

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 C. St. Clair brought forward application PB2026-021 for 604 Endicott St N, seeking an amendment to the site plan to increase the stormwater detention pond. C. St. Clair inquired with the staff whether stormwater was the reason for this discussion. R. Mora responded that the applicant had submitted a revised drainage analysis dated March 21, 2023, and revised in 2025, indicating a net decrease in flow rates from pre-development to post-development. This analysis was conducted following site plan regulations for the 24-hour storm event for the 2, 25, and 50-year storms. Mora concluded that according to the analysis the proposed development would not have any adverse effects downstream regarding stormwater flow rates or quality.

Laconia's legal counsel, Laura Spector-Morgan, noted that it might be helpful for the board to explain why it is only considering the drainage aspect of this application. C. St. Clair prompted the legal counsel to clarify this point. L. Spector-Morgan explained, "This is because when this matter originally went to the Superior Court, the only reason the court remanded your decision was that it did not understand how you reached your conclusion on the drainage issue. Although the campground appealed that decision to the Supreme Court on various grounds, the currently pending decision only pertains to drainage. Mediation was held at the Supreme Court, and the issues addressed in the settlement agreement are solely related to drainage."

She continued, "It is appropriate for this board to limit its analysis of this application to drainage, especially since the only changes made to the plan relate to drainage. Therefore, it makes sense to focus your review on these changes. I know Attorney Tierney wanted to explain why you should consider other aspects and has submitted letters advocating for this. However, I thought it might be beneficial for you to clarify to the public and to Attorney Tierney why you are not considering those other factors."

C. St. Clair expressed the Board's concern that drainage was the only issue to be handled. L. Spector-Morgan confirmed, "Yes, drainage is the topic of discussion." St. Clair then stated that a public hearing could not be held that evening because it had not been properly posted. Legal Counsel advised that if the Board were to reopen a public hearing, it should remain focused on the topic of drainage, as that was the sole reason for the proposed changes.

Attorney Michael Tierney attempted to approach the podium to speak but was informed by St. Clair that no public comments were allowed. Tierney responded, "Respectfully, since you took testimony from the City Attorney, I feel I have the right to respond." St. Clair reminded the attorney of the rules, to which Tierney asserted that he believed it was an error not to 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.

A. 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. The 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 delivered a presentation on the Lakes Region Planning Commission and the services it provides. Currently, the City has three positions for commissioners. The current commissioners are T. Carmichael and R. MacNeill. The commission focuses on areas such as transportation planning and funding, brownfields assessment, grant funding and writing, as well as culvert and road reviews. There are 31 member towns participating in the commission. Additionally, there is a 10-year transportation plan. S. Saunders also discussed the hazardous waste day activities that take place within the city and the region. Membership pricing and fees were also addressed.

The board posed several questions regarding the presentation.

C. St. Clair requested assistance with road maintenance and hazardous waste removal. He asked which member of the group is the smallest. S. Saunders stated that Hill is the smallest member. When C. St. Clair inquired if any members had dropped out, S. Saunders responded that Alton had dropped out but has since returned.

G. Dionne asked whether the group provides help with recycling. S. Saunders confirmed that they assist in securing financing for recyclable items.

G. Ober questioned whether the notice for hazardous waste disposal is published in a private newspaper. S. Saunders replied, "I believe we do." G. Ober also raised the topic of boat wrap recycling and inquired about any benefits for the State School Project. Staff, along with S. Saunders, discussed environmental studies in relation to this topic.

R. MacNeill mentioned that many resources from the group are not utilized by larger communities like his, since they have their own staff.

D. Ouellette asked about the membership structure and whether it is divided into dues. S. Saunders explained that the dues are based on population and assessed value, totaling \$20,000 annually.

A. Lovisek asked about the grant writing process. S. Saunders clarified that grant requests are evaluated based on need, and the LRPC determines what will be provided.

R. Mora noted that the LRPC offers many great opportunities, emphasizing that Hazardous Waste Day is particularly important since the area is surrounded by wetlands and sensitive environments.

