

City of South Portland
O'Neil Street Re-use Committee
Summary of the Committee Process

The O'Neil Street Property Re-use Committee was formed in early 2017 and began meeting in March. The Committee of 10 people and a hired facilitator consisted of City Staff, a City Councilor, an engineering consultant (Sebago Technics), representatives from the Planning Board, Comprehensive Plan Implementation Committee, Conservation Commission, Energy and Recycling Committee, a sample of neighbors, and residents from other parts of South Portland. They were selected to represent their roles, as well their contribution to a mix of relevant experience, skills, age balance, gender balance and perspectives. The meetings generated robust discussions and an interest in hearing and taking into account public comment.

The O'Neil Street Re-use Committee included:

- Mayor Patti Smith (Chair, Council Representative)
- Joshua Reny (Assistant City Manager)
- Tex Haeuser (Planning Director)
- Owens McCullough (Consultant, Engineer)
- Linda Boudreau (Planning Board Representative)
- Andrew Capelluti (Energy and Recycling Committee Representative)
- Barbara Dee (Conservation Commission Representative)
- Steve Marston (Neighborhood Representative)
- Craig Piper (Comprehensive Plan Implementation Committee, Architect)
- Harold Spetla (City Resident)
- Linden Thigpen (Neighborhood Representative)
- Sara Zografos (Neighborhood Representative)
- Laura Moorehead (Facilitator and Neighbor)

Interim City Manager Don Gerrish brought forward the O'Neil Street Re-use Planning Process and Timeline (Appendix A) during the City Council Workshop on February 27, 2017 where it was approved. This document outlined the objectives and responsibilities of the working group:

- Identify a responsible re-use of the O'Neil Street Public Works property through a transparent process, one that is responsive to the environment, fiscal impacts to the City, and addresses both neighborhood and City objectives.
- Engage the public, especially from the surrounding neighborhoods, in envisioning how the property might be used and creating recommendations to the City.
- Demonstrate that a transparent process uncovers potentially unforeseen barriers and gives citizens a voice in what matters to them and what they want.
- Through creation of a working group, involve a small, carefully chosen diverse mix of community members in the planning of and communication about the process.
- Engender pride in the process taken to create positive, inclusive change.

The Committee members met monthly from March to December 2017, and had the opportunity to walk the site in early April, with Owens McCullough and City Staff providing background information and answering questions. The group sought to understand the assets and issues inherent in re-purposing the O'Neil Street Facility, which has been used by the Public Works, Transportation, and Parks & Recreation Departments for many years (See Appendix B). The goal was to determine what

recommendations the Committee felt were most reflective of their discussions and the input from the public during the Committee meetings and Public Forums.

Early on, a theme emerged that was important to the Committee: The six acres should be redeveloped in a way that creates a “gem” for South Portland, a unique, accessible and attractive site, with a balance of open space and housing, that is unique, yet blends with the existing, older Meeting House Hill neighborhood. In some meetings, the Committee discussed that the *process* of working toward the recommendations should also be considered “gem” quality, a model for future committees with a similar challenge. This theme continued to be a value for the Committee throughout its process.

In April and May meetings, Committee discussions identified a need to be more concrete about what sort of site designs/layout could be possible. To this end, Landscape Architect Kylie Mason of Sebago Technics led a process working with architects Craig Piper (who is also a Committee member) and Curt Jensch to create a series of rough design concepts that demonstrated what could be possible for the O’Neil Street property. The eight concepts were meant to be educational and a catalyst for the Committee in generating its recommendations. The concepts were in no way intended to be the Committee’s set of recommendations. In the May meeting, they were used in a brief charrette with the Committee and the public in attendance to explore ideas for the property (Appendix B2).

Additionally, on June 20, 2017, the concepts were used as a visual starting point for group conversations/charrettes during the first Public Forum (See Appendix C). The Forum, which was preceded by a public site walk of the facility, was held at Brown Elementary School in the Meetinghouse Hill neighborhood. Approximately 60 people participated in charrettes that evening, yielding significant feedback about what the public wants and does not want in the re-use of the O’Neil Street facility. (Appendix C)

There were many questions raised in the Public Forum that the Committee promised to answer. Josh Reny responded with a Q&A document uploaded to the O’Neil Street Re-use Committee webpage, which was updated as new questions were generated by the public.

Laura Moorehead provided an interim report to City Council during their workshop on June 26, 2017 (Appendix E). The Council comments were noted, including the wish to consider up to three design alternatives, rather than the Committee recommending a single specific design at the conclusion of its work.

In July and August, the Committee focused on developing its recommendations to City Council. It was determined, however, that the group first needed to understand what potential developers would say about the project, confirm that it is financially feasible, and what information should be made available before the City requests proposals. Josh Reny and Owens McCullough took the lead to invite five developers to speak with them in individual conversations about their thoughts related to the property. It was an informative and useful step that resulted in the following feedback:

- The project is financially feasible even with single-family development concept with 20+ units; however, the acquisition fee paid to City will be proportional to the total value of the redevelopment, i.e. small # of single-family homes = smaller fee.
- Current zoning would produce lot sizes much larger than currently exist in the neighborhood, and houses would likely be larger and more expensive. A contract zone may be appropriate to ensure the re-use plan and design meet the City’s requirements.
- It would be ideal to continue O’Neil Street through to Pitt Street. It is the most cost-efficient

approach and will maximize both green space and buildable area.

- If O'Neil Street is built to Pitt, then the land along west side (Walnut Street side) should likely continue with current development pattern, i.e. lot size and home sizes. This would ensure low impact residential development adjacent to abutters.
- The land area east of O'Neil Street extension is much larger, and a natural buffer exists with the elevation change and pocket park on Pitt Street. This land is where the opportunity exists to be more creative with design, increase density, create open spaces, etc.
- The Parks building is the only salvageable structure on the lot. Some proposals may include a re-use of this building and the City was asked to keep an open mind about what this building could be.
- It will be important for developers to understand the City's vision for the neighborhood, but RFP should not be overly prescriptive. It is unlikely that every "want" can be met, and so there needs to be some flexibility to have a "back and forth" with the City to create the best redevelopment plan.
- Developers will want to understand what goals the City would like to accomplish, if any. For example, should the redevelopment aid with housing affordability? Access to open space? Sustainable and universal design concepts? Some of these goals may be in conflict with one another so the City should evaluate each proposal based on the "entire package".
- Developers may wish to provide more than one conceptual design as part of their proposal.
- The RFP process should also be a Request for Qualifications (RFQ). It is equally important to choose the right partner as it is to choose the right design concept. The preferred design concept is likely to evolve from the original proposal based on City Council and neighborhood feedback.
- A public engagement process will be key once a preferred developer is selected. The RFP should require a description and timeline for public engagement before formal approval by City Council. The work done by the O'Neil Street Committee has set the stage for this, and there may be a continuing role for the Committee to assist the preferred developer with this process.

Traffic concerns had been a theme throughout the Committee's discussions, i.e. will traffic significantly increase as a result of additional housing in the neighborhood and will there be issues with access to Cottage Road from O'Neil Street (queuing, safety, etc.)? In August and September, Owens McCullough commissioned a traffic study to assess the possible impact of creating new housing and extending O'Neil Street to Pitt Street. The study measured traffic at peak times of the day and when school was in session and children were being transported to schools in the area. It was determined that traffic, even for the development scenarios with the highest density, would not significantly increase, given the low trip generation of residential land uses and the many possible routes through the neighborhood to points north, south, and west. Additionally, the Committee was concerned about creating a safe neighborhood for children on O'Neil Street. The traffic study determined that O'Neil Street, even if extended to Pitt Street, would not likely result in faster traffic, since there would be a T-intersection at Pitt Street that would force a right or left turn. This would make it less likely that the street would be used as a cut-through. Nonetheless, the group expressed support for a street design that conforms to Complete Streets and traffic calming principles.

