

CITY OF LACONIA  
REGULAR PLANNING BOARD MEETING  
Tuesday, January 6th, 2026 - 6:30 PM  
City Hall - Armand A. Bolduc Council Chamber  
*Draft Minutes*

1/6/2026 - Minutes

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair: C. St. Clair called the meeting to order at 6:30PM

**2. MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE**

Gail Ober, Dave Ouellette, Rich MacNeill, Mike Conant, Gary Dionne, Michael DellaVecchia, Charlie St Clair, Amy Lovisek, and Jacob Roy.

**3. RECORDING SECRETARY**

Planner Technician Scott Pelchat

**4. CITY STAFF IN ATTENDANCE**

Planning Director Rob Mora, Assistant Planning Director Tyler Carmichael.

**5. ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING**

**5.1. Minutes from the 12/16/2025 Regular Planning Board Meeting**

G. Ober requested the minutes be tabled to allow for edits to be made to the minutes.

**6. CONTINUED APPLICATIONS AND PUBLIC HEARINGS FOR FORMAL CONSIDERATION**

**6.1. PB2026-021; 604 Endicott St N (128-252-3.1)**

**6.1 PB2026-021; 604 Endicott St N (128-252-3.1)** Charlie St Clair asked if the application was ready for acceptance. **PB2026-021 604 Endicott St** an amendment to the application to allow for an increase in the storm water detention pond. **Gail Ober** recused herself citing fiduciary relations with an abutter. **Charlie** sought a motion to accept this application **Michael DellaVecchia** motioned to accept Application PB2026-021 an amendment to the site plan for 604 Endicott St it was seconded by **Gary Dionne** and was accepted with 7 votes to the affirmative. **Agent Ethan Wood** introduced himself as well as **Engineer Mario Focareto** Agent Regarding what you have been asked to do this came before the planning board in 2023 it was approved by the planning board and was appealed to superior court the order from superior court as you can see in the staff report was to remand it but what happened is it got appealed to the supreme court and supreme court asked us to go to mediation. We reached a settlement agreement which you have a copy of. And that settlement agreement functionally required that we undertake different activities related to the storm water detention and ensure that any water that may get displaced because of the building is routed to the storm water detention area. Agent stated that the Abutter Pine Hollow Campground was the party that had sued the City of Laconia. Agent stated a review period of 60 days was given to allow their engineer to review and we submitted the amendment to the site plan pursuant to the settlement agreement thereafter. Agent referenced conditions that need to be included. Agent Summarized what we are asking you to do now is approve the amendment to the site plan which increases the size of the detention area, puts gutters on the buildings that route the water into the detention area and then increases the amount of green space. **Charlie St Clair** asked the Agent have you gone over this with your neighbors. Agent the settlement

agreement that was reached between the City of Laconia and my client and the abutter who sued has been complied with completely. **Michael DellaVecchia** is there a map and yes Engineer brought up the map to allow the board to see the proposed amendment on the site plan. **Charlie St Clair** if the pond was to overflow where does that water go? Agent so it would be challenging for that pond to overflow. Engineer stated it's important to understand what the water is doing before it reaches the retention pond. water cascades across Endicott St onto the subject parcel and around two buildings as it travels to the lower graded area behind the subject property. **Gary Dionne** when the original approval May 3rd, 2023, was, this was stated by Tyler and Ethan.

**Dave Ouellette** the overflow pipe and its location Engineer answered we were asked to move it as far as possible. to change it from a pipe style to a weir style to allow for flat discharge. This came from the agreement **Engineer** and **Gary** discussed the Weir for the discharge system. **Jacob Roy** inquired regarding the flow rate calculations it was found it was run twice with the latest calculations being submitted on January 13, 2025. This was confirmed by Rob Mora and by Ethan Wood.

### Planning Chair Charlie St Clair opened to public comment at 6:51PM

**Attorney Michael Tierney** spoke on behalf of his client Pine Hollow Campground. Michael Tierney greeted the board and inquired regarding the two letters he sent regarding this proposal. The attorney stated that site plans should be reviewed in their entirety and that with this amendment this board should make the applicant show each use that exists on the property as well as all calculations that may be needed for the entire property. The attorney stated Stormwater, Parking, and lighting as aspects that may affect his client's property. Michael spoke for a period in opposition to this amendment to see video for full narration. **Rich MacNeill**, a question for you. So, you're saying that their construction will increase the water flow? Michael No, I'm saying that they have not shown that they will not increase. **Rich MacNeill**, are prefilters required it was found to be no. **Tyler Carmichael** what happened is the board approved the site plan in 2023 as they had mentioned. They appealed to the Belknap superior court. The Belknap superior court did affirm portions of the site plan which they can do and then they remanded only the storm water portion back to the planning board. The only thing the court had questions about was storm water. that was basically going to come back to the board anyways had they not further appealed to the Supreme Court for the board to make additional findings of why they approved the storm water mitigation. **Charlie St Clair** getting back to the lighting, wasn't the lighting normally a consideration the lighting is pointing down and not out or up. **Tyler Carmichael** Yes, security lighting is exempt from our lighting regulations as well. But I will say that again the original site plan was approved by the board which includes parking, traffic, lighting, everything in the regulations that comes before your jurisdiction was already approved. The only thing that the court asked the board to look at again was storm water mitigation, which is why it's back before you know.

