directed by the Selectmen.
10. Roadway Width: Centerlines of roadways shall coincide with centerlines of street rights-of-way and shall have the dimensions shown in Appendix B. All travel surfaces shall have a minimum of 24' of travel surface with 3' of gravel shoulders.
11. Curb: Where used for sidewalks, curb shall be 5" by 17" vertical granite. Where used to direct storm water flow and at interception's radius curves, 4" by 11" sloped granite curve may be use in lieu of vertical granite curb.
12. Sidewalks:
 - a. Sidewalks shall be constructed with similar preparation to street construction. Subbase gravel shall be 12" of bankrun (NHDOT 304.2). Base gravel shall be a minimum of 4" of crushed (NHDOT 304.3). All compaction criteria used in street construction apply.
 - b. Sidewalk surface shall be 2" hot bituminous asphalt (NHDOT type E), 4" reinforced concrete (4500 psi with 6x6 2.9x2.9 wire mesh, or pavers set on 2" of stone dust.
 - c. Provide ADA complying curb-cuts and warning surfaces as required. Provide proper pitched to sidewalk for ADA compliance.
 - d. See typical sidewalk cross section in Appendix B
13. Guardrail: Guard rails shall be required here the slopes are excessive in the opinion of the Director of Public Works after consultation with the engineer.
14. Traffic control: Traffic control signage, cross walks, painted striping, and painted symbols shall be provided.

15. Electric, telephone, cable TV, internet, and similar systems are encouraged to be installed underground. Comply with Zoning Ordinance requirement for Schedule 80 conduit. Install at a minimum depth of 36".

B. Drainage

1. Underdrains: Underdrains shall be installed where the character and composition of the soil in the roadbed and other areas of the subdivision render such installation necessary in the opinion of the Selectmen. These underdrains shall consist of perforated ~~metal~~ schedule 40 PVC pipe ~~or perforated fiber pipe~~ of a minimum six (6) inches in diameter enclosed in the center of 24" of $\frac{3}{4}$ " crushed stone all wrapped in filter fabric and laid in the bottom of a trench at such depth and width as may be necessary. The trench shall be filled with clean bank run gravel, or equivalent material approved by the Selectmen.
2. Storm drains, culverts catch basins: Storm drains, culverts and related installations, including catch basins and drop inlets, shall be installed within or without the subdivision as appropriate to permit unimpeded flow of all natural water courses, to insure adequate drainage of all low points along streets, and to intercept storm water runoff along streets at intervals reasonably related to the extent and grade of area drained. (Where required, catch basins may be on both sides of the roadway on continuous grade at intervals of approximately three hundred (300) feet.) Drainage improvements shall meet the specification of AASHTO (American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials) in regard to material and strength requirements. Catch basins and drop inlets shall be equal to New Hampshire Standard Type A or acceptable to the Selectmen. Load capacity shall be per NHDOT standards. Storm sewer pipes shall be a minimum 15" diameter reinforced concrete or plastic, and culverts shall be a minimum of 15" diameter reinforced concrete, bituminous coated corrugated galvanized steel, or plastic and shall have a minimum four (4) foot (or depth approved by the Director of Public Works) cover over all pipes. Headwalls on inlets and outlets shall be either of concrete or rubble masonry.
3. All culvert work shall have adequate drainage ditches to and from culverts with concrete or rubble masonry headwalls. Drainage ditches shall be lined with grass or rip-rap. All driveways shall have culverts unless waiver granted by the Public Works Director.
4. Erosion protection: Erosion control stone shall be provided in ditches where soil or velocity conditions warrant protection from erosion as determined by the Selectmen. Stone rip-rap, jute matting, mulch, or other appropriate materials shall be used to control erosion of slopes.
5. Any condition that is found unsatisfactory shall be resolved to the satisfaction of the Director of Public works.