In August, September and October, the Committee focused on further developing its recommendations. Given the strong theme of creating a "gem" for South Portland, in September, Committee members honed their sense of what constitutes "gem" quality development for this property. This was accomplished using all information at hand, including notes from Committee discussions, Public Forum

feedback and public comments during Committee meetings. It became increasingly clear that, instead of offering City Council three specific design concepts to consider, it would be more effective to broadly describe the vision, criteria, qualities, and amenities that a developer must consider when submitting a proposal. The Committee recommendations were further expounded and clarified at the October meeting. This process resulted in much more specificity in the recommendations.

The Committee reviewed and finalized its recommendations at the November 30 Committee meeting. Also during this meeting, three committee members were identified to represent the O'Neil Street Property Re-use Committee on the Selection Committee when it is formed, in order to provide continuity to the process. They are Linden Thigpen, Barbara Dee and Sara Zografos.

The recommendations created by the Committee read as:

O'Neil Street Facility Re-use Planning Committee Final Recommendations

General

- The redevelopment of the O'Neil Street Facility should maintain the quality of life in the neighborhood. There should be a sense of security, community and peace.
- The redeveloped parcel should be primarily residential, with certain home occupations allowed as they are under current zoning.
- An innovative and low-impact re-use of the Parks Department building on Pitt Street may be considered, as long as it is a use that fits within the neighborhood. All other structures should be razed, and the Parks building may be razed if re-use is not practicable.
- The redevelopment should be of quality design, fit well within the neighborhood, appropriately scaled, and support various community goals, i.e. access to quality and affordable housing, balance between built space and open/green space, and environmentally responsible development.
- Upon completion, the redevelopment of the City's O'Neil Street Facility should be a point of pride for the neighborhood and City, an example of well-executed redevelopment, in both process and outcome.
- The City's financial return on this parcel is one of many considerations, and maximizing return should not be the primary consideration when judging redevelopment proposals. The City should take a long view and holistic approach to the measure of public value and benefit to the community.

Housing & Affordability

- A multi-generational neighborhood is welcomed. The redevelopment should create new housing opportunities for seniors, families, young people, etc.
- The redevelopment may include a mix of owner-occupied and rental units, single family homes and multi-unit buildings. The unit mix and site layout should be judged by its overall fit with the current neighborhood and public value it creates.
- A substantial share of the new housing units created should be accessible to households with an annual income that is close to the City's median.

- South Portland Median Household Income is approximately \$56,250
Source: U.S. Census, 2012-2016 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates
- The sale price of new owner-occupied housing units should be generally in line with, or less than, the current cost of housing in the neighborhood.
- The City should welcome redevelopment proposals that include innovative ways to achieve affordability. Some examples discussed in committee include creating a neighborhood land trust; leaving extra rooms in new housing units unfinished for future remodeling/expansion; innovative financial partnership with City to make units more affordable, etc. The City should encourage new ideas in the proposals.

Design

- The types and styles of new buildings should fit well within the neighborhood and City as a whole. Architecture should be diverse and interesting.
- The redeveloped parcel should not be an island, disconnected from the neighborhood. It should also not be a mere replication of the current neighborhood.
- The redeveloped area should transition well into the existing neighborhood; i.e. built areas are “soft” at the parcel boundaries nearby current homes.
- The redevelopment will likely require conditional zoning that imposes specific requirements, site layout, and design standards. Redevelopment concepts and proposals should not be constrained by current zoning, but should reflect the overall vision that has been articulated by the City in the Committee Report.
 - A conditional zone is a special arrangement to change the land-use requirements for a specific property that has unique considerations. South Portland has done this recently for the Armory project and affordable housing projects.

Open/Green Space

- There should be an appropriate balance between built space and open space.
- Public access to functional open and green space is highly desired.
- Outdoor amenities may include a playscape, park, community garden area, or a combination of these.
- The redevelopment should integrate eco-friendly landscape design, including low-maintenance green landscaping with native trees, grasses, etc.

Traffic

- The redevelopment should allow for the extension of O’Neil Street to Pitt St. in order to connect the neighborhood and reduce traffic delays at Cottage Road.

- The City should require that any street to be accepted as a public way is designed and built to “Complete Streets” principles, emphasizing safety and traffic calming.
- Bicycle and pedestrian mobility through the neighborhood is valued and should be considered as part of the redevelopment.

Environmental

- The redevelopment should have a landscape design plan that supports the ecology of the site and is environmentally responsible.
- The redevelopment should integrate all Best Management Practices (BMPs) related to stormwater management to the highest-level standard, i.e. rainwater drains, porous pavement, rain gardens, etc.
- The redevelopment should integrate energy efficiency into building plans wherever practical, i.e. buildings oriented to the sun, solar panels, heat pumps, sustainable building design/materials, etc.

On December 13, 2017, the second Public Forum was held at the Brown Elementary School. The Committee process was reviewed and the recommendations were shared with the public, in order to gather public comment, to be included in this report to City Council (See Appendix G).

Owens McCullough, Josh Reny, and Tex Haueser drew up the Request for Proposal (RFP), which is planned to be advertised soon after the January 8, 2017, Council Workshop, if determined by Council to be “ready to advertise.” Based on the discussions of the Committee and public input, they have recommended the following criteria and requirements be part of the RFP:

Recommendations for the Request for Proposals (RFP)

1. The selection criteria should include qualitative considerations, including the experience and professional qualifications of the developer, past experience with similar projects, ability to work in partnership with a municipality to redevelop a publicly owned piece of land, etc.
2. The RFP should require a description of the team’s overall qualifications and the roles of each team member. Architectural and landscaping qualifications and experience should be emphasized.
3. The RFP should require a public engagement process. Respondents should include an overall process for working with the Selection Team, City Council, and the Public to respond to feedback and make changes to the proposal as necessary before final approval is given. RFP should include a detailed timeline.
4. The RFP should require demonstration of financial capacity.
5. The RFP should require a detailed description of the entire parcel, number and type of housing units,
6. The RFP should require a detailed description of the anticipated sale prices of new housing units created, rent prices (if applicable), and the overall approach and methods to achieve housing affordability.
7. The RFP should require a detailed description the design and amenities that allow it to be characterized as a multi-generational neighborhood.

8. The RFP should require a description of how they plan to create buffering or low-impact development near current housing in the neighborhood.
9. The RFP should require a detailed description of the open and green space, the ratio of built space to green space, what amenities will exist, etc.
10. The RFP should require a response related to public access to open/green space, including what legal arrangement is proposed, who would be responsible for maintenance, where publically accessible parking could exist (if applicable), etc.
11. The RFP should state explicitly that design concepts that include a playground, park, or community garden, or a combination thereof, will be received more favorably.
12. The RFP should require a detailed description of the landscape plan, and ask proposals to respond to City's desire for low-maintenance and "green" landscape design. It should describe what, if any, native plant life would be included.
13. The RFP should require a response describing any improvements or modifications to the "slope" area of the property, its intended final state, and overall landscape plan for that area.
14. The RFP should require a description of any roadway and other transportation-related infrastructure to be constructed, whether there is intent for the City to accept said roadway, its design and features, etc.
15. The RFP should require a description of stormwater management plans, utility services, broadband, etc.
16. The RFP should require a response regarding building design standards for energy efficiency, what design features will be integrated, plans for HVAC, etc.
17. The RFP should ask developers to consider innovative ways to achieve housing affordability

We look forward to discussing the recommendations and RFP in the City Council Workshop on January 8, 2018.

