

Town of Stoneham
Request for Proposals
East and North Elementary Schools
Comment Period
July 6, 2011 thru July 20, 2011

Chronology

- Draft copy of East and North School RFP posted to www.ci.stoneham.ma.us on Wednesday July 6
- Marcia Wengen notified the following people by e-mail on Wednesday July 6: Shelly MacNeill, Bee Russo, Paul Rotondi, Kristen Drew, Steve Chiodi, Gene Ferullo, Gail Melkonian , John Bracciotti, Valerie Corrente, Regina Marquis (came back undeliverable at 3:32 pm)
- Letter to abutters mailed Thursday July 7

No responses from East School abutters. Responses from North School abutters as follows:

=====

-----Original Message-----

From: Mark Drew [mailto:mddrew@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 06, 2011 5:59 PM
To: mmwe@mmwe.cnc.net
Subject: [JunkMail] Fwd: Fw: DRAFT of RFP for North and East Schools

Marcia,

Thank you for the draft RPF. I am unable to locate the deadline date for submitting any requested revisions to the town. Could you please let me know that date.

Sincerely,

Mark Drew

Response from Marcia Wengen at 6:59 p.m. on July 6

[Mark](#)

[the letter will say Wed July 20; sooner would be helpful](#)

=====

-----Original Message-----

From: Mark Drew [mailto:mddrew@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 06, 2011 7:02 PM
To: marciam.wengen
Subject: [JunkMail] Re: DRAFT of RFP for North and East Schools

Marcia,

Would you mind clarifying the process. After we have submitted requests for revisions, will there be a final DRAFT prior to sending out the RFP? Who will decide what changes go into the RFP? Also, how will all of the individuals at the meeting as well as people in the neighborhood know what other individuals have requested for changes?

Thank you for your assistance in answering these questions.

Mark Drew

Response from Marcia Wengen at 7:46 a.m. on 7/7/11

Mark: received, will get back to you, probably Monday when David Ragucci returns from vacation

Regards,

Marcia M. Wengen

From Mark Drew on 7/7/11 at 8:12 am

Marcia

Thank you for following up so quickly. I very much appreciate it.

Sincerely,

Mark Drew

=====
=====

Original Message-----
From: Valerie Corrente [mailto:Valerie.Corrente@umb.edu]
Sent: Thursday, July 07, 2011 12:04 PM
To: marcia m. wengen
Subject: RE: North School RFP - DRAFT

Marcia:

I would like to ask why each option has condominiums as part of the option? I thought the abutters were pretty clear that we did not want condominiums. Or do you mean condo's in relation to the 55+ living situation?

Valerie Corrente

Marcia Wengen responded on 7/7/11 at 5:31 p.m.

received; will get back to you, probably Monday, when David Ragucci returns from vacation

Regards,

Marcia M. Wengen

-----Original Message-----

From: m.corrente@comcast.net [mailto:m.corrente@comcast.net]

Sent: Thursday, July 07, 2011 4:40 PM

To: mmwe@mmwe.cnc.net

Subject: Fwd: North School RFP - DRAFT

Marcia, I attempted to view the North school RFP file on the Stoneham Town web site and got the message that the file is corrupted and unavailable? I would like to review the RFP.

Also, while you already have my wife Valerie's email address, please also add mine: m.corrente@comcast.net

thank you,

Michael Corrente

Response from Marcia Wengen 7/7/11 at 5:01 p.m.

Sorry, it worked yesterday. I forwarded your statement to the town's IT guy who did the original load. A paper copy will be available at the Town Administrator's office before noon. More to follow

Regards,

Marcia M. Wengen

Marcia,

We hate to see another building destroyed. What can we do to save the building?

Mary Lou Bracciotti

E-mail from John Bracciotti on 7/7/11 at 7:53 pm

No e-mail response from Marcia Wengen

Email from Paul Rotondi on 7/8/11 5:55 pm

I have two general comments;

1. There should be two prices, one without the extra houselot and one including the houselot.
2. The demolition of the building is not limited to the houselots, one senario is adaptive re-use and the other is demolition.

