

CITY OF LACONIA PLANNING BOARD  
6:30 PM City Hall - Armand A. Bolduc Council Chamber  
*Accepted February 7, 2023*

1/10/2023 - Minutes

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Peter Brunette called the meeting to order at 6:31 PM

2. ROLL CALL

Members present: Rob Mora, Amy Lovisek, Bruce Cheney, Rich MacNeill, Stacy Soucy, Mike DellaVecchia, Louis Joseph, Charlie St. Clair Absent: Peter Brunette

Absent: Brett Beliveau, Scott McWilliam

L. Joseph was seated as a voting member.

3. RECORDING SECRETARY

Kalena Graham

4. STAFF IN ATTENDANCE

Planning Director Dean Trefethen

5. ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS

5.I. Acceptance of Dec 6 minutes

With no objections, Chair P. Brunette declared the minutes accepted.

6. PRESENTATIONS

7. EXTENSIONS Note: The purpose of this agenda section is for the board to consider requests from applicants with previously approved projects to extend the deadline dates. The board may also deliberate the request, decide and conduct a final vote at this time. PUBLIC INPUT IS NOT TAKEN ON EXTENSION REQUESTS.

7.I. PL2020-0066SU, 0067CUP(cluster), 0068CUP(wetland); Mile Hill Road, Mountain Lake Village; Request to extend the approval for a 51 lot (18 in Belmont, 33 Laconia) cluster subdivision with underground utilities & sidewalk

Applicant: Atty Phil Brouillard addressed the board. The project had lots of conditions between the two municipalities and they are getting close on the intermunicipal agreement. The state permits are in process. The extension is for all the dates, not just completion.

Motion to approve the extension request made by C. St. Clair, B. Cheney seconded. All voted in favor.

8. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE VOTE Note: The purpose of this agenda section is for the Board to continue the Public Hearing for the applicant and the public to provide input. The Board may also deliberate the application, decide and conduct a final vote at this time.

9. PUBLIC HEARINGS, POSSIBLE CONSIDERATION AND VOTE Note: The purpose of this agenda section is for the Board to have a presentation from the applicant and open a Public Hearing for the public to provide input. The Board may also deliberate the application, decide and conduct a final vote at this time.

9.I. PL2022-0113SP; 23 Messer; Proposal to change the use of the building to assisted living

Motion to accept the application made by C. St. Clair, R. Mora seconded. All voted in favor.

Applicant: Amelia Brock of Samyn D'Elia Architects, Celyne Godbout from LRMH and the property owner were present. A. Brock addressed the board. She noted that she is an architect not a surveyor, so the plans are from existing plans. Currently there is a set of spiral stairs for emergency egress and those will be replaced by an enclosed set of stairs. The proposal is not to have transitional housing but full-time. Currently, the building has occupancy of 14 and trash is picked up by the city. If the trash increases, the plan is to have a contract service. Lighting exists and no changes are proposed. Snow storage will be on the grassy area on the side of the property perpendicular to the river. In that same area the applicant will be making the green area wider in place of taking green for the larger emergency staircase.

C. St. Clair asked about parking on the sublawn and if the board can require the applicant to restrict that. Planning Director D. Trefethen said he would talk with DPW and see if they can evaluate and what the possibilities are for that area. R. Mora asked about ADA parking. A. Brock noted that none of the existing units are ADA accessible as most of the residents have mental health disabilities rather than physical.

The public hearing opened at 7:03 PM.

Abutter input:

Susan Cone questioned the fact that the property wasn't surveyed and the parking not on the street. Chair P. Brouillard noted that all parking will be on the lot and not on the street.

The public hearing closed at 7:07 PM

C. St. Clair about the current residents and their situation. M. currently the building is a sober house and the residents know the situation. When their time is up they have been not filling the units getting ready for the new.

Staff Review: Planning Director D. Trefethen read the staff review. The applicant has received a special exception from the ZBA.

Motion to approve the site plan application with the dates and conditions as stated in the staff review made by R. Mora with additional conditions: occupancy to be capped at no more than 14, If trash needs in the future need a dumpster, the dumpster is to be screened as per RSA 235-42 E 1, Substantial lighting changes to be brought back before the planning board for approval, with adding the finding that this kind of housing is what the city needs, seconded by C. St. Clair. Majority voted in favor with B. Cheney opposed.