C. Topsoil and Seeding:

Topsoil moved during the course of construction shall be redistributed to provide at least four (4) inches (measured after consolidation) of cover to all areas of the subdivision and shall be stabilized by seeding and mulching or planting. No topsoil shall be removed from the subdivision site, unless specifically authorized by the Board.

Topsoil shall be limed, fertilized, seeded, and mulched. Scarify and reseed until full healthy grass is accepted by the Public Works Director.

D. Monuments

Monuments shall be set on the right-of-way lines, at the beginning and end of the project, beginning and end of curves, angle points, and on tangents with a maximum distance between bounds of 500 feet. Such bounds to be stone 4" x 4" x 36" long. The bound shall be flush with finished grade in lawn areas and 4" above grade in wooded or undeveloped areas. No permanent monuments shall be set until all construction which would disturb or destroy the monuments is completed. Bounds shall be set by a registered professional engineer or land surveyor. Similar monuments shall be installed on

all front lot corners at the right-of-way line and shall be installed upon the completion of the road construction but prior to the issuance of any Building Permits. The front lot corners for lots fronting on existing streets shall also be marked with similar monuments, at the right-of-way line. All rear lot corners shall be marked with permanent objects, i.e., iron pipes, iron pins, monuments, etc.

E. Water and Sewer Facilities

1. Comply with the Warner Village Water District requirements for piping and system requirements if their system will be used by the development.
2. Common systems: Such systems proposed by a subdivider shall be of sufficient capacity to serve the subdivision and shall be designed and constructed for incorporation into the future town or precinct systems. All such facilities shall meet the requirements of and be approved by, the NH Department of Environmental Services, Division of Water Supply and Pollution Control, local and county health and public works agencies, and/or other public body having jurisdiction, and shall be accepted by the Selectmen.
 - a. Site plans to include:
 - (1). Five (5) foot contour intervals
 - (2). Well site with two hundred (200) foot protective radius. No subsurface disposal system permitted in this area.
 - (3). All lots numbered.
 - (4). Distribution system with water line sizes, pipe material, buried depth of piping, all valving and hydrant locations.
 - (5). Indicate type of establishment; mobile home park, apartment buildings, etc.
 - b. Complete quality analysis for the well water as conducted by the State Water Testing Laboratory within the past six (6) months.
 - c. Continuous 48-hour yield test log of the well showing water level and rate of pumping at one hour intervals.
 - d. Schematic drawing of pumphouse piping.
 - e. Detailed elevation of pumphouse facilities.
 - f. Detailed elevations of well design.
 - g. Storage facilities to be provided.
 - h. Characteristic curve for all pumps-well and booster.
 - i. The proposed water systems must meet all the requirements of the **N.H. Water Supply Engineering Section** at the date plans are presented to and accepted by the Planning Board.
 - j. Show that new and replacement water and sewer systems including on site and common systems be located, designed and constructed to minimize infiltration and avoid impairment when locations fall within 500 feet of a Flood Zone.
2. Individual Service: Individual wells and subsurface disposal facilities shall in all respects comply with all applicable local, county and/or state requirements including those of the **Division of Water Supply and Pollution Control**. In areas not currently served by common sewer systems, it shall be the responsibility of the subdivider to provide adequate information to the installation and operation of an individual sewerage disposal system (septic tank and drain field). The subdivider shall be required to provide the necessary equipment and labor for the making of these tests, required by local, county, and/or state authorities having jurisdiction.

- a. Show that new and replacement water and sewer systems including on site and common systems be located, designed and constructed to minimize infiltration and avoid impairment when locations fall within 500 feet of a Flood Zone.

F. Time Limit to Complete

At the time of the Board's approval of a Final Plat, the Board may specify a time limit, not to exceed three (3) years, within which all required improvements caused in the course of the work performed in the development of the subdivision shall be completed. In the event no time limit is specified by the Board or the Board of Selectmen, all such improvements and repairs shall be completed within (3) years of the date of such Final Approval. This time limit may be extended by mutual agreement of the subdivider and the Board of Selectmen.