--- Submitted by Laura Moorehead, Facilitator, O'Neil Street Property Re-use Committee

Moorehead Consulting Partners
Laura Moorehead



Public Process of O'Neil Street Re-use Planning
February, 2017

Planning Overview

The public process of the O'Neil Street Re-use Plan will accomplish several objectives:

- Identify a responsible re-use of the O'Neil Street Public Works property in a manner that includes a transparent process and is responsive to the environment, fiscal impacts to the City, and addresses both neighborhood and City objectives.
- Engage the public, especially from the surrounding neighborhoods, in envisioning how the property might be used and creating recommendations to the City.
- Demonstrate that a transparent process uncovers potentially unforeseen barriers and gives citizens a voice in what matters to them and what they want.
- Through creation of a working group, involve a small, carefully chosen diverse mix of community members in the planning of and communication about the process.
- Pride in the process taken to create positive, inclusive change.

Roles and Responsibilities

City Council: Consider recommendations and make the final decision about the re-use of the O'Neil Street Public Works property.

City Staff: Partner with the process consultant to design and lead a successful public process. Provide information to educate the Working Group and the public as they consider the possibilities for re-use of the property. Serve as a member of the Working Group and/or provide specific expertise as needed. Help to recalibrate the process, if necessary. City Staff also will provide administrative assistance that may include reserving meeting space and forum venues, making copies, managing the logistics of each public meeting, and working with the process consultant on alternative communications.

Sebago Technics (Owens McCullough): Participate in the public process by providing general expertise and specific technical understanding of this property. Serve as a member of the Working Group. Partner with Planning Staff to educate the Working Group and the Public Forum participants as they consider the possibilities for re-use of the property. Prepare reports to City Council, in partnership with City Staff and Laura Moorehead.

Moorehead Consulting Partners (Laura Moorehead): Partner with City Staff and Sebago Technics to design and lead the public process. Provide expertise in public process and facilitation. Create agendas and facilitate all Working Group and Public Forum meetings and capture information generated from these meetings. Partner with the City Staff and Sebago Technics in keeping City Council apprised of the work of the Working Group. Contribute to the reports to City Council that allow them to make the final decision about the re-use of the O’Neil Street Public Works property.

The O’Neil Street Property Re-use Working Group: Carry out a public process that offers City Council the necessary input and information to make an informed, appropriate decision. The objectives of the Working Group include:

- Productive and outcome-oriented Working Group meetings, where new relationships are formed, citizens gain confidence in working with City staff, and results are achieved in the determined timeframe
- Working with the South Portland Planning Department and Sebago Technics to develop the forums
- Seeking maximum involvement of the public, appropriate to the situation
- Creating and participating in an interactive set of forums, culminating in tangible feedback and recommendations
- Educating citizens about the specific property and how reuse is carried out
- Considering additional ways to gather public comment from citizens and residents of the neighborhoods potentially impacted by strategies for reuse of the property.
- Communicating with the public across multiple media throughout the process.

Responsibilities of the group:

- Think through and understand the available assets and issues inherent in re-purposing the O’Neil Street Public Works property. In addition, understand any existing factors (the “givens”) that the public will need to know during the forums, including what has already been decided and what won’t change in this situation.
- The Council representative will communicate updates to City Council during the planning.
- Serve as a community ambassador to solicit neighbor’s input and encourage them to attend the public forums.
- Participate in the success of the forums by assisting during the forums.
- Determine one to three options for City Council to consider as they make their decision.
- Endorse the report to City Council after the conclusion of the public process.
- Attend the City Council meeting where the options will be discussed, and in a later meeting where the outcome will be determined.

Pre-work Before the Public Process Begins

Timeframe: February to March

In preparation for the Working Group’s task of planning the public forums, City Staff will accomplish the following steps:

- Identify the City of South Portland general vision.
- Assemble available data of the O’Neil Street site:
 - Surveys
 - VRAP
 - GIS Information

- Utilities
- Zoning – Space & Bulk, Allowed Uses, etc.
- Aerials
- Determine expectations of the process and desired outcome (i.e. community and Council acceptance of a redevelopment plan).
- Identify stakeholders and the composition of the Working Group.
- Review potential approaches to the redevelopment of the O’Neil Street property (Staff level initially). Options include:
- Hold a Council Workshop to present the work plan, discuss it and obtain authorization to proceed (February 27, 2017).

Simultaneously, Laura Moorehead will work with City Staff to determine the participants of the Working Group. Ideally, the Working Group will be comprised of no more than 10 people, with:

- 2 City Staff
- 1 City Councilor, ideally from the O’Neil Street district
- 1 Conservation Commission representative
- 1 Planning Board representative
- Owens McCullough, Sebago Technics liaison to South Portland
- 4 Residents, at least 2 from the adjacent neighborhood

A number of citizens have expressed interest in being involved in some way with the overall process. Considerations for an appropriate mix of residents in the working group will include:

- Overall age balance
- Overall gender balance
- Right ratio of neighbors to stakeholders from other parts of South Portland
- The individual’s interest in being part of a constructive working group, with openness to learning and considering other views
- The individual’s ability to be a neighborhood ambassador during this process.
- The individual’s ability to commit to the responsibilities of the Working Group, including attending meetings and public forums

As decisions are made about who will be invited to participate on the Working Group, those who were not selected will be invited to participate in other significant ways, including inviting them to assist at public forums and encourage people to attend.

The Working Group will meet in approximately 6 meetings (1.5 hours each) to carry out all phases of the public planning process. Laura Moorehead will prepare the agenda for each meeting, facilitate the meetings and transcribe the minutes. If a survey or other data gathering process is used, she will work with City Staff to design the tool for the Working Group to consider.

Phase One: Planning with the Ad Hoc O’Neil Street Reuse Working Group

Timeframe: March to May

In Phase One, the initial planning before holding public forums, there will be three meetings, with planning among the City representatives, Owens McCullough and Laura Moorehead between meetings.

- The first meeting will be educational in nature, with Sebago Technics and the Planning Department sharing technical information about the site.

- The second meeting will include a walk-through of the property and initial discussion of the options.
- The third meeting will be about reviewing the detailed plan and agenda for public forums and other input gathering processes.

Phase Two: Initial Public Forums

Timeframe: May through July

Early in this timeframe, two identical public forums (2 hours each) will be convened. To assure maximum participation, the forums will be scheduled on different days of the week, such as one on a midweek evening and one on a Saturday, and perhaps in different venues.

Laura Moorehead will facilitate the two sessions. Sebago Technics and City staff will be instrumental in offering a relatively brief presentation at the start of each forum and providing maps and other information so that participants are well informed as they discuss the possibilities for the property. Working Group members will play a role in the forums, too, ensuring participation, capturing comments and recommendations, and in other ways helping to assure success.

A Working Group meeting (1.5 hours) will be held between forums to debrief the public meeting, review the comments and recommendations, and to refine the next forum, if needed.

After the second forum, Laura Moorehead will draft a brief report about the public comments and recommendations from the forums and any other feedback mechanism that has been used. The report will be used in an update to City Council.

At this time, City Staff and Sebago Technics will prepare up to five alternative development plans for Working Group consideration and City Council discussions. The plans will include:

- High level cost estimates for the alternatives.
- Discuss potential approaches to implement the preferred vision: RFP, public-private partnership, city initiated and owned.
- Identify permitting requirements.
- Identify potential grant or funding opportunities: CDBG? TIF District to fund re-development?

