

CITY OF LACONIA
REGULAR PLANNING BOARD MEETING
Tuesday, [February] [3rd], [2026] - 6:30 PM
City Hall - Armand A. Bolduc Council Chamber
Draft Minutes

2/3/2026 - Minutes

1. CALL TO ORDER

C. St. Clair called the meeting to order at 6:31PM

2. MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

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

3. RECORDING SECRETARY

Planner Technician Scott Pelchat.

4. CITY STAFF IN ATTENDANCE

Planning Director Robert Mora and Assistant Planning Director Tyler Carmichael.

5. ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING

The prior meeting minutes were discussed and voted on this was done in two parts as two sets of minutes were to be reviewed.

5.1. Planning Board

G. Ober motions to accept the minutes from the December Planning Board, seconded by M. Conant.

M. Conant (yes) A. Lovisek (Yes), R. MacNeill (Yes), M. DellaVecchia (Yes), G. Dionne (Yes), D. Ouellette (Abstained) and G. Ober (Abstained). J. Roy was not seated as a voting member. The Board voted 5-0

5.2. Planning Board

D. Ouellette motions to approve the minutes from the January Planning Board Meeting, seconded by G. Dionne.

D. Ouellette (yes), G. Dionne (yes), A. Lovisek (Yes), M. DellaVecchia (yes), M. Conant (yes), R. MacNeill (yes) G. Ober (yes) J. Roy not seated as a voting member. the Board Voted 7-0 to approve.

6. CONTINUED APPLICATIONS AND PUBLIC HEARINGS FOR FORMAL CONSIDERATION

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

Gail Ober recused herself from the hearing for this application.

Chair Charlie St Clair, brought the application PB2026-021 for 604 Endicott St N to allow for an amendment to the site plan. to increase the storm water detention pond. C. St. Clair asked the staff the storm water is the reason for this discussion R. Mora stated the applicant submitted a revised drainage analysis dated march 21st 2023 revised 2025 showing a net decrease from the pre to the post development flow and it was done based off of our site plan regulation for the 24 hour storm event for the 2, 25, and 50 year storms. In conclusion was the proposed development will not create any adverse effects downstream in storm water flow rates or quality. Laconia's legal council, Laura Spector-Morgan, I felt the board might want to explain why it is only considering the drainage aspect of this. And perhaps you wanted me to explain why your only considering the drainage aspect. C. St Clair prompted the legal council to explain the drainage aspect. L. Spector-Morgan " That is because when this originally went to the superior court , the superior court found the only reason on which it remanded your decision on this application in the first place because it did not understand how you reached your conclusion on the drainage issue. Now, the campground did appeal that decision to the supreme court on various grounds , but the currently pending decision only relates to drainage. A mediation was held at the supreme court and the only issues that are addressed in the settlement agreement really relate to drainage. L. Spector-Morgan I think its appropriate for this board to consider its analysis on this application limited to drainage and in addition the only changes made to the plan relate to the drainage and therefore it is appropriate that you limit your review to the changes to the plan. so, i know attorney Tierney wanted to get up and tell you why you should consider other things. I know he has submitted letters telling you why you should consider other things. I just thought it might be appropriate for you to explain to the public and to attorney Tierney why you are not considering other things. C. St Clair expressed the Board questioned that drainage was the only factor to be dealt with as a board L. Spector Morgan yes drainage is the topic of discussion, C. St Clair stated we cant do a public hearing tonight anyway because it hasn't been posted. Steps for moving forward as the board were mentioned by Legal Council to the Board. Legal advised if the board were to reopen a public hearing it should remain on the topic of drainage because that is the only reason for the change.

Attorney Michael Tierney attempted to approach the podium to speak and was advised by C. St. Clair that no public comment was to be entered. M. Tierney "Respectfully seeing as you took testimony from the City Attorney i feel i have the right to respond" C. St. Clair advised the attorney of the rules and the attorney stated he thought it was an error to not allow him to speak.