Section VII Design Standards

The subdivision plat shall conform to the design standards set forth herein to encourage good development patterns within the Town. Whether either or both an official map or comprehensive plan has or have been adopted, the subdivision shall conform thereto with respect to streets, public open spaces and drainage ways.

A. Streets

1. **General Design:** All streets in the subdivision shall be designed to provide safe vehicular travel. Due consideration shall be also given to the attractiveness of the street layout in order to obtain an optimum livability and amenity of the subdivision. Provisions shall be made for the future extension of streets to adjoining unsubdivided property. Subdivisions that adjoin or include existing streets that do not conform to the width shown on the comprehensive plan or official maps or the street width requirements of these regulations shall dedicate the differential width along either or both sides of said existing streets in accordance with Section IV.A.10. If the subdivision is along one side only, one-half (1/2) of the differential width shall be dedicated. Setbacks shall be measured from the new or future right of way line.
2. **Naming:** No street shall have a name which duplicates or which is substantially similar to the name of an existing street. The continuation of an existing street, however, shall have the same name. Proposed street names shall be submitted to the Board of Selectmen for review and approval. Submittals shall be on the form and in the manner prescribed by the Selectmen. All street signs shall conform to current Local, State, and Federal Standards.
3. **Cross-Section:** Street right-of-way width shall be as follows:

<u>Type of Street</u>	<u>Minimum (ft)</u>
Collector (Class B)	70
Local (Class C)	60

Right-of-way widths and other applicable cross-sectional standards are shown in Appendix B.

4. **Alignment:** Street jogs at intersections shall have a minimum centerline offset of one hundred twenty-five (125) feet. The minimum centerline radii of curved streets shall be as follows:

<u>Type</u>	<u>Distance</u>
Collector (Class B)	300 feet
Local (Class C)	150 feet

All reversed curves on Class A and B streets shall be separated by a tangent at least one hundred (100) feet long. Streets shall be laid out so as to intersect as nearly as possible at right angles. No street shall intersect any other street at less than seventy-five (75) degrees.

5. Design of intersection roadway surfaces: Intersecting roadway pavements shall have a paved transitional area at all corners to accommodate turning movements according to the following radii:

<u>From:</u>		<u>Class A</u>	<u>Class B</u>	<u>Class C</u>
	To:			
Class B		50	30	30
Class C		30	30	30

For all intersections in commercial and industrial areas, this paved area shall have a minimum radius of fifty (50) feet.

Lot line corners shall be rounded at street intersections to be parallel to the intersection radii of the street surface.

6. Grade: The centerline grade for any street shall not be less than 0.5 percent. Maximum allowable centerline grades shall be as follows:

<u>Type</u>	<u>Percentage Grade</u>
Collector (Class B)	8%
Local (Class C)	10%

All changes in grade exceeding 0.5 percent shall be connected by vertical curves of sufficient length to afford adequate sight distances, in the opinion of the Board.

7. Deadend Streets: Deadend streets shall be provided with an approved type turnaround, as determined by the Planning Board to be a "Temporary" or "Permanent" need. Design for the turn-arounds shall be as follows:

- a. Temporary turnaround: The right-of-way width, per classification the roadway, shall be maintained to the end of the improvements and further, to the property line, if so ordered by the Board. A "T" type turnaround shall be constructed at the end of the road. Said "T" to have the dimensions shown on the typical.

The "ears" or "extensions" that form the "T" shall be deeded to the Town of Warner in the form of an Easement. The Easement shall stipulate that the Town has sole rights to use and maintain the area and that such Easement shall expire when those portions of the "T" are no longer needed. Those portions of the "T" no longer needed shall revert to owners of the abutting lots. For the purposes of frontage requirements only, that portion of a lot that would front on an extension of a street when the "T" is discontinued, or the width of the right-of-way for the "T", shall be counted and not the lines around the "T". This type of turnaround shall be used only when the possibility of extension is evident. This type of turnaround shall not be considered as a permanent turnaround.

