

Community Preservation Committee  
Minutes  
March 21, 2017

Members Present: Catherine Schlichte, Co-Chair, Barbara Silberman, Co-Chair, John Feener, Hank McCarl, Ellen Preston, , David Rhineland

Absent: Heidi Wakeman and Karen Carter

Affordable Housing Trust: George Sibley, Chair; Mike Luster and Rick Doucette

Staff Present: Deb Laurie, Gregg Cademartori, Planning Director and Matt Coogan, City Planner

The meeting was called to order by Catherine S. at 6:35 PM. Catherine S. said we would take items out of order to accommodate Gregg C. and Matt C. for the Housing Production Plan Presentation.

**Item #4 Housing Production Plan**

Gregg C. introduced himself and Matt. He gave a brief introduction of the Plan and turned it over to Matt C. for the power point presentation. (see attached) The Committee and the Trust had a few questions, during the presentation. Gregg stated some ideas they are looking at regarding how to streamline the permitting process as well as the funding process to make it easier for developers and organizations to actually build something in Gloucester. Catherine S. asked if there was anything the two Boards should be doing in the meantime. Gregg stated that they need to come up with what the potential solicitation or programs are going to be and then come back to the two boards with the information in about six months. The Committee praised Gregg C. and Matt C. for the presentation and all their work on the plan, which should be a useful tool moving forward.

**Item #5 Round Table Discussion with Affordable Housing Trust**

The two Boards discussed their process for accepting applications and how they could coordinate their efforts to make it more effect for applicants and developers. The Trust receives their funds from a developer in lieu of creating an affordable unit or units. They have only received \$350K from the development in West Gloucester and spent about \$100K on four projects to date. They have approximately \$250K left to award. They do not have an application round; they wait for applications to come to them. They have a quick turnaround unlike the CPA. Catherine S. explained that CPC accepts applications once a year and it takes about 10 months to get everything approved with City Council. 10% is set aside for housing. CPC hasn't received many applications for housing so there is money available. CPC can also give money out of the general reserve also. Most of their applications are for historic preservation and open space/recreation. The Committee talked about the Fuller project and how the funding formula works. Catherine S. feels the formula needs to be changed to obtain as many affordable units as possible. If the Trust is to receive the 1.5M; you can't build 25 units for that amount of money. The Committees look forward to working together on coordinating the process and perhaps giving the Trust some housing money.

**Item #1 Approval of Minutes**

John F. made a motion to accept the minutes of February 21, 2017, and seconded by Hank M. All in favor, yes. Minutes approved.

**Item #2 Update on Open Projects and Eligibility Forms Received**

David R. asked what the status was with the Legion Building. The meeting was postponed but the Legion's proposal was approved and they already have their Purchase Order for the architect for \$9,500.

The Committee reviewed the eligibility forms received. A few questions, regarding some of the projects were asked and answered by Deb L., Catherine S. and Barbara S.

Deb L. gave an update of ongoing projects; nothing really new happening except with Matto's Field project. They raised the additional funds they needed for the bid; groundbreaking was last Monday with the Mayor. They will be awarding contract and starting project next month.

Catherine S. brought up the issue with the Legion application. They did not supply an Eligibility Form, but now want to submit an application for funding. This is separate from the \$9,500 that was just awarded for the architects scope and specs. The question on the table is whether or not the Committee should accept the application without having received the Eligibility Form. The Committee discussed the issue at length and decided that they should not accept the application. Catherine S. asked for a motion on whether or not to accept the Legion's Eligibility Form late. Hank M. wants to see the report from the architect before they consider anything else. Barbara S. made a motion to deny their request to submit an eligibility form late. Seconded by John F. All in favor, yes.

Deb L. mentioned that the projects that need Gloucester Historical Commission approval are before that Committee next Monday. Doesn't think there will be any issues.

Next meeting has been rescheduled from April 18<sup>th</sup> to April 25, 2017 in order for the applications to be reviewed by Committee. They were due on April 17<sup>th</sup>, but that day is a holiday, so Deb will let applicants know that they will be due on April 18<sup>th</sup>.

**Item #3 Response to Scituate Letter**

Pros and cons of possibly changing the law regarding water related uses of CPA funds were discussed. Barbara S. has done some research on the subject. She has done two things; spoke with Stuart Staginor of the Community Preservation Coalition and looked at the potential volume of such a request and how that may affect the funding. We have the third highest land to water ratio in the United States. Alaska is first and Michigan is second. Water uses would not be limited to just ocean; it would also include lakes, ponds, rivers etc. 26% of Massachusetts is water and the coastline is 192 miles long. She also looked at what is already in the water that has been funded; there are 15 vessels along the lines of the Schooner Adventure that require millions of dollars of repairs.

She also spoke with Stuart Staginor of the Community Preservation Act. He said he keeps of list in their office of all the communities' requests to change the CPA laws. They get many requests. The Coalition's main goal is to ensure that there is money in the Trust. The legislation hates to hear about potential changes because they set the program up to be funding something that was not funded. There was no money in the state budget for historic preservation, recreation, etc. So they don't want to expand it; if they expand it they may as well be part of the general fund. He stated that the potential for funding would render the program virtually ineffective. The Committee discussed the issue a bit further and decided not to support their request. Barbara S. will draft a letter of response indicating our concerns and that the Committee does not wish to support their effort.

MOTION by Catherine S. to adjourn, seconded by Ellen P. APPROVED unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 8:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Deborah Laurie

**List of Documents Reviewed:**

Draft minutes February 21, 2017  
Letter from Scituate  
Eligibility Form Chart