C. St. Clair commended the applicants on the project.

9.II. PL2022-0070SP, 0071CUP(perf zon); 35, 53, 71 Winnisquam Ave; Proposal to reconstruct retaining wall, boat ramp, boathouse and one residential building within the four parcels

Motion to accept the application made by M. DellaVecchia, C. St. Clair seconded. All voted in favor.

Applicant: Jessica Jacobson of Wilcox and Barton addressed the board. There will be no proposed additional residence or slips. The shore has a 700 linear foot retaining wall along the property. The

applicant is in the permitting process with the state. The existing boat ramp will be extended for a safer launch but all renovations will match the characteristic of existing structures. The applicant recently acquired 19 more parking spaces across the street that will be dedicated to the marina. The pull in parking onsite will be reviewed by City Council. If that is not approved the applicant will look at other parking options like parallel parking. The properties will be merged. The sewer lines are to be configured now that they have been located. A. Lovisek asked if the "no outlet" sign could remain and was agreed.

The public hearing opened at 7:32 PM

Abutter input:

Tammy Griffin of 18 Bay Street addressed the board. She has concerns about the amount of traffic on Bay Street and the noise that goes with all the traffic. Currently the boat traffic blocks the street and causes lots of congestion. There are concerns about more congestion. There was discussion about through traffic and having the residents talk to the city about putting up "No Through Traffic" signs. T. Griffin asked the board to consider the neighborhood.

Garrett Grasscant, of NH Fish & Game addressed the board. He had concerns about the seasonal helical pilings and their location. J. Jacobson clarified his questions.

Tom Selling of Academy Street representing Lake Winnisquam Association, addressed the board. The association has concerns with road access and the road being shut down during construction.

Mike Little of Charles Street addressed the board. He noted that Bay Street is narrow and when public can't find parking, they park in the street.

The public hearing closed at 7:46 PM

Staff Review: Planning Director D. Trefethen read the staff review. The applicant, DPW and DES have been working together to get issues resolved. He reiterated the number of slips is not increasing so there should be no more traffic than what is there currently. B. Cheney asked if DPW Director Wes Anderson could look at allowing parking on only one side of the street. Planning Director D. Trefethen noted the parking is not yet scheduled before council. He would look to the board to say whether in order to have the head in parking spots remain, would need city approval or whether city council approves before the planning board. It would be up to the board as he doesn't have a preference either way.

Motion to table the application to February 7 made by B. Cheney. R. Mora asked if the board should give direction on whether the board wants council approval for the head in parking prior to planning board approval or does the board want approval contingent on city council approval or to have a conceptual approval after board approval. Chair P. Brunette noted there is nothing to approve because they are tabling the application. B. Cheney feels that the application can go ahead at the next planning board meeting with or without council approval, but the rest of this application is approvable. Chair P. Brunette noted this is where the next meeting would be picked up. C. St. Clair seconded the motion. Majority voted in favor with B. Cheney abstaining.

10. APPLICATION ACCEPTANCE Note: The purpose of this agenda section is to publicize that a Planning Board application has been submitted AND for the Planning Board to determine if the application is complete enough to begin the review process. PUBLIC INPUT IS NOT TAKEN AT THIS TIME. If the application is accepted the Planning Board will schedule a Public Hearing at which time the application will be heard and public comments will be accepted. Information about applications can be obtained on the city's web site or by calling the Planning office.

- 10.I. PL2000-0109SU amd5; 61 Pendleton Rd, Beechwood Development; Proposal to amend the cluster subdivision from 12 to 13 lots

Motion to accept the application complete and schedule the public hearing for February 7 made by C. St. Clair, M. DellaVecchia seconded. All voted in favor.

## 11. NEW BUSINESS

### 11.I. 244 Province Street agreement easement modification

Planning Director D. Trefethen gave a brief background as a memo was handed out. The apartment complex requires an easement across city land to get to Growth Road. The proposal was present to Council without objection, but are looking for more conditions. That is which is proposed. If the board approves the additional five conditions they would be added to the existing approved project. Nothing from the original approval changes, just the addition of these five. Chair P. Brunette asked if that should be back for a public hearing and Planning Director D. Trefethen said no. Nothing is changing from a site plan standpoint.