Where a subdivider proposes to extend a street which currently ends in a T-type turnaround or other temporary deadend, it is the subdivider's responsibility to restore the temporary turnaround to through street standards. This includes, but is not limited to removing the "ears" or other maneuvering facilities where abutters desire and installing a suitable drainage system.

- b. Permanent turnaround: All streets that shall permanently terminate, as shown on plans, shall have a turnaround constructed to the following minimum specifications: The right-of-way shall be flared to form a circular, or partially circular section of roadway for the ease of maintenance and travel. The radius of the centerline of the pavement around the turnaround shall be a minimum of 100 feet. The "tear drop" shape is preferred over the "P" or "lollipop" shape. Pavement widths shall be the same as for the road servicing the development as will all other improvements within the turnaround area. The deed to the Town for the roadway shall include all lands within the outermost dimensions of the turnaround area. All drainage, signs, and other improvements within the area of the turnaround shall be as per guidelines contained within these regulations for "Required Improvements". (See Appendix B)

Where a subdivider proposes to extend a street which currently ends in a permanent turnaround, it is the subdivider's responsibility to restore the turnaround to "through street" standards, including, but not limited to, removing unnecessary street surface and subsurface, replanting areas previously used for street, restoring lot access, installing drainage facilities, and necessary title and deed work, as directed by the Board.

- c. General:
- (1) Delineator posts or reflectors of a design approved by the Selectmen, shall be furnished, located and installed as a part of the required improvements for all turnarounds.
 - (2) The roadways constructed within the turnaround areas, shall conform exactly with the design criteria contained in these Regulations.

B. Blocks

In general, block length shall not be less than 500 feet, nor greater than 1200 feet. In blocks over 1000 feet long, pedestrian crosswalks may be required in locations deemed necessary by the Planning Board.

C. Lots

1. Lot dimensions and area shall not be less than the requirements of the zoning ordinance, or as required by soil and/or topographic conditions.

2. Insofar as is practical, side lot lines should be at right angles to straight streets, and radial to curved streets.
3. Where extra width has been dedicated for widening of existing streets, lots shall begin at such extra width line, and all setbacks shall be measured from such line.
4. Where there is a question as to the suitability of a lot or lots for its or their intended use due to the presence of such factors as rock formations, steep slopes, unusual surface configurations, tendency to periodic flooding, poor drainage, unsuitable soil or soils, and inadequate capacity for sanitary sewer disposal, the Planning Board may withhold approval of such lot or lots.
5. For large lot subdivisions into which municipal or community water and/or sewer service may be extended in the foreseeable future, lots shall be designed with larger frontages to facilitate further subdivision at such time as water and/or sewer service becomes available.
6. Lots shall be graded in such a manner so as to prevent the collection of water at low points thereon.
7. Any land designated as Flood Zone or shown to be bog, marsh, swamp area, area of high water table or any similar situation, shall not be counted toward the required minimum buildable lot requirement, but shall be allowed to be added to lots if the Public Welfare and safety is protected. Any soils listed by the N.H. Water Supply and Pollution Control Commission as Group 5 or 6, in addition to the above conditions, shall not be counted towards the minimum buildable lot requirement.

D. Easements

1. Easements for utilities across lots or centered on rear or side lot lines shall be provided where necessary and shall be at least twenty (20) feet wide.
2. Where a subdivision is traversed by a water course, drainage way, channel or stream, the Board may require that there be provided a storm water easement or drainage right-of-way of adequate width to conform substantially to the high water lines of such water courses, drainage way, channel or stream, and provide for construction of other necessary facilities.

