

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 (was seated by the Chair as a voting Member)

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)

G. Ober recused herself citing fiduciary relations with a abutter.

6.1 PB2026-021; 604 Endicott St N (128-252-3.1) C. St Clair asked if the application was ready for acceptance. **PB2026-021 604 Endicott St** an amendment to the application Staff stated it was ready for acceptance.

C. St Clair sought a motion to accept this application M. DellaVecchia motioned to accept application PB2026-021 an amendment to the site plan for 604 Endicott St it was seconded by G. Dionne and was accepted with 7 votes.

Agent E. Wood introduced himself as well as Engineer M. Focareto. E. Wood stated regarding what you have been asked to do, this came before the planning board in 2023 it was approved by the planning board and 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. E. Wood stated that the Abutter Pine Hollow Campground was the party that had sued the City of Laconia. E Wood 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. E Wood referenced conditions that need to be included. And 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". C. St Clair asked E. Wood, have you gone over this with your neighbors. E. Wood stated the agreement that was reached between the City of Laconia and my client and the abutter who sued has been complied with completely. M. DellaVecchia there is a map, yes M. Focaretto brought up the map to allow the board to see the proposed amendment to the site plan. C. St Clair if the pond was to overflow where does that water go? E. Wood so it would be challenging for that pond to overflow. M. Focaretto 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. G. Dionne when the original approval was May 3rd, 2023, this was stated by T Carmichael and E. Wood. D. Ouellette, the overflow pipe and its location M Focaretto 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. M Focaretto and G. Dionne discussed the Weir for the discharge system. J. 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 R. Mora and by E. Wood.

Planning Chair C. St Clair opened to public comment at 6:51PM

Attorney Michael Tierney spoke on behalf of his client Pine Hollow Campground. M. 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. R. 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 the flow.

R. MacNeill, are prefilters required it was found to be no. T. 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.

C. St Clair getting back to the lighting, wasn't the lighting normally a consideration the lighting is pointing down and not out or up. T. 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. C. St Clair, it sounds like that's what's been done. You're saying that was already done except for the storm water. T. Carmichael was decided on the superior court. They have appealed to the Supreme Court. However, at the Supreme Court R. Mora, I agree with Tyler in every statement that he's made in our discussions with our own legal counsel, what the 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.

D. Oullette those are labeled as best practices. G. Dionne, I do not recall seeing anything in your packet about the court decisions. Were those available? R. 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. C. St Clair. 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. 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. C. St Clair That seems reasonable. G. Dionne So perhaps I do not know if you want to continue with the hearing. R. Mora, if I may we want to finish the hearing and listen to any comment and then we can conclude after the public hearing. G. Dionne perhaps we will bring it back at another date to look at more documents. B. Heavey, 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. M. Focaretto rebutted some of the comments. G Dionne. but if their decisions, I wouldn't mind seeing those before I make any decisions. C. St Clair That seems reasonable. G. Dionne So perhaps I do not know if you want to continue with the hearing. R. Mora, if I may do you want to finish the hearing and listen to any comment and then we can conclude after the public recesses the hearing and calls it back to another date after we have had a chance to look at more documents. E. Wood 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? I will. Okay. I am going to start with the existing. All right. So, the couple of comments that the other engineer had made. 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 the drainage is contentious but what he's saying is on my 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.

C. St Clair, Okay. Thank you. E Wood, do you have any questions. M Focaretto, I am happy to hear comments. E. Wood, it is important to remember how we got here and that it is an 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? C. St Clair, do you know where the property line is? E Wood, but I am not a surveyor. C. St Clair and the agent and engineer discussed pins monuments and markers regarding the subject property. C. St. Clair

stated However, I agree with Gary. We are missing something that would make it easier for us to understand the court's decision. R. Mora advised So if I may, C. St Clair, 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? C. St Clair G. Dionne R. 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.

Planning Chair C. St Clair closed to public comment at 7:37 PM

G. Dionne Motioned to table this application to the February 3rd 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 A. Lovisek and was voted 7 votes to table

and G. Ober 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)

Staff discussed with the board that the applicant would like to table their application until they have a chance to make some significant changes. The application was tabled at the applicant's request.

8. CONCEPTUAL REVIEW AND PRESENTATIONS

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

Attorney J. Cronin presents conceptual application for 1085 White Oaks Road and introduces owner and staff; Peter Grenier, Tony Dionne, Nick Loring, and Justin Kiernan. J. Kiernan presents redevelopment Plan to the Planning Board. Discusses that they are still in the conceptual phase and looking for feedback from the Planning Board, before formal submission and going to the Technical Review Committee.

Planning Board members discuss parking, traffic ingress/egress, State DOT permit requirement on Endicott St E, School Bus Routes and Stops, Seasonal vs Year-round use, and lighting. A board member was also in favor of doing a site walk. There was concern on whether the single-family homes along White Oaks Rd would be accessed internally or via White Oaks Road. Board also clarified that the proposed unit count was 150 and that White Oaks Road currently seeing a lot of development.

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.