

CITY OF LACONIA PLANNING BOARD
6:30 PM City Hall - Armand A. Bolduc Council Chamber
Draft Minutes

11/9/2021 - Minutes

1. CALL TO ORDER

Prior to calling the meeting to order the board held a moment of silence for the passing of former Mayor Ed Engler.

Vice Chair Stacy Soucy read the meeting intro and called the meeting to order at 6:36 PM

2. ROLL CALL

Members present: Scott McWilliam, Charlie St. Clair, Kirk Beattie, Sarah Jenna, Rich MacNeill, Mike DellaVecchia, Susan Hodgkins, Stacy Soucy

Members present via Zoom: Peter Brunette

Alternate members S. McWilliam and S. Hodgkins were seated as voting members.

3. RECORDING SECRETARY

Kalena Graham

4. STAFF IN ATTENDANCE

Planning Director Dean Trefethen, Assistant Planner /Zoom host Rob Mora

5. ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS

5.1. Acceptance of minutes from October 5

With no objections Vice Chair S. Soucy declared the minutes accepted as submitted.

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.

7.1. PL2010-0010SP; Scenic Road (63-99 Fletcher Ln), The Lodges; request to extend the approval to construct 3 structures with 72 residential condominium units

Applicant: Chris Duprey, representing Akwa Waterfront LLC, addressed the board via Zoom. He explained the history of the project. This was the first project permitted then moved through various other phases on smaller scale. They were struggling on how to start when the pandemic hit. Substantial improvement in infrastructure has been put in the site. Received ZBA extension approval last month. Planning Director Dean Trefethen noted there was no reason not to approve the extension.

Motion to approve the extension request made by C. St. Clair, K. Beattie seconded. All voted in favor by roll call vote.

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.

8.I. PL2021-0120SP; 674 Main Street; Proposal to change second floor commercial to two residential units

Applicant: Jonathan Ferrante, owner of the property, addressed the board. He explained the proposal. The use of the multifamily needed ZBA approval and was approved last month. The first floor will remain commercial space. There is no access between the first and second floors as it is being separated. The goal is to keep the new units under \$1500. The third floor is already occupied.

The public hearing opened at 6:48 PM

There was no one to speak for or against the application. The public hearing closed at 6:49 PM

Staff Review: Planning Director Dean Trefethen read the staff review. He noted that in the downtown area if the applicant is not adding square footage there are no parking requirements as it's in the overlay. The property currently has 3-4 spaces.

Motion to approve the site plan with the dates and conditions as stated in the staff review made by S. Jenna, R. MacNeill seconded. All voted in favor by roll call vote.

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. Revisions to Accessory Dwelling Units section 235-41:A of the ordinance

Planning Director Dean Trefethen gave a brief explanation of the proposal.

The public hearing opened at 6:52 PM

There was no one to speak for or against the revision. The public hearing closed at 6:52 PM

Motion to refer the revisions of the ordinance as presented to city council made by K. Beattie, S. McWilliam seconded. All voted in favor by roll call vote.

- 9.II. PL2021-0123CUP(wetland buffer); 80 Main Street; Proposal to put a modular home in the wetland buffer ~waiver request for wetland mapping

Motion to accept the application as complete made by K. Beattie, S. Jenna second. All voted in favor by roll call vote.

Applicant: Bernard Colangeli, property owner, addressed the board. B. Colangeli explained the proposal. The house burned and has since been demolished. He noted a delivery date of a modular to be put on the existing slab foundation in February. K. Beattie asked if he is keeping the shop that is located on the property and told yes. Durkee Brook runs along the rear of the property leaving most of the property in the 75 ft buffer. B. Colangeli noted the brook has about a 15 ft drop.

The public hearing opened at 7:03 PM

There was no one to speak for or against the revision. The public hearing closed at 7:03 PM

Staff review: Planning Director Dean Trefethen read the staff review. Staff is in support of the waiver

request and explained the request. The brook location is clean and can be measured. The building will be further away from the brook than current building was.

Motion to approve the waiver for wetland delineation made by K. Beattie, S. Jenna seconded. All voted in favor by roll call vote.

Motion to approve the site plan and conditional use application with the dates and conditions as stated in the staff review made by P. Brunette, C. St. Clair seconded. All voted in favor by roll call vote.

- 9.III. PL2018-0071SP amd1; 174 Province Street, Grace Presbyterian Church: Amendment to allow the site plan to be constructed in phases

Motion to accept the application as complete made by S. Jenna, K. Beattie second. All voted in favor by roll call vote.