C. St. Clair asked the board if any discussion Tyler Carmichael read into the minutes the staff report

Findings of Fact

1. The application is complete and consistent with State and City land use regulations.
2. The original site plan application was accepted as complete and conditionally approved by the Planning Board at its May 3, 2023 meeting.
3. Pine Hollow Campground appealed the Planning Board's decision to the Belknap Superior Court. The Court issued its ruling on November 20, 2023 which affirmed the Board's decision regarding application acceptance, parking, and traffic but remanded it back to the Board to clarify its findings regarding stormwater runoff mitigation.
4. Following further appeal to the New Hampshire Supreme Court, a mediated settlement agreement was executed between Pine Hollow Campground, the Applicant, and the City on March 19, 2024. The Applicant submitted this site plan amendment in accordance with that agreement.
5. The application, site plan, and stormwater management analysis report were reviewed by the Technical Review Committee (TRC) at its November 18, 2025 meeting. The TRC had no concerns regarding the application, amended plan, and stormwater management analysis report as it shows a net decrease from pre-development flow to post-development flow.
6. In accordance with the Superior Court's ruling and the mediated settlement agreement, the

Planning Board is only invoking its jurisdiction to review the amended site plan for the changes to the detention pond.

Staff Recommendation – Application Acceptance and Approval

The Planning Department recommends the Planning Board accept the application as complete and hold a public hearing on the application. After the public hearing has concluded, the Department recommends the Board discuss and vote to approve the application with the recommended conditions of approval.

1. **Settlement Agreement.** The applicant must adhere to the requirements and conditions outlined in the Pine Hollow and Tiki Plaza LLC Settlement Agreement dated March 19, 2024.
2. **Third-Party Inspection.** The Department of Public Works shall oversee a third-party inspection of the detention pond at the applicant's expense to confirm construction was completed in accordance with the approved plans prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy.
3. **Prior Conditions.** All conditions of the previous Planning Board approval which are not altered by this approval remain in effect.
4. **Completion Date.** The project and all associated conditions must be completed by no later than November 3, 2032. If all conditions are not met, nor any extension application filed with the Laconia Planning Department, by the completion date, this approval is null and void.

C. St Clair sought a motion : Amy Lovisek motioned to approve PB2026-021 604 Endicott St N to amend the previous site plan approval to increase the size and capacity of the stormwater detention pond. This motion was seconded by M. DellaVecchia.

A. Lovisek (yes), M. DellaVecchia (yes), D. Ouellette (yes), R. MacNeill (yes) M. Conant (yes), G. Dionne (yes), and J. Roy (yes). the Board voted 7-0. to approve.

7. CONCEPTUAL REVIEW AND PRESENTATIONS

7.1. Lakes Region Planning Commission Presentation

Shauna Saunders gave a conceptual presentation regarding the Lakes region planning commission. and the functions it provides. Currently three commissioners are allowed to you Myself S. Saunders T. Carmichael, and R. MacNeill. also transportation planning & Funding. Brownfields assessment, grant funding and writing, culvert and road review. 31 Member towns. 10 Year plan fundings. S. Saunders mentioned as well hazard waste day remediation that occurs within the city. Pricing and fees to be a member were discussed by S. Saunders. **The board asked these questions regarding the presentation.**

C. St. Clair. assistance with roads, Haz waste removal, who is the largest in the group who is the smallest? Laconia - Hill. Has anyone dropped out yes Alton but they have returned.

G. Dionne. Recycling help, S. Saunders stated yes we help with getting financing for the item to be used.

G. Ober. is the notice for hazardous waste in a private paper?. S. Saunders i believe we do. G. Ober commented regarding the Boat Wrap recycling. Could this help with the State School Project? State owned no conversation at this point.

R. MacNeill. advised that there are a range of items that are not utilized because of having City staff.

D. Ouellette. Inquired regarding how the membership works throughout and is it broken down into dues. Its based on population and assessed value. and it is annually 20K.