Before mid-June, an additional developer forum will be held to solicit input from the development community. The forum will be open to the public, and advertised as a highly technical discussion with developers about the property and its potential.

City Council will meet in a workshop that engages Councilors in a less formal, off-the-dais discussion of the public input and the alternatives, answers any questions Councilors may have, and airs any clear no-go options for re-use of the property.

Phase Three: Determining Recommendations

Timeframe: July to August

The Working Group will hold one to two meetings (1.5 hours each) to narrow alternatives and determine up to three recommended options for re-use of the property for City Council to consider.

City Council will receive an update at this time, including the alternatives. The Working Group will obtain permission to present the options to the public for further comment.

Phase Four: Third Public Forum

Timeframe: September

An additional forum (2 hours) will be held to present to the public the results of the conceptual planning. City Staff and Sebago Technics will present the alternatives, including any specific considerations for each. Laura Moorehead will facilitate a process for public comment and recommendations and will collate the results. Members of the Working Group may play a role in the forum, ensuring participation, capturing comments and recommendations, and in other ways helping to assure success.

Given that this phase is often when the public is most interested, the City may choose to offer the presentation and other information over alternative media or in an additional forum.

The consultant, Sebago Technics and City Staff will write the final report, to be used with the Council as it considers and chooses the preferred alternative (Phase Five).

Phase Five: Decision Process

Timeframe: September or October

The City Council will meet in workshop to discuss and decide on the future use of the O'Neil Street property. Members of the Working Group will attend and may contribute to the discussion, as needed.

Phase Six: Implementation

Timeframe: October and beyond

The work will begin to implement the re-use plan. This will be highly dependent on the determined approach and financing. This phase will be refined as the previous steps are completed.

Appendix B

O'Neil Street Re-use Working Group Assets, Ideas and Principles

ASSETS

Location, location, location.

Schools (Brown, Holy Cross, Memorial, HS)

Parks/playground (Mill Creek Park, Brown School playground and fields, Mahoney fields)

Shopping (Knightville/Millcreek)

Restaurants

Library

City Hall

Public Transportation

This area is also protected from hustle and bustle of major streets and would appear to attract only those people targeted to use it.

Bordered by major streets, Cottage, Highland, and Ocean. Really defines the area. Great neighborhood and will really thrive once the public works is not in the middle of the area.

Within walking distance*to Public Library, Mill Creek (Art in the Park, skating in the winter, summer music concerts), grocery stores, local shops, and some (not enough) places to grab lunch, breakfast, dinner), walking distance to Elementary and Middle schools. A few streets away from Trout Brook Nature preserve, Sawyer Marsh vistas. Within 5 mins (driving and 15-20 walking) to Willard Beach and Portland Players Theatre. The neighborhood has some variety of smaller (affordable?) "starter homes", with small to average footprints. Surrounding neighborhood has older, mature trees and because of the trees in the neighborhood, it stays coolish even during a heat wave. Several churches also in walking distance. Neighborly pride and friendliness and a sense that neighbors generally care about their next door/abutting neighbors or folks on their street. See a lot of walkers and people walking their dogs which I think translates into a "neighborhood watch" effect.

*crossing Broadway is still a problem for walkers and people on cycles, so the perception of easy walking distance should be footnoted with the high traffic and dangers of crossing Broadway (it's width and heavy traffic use) deters folks from walking to Mill Creek and shops versus driving there.

1. Very quiet
2. Low traffic count
3. Homes well maintained
4. Homes of a variety of styles but fit nicely into the neighborhood

IDEAS

Single family homes similar to the ones in the neighborhood in style and value.
Condos in single floor or town house style, two units to a building.

I would like to see:

- housing for young families,
- 3 bedroom modest homes
- focus on community where children and families live in a safe, shared neighborhood
- small playground or children's park
- community garden
- benches and picnic tables for people to socialize if they want.

In talking with neighbors, the consistent comment is that they want to maintain diversity in the neighborhood. Hence housing that is affordable for first time buyers, moderate income families & sized appropriate for retirees.

That this space is ideal for a real experiment in 21st century design technology, solar, top surfaces that need no mowing, state of the art drainage.... Let's get some national coverage for a planet friendly community.

Row housing to maximize living space & minimize unused lawns. Perhaps English style with fenced dooryards.

Common park & playground areas to bring community together & reduce need for lawns.

Existing PARK on Pitt fenced & slides, swings, etc. added for the growing number of young kids in neighborhood. Add a few tables with checker boards on top for people of all ages to play chess, etc.

City should not sell land but retain as an investment for the future & rent to a tiny house grouping.

Have at least an area of tiny houses. We'd need to have strong codes as to architecturally designed, etc., so that we'd have a tasteful grouping. Currently in So Portland it's impossible for single, average income people to own a home & have \$\$ left over to enjoy travel or other personal pursuits.

The snow rolling wheels at the back of the property need to be saved & used as a "monument" to SP history, or site history. They are beautiful.

Existing brick building be retained & used as community center, art studios.

This development, whatever shape it takes, should emphasize Community.

Opportunity for abutting property owners (especially on Walnut St.) to possibly purchase additional land that abuts their property.

I would like to see a mix of uses for the lot. I see some opportunities for higher density mixed use units on the hillside portion of the lot and more traditional single family homes on the Walnut side of the lot. This would achieve the city's goal of generating revenue, while also fitting in with the fiber of the well-established neighborhood. To accomplish this I think all buildings need to be demolished and I think it would be essential for O'Neil Street to be extended to Pitt Street.

The people I've talked to want it to be sold and produce taxable income for the City. (Offset the cost of the new public works facility)

Tiny house village in the City specifically as a way to "develop" small nonconforming lots. The idea here was to allow energy- and sewer-independent on-chassis tiny houses to park there for a set permit fee good for one year, possibly renewably for a limited number of renewals, but also have a pathway for them to become permanent on-slab units.

My fear is the cost of cleaning up the site (not just demolition of the existing buildings) and safely shoring up the sloped bank to the south.

Possibilities:

- Maximum density residential development
- Existing neighborhood density residential development
- Ordinance net residential density residential development
- Tiny home village
- Sustainability-oriented residential development (renewable energy, efficiency, etc.)
- Affordable housing residential development
- Cluster subdivision (could include the above)
- Attached dwelling units (could include the above)
- Through street(s) residential development (vs. cul-de-sac)
- Passive recreation park
- Active recreation park
- House of worship
- Multi-purpose community building
- Hybrid of various of the above

Parks and playgrounds made with recycled materials, with some part of them indoors for winter play.

A site that draws people from other parts of South Portland (West End), while contributing to the neighborhood.

The process is as important as the end product in terms of drawing people to the new entity. Involve the Recycling Committee and other committees to the process.

An electric car charge station

Make sure the design tells the story of how and why this was created.

I would like to see continuity of small single family homes with a mix of public open space park for these neighborhoods. I like the idea of more density of homes in this area but think that should occur in other areas of the city, Millcreek, West End, etc., where there is more land.

Subdivision with some dedicated open space for the neighborhood and city as a whole.

Provide a public playground. All other city neighborhoods' playgrounds are difficult to get to from this area of town. Brown School is great but can't be used during a school day (crossing Ocean and Cottage).

