

Community Preservation Committee

Judge Welsh Hearing Room

July 12, 2005

9:00 a.m.

Members Present: Elaine Anderson, Mona Anderson, William Dougal, Eric Dray (arr at 9:15 a.m.), Nancy Jacobsen, and Winthrop Smith.

Members Absent: Tim Hazel (excused absence)
Stephen Milkewicz (unexcused absence)

Consultant: Laura Shufelt (excused absence)

The meeting was called to order at 9:02 a.m.

Meeting Agenda

Public Statements

There were none.

Continued Discussion with Laura Shufelt

Laura called and said she couldn't make the meeting because she had to be in Providence on a family matter. Elaine Anderson - after receiving a list of available dates from Laura – decided to stay on schedule and ask for her availability on July 26th. It was also thought that if she were not available, perhaps the new proposed forms could be received by all the Committee members via e-mail prior to the next meeting.

The general consensus was that Form 2 would be the preferred one. Everyone felt that Form 2 was a good starting point but they had many suggestions for tweaking.

To best summarize everyone's opinion on Form 2, the following suggestions were made:

2. Community Need is more in line with goals. There should be multiple choice of perhaps 3 options and maybe a narrative could be attached.
6. Success Factors: Elaine wants it left in – Eric wants it left off (redundant).
12. Should become #6 (regulatory compliance)
13. Should become #3 with a phrase added “and goals of Economic Development Council and the Local Comprehensive Plan (LCP).
14. Should be additional number detailing “Prior to submission a checklist should be submitted.”

Also under the section entitled **ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:** Numbers 10 through 13 should have titles, i.e. #12 Regulatory Compliance, and all of these titles should be highlighted.

There were two Form 2s and since none of the proposed forms were either dated or paginated it will be difficult to track future versions.

MORE COMMENTS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Bill Dougal said after reading over #12, “Are we implying that applicants have to go before ConCom before presenting to us?”

Mona Anderson wondered if it is limited to renovation projects? She feels that it is unclear? Bill said that it may not require all those approvals.

There were a few scenarios thrust about which would come under the title of “what ifs?” and had no concrete proposals as examples.

CONCLUSION:

It was thought that it would be valuable for any applicants to come before the Committee for “discussion only” purposes. They would talk about what they would like to do and would be guided by the Committee. They would not be able to go to regulatory boards and say, “We have the Community Preservation Committee’s blessing.”

After the applicant had the discussion and went to the different regulatory boards, they would be asked to then return for final approval. Bill Dougal also would like to require that the votes of the different boards, as well as, letters regarding support and/or non-support be presented to the CPC at that time. In that way, the Committee would be able to gauge community support for a particular project. This puts the onus on the applicant.

There were a few financing questions that are being held for Laura’s input.

Bill Dougal said there is a philosophical question cloaked in all these discussions. The longer the Committee waits to act, the less capacity we have to do things. Property values are escalating. Eric Dray also agreed, saying, “The earlier we spend this money, the better.”

Mona asked, “In terms of giving money to the applicant – do we just give blanket, requested amounts of money to the applicants – or do we receive progress reports much like a construction loan? Would we structure our money like a construction loan?” Mona would prefer it that way. She also thinks a checklist is important.

Bill – referring to Economic Development – said the LCP is not a big thing with the BoS. Eric feels LCP should be important to the BoS. The group agreed.

It was decided to send the changes that the Committee had hammered out to Laura and ask for a redo on July 19th so it can be digested before the meeting on the 26th.

Bill said a matrix system should be devised – regarding community support for projects. This Community Preservation is for the community and if the community doesn’t perceive that we’re fulfilling a need, then we have failed. Mona would like to take a poll of the townspeople. Eric Dray said that whatever project comes down the Pike; it will get a whole lot of press. Thus the public will be informed. Bill added that we’re still under Chapter 40B, “so just remember that.”

Mona asked if the Committee should tell the applicants that the projects are contingent upon public approval? Eric said that he is not afraid of supporting projects that the Town is not particularly in favor of.

Elaine Anderson worried that the Committee shouldn't set itself up as a wall – but rather as a partner. This Board has to agree on what we see as guidelines and priorities. That's the first order. She will request from Laura that everyone gets the redo by the 19th so everyone has something to report on.

Approval of June 14th minutes.

There was a change at the bottom of page 1 regarding Laura Shufelt's Invoice. There is no need for an RFP *because the invoices are considered intergovernmental services.*

Motion: Eric Dray made a motion to approve the minutes as amended. Bill Dougal seconded the motion and it was approved 5-0-1 abstention (MA).

Approval of June 28th minutes.

There were a few corrections to the minutes that Win Smith took. He will make these corrections and submit the final copy to the Town Clerk.

Motion: Bill Dougal made a motion to approve the minutes as amended. Eric Dray seconded the motion and it was approved 5-0-1 abstention (MA).

Any Other Business That Might Come Before The Committee

Mona Anderson had e-mailed Elaine Anderson with a comment that it could be a discussion item.

Mona's idea: Since the Tides Motel will be torn down, the Committee should petition the BoS to bank those bedrooms for future use in affordable housing plans. She said she will – if pointed in the right direction – go forth and work on this. When the acquisition is complete, she would like to be able to deed-restrict them.

Bill Dougal said he was at the BoS meeting yesterday and the BoS is very interested in this concept; also combining it with the Economic Development Council and how bedroom counts are allocated. There are certain critical red-dot properties that haven't connected to the sewer and how these bedrooms will be allocated.

Mona – with all that said – wants the bedrooms committed to the CPC – but WD says it should be in the Growth Management group. Mona wants a specific granting of bedrooms and Bill said that it won't happen. Bill Dougal said that there is no system for capturing lost gallonage of flow. "There is just no policy for that."

Eric said the group's goal should be to find ways to reduce costs so a developer can come before us with a project for 100% affordability. Elaine said she would like to keep this before the group as an open discussion. Laura would support that as well.

Win Smith's Update

Win said that the Planning Board is about to rewrite Category 3 of the Growth Management By-laws. He suggested the CPC work closely with the Planning Board on Category 1, changing terms to those consistent with C.P.A. documents and, for example, rewarding 1.A low/moderate income year-round

rental housing units so that everyone is in agreement. Mona agreed saying that there needs to be permanency for people who are forced to move from place to place depending on the season. She toyed with perhaps establishing a category called “lifetime tenancy.”

Bill Dougal said that the Committee’s charge is to produce 120 rental units. There is a lot of confusion about 1 bdrm and 2 bdrm, etc. how do we do it? He doesn’t want to support a project on that basis but will support a by-law if needed. (1st come – 1st serve basis doesn’t work any more.)

Schedule Next Meeting

THE NEXT MEETING WILL HAPPEN ON JULY 26TH AT 9:00 A.M.

The meeting adjourned at 10:40 a.m. by a unanimous vote.

Respectfully Submitted

Evelyn Gaudiano

E. Rogers Gaudiano

Approved by: _____ on _____
Elaine Anderson, Chair Date