E. Subdivisions Subject to Article XIV of the Warner Zoning Ordinance ("Open Space Development"). The common open space in any subdivision developed under Article XIV of the Warner Zoning Ordinance shall meet the following standards:

1. The location of common open space shall be consistent with the objectives of the Warner Master Plan.
2. All common open space areas shall be part of a larger continuous and integrated open space system within the parcel being developed.
3. Developable building lots shall be grouped in contiguous areas sharing common boundaries, and shall not be scattered throughout the subdivision. (See Appendix C)
4. The location of developable lots and common open space shall take advantage of natural features of the landscape, and minimize the required construction of new roads and/or common driveways, as consistent with the purpose and goals of Article XIV of the Zoning Ordinance.
5. Common open space shall protect site features that have particular value in the context of preserving Warner's historic heritage and rural character, in compliance with the intent of this ordinance and the goals laid out in Warner's Master Plan. These features include, but may not be limited to:
 - a. Existing fields that are used for pasturage, production of hay and/or other crops, and other agricultural purposes.
 - b. Cellar holes, foundations, and other sites of historic value.

- c. Environmental or wildlife corridors, important wildlife habitat (such as deer yards), isolated natural resource areas, or other areas of environmental significance that may be identified by the Warner Conservation Commission, New Hampshire Natural Heritage Inventory, or other competent authorities.
6. Common open space shall generally be maintained in its natural condition, but may continue to be managed in accordance with historic land uses, including, for example:
- a. Management for timber production;
 - b. Production of hay and other crops;
 - c. Pasturage.

In addition, activities may be undertaken to improve or restore the overall condition and natural processes on the open space, including, for example: woodland management; reforestation; meadow or wetland management; streambank protection.

7. The common open space shall wherever possible connect or provide avenues of connection to other open space areas on adjacent land, including areas preserved by easement, town or state ownership, or other restriction on future development.
8. Common open space shall be laid out in a manner that assures the availability of access to the common open space by all who are entitled to such access.
9. Developable lots shall be laid out in a manner that precludes construction of new dwelling units on ridge tops and hilltops. Ridge tops and hilltops, including a buffer extending 100 feet (measured along the slope) downhill from any ridge top or hilltop, should be contained within common open space wherever possible.
10. No area of common open space shall be less than 30 feet in its smallest linear dimension or less than 10,000 square feet in area. Open space not meeting this standard shall not be counted toward the total required percentage of common open space as specified in Article XIV of the Zoning Ordinance. (See Appendix C)
11. Common open space shall be distributed throughout the subdivision to serve and enhance all dwelling units and groups of dwelling units.

ATTACHMENT B

Warner PB Board members:

I finally was able to stop Allan Brown long enough to get his comments on the current Road and Utility DRAFT June 1 Revisions everyone was previously given by Jean. Everything is OK except as follows:

1. On the "All Roads" section, the 60' ROW will vary with consultation with the Director of Public works.
2. On all the road sections the minimum depth of drainage swale on both sides is three feet below the top of finish Surface Treatment or as agreed to in consultation between the engineer and Director of Public Works.
3. Section VII item A.7.a – Allan is OK with the "T" street end designs
4. Section VI A.1.e – begin this with "Warner requirements shall govern; however if not indicated.....".
5. Section VI A.6 on Embankments: in forth sentence remove "rubbish,". (unsuitable will cover rubbish, etc)
6. Section VI A.12.b – sidewalks with "pavers set on 1" of stone dust". Allan says on the Mill Street project a consultant said too such stone dust can cause a lack of stability for the pavers.
7. Section VI A.13 – change to read – Guardrail: Guard rails shall be required to comply with NHDOT slope requirements; or where the slopes are excessive or the situation warrants guardrails in the opinion of the Director of Public Works after consultation with the engineer.

Allan would also like a section referring to his authorized upgrade on a class six road by an individual land owner. Add Section V1 A.16 – "Where authorized by the Director of Public Works, a class six road can be upgraded by an individual land owner using the specifications in this section with the difference the surface may be gravel with the top 3" of crushed gravel being $\frac{3}{4}$ " minus meeting the other gradation requirements."