The only thing that the court had confusion over was storm water which they then appealed to the Supreme Court which led to the mediated settlement agreement which we've included in our conditions the conditions that the agreement says we needed to include. **Michael Tierney** disagreed with Tyler. **Charlie St Clair**, it sounds like that's what's been done. You're saying that was already done except for the storm water. **Tyler Carmichael** was decided on the superior court. They have appealed to the Supreme Court. However, at the Supreme Court **Rob Mora**, I agree with Tyler in every statement that he's made in our discussions with our own legal counsel, what he states is to our best recollection. We are not lawyers by any chance. it is accurate to the best of our knowledge. back to the pre-treatment uh that refers to the 2008 New Hampshire storm water manual volume two. **Dave Ouellette** Well, those are labeled as best practices. **Gary Dionne**, I do not recall seeing anything in your packet about the court decisions. Were those available? **Rob Mora** they are available. They are in the property file. We are more than capable of getting them or sending out copies to the board. Whatever the board desires, we can provide. **Charlie St Clair**. Well, I mean, I don't know how we can decide if we get all these questions out there and we're still missing something that You think may or may not help us. **Gary Dionne**, we have two different legal opinions And we are trying to decide who, if either, is right. And having seen the court decision. I do not know from what quoting is whether that is so or not so since I haven't read it. I mean, I've seen I thought it was a little more straightforward having read the settlement agreement, but uh if there's other issues there regarding both the Superior Court and Supreme Court decisions, I wouldn't mind seeing those before I make any decisions. **Charlie** That seems reasonable. **Gary** So perhaps I do not know if you want to continue with the hearing and uh. **Rob**, uh, well if I may uh we want to finish the hearing and listen to any comment and then we can conclude after the public.

**Gary** recesses the hearing and calls it back, calls it back to another date after we have had a chance to look at more documents. **Bob Heavey** The owner of Pine Hollow Campground spoke in opposition to this amendment to the approved site plan citing these concerns Storm Water, Parking and Lighting please see the full video for all comments provided by the abutter. **Engineer** rebutted the comments regarding drainage. I just wanted to give clarity to some of the comments from the other engineer on the drainage. Are you going to show the new plan there? I will. Okay. I am going to start with the existing. All right. So, the uh couple of comments that the other engineer had made. Um one was that we under showed or under or over evaluated the impervious amount on the existing conditions. And what he is saying is that there's some clarity I know that um the drainage is contentious but what he's saying is on my um post analysis on my pre-analysis of my hydro cad I showed this whole area being gravel and his comment is your existing conditions don't show that well our surveyor did not look at this land Like an engineer does he went out there and he said this clean gravel here and there's some weedy areas here and some clean gravel there and he shots as and when he when he drafted it up he drafted up gravel area gravel area when I went out there to look at it is compacted like people are parking on it as they're saying as this is a loading dock and they drive from this gravel to that gravel it is acting like impervious I modeled it as I saw it the most accurate way I can I did not make any revisions to the existing conditions plan. I did not see it to be necessary. I thought that the precondition I showed it the post condition. It was clear and fundamentally correct, and the engineer agreed with that. The other comment that the engineer had was that I missed a portion of pavement coming off the roadway which is not shown here. It would be somewhere over here. And he is right about that. It is about couple of parking spaces worthy of pavement, but it was missing in the precondition as well as the post condition. So, the effect is null. It is the same amount of water as I'm measuring coming in before we do anything, the same amount as measuring afterwards. So, he is looking for technicalities. That is what he found. But he agreed with the fact that this will not increase flow onto the property. And the last thing is to respond to the abutter's comment about um stating that zero water will come out of this pond. The storm water goal, the design storm water design goal is not to stop all water from leaving the site that would starve wetlands and have adverse effects. What we want to do is have the same amount of flow or just less of what is happening before work is done after work is done. So, there's really no difference of a new construction of a building being there and we have achieved that. We achieved it on the first submission that was approved and we achieved it again with a resubmission after we made the adjustments per the settlement agreement. So, those are the only outstanding questions that they had brought up about the drainage. I think they are technical and nitpicky, but they are fundamentally correct. **Charlie**, Okay. Thank you. **Agent**, do you have any questions. Engineer I am happy to hear comments. Agent, it is important to remember how we got here and that is you approved of the plan. That plan appealed to the Superior Court. The superior court made decisions and then the abutter appealed it to the supreme court. They appealed to them the entire decision by the superior court. When we went to mediation, we produced this settlement agreement. They had an opportunity to ask for anything else. They could have asked for parking. They could have asked for whatever they wanted. This is what they asked for. This is what we gave them. This is the agreement we reached. And this is the entire settlement. Your job as the board is to look at this settlement agreement and say this amendment to this site plan based on this settlement agreement, are we approving it or not? **Charlie**, do you know where the property line is? **Agent**, but I am not a surveyor. **Charlie** and the agent and engineer discussed pins monuments and markers regarding the subject property. Charlie stated However, I agree with Gary. We are missing something that would make it easier for us to understand the court's decision. Rob Mora advised So if I may, Charlie, please. If the board decides to table the application, can the board be clear with both applicants and staff of what they would like to move forward for the board to make decisions? **Charlie St Clair Gary Dionne Rob Mora spoke regarding tabling the application to the next meeting to allow for further review of the court documents and to allow the City's Legal advice to be conveyed to the board. Charlie Okay, so we will close the public hearing at 7:36.**

