



**CITY OF LACONIA
MAYOR'S SPECIAL CITIZENS AD HOC REVIEW COMMITTEE -
CITY OWNED PROPERTY AT OLD NORTH MAIN ST. AND PARADE ROAD
MARCH 26, 2025 - 5:30 pm**

**Lakes Region Mental Health Center Conference Room
40 Beacon Street, East
Laconia, New Hampshire**

AGENDA

1. Welcome / Call to Order

Roll call by Andrew Hosmer (ward 3)

Committee Members

Eric Hoffman – Chair (ward 1)

Mike Little - (ward 1)

Jason Sproul - (ward 1)

Vanessa Saunders - (ward 1)

Ollie Anderson - (ward 1)

Laura LeMein – (ward 1)

Bill Marshall – (ward 1)

Matt Cashman – (ward 1) joined meeting at approx. 7pm

Patrick Wood – (ward 1)

Staff

Kirk Beattie, Joia Hughes, Rob Mora, Tyler Carmichael, Tim Joubert

Members of the public

Meg Daubenspeck and Catherine Bowler

2. Recording secretary

3. Presentation by the Mayor's Task Force – no presentation

**4. Review of responses received in response to Request for Qualifications, RFQ
No. Q24-08-08 regarding City-owned property located at the intersection of Old
North Main Street and Parade Road (NH Route 106)**

Eric Hoffman opened the meeting and explained that we would talk about each proposal.

Jason Sproul – written memo presented, explained limited equity cooperative thought. Perhaps that this type of investment would allow owners to build equity. Pat Wood has similar thoughts, but the developer needs to get some return to make it worth their time and wondered how that would work. Maybe they could be **changed** to condos at a time when the developer realized a reasonable profit. (please see handout)

Vanessa Saunders – presented her memo and thoughts, has a concrete 3D homebuilder from Maine who might be better suited. Noted that fractional interest financing might be a good fit for this. Noted that the problem is housing affordability, need more supply. Restrictions on who can buy and what the use of the homes remains over time to maintain the affordability. (please see handout)

Bill Milner read notes from Matt Cashman – the RFQ asked for submittals that were congruent to the residential character of the surrounding property. Proposals are from 30-250 units and 200 people voiced their concerns against this type of development. Realtors state this development location is wrong. Adding workforce and below market rate housing would create marketing concerns and is best suited for 8-10 single family homes. He recommends that the 4 RFQs be rejected until a citywide master plan is done.

There was some discussion on 3D printing, the materials used, lifespan of the products in our climate and labor savings.

Bill Milner – question on when this committee will present their findings for the city council. He noted that the neighborhood residents are experiencing fear and anxiety over this project.

First responders and teachers are the incomes that were used in the presentation last meeting, right? He noted that the average salary of a teacher in Laconia is more like \$63,000 and the median family income as reported by HUD is \$107,000.

Rob Mora – after the last meeting he did an overlay on this lot and determined that 22 housing lots could be developed and would require a 119 feet long road and infrastructure.

MADCO – concern over the lifespan and the financing for it, general discussion about 3D printing and homes ensued. Vanessa has done some research and found a company out of Maine that does concrete homes and will get more information. The advantage to this type of development is that it's fast and easy to develop.

Vote taken to request further information/presentation from this developer – no votes in favor of proceeding with this developer.

Anagnost – the committee had little discussion, the general consensus was that the buildings and unit count was too large and not complimentary to the surrounding neighborhood. Members noted the development on Province Street and concern about this style of building.

Vote taken to request further information/presentation from this developer – no votes in favor of proceeding with this developer.

LRCD – consensus is nice but has consideration for greenspace and cluster development. Concern on the environmental issues and the water shed, Olie noted that he has issues with standing water on his property.

The committee thought they could consider 36 to 48 units. Further discussion will need to occur on the density, configuration, appearance and mechanism to deed restrict the property to maintain affordability long term.

Vote taken to request further information/presentation from this developer – 6 votes in favor of proceeding with this developer.

Pennrose – concern with high density and using funding sources that may not be available due to funding cuts.

The committee has concerns if the developer could create something that fits into the existing neighborhood. Might be worth hearing from the communities they have already developed in?

Jason – thought the proposal was extractive not constructive and to make every dollar they can. Other committee members agreed.

Vote taken to request further information/presentation from this developer – 1 vote in favor of proceeding with this developer.

There was general discussion about the feasibility and number of units that a developer can build and still make a profit while keeping rents affordable to middle income families.

Catherine Bowler noted that no developer is going to be able to provide the level of site plan and architectural renderings desired without a commitment to go forward as those are very expensive to produce (about \$100k).

It was noted that plans like those wouldn't be required until a planning department application was submitted.

Invite the LRCD back to make a presentation and address the following concerns of the committee:

Aesthetics

Timeline

Parking

Storage

Trash

Potential garage

What number of units makes this feasible

Since the 2018 master plan, what number and type of development has occurred?

What is in process right now?

Within the next 3 years?

Rob can get this data

Master Plan – proposal going out soon and funded in budget for next FYE

Housing Champion progress

5. Next meeting date

6. Adjournment