Applicant: Mike Bemis of Steve Smith & Associates now Dubois & King and trustee of the church, addressed the board. He explained the proposal and gave a brief history. He met with staff a few times for figure how to keep the project moving forward. The applicant would like to phase the project into three phases. Phase one: addition for installing the lift and handicap bathroom and mechanical room and sewer tie in, electric and underground utilities, catch basins. Phase two: parking expansion and drainage and stormwater treatment swales. Phase three: addition to the back of the building to increase seating to 150. The applicant's parking exceeds the parking regulations.

The public hearing opened at 7:16 PM

Patrick Dalton of 178 Province St addressed the board. He asked about the catch basins and had concern about runoff to his driveway. M. Bemis mentioned the plan is keep it away from Province Street.

The public hearing closed at 7:17 PM

Staff review: Planning Director Dean Trefethen read the staff review. He noted that all the 2018 conditions still will apply and that this is just for phasing the project.

Motion to approve the phasing with the dates and conditions as stated in the staff review with the original conditions from the July 10, 2018 Notice of Action made by K. Beattie, R. MacNeill seconded. All voted in favor by roll call vote.

- 9.IV. PL2021-0124SP; 18 Endicott St North, North Water Marine; Proposal to redevelop the property by reconfiguring buildings, upgrade drainage, build a retaining wall and build a new forklift launch well

Motion to accept the application as complete made by S. Jenna, K. Beattie second. All voted in favor by roll call vote.

Applicant: Matt Bangert (Project Manager/Owners Representative), Ari Pollack (Legal), Pete Blakeman (Civil), Mike McKeown (Architect). Bob Conrad (Owner) was present. The applicant went over the issues that had brought up at the last Planning Board meeting as well as the technical review meeting. The marina is on two separate lots, lot 10 and lot 5. The applicant was before the ZBA for setback and was approved. Conservation Commission has been onsite and the applicant has addressed those comments. ConCom has given their support for the retaining wall reconstruction.

The applicant has been working with the railroad to address crossing issues. They have obtained permission to build a cross walk to Channel Lane. There is a slight modification to the packets the board received. After meeting with the Deputy Fire, the applicant is going to eliminate the parking spots on Channel Ln and extend the walkway. The biggest concern was pedestrian safety on Channel Ln. The applicant has had meetings with DES and is in process of applying for the required permits. The

applicant met with Marine Patrol for traffic mitigation in the Channel. The plan is to have the boats go south to the wider area of the channel then turn around. There are 20 slips allocated for the valet fleet.

The improvements are a necessary upgrade of dated and failing buildings. The boats are no longer being driven in by the ramp due to the steepness and are being lowered in for safety. Overall there will be a net loss of 10 boats when everything is completed compared to existing. Traffic and pedestrian concerns were addressed with the crossing and channel congestion. Where the forklift runs, Channel Ln is 20 ft wide. The applicant will line the street for two clear lanes. Operators will be OSHA certified and trained to run unlike the current situation. The forklift will also have spotters when on the road. The buildings are proposed to be turned which will allow the forklift less time in the road. This will lead to 38% less ground cover and be less obstructive. The total volume is equal. The buildings are dilapidated. Dock configuration will change a bit. The boats will go from storage to the temporary slips. The applicant will be eliminating the general public launch. This will help with transfer of milfoil as all boats will be inspected by staff prior to going in the water. The 20 valet slips will not be leases out. Currently the marina holds 376 boats and will house 366 after renovations. The current buildings are 36 ft tall and the replacements will be 56 ft tall. R. MacNeill noted that the area is an active snowmobile trail.

There was a question on the 50 ft right of way that currently goes through the drive in. The ROW was put in before receiving the crossing from the Railroad to access the back lot.

M. McKeown went over the overall changes to the site. There will be stairs over the railroad track crossing with signage for a clear distinction. The applicant is capturing green space along the water by reconfiguring the buildings. Security lighting around the water will be very low level. The proposal is to do the renovations in phases. The building that is falling into the water is first then Channel Lane and building 6 replacement then docks the renovations and buildings one and two for the last phase. The applicant expects this to be a multi year projects but feels confident that they can meet the two year deadline. One goal is to open the view to Channel Lane.

The color scheme will be blues and grays to keep within the corporate colors. The tops of the buildings will be white to fade into the sky. Two boat houses on the shoreline will be removed. He went over the 3D photos from different views across the channel.