M. Conant shared that he has made use of the hazardous waste collection day, held at the DPW building, which is well attended.

S. Saunders clarified that there is an additional cost for hazardous waste disposal beyond the \$20,000 annual dues.

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

Michael Bousaleh presented the concept for 5 Hilliard Rd. He summarized the planned construction of a five-story, 24-unit condominium building, which will include an elevator and outdoor parking for 26 vehicles.

Board Discussion with Applicant

C. St. Clair expressed concerns regarding the lot size, buffer size, tree ownership, and potential runoff. He suggested that this plan be shared with the neighbors and raised concerns about the placement on the lot and road access. He vocalized public concerns that had been referred to him.

G. Dionne discussed the location of the structure and parking lot, as well as parking calculations. He highlighted current zoning values in relation to the requested performance zoning, suggesting 2 to 3 stories for the building and a possible reduction in the unit count to possibly 12 - 16 units.

G. Ober inquired whether there is water and sewer service on Endicott, to which the answer was yes.

R. MacNeill asked about snow storage and noted that plantings would be used as a buffer and for dumpster placement. He also raised questions regarding staff regulations on elevators, which were deferred to the Code department for clarification. Additionally, he questioned whether a generator would be needed for this lot and addressed concerns about parking for residents with multiple vehicles. He concurred with Amy's viewpoint regarding a maximum height of three stories.

D. Ouellette agreed with Amy's concerns about the lot.

A. Lovisek was worried about the height and density of the planned units, stating it felt excessive for such a small area. She suggested a maximum height of three stories and inquired whether the development would be for workforce housing, to which the answer was no.

R. Mora proposed that the board might offer suggestions to the applicant on how to address some of the questions and feedback provided. R. Mora advised that a traffic study would be necessary for this development.

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

Dari Sassan and Kevin Lacasse presented a conceptual plan for the property at 59 Doe Ave. They proposed using performance zoning to construct a 40-unit building on the 2.9-acre site located in the CR district. D. Sassan emphasized that this plan would accommodate two buildings, each containing twenty units. He referenced the site plans he had previously provided to the planning board, detailing the structural layout of the buildings on the lot. K. Lacasse also mentioned plans for an underground parking facility, single-floor living units, and the inclusion of 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.

Board Discussion with Applicant

C. St. Clair inquired about the total height, asking if it was 60 feet or less. He expressed concerns regarding traffic and what measures could be taken to alleviate it. The team mentioned alternative options for egress. C. St. Clair pointed out that this development would change the neighborhood and asked again about the total height. K. Lacasse provided information about the average height. C. St. Clair also inquired about the pervious area, which was found to be 58%, noting that 60% was required. He raised concerns about runoff still being a problem. Additionally, he asked how old the house was, indicating that it was old and would require review due to its age. C. St. Clair emphasized the need to make room for sidewalks.

G. Dionne questioned whether the units would be rentals or for sale. K. Lacasse confirmed that they would be for sale. He noted his approval of the underground parking aspect but not the overall height. Dionne asked where snow storage would be located, to which D. Sassan responded that it would be determined in the future. There was also a question about the access easement.

G. Ober asked if this was the only project on Doe Avenue. The answer was no. She then inquired about the lot size, which is 2.8 acres, and raised a concern regarding the easement on the plan, stating she was not opposed to it but would like to see less surface parking. She also asked if there was room for a retention pond, to which the answer was yes.

R. MacNeill asked if a similar design had been used in the past. The answer was no.

A. Lovisek suggested they should retain the current parking instead of following G. Ober's recommendation.

M. Conant mentioned that he designed the traffic flow to have egress at the top side, which would be better than the lower egress. K. Lacasse spoke with M. Conant about the need for roadwork to be added as well, noting that it reminded him of the Center Harbor Inn, which he found appealing.

