

Adams School Reuse Committee

Meeting Minutes – Thursday June 14, 2007, Cummings Center, 7:00pm

Committee Members: Dan T. Haley, Jr. and Matt Thayer Co-Chairs, Cythia Fitzgerald, Eric Stark, Justina Marcisso, Eric Stark. Councilors: Kevin Donoghue. City Staff: Alex Jaegerman, Planning Director, Amy Grommes Pulaski, HCD Program Manager (note taker)

Matt opens the meeting. He discusses a talk he had at the Munjoy Hill Neighborhood Organization meeting. He talked vaguely about his presentation. Markos mailed Matt and Dan a letter in response to the MHNO meeting. Matt summarizes the letter. Markos feels there is extra emphasis on senior housing. Matt says that the explained the senior housing component was overlooked in the process. Markos also said that Matt did not discuss the possibility of esingle occupancy units. Markos' point that some people in the process have identified a need for these types of units. He also explained that the elderly are one of many that were identified on the site. Matt submits the letter to Alex for the record.

1. Review and Approve Meeting Notes

Matt says that now we can review the meeting minutes. He begins with the May 24 and opens for comments or revisions. There are none. He than moves to May 10 and opens to comments or revisions, there are none. April 12 opened for comments or corrections, none. March 8 comments or corrections, none. Eric notes that he was late but did arrive. Move to January 25. Matt has one comment. He amends his second statement ~~“What I propose is that if we take any comments we amend them the next time.”~~ “What I propose is that if we take any comments we amend them the next time.”
Eric moves to accept, Dan seconds. All approved.

2. Review and Discussion of the Committee's Workshop May 24

Amy reviews the information in the packet along with the meeting summary from May 24. She describes how the majority of interest is in housing with some community space. There was some discussion on whether Adams School is appropriate for retail. There was a lot of interest in retail on the community design day and the committee struggled with that. Eric specifies its not the need of retail on the hill it's the appropriateness on this space. Kevin says he has heard of a lot of interest in having some sort of flexible space, without specifying the type of use. Justina discusses how the committee was leaning toward more housing, community and green space over retail. Kevin questions if this is divergent from the community design day. Alex says it was discussed at the community design day, so it would be a divergence from this.

Alex explains that the community design day also emphasized the diversity of housing. Dan explains that diversity should reflect what it is currently on the hill.

Matt says he recalls a discussion around the senior housing with an emphasis on diversity as toward the dot exercise. Eric said that under the flip charts said under program use: family housing and senior housing. He is not comfortable with limiting housing to those two categories. Kevin says to reflect the composition of the hill now has many single 30 somethings. Dan

clarifies the idea of lifecycle on the hill from being born, growing up, having a family, and growing old on the hill.

Referring to the May 24 notes he feels much more comfortable with sections 1) physical design features- site specific: view corridor, playground, beckett street walkthrough, height restrictions, design criteria, blendable style housing; and 3) proposed policy ideas: permability, mixed housing, life-cycle on the hill, elbow room, knitting the neighborhood together, enhanced community, green sustainable design/ construction. He is less comfortable with 2) program use: family housing, senior housing, community spaces, sufficient parking.

Matt says that this was a first go at the recommendations and Eric agreed. Matt explains some of these things may or may not have gotten on the list without full consensus. They all agree there was not consensus on carbon neutral design. They discuss the significance of this.

Matt says one of the things to discuss is how to continue this conversation, but we ran out of time. Alex says that this is a good forum to continue doing this.

Eric wants to add something about the diversity of housing. Eric says to him this means diversity of housing types not diversity of the types of people who live in the houses. Eric drew a few diagrams on what would fit on this lot. He passes these out. He thinks about blending the style of building in reflection of the neighborhood. He explains the diversity of style of housing that exist on the hill. Eric says that some of these ideas came out of Alex's homesteading idea. He continues to describe the handout. One is the existing site. Some discussion has been about keeping or tearing down the existing building. The truth is unless the city is going to tear it down than its up to the developer which means you cannot subdivide. He explains all of these options. He explains this helps him to visualize the possibilities.

Cynthia questions whether Eric's lots comply with the City's minimum lot size. Eric says it reflects the neighborhood. Alex says it will probably not comply with zoning requirements, which can be adjusted.