A. Lovisek. how is grant writing done? it is assessed by need and decided by LRPC of what will be provided.

R. Mora. A lot of great opportunities are provided by the LRPC. Haz Waste day is very important as we are surrounded by wetlands and highly sensitive areas.

M .Conant stated he has utilized the hazardous collection day and it is at the DPW building and is well used

Saunders did state that the Haz -waste does have an alternate cost attached to it. over and above the 20k annual dues.

See video for full narration

7.2. PB2026-029; 5 Hilliard Road; Conceptual Review

Michael Bousaleh gave the conceptual presentation for 5 Hilliard Rd. M. Bousaleh summarized the demo of the existing building to allow for the creation of 5 story 24 unit condominium building with elevator and outdoor parking for 26.

The Board asked these questions regarding the presentation.

C. St. Clair. lot size, buffer size, tree ownership, potential runoff. bring this plan to your neighbors. C. St. Clair concerned with placement on the lot. Had concerns with road access. C. St. Clair vocalized public concern referenced to him.

G. Dionne. Location of structure, location of parking lot. parking calculations. G. Dionne referenced current zoning values over the ask of performance zoning. 2 to 3 stories suggested and possible lesser unit count.

G. Ober. Do you have water and sewer on Endicott? Yes.

R. MacNeill. Do you have snow storage? Yes and also plantings to be used as a buffer and also dumpster location. Question to staff regulations regarding elevators. this was deferred to Code for the answer. Also if a generator is needed on this lot. If people own more than one car where do they park?. I agree with Amy something three stories no more.

D. Ouellette. agreed with Amy regarding her concerns for the lot.

A. Lovisek. Was concerned with height and also density(units). too much for the small area. Maybe 3 story's tall. will this be work force housing. it was answered no.

R. Mora. Does the board want to make a suggestion to the applicant of how he may meet some of the questions or advice given. R. Mora advised a traffic study would be needed for this development.

See video for full narration.

7.3. PB2026-030; 59 Doe Avenue; Conceptual Review

Dari Sassan and Kevin Lacasse gave the conceptual presentation for 59 Doe Ave. To allow for performance zoning and construct a 40 unit building on the property at 59 Doe Ave. Dari stated it was a 2.9 acre site in the CR district. to allow for two twenty unit buildings on site. Dari referenced the provided siteplans he has provided to the planning board. Dari referenced how the structural layout would be on the lot itself. Kevin Lacasse mentioned drive under parking with single floor living and to also have an elevator.

K. Lacasse mentioned ease of living as the design wheel behind this conceptual 83 spots were allowed for parking and K. Lacasse stated we provide more than less parking. K. Lacasse mentioned a study may give you the results you are looking for.

The Board asked these questions regarding the presentation.

C. St. Clair. What is the total height? 60 feet or less. My concern is traffic what can be done? the team referenced other options for egress. C. St. Clair referenced this will change the neighborhood. C. St. Clair inquired over total height. K. Lacasse advised of average height. C. St. Clair inquired about pervious area and it was found to be 58% where 60% is needed. C. St. Clair runoff is still a problem. How old is the house? old so it will need review regarding the age. C. St. Clair make room for sidewalks.

G. Dionne. Would these be rentals or would they be up for sale? K. Lacasse. for sale. Liked the underground parking aspect. Not the height overall. Where would snow storage be? D. Sassan Will be in future plans. Access easement was asked about.

G. Ober. Is this the only thing on Doe Ave? answer no. lot size ? answer 2.8 acres. Inquired regarding easement on the plan not opposed to the plan. But would like to see less surface parking. Any room for a retention pond? Yes.

R. MacNeill. Have you done something in the past with this design prior to this? the answer was no.

A. Lovisek. They should keep the parking they have opposed to G. Ober comment.

M. Conant design the traffic flow to egress at the top side over the lower egress to allow for better results. K. Lacasse spoke to M. Conant regarding and roadwork may need to be added as well. Reminds me of the Center Harbor Inn and i find that very appealing.