Motion to recommend additional conditions to recommend the following additional conditions to the approvals from May 3 and June 7, 2022: 1. The proposed driveway and sidewalk from the main part of the apartment complex to Growth Road will be constructed to City type street construction standards, including drainage requirements; 2. The proposed driveway will be maintained, in all seasons, to City standards, including condition of pavement and winter maintenance; 3. An adequate lighting plan will be approved by Planning staff to provide safety for motorists and pedestrians; 4. The Department of Public Works, through the Planning staff, shall collect an additional site security amount to cover any damage that may occur to Province Street, Growth Road, or Hounsell Avenue during construction of the apartment complex or connecting driveways; 5. It is further reiterated that the driveway within the easement will always be a private driveway owned and maintained by the apartment complex and will not become a city accepted street without additional Planning Board and City Council action. S. Soucy made the motion, C. St. Clair seconded. All voted in favor.

### 11.II. Policy recommendation to the City Manager and City Council as suggested by the CIP Committee

Planning Director D. Trefethen noted during the CIP committee process there was expressed desire for the city to consider having capital reserve funds established for the various city departments.

Motion to recommend to city council a reserve capital funds be established made by B. Cheney, C. St. Clair seconded. All voted in favor.

## 12. OLD BUSINESS

### 12.I. Discussion of whether the City should adopt an ordinance, pursuant to NH RSA 674:22 and RSA 674:23, declaring a temporary moratorium on the issuance of building permits or the granting of subdivision or site plan approval due to the City's, "lack of capacity to accommodate anticipated growth in the absence of such an ordinance."

Chair P. Brunette gave a brief history of the reason for the agenda item. He wasn't going to discuss it, but heard that there was some public that would like to discuss the item.

Brian Wolfe addressed the board while handing out an evaluation of impact analysis of the proposal at the state school property. This was produced over the last month, since the January 10 meeting. He summarized the overall plan which used the case study technique of impact analysis. This require the evaluation of a proposed development with the department head that would be most impacted by the development itself. It was reminded that the board is not taking any action on the moratorium tonight, just taking thought into consideration. The board would need some time to review the handout. Chair P. Brunette asked about the cover letter and if that went to all the members and was told it only was to the chair. Randy Viola from the City is the one who signed the letter, who represents the Lakes Region State School evaluation team. C. St. Clair asked if the report is city wide or only conclusive to the state school property and was told the single property.

Shawn Slattery of Meredith Center Road feels the proposal is too aggressive for the area. It would have a huge impact on the wildlife and environment. Chair P. Brunette reiterated that nothing is currently before the board for the property. The city only knows the large scope of the project. B. Cheney added that no one knows the exact proposal as the Governor has kept it all secret.

Atty. Phil Brouillard agreed with B. Cheney's comments and complimented the Planning Board and staff for getting things done. He feels that using the moratorium term could be a shot in the foot and could possibly scare away other future development.

Randy Viola thought it be a good idea that the proposed developer know there could be the possibility of a moratorium and any issues that could be up in the air. Chair P. Brunette reiterated that nothing is currently before the board for the property and are not involved in the purchase and sales of the property. The only job of the Planning Board will be to regulate any proposal that comes before the board. He noted the City Planner has been involved from the beginning but since all is confidential, not allowed to reveal much information.

Planning Director D. Trefethen asked if when the analysis was created did the City Departments heads have a clear understanding of what was being created and that it was going to be publicly shared? The answer was yes. Planning Director D. Trefethen noted that the department heads have all been spoken with and information gathered prior. He continued stating that it is obvious that when a large development is proposed having children as a number is not a surprise. The exact number is not known to anyone at this time. He has been in contact with the Salem Planning Director regarding the Tuscan Village development, and explained the numbers. Chair P. Brunette reiterated that no one knows what will be presented to staff and the board until it comes in and any discussion of a moratorium would be premature. It is just a tool that we know could be used if necessary but not anticipating taking action. Chair P. Brunette thanked those that spoke.

B. Cheney noted that a moratorium would be an ordinance change and would start at the planning board lever but ultimately be a council decision. R. Mora suggested the Master Plan Steering Committee be involved. Planning Director D. Trefethen noted that the applicant has a timeline but that could all change. He understands the concerns, but the developer is not concerned about a moratorium.

### 13. PLANNING DEPT REPORT

### 14. LIAISON REPORTS

Conservation: S. Soucy noted there are four goals that they are working on. She would like to bring up the topic of places to wash boats to the conservation commission boats near the ramps for less transportation of invasive plants from water body to water body, but hasn't done that yet.

HDC: C. St. Clair noted they are waiting to hear from the Ordinance Committee for the meeting at the end of the month.