** not in any special order**

1. Some portion of the parcel is preserved for a pocket park, gazebo/picnic shelter, picnic benches with a crushed stone pathway. Design public space with community gathering in mind, mix of grass and interestingly designed gathering areas. (Place making).
- 1a. An award winning community space design. Something so unique that residents from other parts of the City will want to see and enjoy themselves
2. Community Gardens- A similar sized area (100 x 110 ft- Hamlin School gardens) protected and used for community gardens for the neighbors/food pantry and/or any SP resident.
3. An edible walking path and pollinator corridor weaving throughout the property.
4. Botanical gardens or arboretum.
5. Co-working studio space or local artisans that could include gallery nights/low key retail. Highlight local artisans, who can't afford Portland rents.
6. Cluster of tiny homes- affordable.
7. Cluster of cutting edge eco-designed, low impact homes as models of sustainable living. (Design matters)
8. Incorporate small solar grid
9. Small Planetarium
10. Outdoor amphitheater (build seating into earth to control erosion of the slope that is problematic. (Not amplified). Neighborhood theater nights.
11. Playground for children

Orient the new buildings towards the sun.

Convey storm water into a rain garden.

Include shared spaces such as a community garden, greenhouse or micro-grid for solar power.

The property could be repurposed as a neighborhood park with a playground.

Any housing built cannot exceed two stories - it can't block the Hillside view of the Portland skyline.

Those snow rollers need to be kept somewhere on the property for historical reasons.

I think condos might fit in that space better than separate houses but then that means more traffic through the area. Individual houses should be reasonable in size not 4000 sq. ft. mansions.

There is no need to consider a convenience store in that area.

I really don't want to see apartment buildings in that space. Some affordable housing should be available.

Tiny homes?

Half housing half park.

Expand that existing park to include a playground.

Keep the greenhouse.

The Open Bench Project is looking for a new home.

Use the Parks Building for renting tools, the lift and other equipment to South Portland residents, something like the Tool Library in Portland.

Appendix C

City of South Portland
O'Neil Street Re-use Public Forum
June 20, 2017

Report of Public Input

Input from Activities on the Walls

What brings you here this evening?

- Abutter to the property
- We care about what happens to the property. We live across the fence on Walnut.
- I'm an abutter on Walnut Street and concerned about appropriate development.
- Neighbors who want to see size-appropriate development
- Curiosity
- We hope that we can make the city greener together.
- Making sure that my home and neighborhood are not devalued by this development.
- Neighbor, concerned about the right thing being done
- Size-appropriate housing
- Protect our neighborhood experience from overdevelopment
- Concern that more homes will be built and the charm of the city will be lost.

What do you treasure about South Portland?

- Great city which has made positive contributions to preserving environment
- Enviro-consciousness of City officials (2)
- More community gardens (2)
- Community (2)
- Walkability (4)
- Mix of ages and incomes
- Charm. Its character. "Don't go changing..."
- The feel of a small city, but the community of a larger one
- Ease of commute
- Quiet
- Ability to grow vegetables, keep bees and chickens
- Diversity (2)
- Safety
- Community public space
- Well maintained green spaces
- Walking paths (2)
- Cute shops
- Proximity to Portland
- Close to everything
- Elsemere

What would make our city even better?

- More businesses/commercial development
- If buildings like Hannaford utilized their ocean views
- Respect and support for our environment
- Continued growth, balanced with green space (4) and parks
- More community gardens (2)
- Pedestrian friendly
- Crosswalk lights
- Expand walking paths
- More sidewalks (3)
- Get rid of huge oil cans; take back ocean
- Free public docks
- Better on-ramps to 295
- Bike lanes
- Blinking lights to slow traffic when kiddos are walking to school
- Recreation space
- A taller bridge, a second bridge
- Reroute Cape traffic
- Preserve our community

Principles: Those factors that we will keep in mind as we make our recommendations to City Council.

Add a principle to our list or place a dot next to the one that is most important to you.

Added: An open, green space that would be residential-free (no homes) that would incorporate playing fields and gardens, environmental friendly.

Dots on:

- Provide a mix of housing and open space.
- An open, green space that would be residential-free (no homes) that would incorporate playing fields and gardens, environmental friendly.

Table Conversations

WANTS...

City must re-coup its costs

Use of federal/ state grants (3)

Develop green space, with homes on one side to offset costs.

South Portland Land Trust; Cape Elizabeth Land Trust

Access to the public

Community artist sculptures and buildings

Safe

Well used by all
Create this property's identity; make it a jewel

Housing

Housing affordable – under \$300k (2)
Affordable Housing – Co-housing, co-ops, townhouses (4)
Minimum 6000 sq. ft. lots
Big lots, fewer homes (the 16-18 units or less) (3)
 21 lots – better concept
Want condos like those off Willard (look like attached capes)
Build some tiny houses with restrictions against expansion
 Permanent houses, not mobile
Cottages/small houses
More lots with small house options
Row houses ok if single story
Less density, more green space
Row house and park, with parking
Townhouse/condos concept – maintenance-free for owners (3)
Encourage multiple generations in the neighborhood. (5)
Development toward retirees or mixed residential use, 55+ community, universal design (3)
Some units without yards for older people – don't have to take care of it.
OK with multi-story near embankment
Within character of the neighborhood; lot sizes similar to existing neighborhood
Traditional lot concept, especially the curved plan (4)
 Lowest impact on the neighborhood, but not interesting
 Reasonable prices
 Low density
Individual character
Similar style housing
Sell each unit to people (under a certain AMI(?), instead of developer, to create affordable housing (2)
Parking next to homes
No association
Buyers: lean toward year-round residents and first home buyers

(from email) Maybe a mixture should be considered, reflecting the many neighborhoods of the City. Some clusters, some tiny houses, some regular one- and two-story single family homes, a cul-de-sac or two, etc. Not exactly something for everyone, but something more heterogeneous. Is that a feasible development idea? Depends on how creative the developer might be.

(from email) I urge the committee to recommend setting aside a portion of the site for development of affordable housing, subject to design controls to assure that the housing is compatible with the surrounding area and other housing developed on that site.

(from email) I understand that the O'Neil Street Facility Re-Use Planning Committee will be holding a public forum tonight at the Brown School. As you know the mission of the South Portland Housing Development Corporation is to provide affordable housing in South

Portland. Although we have identified sites for possible development of housing within the City of South Portland, we have been faced with opposition. The South Portland Housing Development Corporation would like to have the O'Neil Street re-use plan include a portion of the site designated for affordable housing development. City staff and City Council members recognize a need for housing and this Re-Use Planning Committee has an opportunity to incorporate this housing need in the re-use plan and the beginning of the plan. If a portion of the property were designated for affordable housing, this would give us an opportunity to develop much needed housing in South Portland. I ask that you consider our comments in your meeting tonight.

Green Space

The whole parcel open space or park

Tax increase might be worth it.

Community gardens

There is no open space in the neighborhood.

Connect to Trout Brook?

Public access to green spaces (association vs City ownership)

Organic flow of houses and green space, curves

Leave the park the way it is now

Take the metal fence down (behind Hillside Ave. and Walnut St. houses)

Buffered to Walnut Street (2) and other parts of greater neighborhood

Maintain heavy buffer to homes on embankment

Liked the "common" design for green space (9)

With play space and exercise equipment

Calms traffic

A playground in the heart of the community and a walkable neighborhood. Have visitor parking.

Trees and edible shrubs

Partner with Maine Audubon for the public space development

Keep existing park on Pitt St.

Community pool – outdoor

Sledding hill

Garden spaces at houses (2)

Community garden space (4)

Communal shed for gardens and tool lending

Greenhouse (2)

Rather than resident gardens

Pollinator garden and bee hives (apiary) near the community garden

Fruit trees

Parking lot for gardeners

Trails around development (6)

Circle trail

Trail in back of houses

Make the entire property green space and park

Will the public really be welcome in the central spaces of the neighborhood?