Kevin agrees with Eric that when one says a diversity of housing its types and not users. That would be too much administration. If you supply housing with handicap accessibility it would tend towards seniors. Eric says one thing the committee can recommend is size etc of units like three bedroom that would aim at family. Eric says you can still split it between three developers because it is a sizable lot. Each developer could have specific directives and it would create diversity as a result.

Ed Democracy asks questions to both Kevin and Eric.

Matt questions with the committee whether they would like to hold comments til the end of the meeting.

Matt would like to strike the carbon neutral design, all agree.

Matt says one thing we have not discussed is ownership. He questions whether we should focus on ownership or rental opportunities. Dan says if we use the multi-unit approach for a three flatter is that would be ownership and rental. Eric says that it is unlikely someone will build a three unit and sell it as such they would get more money to sell them as condos. Dan says one of the problems on the hill are too many condos that cost too much. Cynthia questions whether the city has funds available to do this. Amy explains that there is funding available through the city and the MSHA. The committee continues to discuss ownership vs. rental. Many express their interest in ownership options. Matt does not feel that there was a strong preference for ownership. He does think home ownership is a good thing. Justina says if its ownership than it fits into the lifecycle on the hill. She describes her interaction with CIEE.

Eric explains how the developers explain that at Walker Terrace has only one space per apartment and what happens is the people who rent there have no more than one car. In the same sense he likes the idea of diversity of housing, meaning types but and not who is living there. He said it is also not how communities grow. Alex says that a change the wording to specify size 3 bedroom, meaning family but not specifying and high accessibility would mean seniors, but not be limited to that.

Matt returns to talking about the continuum of care and how small a space would you need to build that. He has a hard time recommending this without exploring that. He says if this is the only opportunity to provide continuum of care on the hill he doesn't want to pass it up. Kevin questions whether he is gathering this preference from the community design day. Members have discussions of the interest for continuum of care. Alex discusses how we have to be responsive different interests and cannot monopolize the process.

Justina likes the idea of senior housing- its safe and its nice. She questions whether the people are recommending senior housing are thinking whether it is will be where they go. She says that the people who live there may not be from the hill they may be from away.

Alex says we do not want to specify the people who will live there.

Eric suggests that the existing building be left as an option to the developer. Matt says we have not discussed the RFP vs RFQ. He says that Richard Berman's project at Unity Village. Matt questions whether the City does pre-construction site prep prior to going to the developer. Amy and Alex explains the City is neutral to this issue and do not typically do pre- site work. They provide subsidies for the developer to do the work.

Eric says that he does not see this as a great 1.5 acre lot. Instead he says that he sees it as several parcels of land. Alex says we can develop it like we did in bayside where there is several identified parcels with a trail running through it, like for this a street is running through it. This says the developer could develop all of the lots or develop small of them. Kevin says that you can specify a diversity of architecture even if it is all developed by one developer. Eric thinks that one developer doing the whole lot would always win out due to the economies of scale. They say that with island view is that it is a "think" a monolithic development. They would prefer a heterogeneity of styles.

The committee continues to discuss the use or reuse of the building. Overall they decide that the committee is neutral and let the developer decide. Eric also brings up the idea of community space as a use. Would that be tied to the school or could be separated from the school. Justina thinks that the community space would be in the school and if it was torn down than she thinks of housing. Matt and Alex comment that community space is not necessarily connected to the existing space. The committee continues to discuss land use.

*Discussions to revisit: diversity of housing types, the playground, parking.
Eric would like to revisit to get consensus whether we will put out the site as one piece or divide it into parcels.*

3. Review of the Draft Committee Report for the ReUse of Adam's School

This will be reviewed at the July 12 meeting. To be distributed one week earlier.

4. Begin Drafting Initial Recommendations

Use the categories on the flip chart plus what is below.

Physical Design Features – Site Specific

Add Neutral as to the reuse or removal of the school building

Physical Design Features

Change Whether developed in its entirety or in parts it must be of heterogeneity design

Proposed Policy Recommendations

Add Creating ownership opportunities

Eliminate “Carbon neutral design”

5. Discussion of Remaining Steps and Timeline

June 15 - Senior housing discussion

June 28 - 3 hr. longer meeting: wrap up discussions and final recommendations

July 12 - Wrap up

Get something into the Munjoy Hill Observer

August 13- MHNO meeting

This proposal to go to Housing Committee

Cynthia is not getting committee emails.

Matt says in the workplan there was a public release and