### 15. OTHER BUSINESS

C. St. Clair brought up 76 Lakeside Ave demolition permit was picked up. He is concerned the property will stay vacant land and as a resident he doesn't want to see values go down.

#### 15.I. 711 Weirs Blvd; Conceptual review for 13 lot subdivision: 40 site campground and 12 residential lots

Applicant: Tom Selling representing the property owner, Kevin Hayhurst, at 711 Weirs Blvd. A short video from Pacific Domes was presented. The proposal would be to put in approximately 40 glamping sites and They would be on decks as to minimize disturbance. Currently the lot is being surveyed and updated to show wetlands. There are a few isolated vernal pools that may have been developed with the previous property owner's work on the site. There is sedimentation and some runoff that the applicant is

addressing. The applicant is proposing a well system as municipal water may not have sufficient flow pressure. There will also be a 12 or 13 lot subdivision off Weirs Blvd. A central driveway would go into the property then split for the campsites and the residences. The applicant will be working closely with the State. The proposal is in the planning stage and could possibly be back by mid spring. Chair P. Brunette asked about sidewalks along Weirs Blvd and was told that the applicant would contribute money toward sidewalk and suggested recreation loops around the bay as well. Planning Director D. Trefethen clarified that most of the driveways will be accessed in the rear of the property and the hope is yes but the applicant is still getting feedback from departments. R. Mora asked about emergency turnaround for the driveway and the applicant will be speaking with the Fire Department again.

15.II. 17-19 Bay Street; Conceptual review to develop 22 units in two phases

Applicant: Sal Steven-Hubbard, Real Estate Development Director with Lakes Region Community developers and Celyne Godbout with Lakes Region Mental Health addressed the board. S. Steven-Hubbard explained the proposal. The two buildings will be broken into 22 very small units, for individuals, not families, each with approximately 288 sq ft. The project would serve homeless or those at risk of homelessness who services through LRMH, who will be partnering with LRCD for the first phase. The second phase is hoping to partner with Lakes Region Community Services, to serve those with intellectual and developmental disabilities. There would be two phases, 12 units in the first and 10 in the second. This would be the start of performance zoning where they are looking for relief for parking. They are only proposing four spaces, for visitors and service providers. Possibly setback requirements as well but that will be figured out when the site plan gets flushed out. The plan is to work with NH Housing for them to approve a resident service plan and selection plan.

Staff will be onsite every day but not live there, so no night supervision. Leases and property management will be with Hodges and the LRCD offices is only two doors down on the corner of Bay and Court St. This proposal is supportive permanent housing. The concept is the people who need independence but also need support services. There are rules and regulations and if those are broken, the eviction process would start. A. Lovisek concerned that without staff onsite 24/7 how can the rules not be broken. C. Godbout reiterated the fact that the clients would be referred from the service partners to the program to make sure they are ready before actually moving in. Chair P. Brunette understands this meets a need but is concerned that the tenants will be left on their own to fail rather than given the ability to succeed. He doesn't want it to be just a place where people are parked. He asked if electronic monitoring like video could be considered and it was agreed. He feels someone should be there for a resource every day.

R. Mora also has an issue with parking. He doesn't feel four spaces is enough for the proposal with support services and possible visitors. Chair P. Brunette offered substituting some greenspace for more parking. Based on the concerns from the board he feels this is great for addressing a need for the city for those that will be sleeping in tents. However the board will be interested to see more than just a site plan and maybe a lease agreement, but a comprehensive explanation of the services that the people will be receiving. He understands and has compassion but it is the responsibility of the board that the development is responsible as well as addressing the goals and needs of the city as a whole. He would like to see more detail on the populations that are intended to serve and how they are intended to be served. Also, what the landlord's responsibilities are going to be. Especially as far as dealing with the concerns of the neighborhood. Give all the information that the public will need to know. S. Steven-Hubbard agreed and can do that. She doesn't like to think of the project as a facility but housing for those that don't have it now.

S. Soucy would feel better knowing one apartment would be dedicated to staff.

R. Mora asked if fencing was discussed and that can be done.

Planning Director D. Trefethen reminded that direction to the applicant be done as it is the beginning of the performance zoning. The public is always welcome and encouraged to submit in writing to the Planning Dept any questions, comments or concerns regarding the application.

Motion to table to February 7 made by R. Mora, B. Cheney seconded. C. St. Clair asked for comments to include detail. All voted in favor.

16. ADJOURNMENT

With no objection, the meeting adjourned at 9:33 PM

Respectfully,

K. Graham