Paul

No e-mail response from Marcia Wengen

Response at 4:14 pm on July 11 from Marcia Wengen to Mark Drew e-mail of July 6

[Mark: here is the response from David Ragucci](#)

no other drafts will be posted however comments concerns and issues raised during the comment period will be addressed if need be in the final RFP. The final RFP will be in the central register on 7-27-11. If there are any other problems with the RFP we will address them through addendums. Yes we will attempt to compile questions and answers on the web page with regards to the RFP.

Regards,

Marcia M. Wengen

Reply from Mark Drew 7/11 at 5:06 pm

Marcia,

Thank you for the follow up.

Sincerely,

Mark Drew

=====
=====

Response at 4:23 p.m. on July 11 from Marcia Wengen to Valerie Corrente email of July 7, 2011

Valerie Corrente

I spoke with Mr. Ragucci this morning and he remembers condos as one of the options.

Also, I recall that Jack Bracciotti from Broadway stating his interest in 'high end' condos. I think it was Mr. Crowley from Steele St who mentioned over 55 condos for those who were tired of raking leaves!

Subsequent research has determined that the over 55 qualification needs 10 acres of land which this property does not have.

Feel free to write the options you think would be appropriate keeping in mind that as a town we want to cast the widest net for interested developers.

Regards,

Marcia M. Wengen

Out-of-office reply from Valerie Corrente 7/11/11 at 4:22 pm

I will be out of the office until July 25th. I will have limited access to email. If your issue is urgent, please mark that in subject area.

I will return all emails upon my return.

If you need immediate assistance please contact Nancy. Mccarty@umb.edu.

Response from Valerie Corrente on July 12 at 8:21am

Marcia:

I clearly remember Mr. Ragucci talking down condo's since no developer would finance condo's and there is not a market for condo's etc. I guess we have different memories. I will discuss with my neighbours.

Valerie Corrente

No e-mail response from Marcia Wengen

-----Original Message-----

From: Chiodifam [mailto:chiodifam@rcn.com]

Sent: Friday, July 15, 2011 8:06 AM

To: marcia m. wengen

Subject: Re: North School RFP - Draft

Marcia,

Can you add in the RFP a mandate stating no on street parking?

Steve Chiodi
617-875-5991

Response from Marcia Wengen on July 15, 2011 at 11:40 a.m.

Steve: I spoke with David Ragucci and the North School RFP is not the correct venue to address parking issues.

A request to ban on-street parking on Collincote St, or any other street for that matter, would require a petition from the residents to the Town Administrator who would then forward it to the Selectmen for discussion/decision. The petition would also go to the Safety Officer, Joe Ponzio, for an opinion.

Off-street parking will be addressed with the selected developer thru the rezoning process; i.e. the number of parking spaces per housing unit that the developer must provide.

Regards,

Marcia M. Wengen

From John and Anne Harrington
6 Steele Street, Stoneham

Thank you for having the neighborhood meeting on June 29 and posting the RFP. We have reviewed the RFP and want to comment on the following:

1. We are not in favor of Option 4 building single family homes on the undeveloped property. There was only one person in the meeting who stated that interest, and he is not an abutter of the property.
2. We agree that the property next to James Brunini of 2 Steele Street can be sold as a single-family lot. It would be very easy to tap into the town resources and doesn't affect the rest of the North School property.
3. In Exhibit B, it states a 15-foot buffer of trees would separate the subject property neighboring lots. During the meeting on June 29, Paul Rotundi stated at least 5 to 6 times that there would be a 50-60-foot buffer of trees. Now the RFP states 15 which is quite a decrease; and as a property owner abutting the property, this is not acceptable as a mandatory site improvement. At least with 50 to 60 feet there is some room for adjustment, with 15 there is not. Case in point is the Stoneham Bike path between Walgreen's and Angelo's Restaurant. Even though there is a mandated width of a bike path, it was violated and approved by the Town.
4. We would prefer that the North School not be demolished, but rather gutted and used for residential purposes as stated in Options 1, 2, and 3, preferably for the 55+ population.
5. If there is to be an addition to the North School, it should be kept within the architectural design.