Commercial Space

Like the food hub concept; community market (3)
Reach out to MOFGA to partner
Communal spaces (3) – Art studio, co-working space, tools lending
Who manages these?
What are the maintenance costs?

Pedestrian

Sidewalks (4)
Biking
Pedestrian access only at Pitt Street
Walking right of way on Kent Road
For crossing Cottage, make a push button for kids crossing
Walkable

Traffic

Traffic calming – cobblestone? (2)
Curved loop road (3)
with O'Neil Street bisecting the property
narrower, in back of houses, which would preclude people using it as a shortcut
One-way on O'Neil
Especially helpful for Hillside to Cottage difficult intersection
Throughway for autos from Pitt to O'Neil Streets
Stop light at O'Neil and Cottage (2)
To avoid through traffic, block O'Neil at Pitt
Speed controls on ALL streets
Public roads
Make Highland Road 25 MPH

Eco-conscious

Drainage/run-off plan
Underground utilities
Natural gas?
Hold to a green concept/plan as core to development
Environmentally conscious developer
Priority for an eco-friendly development – solar, geothermal, etc. (4)
Net zero on each home (2)
Homes with low operating cost that are energy efficient (2)
Rooftop solar (2)
Passive houses (2)
Minimize energy impact
Parking area with electric vehicles only with the community; charging stations
Speak with SMCC about energy sustainability
General solar development plan for energy production, with people in neighborhood purchasing, at less cost to the City.
The property orientation may be problematic.
Down facing street lights
Green building material
Pervious/porous surfaces

DON'T WANT...

Unwelcoming community

Too many lots, people, traffic (2)

Taxes to go up as a result

Parking lot (on Pitt Street) (2)

Negative impact on neighborhood property values

Smaller homes devalue surrounding property

We have done this before with a comprehensive plan for Knightville, and then the developer gets rezoning approval and the plan now defies what the neighbors wanted. How will this be different? This plan cannot be just about economics; it must be synonymous with the wishes of the neighbors.

Housing

Density higher than A zone or what currently exists in the neighborhood (3)

Mansions (> 2200 sq. ft.)

Traditional lots

Cul de sac

Curved street, with no access to green space

Large development impacting the neighborhood

Developers controlling the project

Strongly oppose buildings over 2.5 stories

Row-houses. Do not exist in the neighborhood already. (4)

Tiny houses

Rental units (2)

Apartment complex

Low-income housing

Very tall/high buildings (3)

Parking lot

Green Space

Lack of a tree buffer

City park

Limited green space

Trail behind a residence

Community gardens

Lose the hill off of Hillside

(from email) I can't believe the 'park/green space' idea would fly with the rest of the City. Let's recoup some money for the treasury.

Commercial Space

No commercial buildings (2); we're not using what we currently have

Food hub concept (4)

Increases traffic

The work hours may impact neighborhood

Food trucks more appropriate to Mill Creek

Traffic

- Concern about use of straight road unless use traffic calming measures
- One-way traffic streets in development (2)
- Perimeter road = more pavement
- Loop road idea (2)
- Significant increase in cut through traffic from many of the abutting roads (2)

Recent Addition: Notes from table conversation

1. Tiny Homes & Cottage Homes Concept
 - a. Like that greenhouse would be kept
 - b. Open space in the middle is great
 - c. Most liked Community Garden, but abutting neighbor did not, wants it moved
 - d. Row House concept group had mixed reactions, yes and no
 - e. Mixed residential concept group had mixed reactions, yes and no
 - f. Should be no parking lots next to already established housing lots
2. All Cottage Homes Concept
 - a. Not enough open space
 - b. Need to slow cars down, avoid traffic issues
 - c. Current O'Neil Street residents at table all supported street connecting to Pitt
 - d. 30 Homes is too many, can it be less?
3. Food as Community Development Concept
 - a. Love bend in road
 - b. Community garden location with buffer is good
 - c. Too dense, but like the concept
 - d. The food market idea was liked by some, but an abutter was very opposed to it
 - e. Adequate open space
 - f. Allowing neighbors to grow their own food is a big plus
4. Traditional Lot Development Concept
 - a. Most of table liked the trail around property
 - b. Density looks good with this design
5. Traditional Lot Development Cul de Sac Concept
 - a. Looks cramped, too dense with cul de sac
 - b. Prefer the other design with the trail
6. Traditional Lot Development Central Green Concept

- a. Density is OK
 - b. Island better than cul de sac
 - c. Concern about street around green area, not safe place for kids to play
7. Traditional Lot Development Curved O'Neil Street Concept
- a. Curved road is great, slow traffic
 - b. Density and green space is great
 - c. What separates green space from back yards? Do neighbors lose privacy?
 - d. Love the street design with esplanade, sidewalk, and trees along the street
8. Mixed Residential Common Green and Pedestrian Frontage Concept
- a. Street along perimeter is interesting concept
 - b. Prefer to see single homes where the row houses are
 - c. Some at table liked the townhomes, others did not
 - d. At community garden closest to current O'Neil Street, move the parking behind and bring garden up to the street
 - e. Liked the center green/common a lot
 - f. Safe place for kids to play
9. Other Comments
- a. Group did not want renters in the neighborhood
 - b. Prefer curved road to straight road
 - c. Most prefer single family homes, but some OK with a blend
 - d. Multi-use green/open space for neighbors, i.e. recreational, gardening, walking, etc.
 - e. Try to max open/green space within bounds of what is economically possible

QUESTIONS...

PLANNING

Do we have city surveys on population demographic trends? Who's here? Who's moving here?

Do we have a recent community survey?

Are there any burning community needs that this could fulfill – schools, mini-library?

What is affordable housing? How is it defined?

How do we implement affordable housing?

Is the City interested in promoting affordable housing?

REDEVELOPMENT

What is the timeframe for the redevelopment?

What's the cost of cleaning up the current site?

Will the City remove the fence between Walnut Street properties and Public Works?

Will there be an option for abutters to purchase additional land?
Will infrastructure (sewage pipes, water lines) be expanded for capacity of extra homes?
Why sell to a developer instead of directly to individuals?
How do we manage the developers?
Is there a reason why we're not discussing the economics alongside the design?

HOUSING

How many units would there be on this 6-acre site under the current A zone?
What is the as-built density of neighborhood?
On the traditional concept, what size would the houses be?
What's the difference between eco-housing and green housing?
How big are row houses?

TRAFFIC

Will traffic congestion be considered?
Will a traffic light be considered at Cottage and O'Neil?
Could Kent or Olive Streets be extended?

OPEN SPACE

What is the cost for the city and residents to create a park?
Who cares for and maintains the green space or trails?

COMMUNAL SPACES

Who would manage the co-working space?
Would community spaces be open to others outside the neighborhood?
If parking were not provided in the immediate area, what would the parking situation be? What is the impact to the neighborhood?
Would a playground or food market draw in too many outsiders in terms of traffic and parking?
Who has access to gardens if there is a community garden?

Why is there orange and pink spray paint on the road?

Appendix D

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS – O'NEIL STREET FACILITY RE-USE PLANNING

Q: Does the City have surveys on population and demographic trends? How is the population changing and who are the people moving here?

A: Please see Appendix A in the City's Comprehensive Plan [Appendices](#). Q: Does the City have a recent community survey?

A: Please see this [Survey](#) from 2009 — the most recent time a citizen satisfaction survey for South Portland was conducted.

Q: Are there any burning community needs that this property could be used to fulfill, i.e. land for a school, satellite library, etc.?

A: City Departments have not requested use of this property for an alternate use. The land area is too small for a new school facility.

REDEVELOPMENT

Q: What is the timeframe for redevelopment at the O'Neil Street Facility?