**Gary Dionne Motioned to table this application to the February 3<sup>rd</sup> Planning Board Meeting 6:30 PM and requested the planning department provide the board with the superior court ruling and Supreme court mediated settlement agreement. This motion was seconded by Amy Lovisek and was voted 7 votes to table and Gail was recused during the vote.**

## 7. NEW APPLICATIONS AND PUBLIC HEARINGS FOR FORMAL CONSIDERATION

### 7.1. PB2026-022 1206 Old North Main St. (974-404-7)

This application was tabled to allow for edits to be made and will be looked at during the February meeting.

## 8. CONCEPTUAL REVIEW AND PRESENTATIONS

### 8.1. Conceptual Review; 1085 White Oaks Road (163-241-8)

Attorney John Cronin started the presentation for the conceptual for the property at 1085 White Oaks Road. also present Peter Grenier, Tony Dionne, Nick Warring and Justin Kiernan. Justin gave the presentation for the conceptual and fielded the majority of the questions from the board. Charlie thanked the team for not calling it a village. A summarization of the conceptual would allow for a development of different structure types to be constructed at the former Surf Coaster property at the corner of White Oaks Road and Endicott St east. Justin referenced the slides to be used for the conceptual as well. Justin referenced overviews for views and structures as they tier through the grades of the property. Justin spoke regarding the main drive area that would enter at White Oaks rd. and exit onto Endicott as a possible through way. Justin spoke of possible mixed uses and amenities as well. Through open spaces and land use views may be created.

Comments from the board below.

Charlie St Clair asked how many people will reside their? Justin stated 275 People Charlie potentially 150 cars Justin Yes. Parking was discussed as well as the egress onto Endicott St By Charlie and Justin.

Gary Dionne inquired about ingress and egress options Justin stated this would come from a detailed conversation and possible study. Charlie Gary and Justin spoke regarding this. Charlie advised a turning lane be thought of on Endicott to allow for safer entry. Gary inquired if a state permit would be need to utilize Endicott and it was answered yes.

Rich MacNeill referenced traffic on Endicott as a current issue and also the elevation increase to Lakeview row as a potential concern. inquiring on the grade which at this time was not known. Justin responded as best as the answer could be given.

Gail Ober inquired will this be seasonal or would this be long term use? it was answered that these products would be for sale. Gail was concerned regarding school bus travel. also citing commercial use cold generate overuse of parking.

Gary Dionne asked regarding parking and if it would be completed prior to build out of the phases. Justin stated currently there is no start correlating to the numbers. also talked regarding greenspace as a needed calculation.

Gail what is the time frame Justin we will start the TRC and go from there. Gail positioned and asked for a site walk of the property. Gail also asked regarding greenspace and Justin stated that layer of research is not ready at this time.

Charlie St Clair requested the lighting be looked into and planned for as to not effect the surrounding area.

Rich MacNeill will some of these homes be accessed off of White Oaks rd. Justin Possibly if this can be included and will be talked upon in the TRC portion.

Gail Ober referenced all the development on White Oaks Rd at this time.

Dave Ouellette inquired regarding unit count Justin stated 150. and it was found that Dave had a prior iteration slide. Justin corrected Dave.

Gail asked if small retail would be asked for it was stated yes. Charlie thanked the team for the conceptual.

## **9. PLANNING DEPARTMENT MONTHLY REPORT**

R. Mora presented the monthly report to the Planning Board.

## **10. LIAISON REPORTS**

### **10.1. CITY COUNCIL**

### **10.2. LAKES REGION PLANNING COMMISSION**

The Board discussed Lakes Region Planning Commission and having them come and do a presentation.

### **10.3. CONSERVATION COMMISSION**

R. Mora explained to the board that we received our quote from NH DES for MILFOIL / Herbicide treatment. The grant will now be forwarded to City Council for final approval.

### **10.4. HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION**

R. Mora Discussed that once the Mayor appoints a new Councilor to Historic District Commission that the commission would resume.

## **11. OTHER BUSINESS**

## **12. ADJOURNMENT**

G. Ober made a motion to adjourn, it was seconded by M. DellaVechia; the board voted unanimous to adjourn. Meeting adjourned at 8:45 PM.