Thank you for listening to our concerns,

Anne Harrington

John Harrington

Email from Penny Harrington on 7/19/11 at 9:40 a.m.

Response from David Ragucci on 7/19 at 2:24 p.m.

Hi Anne, as was mentioned in the public meeting we wanted to hear concerns from the neighborhood but would have to take into consideration the entire town and the benefit to the 22,000 residents. Mr. Rotundi did recommend a 50-60 foot "buffer zone". With that in mind when we looked at the "buffer zone" it was agreed that 15 ft is a good distance form the property line that will not be touched. Remember we will also require zoning set backs in the rear and side lot lines that would also give the abutters additional privacy. The need to reduce the buffer was so

that the town can make it more attractive to developers. I will speak with Paul and the group to see if we can extend the buffer zone.

The single family homes were discussed but to my memory were not rejected by the neighbors. The 55+ development we learned later can not happen because of State requirements of only allowing this type of development on 5 or more acres, we only have 3. The last point is good and is addressed in Exhibit C. We hope to have the RFP completed next week. Dave

-----Original Message-----

From: Mark Drew [mailto:mddrew@gmail.com]

Sent: Wednesday, July 20, 2011 10:20 AM

To: mmwe@mmwe.cnc.net

Subject: DRAFT North School

Marcia,

I want to thank you and David, and selectmen Rotondi for being so thoughtful in putting together the RFP. Below, I have outlined some requested changes to the Draft RFP dated 6/23/11 regarding North School. The requested changes are in **RED**.

3.0 Reuse Options

Option 1

Adaptive reuse of existing structure

- an assisted living complex (There should be a limit on the number of units. 600 SQFT seems to be an average size in adjacent towns. I submit that we should assign a maximum number of units to be less than 30 Units)
- Market Rate Residential condominiums (no professional units) (There should be a limit on the number of units. 1200 SQFT average would mean 17 or fewer units)
- market rate age restricted (55+) residential condominiums (no rentals) (There should be a limit on the number of units. 1200 SQFT average would mean 17 or fewer units)

Option 2

Adaptive reuse of existing structure with attached addition on north or east side of building as:

- an assisted living complex (There should be a limit on the number of units. 600 SQFT seems to be an average size in adjacent towns. I submit that we should assign a maximum number of units to be less than 50 Units)
- Market Rate Residential condominiums (no professional units) (There should be a limit on the number of units. 1200 SQFT average would mean 30 or fewer units)
- market rate age restricted (55+) residential condominiums (no rentals) (There should be a limit on the number of units. 1200 SQFT average would mean 30 or fewer units)

Option 3

Adaptive reuse of existing structure with detached sympathetically designed building elsewhere in the site as::

- an assisted living complex (There should be a limit on the number of units. 600 SQFT seems to be an average size in adjacent towns. I submit that we should assign a maximum number of units to be less than 50 Units)
- Market Rate Residential condominiums (no professional units) There should be a limit on the number of units. 1200 SQFT average would mean 30 or fewer units)
- market rate age restricted (55+) residential condominiums (no rentals) (There should be a limit on the number of units. 1200 SQFT average would mean 30 or fewer units)

Rationale:

In the RFP, there is a limit on the number of single family homes based on zoning. I think this is appropriate and it should follow that we should set expectations for the number of units for either assisted living or condos. Too many units can cause excess traffic, noise, and could negatively impact the neighborhood. This thought process is in line with 4.0 bullet # 3 on page 8 where it states that "the buyer's commitment to improve the neighborhood with appropriate redevelopment project". We are looking for an improvement to the neighborhood.

I have spoken with my neighbors about these changes as well as our preference for the project. As this process continues, we will continue to be engaged in working with the Selectmen, Town Administrator, and other non-neighborhood Stoneham residents to come to a solution that benefits the neighbors as well as the town of Stoneham

Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions about the aforementioned requested changes.

Please reply to this email to acknowledge receipt of this email.