A: Once the O'Neil Street Re-Use Planning Committee has finished its work, and the City Council has given direction on a way forward, the process will transition toward implementation. Demolition of the current structures is not likely to begin before Spring 2018, but there is currently no solid timeline.

Q: What is the estimated cost of cleaning up the site?

A: The City has contracted with Sebago Technics for engineering and project management. They have estimated the cost of demolition and cleanup at around \$250,000.

Q: Will the City remove the fence between Walnut Street properties and current Public Works facility?

A: Unknown at this time. The Committee is aware that residents are interested in maintaining some amount of buffer for privacy, etc.

Q: Will there be an option for abutters to purchase additional land?

A: The City Council has not yet made any decision on the disposition of this City property. The Committee has been asked to recommend a re-use plan for the entire parcel.

Q: Will infrastructure (sewage pipes, water lines) be expanded for capacity of extra homes?

A: Yes, if residential construction occurs then utilities will need to be constructed to serve those buildings. This would be done at the cost of the developer.

Q: Why should the City sell to a developer instead of directly to individuals?

A: A subdivision project is typically managed by a single developer that oversees all demolition, earthwork, utility connections, and roadways constructed to City standards. The developer would then sell or build on the lots created.

Q: How does the City ensure the developer performs as agreed after the land is transferred?

A: The land is likely to be sold with certain performance guarantees and/or deed restrictions that will protect the City's interests as the project is implemented.

Q: Is there a reason why the Committee is not discussing economics along with the design?

A: The initial Design Charrette and Public Forum were meant to allow the Committee members and public an opportunity to express what qualities and characteristics should be included in a redevelopment plan. There will also be a review of economic feasibility to determine what is possible and how certain design elements can be integrated into the final recommended plan.

HOUSING

Q: How many housing units would there be on this 6-acre site under the current A zone?

A: Zoning in the A zone does not currently allow new housing development at the same level of density typically found in the Meetinghouse Hill neighborhood as part of a subdivision. Under current zoning, new subdivisions are limited to four housing units per acre.

Q: What is the as-built density of the neighborhood?

A: The average lot size in the neighborhood is about 6,000 square feet, or seven housing units per acre.

Q: As part of the traditional concept design, what size would the houses be?

A: The size of houses in the neighborhood vary, but generally are between 1,000 sq. ft. to 1,500 sq. ft. The Committee has not discussed a desired range, but Design Standards would likely be included in any zoning amendment made for this parcel.

Q: What is the difference between eco-housing and green housing?

A: Green homes and Eco-friendly homes are one and the same. In general, a green home uses less energy than a conventional home and is built with sustainable building materials.

Q: How big are row houses?

A: Row houses are a style of design where the front and side yards are very small or non-existent, built to the sidewalk, and typically with enclosed back yards. Row houses are an example of intermediate housing density, and provide a more intimate neighborhood feel. Row houses can be all different sizes, with heights from just one-story to five or more stories.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Q: What is affordable housing? How is it defined?

A: *“Families who pay more than 30 percent of their income for housing are considered cost burdened and may have difficulty affording necessities such as food, clothing, transportation and medical care.” – U.S. Dept. of Housing & Urban Development*

Affordable Housing is generally accepted to mean housing that costs 30% or less of a household’s income. Affordable Housing prices vary at different income levels.

Q: How would a community implement affordable housing?

A: There are many strategies to create affordable housing opportunities for households along the income spectrum. South Portland Households earning 120% or more of Area Median Income (AMI) are unlikely to be cost-burdened in the current market. Common strategies to create more housing opportunities for household between 80-120% of AMI include “Inclusionary” land use policies, reducing the cost-basis to build new housing through a variety of land use policies, and supporting housing agencies that seek to create affordable housing for middle income families. Creating housing for families below 80% AMI is more challenging, and typically relies on various financing programs, government subsidies, and tax incentives to “buy down” the cost of creating new housing units that would be unfeasible to build in the market.

Q: Is the City interested in promoting affordable housing?

A: The City Council has created an Affordable Housing Committee to study the issue, has adopted the Committee’s report in 2016, and has expressed support for pursuing many of the policy recommendations made by the Committee.

Q: What is considered an “affordable” price for a single family home for a family earning the area median income?

A: The median income for a family in South Portland is \$67,051 (2015 American Community Survey). After making some assumptions regarding interest rates, property taxes, and insurance, it is estimated that a family earning the median income could afford a house priced at approximately \$250,000 or less.

TRAFFIC

Q: Will traffic congestion be considered?

A: Yes, the Committee recognizes that traffic is an important issue for the neighborhood and will consider traffic calming streetscape design and points of ingress and egress within the neighborhood. The City has also asked Sebago Technics to conduct a traffic study of the O’Neil Street area.

Q: Will a traffic light be considered at Cottage and O’Neil?

A: The potential changes in traffic patterns and counts are not anticipated to warrant a signalized intersection at the intersection of Cottage and O'Neil. A traffic study will be done as part of the planning process.

Q: Could Kent or Olive Streets be extended?

A: Because of the significant change in grade from those streets to the current Public Works facility, it is not feasible to extend those streets.

OPEN SPACE

Q: What is the cost for the city and residents to create a park?

A: The cost of the park would include both the demolition and clean-up of the site as well as the cost to create and maintain the new park. If the City Council would like to consider that alternative, then a cost analysis would likely be done.

Q: Who cares for and maintains the green space or trails?

A: Unknown. This would depend on who owns the land or has a right to use the land. If retained by the City, it may be the City or Land Trust, etc. If owned by the private property owners, it may be the neighborhood residents themselves or if part of a conservation easement the Land Trust or other organization.

COMMUNAL SPACES

Q: Who would manage the proposed co-working space?

A: The City would have to identify an operator to manage the space on behalf of the City.

Q: Would community spaces be open to others outside the neighborhood?

A: If the land is owned privately then certain rules might apply limiting access. However, if owned by the City or another public entity then it is likely the public would have the right to access the community spaces.

Q: If parking were not provided in the immediate area, what would the parking situation be?

A: It is unknown what the parking demand would be without understanding the size and scope of open space, what amenities would exist, etc. If there was demand for parking and no parking was provided, then some on-street parking would likely occur.

Q: Would a playground or food market attract people from other neighborhoods, and what would be the impact in terms of traffic and parking?

A: The demand for those amenities is unknown at this time. One could assume that any amenity would attract some people. Both traffic and parking will need to be considered when contemplating any public amenities as part of the redevelopment.

Q: Who has access to gardens if there is a community garden?

A: This would depend on who owns the land and what rules exist. For example, if the Community Garden Collective were responsible for managing the garden area, then it would probably be managed similarly to the community garden adjacent to Hamlin School.

Q: Why is there orange and pink spray paint on the road?

A: Anytime a project will involve digging in the ground, the *Dig Safe* process must be followed, which involves contacting all utilities that may have infrastructure underground. Each type of utility has its own respective color. The color Pink, specifically, is a "Temporary Survey Marking". In this instance, the City is undertaking a formal survey of the Public Works property.

Appendix E

Report to City Council – 6-26-17 Status update after the O’Neil public forum

Laura Moorehead, Facilitator

Outcomes from tonight

- I. Update on our process and the forum.
- II. Will also talk about next steps in the process of determining a set of recommendations, with a cost/benefit analysis for each, for you to consider as you decide how the site will be repurposed.
- III. Tonight, we want to know if anything is a clear no-go, or if there is anything you’d like to add to our thinking. This is a chance for you to bring your input to our process of understanding what the public wants and doesn’t want.