ATTACHMENT C

Definition Issues

Zoning:

1. "Structure" and "Storage Container" - change to be in alphabetical order – should be able to do without vote, but would recommend doing at next reissuing or Zoning Ordinance.

Site Plan Review Regulations:

1. Consider putting "Definitions" into Section II and renumbering the existing II to III, and for all the remaining Sections. Definitions are currently at end of Regulation outside of its structure. Definitions are to the front of ZO and SDR (Subdivision Regulations)
2. "Abutter": change to same wording as SDR
3. "Building": Change to same wording as SDR – "Shall mean Building as Defined in the Town of Warner Zoning Ordinance."
4. "Building" or "Board" - change to be in alphabetical order
5. "Selectmen": change to same wording as SDR – "The Board of Selectmen for the Town of Warner, the Planning Board acting as agent for the Board of Selectmen, or another agent designated by the Board of Selectmen.
6. "Subdivision": change to same wording as SDR – differences are minor involving wording of easement utility items.
7. Add "Frontage" – use same wording as in SDR
8. Delete "Lot Frontage" – frontage is frontage and deleting does not appear to interfere with understanding.
9. Delete "Lot, Reverse Frontage" – frontage is frontage – "reverse" is not used in later sections.
10. Delete "Frontage Road" – frontage is frontage and deleting does not appear to interfere with understanding.
11. Add Statement at end of definitions: "Refer to the Town of Warner Zoning Ordinance for any undefined terms. The Zoning Ordinance governs where there are conflicts in Definitions." ...OR " For the purposes of these Site Plan Review Regulations, the meaning of terms or words used herein shall conform to the definitions found in the Town of Warner Zoning Ordinance or Subdivision Regulations, with the provision that if there is a contradiction in meaning, the more stringent of the two shall apply."

Subdivision Regulations:

1. Add Statement at end of definitions: Refer to the Town of Warner Zoning Ordinance for any undefined terms. The Zoning Ordinance governs where there are conflicts in Definitions.

Site Plan Review Regulations issues:

1. Audit issue page 7 - Section XI.C. state that surface materials shall not include cinder blocks and concrete is in conflict with BCO which permits these two materials for chimneys. – Recommendation by RD is no change as one is a safety code issue related to internal construction and the other an external esthetic issue.
2. Audit issue page 7 – Building Code Ordinance: Suggest adding clarity to Article II-A as to what a normal repair is. – Recommendation by RD is no change to proposed 2008 BCO.
3. Audit issue page 14 – "Flood Prone" – suggests conflicts or confusion in regulations – Recommended by RD is to change to "Flood Plain" under definitions and in two locations in Section XV. Also change "floodplain regulation" to "Flood Plain Ordinance" in same section.

Zoning Ordinance issues:

1. CNHRPC suggestion - Add Statement at end of definitions: "Refer to the Town of Warner Zoning Ordinance for any undefined terms. The Zoning Ordinance governs where there are conflicts in Definitions."
2. CNHRPC indicates the need to remove conflicts with Shoreline Protection Act – setback and vegetation verbiage conflicts with State regulations. (this will need to be a separate work session line item)
3. CNHRPC suggested writing definition of façade so as to provide consistency with BCO & SPR. (this will need to be a separate Work Session item).

Wireless Telecommunication issues:

1. Audit issue - SPR Regs' Wireless Telecom Facilities section XIII is similar to the separate Wireless SPR Regulations. – Recommendation by RD is to:
 - a. Retain paragraph headings, add paragraph at each "refer to Wireless Telecommunication Facilities Ordinance Site Plan Review Regulation", and delete all text in each paragraph.
 - b. Or, eliminate the WTCFO's SPR and incorporate in SPR Regs

APPROVED