There are two proposed patio areas for people to wait. There will be trees by the buildings and plants and shrubs by the open areas to keep the view.

P. Blakeman went over the storm water and parking plans. There is no storm water management currently on the site. Some pervious pavement is proposed to collect runoff and the first few inches with sand filter treatment. Stone beds will be under the buildings for more drainage. Borings show that gravel material goes deep in the location. The pervious pavement would be cleaned once to twice a year. The applicant will be taking out the cement basin in the middle of the Lane that isn't catching runoff on the road and replace it.

C. St. Clair asked if the applicant minimized the open area could they make the build shorter and wider and was told no. The 60 ft is for the forklift to handle the boats without spending a lot of time in Channel Lane.

S. Soucy asked about the noise and M. Bangert noted that the forklifts are being upgraded to new ones which will be quieter. Also the travel time is being lessened a lot.

M. DellaVecchia thanked the applicant for the investment in the area. He asked if the corrugated metal siding could be changed. M. McKeown noted that they haven't picked out the siding yet but it has to resist wind load. M. DellaVecchia would like a different façade other than the metal siding. B. Cheney also has concern with the height and suggested putting some thought into the direction of sending folks out. A. Pollack noted that it is important for the marina to enforce safety rules and if someone doesn't follow the rules they will not be allowed back.

The public hearing opened at 8:29 PM

Mike Bordes of Laconia addressed the board. His biggest concern is the height and view from across the channel. He suggested a size limit for boats.

Planning Director Dean Trefethen read the two emails from abutters concerning the view and noise.

The applicant noted that there is currently no view and 200 feet of building along the channel and feels there will be more view with the proposed changes. M. McKeown noted they are looking into translucent panels at the top of the buildings for more light and less blocking. He also noted that the use is permitted and is under the allowed height in the zone.

Alison Hilderbran of Weirs Beach addressed the board via Zoom. She agrees with the emails that were read. She feels it doesn't make sense that the Weirs gets picked on and why people want to make it look industrial.

Will Ryder of 1184 Weirs Blvd addressed the board. His concern is the height of the buildings and noise.

S. Soucy asked how many 30 ft boats they had and M. Bangert explained the size of the boats include any swim platforms and the motor.

Alison Hilderbran added that the buildings will be taking away from the old Weirs.

The public hearing closed at 8:56 PM

P. Brunette left the meeting at 8:55 pm.

S. Hodgkins appreciates the work that has been put in but feels it's not for the Weirs. The charm of the area is like non else. She'd like to see more charming buildings put in.

Staff Review: Planning Director Dean Trefethen read the staff review. He emphasized some key points. Weirs Beach is desirable. The marina has been in existence for decades with not storm water management. There are problems with pedestrian safety on Channel Lane. He pointed out that Channel Lane is privately owned or railroad owned. As for the view, currently you only see the buildings and sky looking from the docks across the channel. The new proposal will have breaks. The view of the Drive In will be changing. He noted that all DES permits need to be in hand before any work is done.

S. Soucy had concern with the people not taking direction in the channel. Planning Director Dean Trefethen reminded everyone that DES and Marine Patrol have jurisdiction over the water, not the city.

Motion to approve the site plan with the dates and conditions as stated in the staff review made by S. McWilliam, S. Jenna seconded. Discussion: M. DellaVecchia noted that this is the only opportunity for the board to do something about the aesthetics for the area. S. McWilliam disagreed. The boat storage on Bay St is a large metal building that he looks at every day and the precedent has been already set. M. DellaVecchia noted that it's not a high traffic visibility area like the Weirs. He noted there are many different panels styles and wouldn't't have an issue if the applicant worked with staff. B. Cheney has an issue with aesthetics not being specific and suggested the applicant come back to the board when the material is picked.

The motion was amended to add a condition that the applicant come back to the Planning board for external material after working with staff. C. St. Clair noted that it's important for some to be able to look at the sky and feels the buildings should be lowered and lose the 24 boats. The motion passed 8-1 with Scott McWilliam, Kirk Beattie, Sarah Jenna, Rich MacNeill, Mike DellaVecchia, Susan Hodgkins, Stacy Soucy in favor and C. St. Clair opposed.

At 9:37 PM the board took a 5 minute break.

- 9.V. PL2021-0128SP, 0129SU; 143 Endicott St NO; Proposal to construct 49 townhouse style units and clubhouse, with entrances off Endicott and Tower streets along with associated drainage, grading, landscaping and lighting

Motion to accept the application as complete made by K. Beattie, S. Jenna second. All voted in favor by roll call vote.

