

Comments/Question for Cranesport

Submitted by D. Dodge

- The Mullins/Eco Village proposal requires the \$250,000 “purchase” price be used as the Town’s match for a River Restoration grant that the Town must apply for. What happens if the grant request is denied? Will there be some language in the purchase and sale agreement that covers that? If the grant is not received does the developer use the \$250,000 for river restoration? Or does the deal die?

Submitted by Anita-Brosius Scott

- How does Mr. Mullins know creatives will choose to rent space rather than work out of their residence?

@\$6/sq ft, 20x30ft would cost \$3600 not \$300. How should that mistake be corrected?

What if we don’t get the five stars grant?

Does Mr. Mullins have the funds to proceed with the project?

Is there any possibility of adding living space in a second floor loft for artisans to reside on site?
– would be a strong feature

Who/what entity would manage the completed property?

Can a public toddler playground be incorporated into the development design?

What considerations are incorporated in the constructions for energy efficiency for electricity and for heating? Will solar PV capacity be incorporated? Will the barn south-facing roofs support solar PV?

Submitted by Geoff Scott

- With all the experience Mullins has in low cost housing development, why didn't he pitch an affordable housing plan instead of an entrepreneurial development?
- What happens if they don’t receive the Urban Waters Restoration Grant?
- It seems the \$500K water grant can only be used for river habitat improvement, including the banks. Is that right? Could funds be used for say constructing a foot bridge across the river?
- Math on page 33 "Projected base rents of \$6 per square foot, or \$300 per month for a 20 by 30 workshop" doesn't add up. Is the monthly a typo and should have been \$3600/month or is the square foot rent a typo?

Submitted by Wyatt McConnell

- Would the town/Cranesport be willing to stipulate the town has a right of first refusal on the barn/pavilion/public restrooms?

Submitted by Sue Kandziolka:

- Is it possible to require native plants for any landscaping, no matter which proposal wins?

Runoff and water/flood control?

With the affordable apartment building and Mullins proposal, they're suggesting public use of private property. How does that work? Ice rink, playground. Would they be open at will? Liability? Stipulations? Probably many things I haven't thought of?

Is there a demand/need for this type of space? Was any market research done?

Did they talk to the Farmers' Market? That doesn't seem like the best place to locate it—where will the vendors park to unload and load and where will they keep their vehicles during the market?

Why pave over the current site of the FM? Why not leave it where it is on the grass? Anyone who's attended the market much prefers the grass as opposed to a paved area.

In this proposal almost the whole property is paved or otherwise covered by impermeable materials (the existing slabs).

How many parking places? Handicapped spaces?

Who will maintain it? Management company? Rental Agent? Snow removal, trash pickup, road maintenance, grounds and building maintenance?

Definition of light industrial; what does "industrial ecovillage" mean? What does the "eco" mean?

Use and disposal of toxic substances—dyes, chemicals, etc by tenants

Building orientation to take advantage of passive solar?

How soon could he resell?

Is there a way to assure they stay affordable? For how long?

More info about possible retail.

Noise, odor and light pollution.

CEDAC has suggested a possible living/studio arrangement. How would that work given the construction? Also the proposal states that these units would be temporary for the tenant, until the business supposedly outgrows the space.

What's to prevent the tenant from living in the space illegally?

****Please note that my page numbers refer to when reading the proposals online, not as printed out, which I think might be different.***

P 5—"In 2014, a majority of Camden voters supported commercial and business uses for the site, as opposed to preserving it as a park and open space." This is true, but the vote was very close. He neglects to mention that.

P 6—"There will be an educational component..." Explain.

P 7--Why is it described as being across the street from the Mt View Cemetery? It isn't—it's across from houses

P 12—what does "placemaking" mean? Who pays for the customization? The tenant? If so, that's an improvement at no cost to the owner that the tenant likely can't take along when they vacate.

"There will be an educational component to the Tannery Park and opportunities for partnerships with local institutions." Please explain. Did they talk to anyone to see if there's an interest? CIFF? The library? Anybody?

P 14--"Facilities and utilities to support the Farmer's Market."—what utilities? How big is the bathroom facility? Available year round to anyone? Who maintains it? Who deals with trash and recycling?

P 16—"A common market"—what does that mean? Moveable seating—how long until it's stolen?

P 18—"The proposed purchase price for the Tannery Park property is \$250,000, earmarked as a local match for the Five Star and Urban Waters Restoration Grant Program... " So the town doesn't retain the purchase price???

"Eligible projects approved by NFWF receive a 100% matching grant. If approved, it would provide \$500,000 in funding to restore this heavily impacted section of the Megunticook River." So the \$500,000 comes from \$250,000 from the town plus the matching grant?

P 20—Year-round farmers' market—building is unheated; if the building is going to be a permanent Farmers' Market, how can it also be used for events such as a wedding? Ice skating rink—who builds it, maintains? Hours? Fees?

P 22—how probable?

P 26—Photo shows interior that is completely finished—is this how they would look when rented or are they rougher? "Village Green" = grandiose; ditto Gateway Green

P 27—drawing shows dormers? Where are vendors' vehicles? Customer parking? Tenant parking? Is there enough parking? Bathroom building blocks view to river touted on a previous page.

P 32—“utility sharing”—what is that?

P 33—“specialized experience in supporting small businesses on the part of the sponsor.” What is this?

P 38—“In the Park’s utility plan, utility lines are reused, and connections made before the cap is placed,” What does this entail? Connections to the individual units? Connections to what?

“helical piles”

P 46—“The Big Barn will also provide additional options for companies, freelancers, and startups to find a shared place to work. This building will have flexible sized spaces that we envision working for a variety of small businesses.” Someplace else he suggests the barn for a year round FM and event space. What are “induced impacts”?

P 47—“landscaping near the river”—what does this mean? It should be left in as natural a state as possible

P 63—how many of these proposals have come to fruition; what kind of track record?
In a screenshot taken from this website: <https://www.camdentannerypark.com/> which supports Cranesport's proposal for the Tannery property. I'm just wondering where the vendors' vehicles are parked? I don't know if the rendering is to scale, but it certainly seems more aspirational than accurate. **-S.Kandzioka**

- Can you design for partial conversion to residential use over time?

Project is in the floodplain. How much is being budgeted to meet federal flood insurance costs?

Can you design for partial conversion to residential over time? **-J. Bennet**

- In the Cranesport proposal there is heavy emphasis on the Megunticook River Restoration Project and brook trout fishing. Two of the six resumes included in the proposal are professionals with water expertise unrelated to the property. When contacted, one of these consultants confirmed that their contribution to the project will be exclusively related to the river, not the larger property. The other consultant has not responded to inquiries.

The Cranesport offer includes payment to the town of \$250,000 to go exclusively to the River Restoration Project, to be match by grants solicited by the Town. Does this bind the town to fund the River Restoration Project? What if they don't secure funding? Is the town obligated to use the consultants listed in the Cranesport proposal, or would they be free to solicit their own consultants? What liabilities are hidden in this arrangement?

While it is a laudable goal to restore the river and promote brook trout fishing, should it be a primary focus of the development of the Tannery property? (which is separate from the River Walk and therefore technically does not even abut the River.) The River Restoration effort described in the Cranesport proposal seems to have nothing to do with developing the property in general and may just add complexity and unwarranted “strings attached” to the deal. If the

town wants to pursue river restoration, it should do so as a distinct separate endeavor, not tied to the development of this property. **-S. Holland**