J. Roy wants the underground parking to remain.

R. Mora mentioned an exaction to be possibly used to allow for a road study.

See video for full Narration.

8. NEW APPLICATIONS AND PUBLIC HEARINGS FOR FORMAL CONSIDERATION

8.1. Subdivision Regulations Amendment: Site Security and Third-Party Review

Tyler Carmichael spoke regarding this site plan regulation T. Carmichael referenced the older outdated regs have been updated by the Planning Department. T. Carmichael referred to this as coming before you know to allow for a fix to be made regarding Escrow, site security and third-party review. This will bring both regs in line with each other and they will function more complementary to each other. T. Carmichael mentioned the new regulations have been reviewed by legal as well. Escrows and performance bonds referenced as well. R. Mora gave a review of what he saw that also led to this review and ultimate creation of the two regulation rewrites. Escrow dispersion was discussed as well as timelines to allow for this. R. Mora discussed how painstaking the return process is now. C. St Clair opened to public comment at 8:30PM and with no comment it was closed at 8:30 PM

G. Ober motioned to accept the regulation as written this was seconded by R. MacNeill and was this was voted unanimously 8 yes votes to 0.

8.2. Site Plan Review Regulations Amendment; Site Security and Third-Party Review

C. St. Clair inquired why was the money not utilized and it was stated money for needs to be used for the subject project and it is not a slush fund for other items. R. Mora this was submitted to allow for these fixes to take place. And the labor hours to go into this current process is very time consuming. G Ober can you explain what is the difference between site plan and zoning ordinance to the public who may not understand it. R. Mora not every board can pass a regulation This Board (Planning Board) this board can govern its own regulations of how development is to occur. That's given to them by state law. An ordinance is a law that is adopted by your legislative body or City Council and that's a law that must be followed unless its deviated from. If it is from this board a waiver may occur. T. Carmichael stated min requirements over regulations which may effect design over use. R. Mora used the example this is how we want the lots to look.

D. Ouellette asked how long they are to be held. 6 years was the answer. C. St Clair opened to public comment at 8:31 PM and with no public comment it was closed at 8:31.5 PM. A. Lovisek made the motion to accept the regulations as written and it was seconded G. Dionne and was voted 8 votes yes and 0 votes no.

9. PLANNING DEPARTMENT MONTHLY REPORT

9.1. PLANNING DEPARTMENT REPORT

R. Mora presented the planning department staff report. Citing current staffing levels within the department. RFP is out for the bandstand, rewrites on development standards. R. Mora referenced back to a prior meeting where a storm water manual was discussed the NH stormwater manual dated 2008 and it was found the updated 2025 is the more current and our current regs have no requirement at this time. This will not be a quick process. The Master plan steering committee as well as the historic district committee was mentioned as well. G. Ober can LRPC help you with your rewrites. R.Mora no.

10. LIAISON REPORTS

10.1. CITY COUNCIL

N/A

10.2. LAKES REGION PLANNING COMMISSION

R. MacNeill My feeling it does not bring value and our staff handles most if not all and it does not bring value. Questions arose for when we pay each year. Staff answered as when the dues are scheduled to be paid on July 1st. D. Ouellette could this benefit us if we stay to be used for the state school property. T. Carmichael reminded the board the Haz waste is on top of the 20K. R MacNeill what happens if they are unavailable to help. R. Mora defined the pros and cons of what could be used to help with this development. See video for full narration.

10.3. CONSERVATION COMMISSION

R. Mora broke down finances used by conservation Commission regarding Milfoil remediation and Dash harvesting. The current milfoil grant is still in the pipeline to City Council.

10.4. HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

C. St. Clair asked who appoints this position it was found to be the mayor that appoints and C. St Clair

stated to M. Conant please ask the mayor to appoint someone. R. Mora gave some timelines that may effect this Commission as it moves forward.

11. OTHER BUSINESS

12. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00PM

DRAFT