

Kent/Station RFI -- 5 Respondents (Redacted)

Team	Specialties	Recent Experience in MA	Comments on Concept/Modifications	Interest
[Redacted]	Senior Housing Mixed income	[Redacted]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sale vs. long term ground lease could be considered – but advocate for developer ownership of land, building, parking and parking operations (Webster St. hotel)</li> <li>- 60 units is feasible and a minimum threshold for provision of on-site services</li> <li>- Would strive to maximize affordability</li> <li>- Project cannot carry an acquisition cost and be predominantly available to low/mod tenants</li> <li>- Project cannot carry the cost of replacing all of the parking; there would be tradeoffs in % market vs. affordable units to cover parking replacement costs</li> <li>- A development with primarily low/mod units is feasible – needs subsidy</li> <li>- Willing to explore other sources for parking (MassWorks)</li> </ul>	Yes, would submit a proposal
[Redacted]	Senior Housing Family Housing Workforce Housing Mixed income	[Redacted]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Town due diligence needed to inform proposals (Environmental/soil)</li> <li>- Consider use of friendly 40B</li> <li>- Clarity on expected compensation for land; acquisition cost diverts resources away from development</li> <li>- Setting purchase price creates a level playing field and lets Town focus on quality of design</li> <li>- Need to replace parking significantly increases cost and takes away from buildable square footage for housing; would ask Town to assist with replacement parking (how?)</li> <li>- Ground lease or ownership structure could work; expectations about compensation to Town hampers development resources in either structure</li> <li>- Confident that 60 units, majority affordable, is feasible</li> </ul>	Interested in RFP
[Redacted]	Senior Housing Workforce Housing Mixed income	[Redacted]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Believe a mixed-income senior development is financially feasible</li> <li>- Site could support as many as 65 units</li> <li>- Sale or ground lease could be considered; land sale more flexible, ground lease would likely limit to a rental project</li> <li>- Mixed-income with a majority of affordable units is optimal, regardless of lease/ownership structure</li> <li>- Would explore a complementary retail use</li> <li>- Wants to balance quality design, maximum affordability and the need to maintain parking</li> </ul>	Yes, would submit a joint proposal

		<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>		
[REDACTED]	<p>Housing for seniors, disabled and veterans</p> <p>- with integrated services</p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Establishing a mix of market, affordable and extremely affordable units could maximize feasibility</li> <li>- Advocates for co-locating units of permanent supportive housing with medical respite beds</li> <li>- Approach is to manage supportive housing units as part of site development</li> </ul>	<p>Interested in RFP; would act as operator/manager of co-located units</p> <p>(Joint application with developer?)</p>
[REDACTED]		<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- On-site services for seniors</li> <li>- Ground lease method is preferable</li> <li>- Feasibility is dependent on public subsidy</li> <li>- 50-70 units is plausible</li> <li>- Development should use space on Station St. for retail/commercial – a “front door” presence</li> </ul>	<p>Interested to submit proposal as Sponsor/Developer</p>