Sincerely,

Mark Drew

Response from Marcia Wengen on July 20 at 10:28 a.m

[Mark: I forwarded to David, Attorney Solomon and Rachel Meredith-Warren.](#)

Regards,

Marcia M. Wengen

-----Original Message-----

From: Mark Drew [mailto:mddrew@gmail.com]

Sent: Wednesday, July 20, 2011 10:36 AM

To: marcia m. wengen

Subject: Re: DRAFT North School

Thank you Marcia. I do have a question that may have been answered at the meeting prior to my attendance. What is Rachel Meredith-Warren's involvement in this project?

Sincerely,

Mark Drew

Response from Marcia Wengen on July 20 at 11:08 am

Mark: Rachel is a Stoneham resident who happens to be a stay at home mommy. She volunteered her skills in urban planning (Masters Degree from Tufts) to help with the RFPs. We are very lucky to have such talent in town!

Regards,

Marcia M. Wengen

Secretary

Stoneham Historical Commission

Town Hall

35 Central Street

Stoneham, MA 02180

Response from Rachel Meredith-Warren on July 20 at 11:22 am

I also have a semi-outdated profile on Linked In too if you all want to see a bit more. I've been devoted to RE development, urban planning, and property management for the past 9 years. In my last job, I was a project manager with a \$24m portfolio of projects in all phases of development, from early pre-dev through construction.

(One thing that pains me about my resume it is that I should have asked for a better title when I worked in Denver. I was working as a Development Officer more than an Assistant. But, that was before I learned how to negotiate! :)

Response from Marcia Wengen on July 20 at 6:19 p.m.

Mark: I've conferred with David and Rachel and we thank you for sending this very useful criteria. We think it will make a great tool to evaluate proposals but are concerned that these limits are overly specific for the RFP itself and conflict with the overarching goal of generating as many desirable options for the Town as possible.

Your neighbor, Selectman Rotondi, recommended that we combine the options into two (2). We are working with Attorney Solomon and it's likely that the wording for Section 3.0 in the RFP will change to something along the lines of:

"With awareness of the needs of the Town as a whole, the Town will consider any and all well thought out proposals for use of the property.

At a public hearing on June 29, 2011, residents of the North School neighborhood articulated several desirable development scenarios for the site. Their preferences, which the Town will also be taking into consideration during their review, are described below (in no particular order).

The neighbors overarching concern is that any development on the site must be consistent with the existing scale and built character of the neighborhood.

Option 1 : Adaptively reuse existing structure. An addition may be attached to structure. Separate complementary or accessory buildings may be included.

Allowed uses:

- Assisted living complex
- Market rate residential owner-occupied condominiums (no professional units)

Option 2: demolish school building (see exhibit G for deconstruction guidelines).

Allowed uses:

- Single family housing not to exceed 10 dwellings
- Assisted living complex
- Market rate residential owner-occupied condominiums (no professional units,)
- 55+ age restricted housing was a preference as well, but the state requires a minimum of 5 acres for such development

The selected proposer may be asked to include in its marketing a preference for Stoneham residents, contingent on such a preference being consistent with fair housing laws, state and federal regulations, and project financing.

Regards,

Marcia M. Wengen

Response from Mark Drew at 8:27 p.m. on July 20

Marcia,

Thank you for your quick response. However, I disagree with the committee's opinion and ask for it to be noted as a matter of record. Unfortunately, I think that a better response would have been to come to an agreement as to a number presented as a limit.

Also, I would like to understand Rachel's role. It was indicated in a previous email that she volunteered to assess proposals. Under what authority from the town has she been granted special privilege to review and provide opinion that impacts decisions related to an official town documents such as an RPF. If a vote has been cast by the committee or selectmen in this regard, would you mind please sharing the meeting minutes. I am in no way challenging her credentials or expertise. I am sure she is very capable. I simply would like to understand her official authority in this process. I have consulted with an independent real estate expert who advised me to include the requested changes that I submitted. Therefore, you can see the dilemma where two expert opinions differ.

For your records, I would like to indicate to you and the other committee members that I consider these correspondence public record and as such I reserve the right to publish and share the correspondence via all media including postings on a website, social media outlets such as facebook and linkedin, U.S. Mail, handouts, and via email. I think it is important to share the responses from the committee with other residents of Stoneham who may have alternative viewpoints on the subject.

Sincerely,

Mark Drew