J. Roy expressed the desire to keep the underground parking.

R. Mora mentioned that an exaction might be used to facilitate road improvements.

8. NEW APPLICATIONS AND PUBLIC HEARINGS FOR FORMAL CONSIDERATION

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

T. Carmichael spoke regarding the site plan regulations. He referenced the older, outdated regulations that haven't been updated. T. Carmichael described this update as a necessary step to address issues related to escrow, site security, and third-party review. Continuing on discussed that the Planning Department is currently working on new regulations. He noted that the new regulations have also been

reviewed by legal counsel. Additionally, the discussion included topics such as escrows and performance bonds.

R. Mora provided an overview of the factors that contributed to the review and the subsequent creation of the two regulation rewrites. He talked about the cumbersome process of escrow dispersion and the timelines involved, highlighting the difficulties with the current return process.

C. St. Clair opened the public hearing at 8:30 PM, and after finding no comments, closed it at 8:30 PM.

G. Ober made a motion to adopt the regulations as written, which was seconded by R. MacNeill. The motion was unanimously approved with eight votes in favor and none against.

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

St. Clair inquired about the reasons why the funds allocated for off-site improvements have not yet been utilized.

R. Mora responded that the funds must be used specifically for the designated area; if Public Works does not install sidewalks in that particular location, the funds cannot be applied to other areas.

G. Ober was asked to clarify the difference between a site plan and a zoning ordinance for the audience. R. Mora explained that not every board has the authority to pass regulations. However, the Planning Board is permitted by state law to establish its own regulations governing development processes. An ordinance is a law adopted by the legislative body or City Council that must be followed unless a deviation is granted. Waivers may be issued by this board under certain conditions.

T. Carmichael noted that minimum requirements could affect both design and usage. R. Mora provided an example to highlight the intended appearance of the lots.

D. Ouellette asked how long these regulations would remain in effect. The response was six years.

C. St. Clair opened the public hearing at 8:31 PM. With no comments received, the public session was closed at 8:31:30 PM.

A. Lovisek made a motion to adopt the regulations as written, which was seconded by G. Dionne. The motion was passed with 8 votes in favor and 0 votes against.

9. PLANNING DEPARTMENT MONTHLY REPORT

9.1. PLANNING DEPARTMENT REPORT

R. Mora presented the staff report from the planning department, highlighting the current staffing levels within the department. He mentioned that a Request for Proposals (RFP) is currently out for the bandstand and that there are ongoing revisions of the development standards. R. Mora referenced a previous meeting where the 2008 New Hampshire Stormwater Manual was discussed and noted that the updated version was released in 2025. He pointed out that our existing regulations do not currently require the use of this manual, indicating that completing a full rewrite will be a slow process. Additionally, he mentioned the Master Plan Steering Committee and the Historic District Committee.

G. Ober inquired whether the Lakes Region Planning Commission (LRPC) could assist with the rewrites. In response, R. Mora said, "No."

10. LIAISON REPORTS

10.1. CITY COUNCIL

N/A

10.2. LAKES REGION PLANNING COMMISSION

R. MacNeill expressed that he feels the service does not provide value, as our staff is capable of handling most, if not all, tasks. Questions arose regarding the timing of our annual payments, to which staff clarified that dues are scheduled to be paid on July 1st. D. Ouellette inquired whether there could be any benefits if the funds are allocated for state school property. T. Carmichael reminded the board that the hazardous waste costs are in addition to the \$20,000 budget. R. MacNeill raised concerns about what would happen if they are unavailable to assist. R. Mora outlined the pros and cons of potential options for aiding in this household hazardous waste.

10.3. CONSERVATION COMMISSION

R. Mora outlined the finances used by the Conservation Commission for milfoil remediation and DASH harvesting. The current milfoil grant is still pending review by the City Council.

10.4. HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

C. St. Clair inquired about who is responsible for appointing this position. It was determined that the mayor has the authority to make the appointment. C. St. Clair then requested M. Conant to ask the mayor to appoint someone. R. Mora provided some timelines that could impact the Commission as it progresses.

11. OTHER BUSINESS

12. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00PM