Applicant: Jon Rokeh, Atty Phil Brouillard, Matt Maggiore, Chris Mulhern. Atty P. Brouillard and M. Maggiore presented the application. The project will consist of 48 residential condominium units. There is a 58 ft grade change across the site. The roads will follow the contours of the site. Each unit will have garage parking and one space in the driveway, with 37 extra spaces throughout. The main entrance to the development will be off Endicott St North. The Tower Street driveways will be for exiting. Detention ponds and a closed system are proposed. The Alteration of Terrain and driveway permits have been submitted to the state. No improvements to Endicott need to be made per DOT. The area where the clubhouse is located will be shielded and landscaped. There will be a pool, pickleball court and putting green. The site will connect to municipal utilities and have underground electricity. All units will be sprinkled and tests show there is enough flow. The sewer is currently under a third party review.

C. Mulhern went over the architectural aspects of the project and the types of the different units. The goal was to have maximum views and the buildings will be worked into the grade. The material will be a mix of traditional and modern with stone base, vertical shiplap and high efficiency windows. There will be street trees on both sides with a heavy evergreen buffer. Each unit will have ornamental plant beds by each door. The building height will not exceed 35 ft above the average grade.

J. Rokeh noted that with a previous more intense use proposal Steve Pernau did a traffic study and there were no issues. The applicant is working with Krista at DPW on Tower Street. They are looking at putting in islands on the entrances of Tower Street for curb stops. They anticipate most of the traffic to use Endicott.

M. Maggiore noted that he has met with abutters and will continue to work with them.

C. St. Clair agrees that most of the traffic will be using Endicott so questioned why have anything off Tower Street at all. Due to the steepness of the site there is not way to put a turn around or connection road so the applicant needed alternate access. C. St. Clair thinks a turn lane off Endicott heading east would be appropriate and the applicant will consider that option. B. Cheney suggested talking to DOT about painting the turn lane.

Snow storage: There is a lot of road area without units and snow can be stored there. As always, if there is too much it will be trucked offsite.

The public hearing opened at 10:27 PM

Robert Sarsfield of 91 Tower St addressed the board. He doesn't think anyone on Tower is against the project. Most have traffic concerns on Tower Hill and how the additional amount will affect it. He had a concern about the headlight on his property which is across the street. He also had concerns with foundations. M. Maggiore said they are still looking into blasting but the company does pre blast surveys if needed. There are no sidewalks proposed on Tower Street and DPW does not support it.

Marie Bright of 40 Memory Lane addressed the board. She was present just to ask for a cross walk. She suggested a cut away to pull into the property. J. Rokeh noted the applicant has agreed to contribute to a cross walk proposed by Hillard Rd.

Rob Donati of 104 Tower St addressed the board. He mentioned that the top of Tower Hill is dangerous. Exits and entrances will be a huge issue.

Nancy Williams of 81 Tower St addressed the board. She reiterated points that had been previously brought up. Storm drains dip down and cars bottom out when they hit them. Most people don't stay in their land to avoid the drains. There are pedestrians on the road as well.

Paul Defrank noted delivery vehicles can back out of driveways and the Tower St entrances can be eliminated. There are currently safety issues on Tower St.

K. Beattie noted that not having a second access won't work for the Fire Dept.

Mike Bordes addressed the board via Zoom. He is opposed to traffic lights.

Alison Hildebrand of 85 Tower St addressed the board via Zoom. She wondered if the traffic report anticipation could be wrong. M. Maggiore responded. She is glad for the crosswalk. She lives at the crest of Tower Hill and mentioned the noise from the grates. Tower Hill will cause a lot of problems. The applicant mentioned that nothing on Tower Street is changing with the proposal. She suggested sacrificing 6 units and putting in a cul de sac. The applicant noted that the project would not be worth building if any units are sacrificed.

The public hearing ended at 11:04 PM

Motion to continue the application to December 7, 2021 made by M. DellaVecchia, K. Beattie seconded. All voted in favor.

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.

11. NEW BUSINESS

11.I. Street Acceptance for Bayside Court

Planning Director D. Trefethen explained the proposal before the board. The street is currently unaccepted.

Motion to refer the street acceptance of Bayside Court to City Council made by S. Jenna, K. Beattie seconded. All voted in favor.

12. OLD BUSINESS

13. PLANNING DEPT REPORT

14. LIAISON REPORTS

15. OTHER BUSINESS

16. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 11:07 PM

Respectfully,

K. Graham

DRAFT