Update

- i. Have met as a committee four times. Third meeting, May 25, invited Curt Jensch, Craig Piper (SMRT) and Kylie Mason (Sebago Technics) to run a short charrette with the committee members and we invited the members of public who attended to join us. From the discussions, the experts created conceptual drawings for us to use in the public forum on June 20, something for the public to respond to, add to and push against.
- ii. You have the notes from the forum on what the public wanted, didn’t want and what questions still need to be answered.
- iii. The committee met in its fifth meeting to debrief on May 22.
 1. We heard that the public wants something that is seen as a gem in South Portland. What that looks like is still unclear.
 2. In general, the committee acknowledged that we need to have more precise definitions and common language. Affordable housing → houses of certain size and price. Eco-conscious/green design – what does that encompass?
 3. Also acknowledged that it is time in the process to bring in experts to talk about green space possibilities, traffic, environmentally friendly housing designs... And to help with the economic considerations of various scenarios.

The committee also identified the most prevalent themes from the forum:

Green space. Range of possibilities from the site being a natural park entirely (a once in a lifetime opportunity with this property)... to having a large green space, with a few houses to offset the cost... to having a design that balances housing and green space, including walking trails, a playscape, a field that serves as a commons, and community gardens.

Question is what % of space will be left natural or landscaped?

Housing. Discussion ranged from housing traditional to the neighborhood to housing solutions for different living scenarios, such as young families, mixed housing and the need for universal design for seniors and others.

Question is what amount of people with what amount of traffic do we want in this space?

Traffic. Lots of discussion about O'Neil Street opening to Pitt Street, with traffic calming measures and curved streets in the property. There was acknowledgement that traffic density in comparison to Public Works vehicles, although different, may be a wash. There were concerns that there should be parking for any communal space, like a playscape or community gardens. If compared to Di Pietro park on Pillsbury, even when well-used, parking may not be as impactful as people are anticipating.

As a next step, we will likely bring in a traffic engineer to talk about "accessories" to the re-development, such as a blinking light or pedestrian crossing at O'Neil and Cottage.

Eco-conscious. To this forum group, concepts included things like... (referred to forum notes).

Work with partners for best results: MOFGA, Audubon, South Portland Land Trust, Community Garden Collective, and the Resilience Hub

Next Steps

1. Narrow to 3-5 recommendations to Council, or fewer, if you prefer, each with a level of analysis. At this juncture, it seems the bottom line choice may be that the City can either retain the property and convert it to green space, or developers who bid on the space must meet a specific set of criteria.
2. Answer the questions through a FAQs format on the Committee's webpage.

So... At this point,

- a. How do you feel about where we're going with this process?
- b. Is there anything that is a definite no?
- c. What would you suggest we consider that you did not hear in my summary?

LM's notes from Councilors' and public comments:

Public:

- This is a city of neighborhoods. We are creating another neighborhood.
- I'm interested in housing that people can afford, those who are downsizing and don't need a lot of space, and young people too. I also want green space and walking trails.

Councilors:

Beecher: How will we deal with the brownfield? It's important to understand what matters to the public. I am not for multi-family housing and am interested in residential use with open space. I would like 4 recommendations.

Cohen: The outreach for this public forum was effective and the process is working, so 2-3 recommendations would be ideal. There has always been the agreement that the proceeds from the sale of the O'Neil Street property would offset the cost of the Highland Road construction. In addition, a percentage of the proceeds would go to the Land Bank. Therefore, the City can't retain the property,

and we don't want to sell lots individually. Great Diamond Island has a good example of single- and double-family residences, common space and trails, which makes it very unique. Will net-zero houses be more expensive? Let's think in terms of traffic into the site having the option to use O'Neil or Pitt.

Henderson: I like the process and would want to see 2-3 proposals. Green space and housing, socialization with common spaces, instead of front lawns. I also want some rental properties, with the size of all houses at an affordable level. Inclusionary zoning should be considered, with deeds written that the owner can't flip a house and sell it for three years or more. We can live comfortably with a lot less luxury. Let's use the Mill Creek Comprehensive Plan and the Broadway Corridor Plan as the basis for the decisions we make about traffic through O'Neil Street. Also, we are assessing the needs of the elderly in South Portland so that they can age in place. Universal design is very important.

Smith: It's been good to have a gut check and it seems we're heading in the right direction. Let's have the Committee come up with three recommendations.

Appendix G

O'Neil Street Property Re-use Committee December 13 Public Forum Comments on Recommendations

During the public forum, participants formed small discussion groups to comment on the recommendations. There also was a letter from a neighbor with comments that have been incorporated here. These are their reactions:

Positive Reactions:

- We embrace this community opportunity to grow our neighborhood in a positive, healthful way that suits current times, yet remains respectful of the folks already here and what they have invested in nurturing their families, homes and yards.
- Let's continue to value Meeting House Hill as an inviting, multigenerational neighborhood.
- There was positive feedback that the re-development shouldn't seem like an "island", that it fits into the fabric of the existing neighborhood. As one longtime resident stated, they would like the design to maintain a high level of continuity between the current dwellings and any new dwelling on the hill. Assure that the development follows the current lot sizes and types of housing already present in our hill neighborhood."
- Originally, the concepts were wide open in their possibilities. Glad that now the site will be residential.
- The ideas and qualities seem like they will fit with the neighborhood.
- Affordable housing is still so important, and yet, we need to guard against the development being too dense. Smaller square footage could keep it affordable, as well as building in a way that allows for later expansion (finishing the basement or second floor) and amenities (solar power, heat pumps). There was much discussion about what "affordable " means and lots of people weighing in on what the price range of the houses might be for "affordability".
- Elderly housing and starter homes for young couples could be similar designs.
- Reduced number of units being considered. (Density based on 30 – 40 units as a basis for the traffic flow studies.)
- Fine community involvement process
- In the first public forum, one concrete thing that emerged was big support for extending O'Neil Street through to Pitt.
- Putting in a community garden would not cost the developer or the City. Deed the land to the South Portland Land Trust.
- Love the idea of an architectural review committee reviewing the preferred developer's design.
- Suggested enclosed storage sheds for outdoor "stuff," like trash and recycling bins
- Owens explained in detail what a contract zone is. [The definition should be part of any future public document that uses this term.]
- The process has been good, and transparent. Appreciate the time that the Committee has taken to be thorough.
- There had been a concern about more traffic on Pitt Street if O'Neil were opened up. However, in understanding that there likely would be a balance of O'Neil residents leaving at different times of the day, he feels like it will be fine.

Concerns:

- The process has gone well, but would have liked to have seen an overall concept along with the recommendations. He knows, though, that when the developers submit their proposals, there will be conceptual designs.
- Suggested that we specify percentages of what we want in the recommendations, e.g. with single family or multiple units
- Wary about the potential use of the Parks building, particularly concerned about anything that encourages lots of cars parking there.
- If there is a park space, who would own and maintain it?
- An abutter thought the City should own the buffer zone around the entire parcel.
- The only way we can have affordable units is if the City does it, and that won't happen.
- Don't want a distinct neighborhood within an existing neighborhood.
- Don't just plow down everything on the property. Preserve the older trees and plantings that can be beautifully incorporated in the design. If Public Works hasn't destroyed them yet, why should a developer?
- An abutter is very concerned that the steep slope will not be taken care of properly.
- A number of people were suspect of the Traffic Study and are concerned about increased traffic and how the O'Neil Street cut-through usage would affect the quality of their neighborhood.
- A neighbor mentioned a high water table and that they didn't want water problems in their basements because of the new development.
- There should have been a mailing for this public forum, along with distributed flyers.