

# Community Preservation Committee

## Minutes

July 17, 2018

**Members Present:** Barbara Silberman, Co-Chair; Catherine Schlichte, Co-Chair; Ellen Preston, Hank McCarl, Holly Clay-Smith, John Feener, Pam Tobey, and Heidi Wakeman.

**Absent:** Karen Carter.

Staff: Jaimie Corliss.

Lisa Ramos, David Faye, David Dow, JD MacEachern, and Mark Poulin.

Meeting called to order 6:04PM by Barbara S. Items were taken out of order

### **Item #7 Approval of Minutes**

MOTION: John F. made a motion to accept the minutes of May 1, 2018 as presented; Pam T. seconded, 8 in favor, 0 opposed

MOTION: John F. made a motion to accept the minutes of May 22, 2018 as presented; Pam T. seconded, 8 in favor, 0 opposed.

MOTION: Catherine S. made a motion to accept the notes of June 19, 2018 as presented; Ellen P. seconded, 7 in favor, 1 abstained.

### **Item # 4 Approval of Projects to be submitted for Coalition Social Media Campaign**

There was brief discussion regarding which projects to put forth for promotion by the Community Preservation Coalition social media campaign.

**MOTION:** John F. moved to recommend the Virginia Lee Burton writing cottage, Norcross Gateway, North Gloucester Woods, and Taylor Street Condo projects be submitted to the Community Preservation Coalition for further promotional purposes; Heidi W. seconded, 8 in favor, 0 opposed.

### **Item #2 – Stage Fort Park Advisory Committee Change of Scope to 2017 project**

Barbara S. discussed the proposed changes to the 2017 Stage Fort Park project for the archaeological survey and cannon restoration. There will be a \$9,245.00 balance in the 2017 Cannon and Archaeological Survey Project, once the survey costs are paid. David Dow, Stage Fort Park Advisory Committee, requested the balance of funding be amended to go towards the preservation of a Parrot Gun. He explained that the 2018 application was intended to be a continuation of the work currently on going at the Fort and would like to move forward with the cannons. At this time, landscape planning is on hold until after the archaeological study is completed. The one cannon not included in the 2017 CPA application is the Parrott gun, which will be used as a saluting cannon. Preparing the Parrott gun to be used will take extra work due to its weight and size. David D. further discussed the process for having the cannon restored. The carriage and wheels will be built out of aluminum and finished to look like wood. This would increase longevity, movability, and reduce maintenance costs. Catherine S. asked if the various

cannons are all from different eras. David D. confirmed that they are; the Parrot gun is from the early 1840s and the others came off the USS Constitution. Holly C.S. asked if the aluminum carriage has been verified as a proper historical preservation technique. David D. stated that it has not yet. There was discussion regarding the best process for amending the 2017 SFP application for cannon restoration. Catherine S. stated the archeological survey may impact the landscaping and cannon plan. Is the landscaper going to wait until the archeological survey is done before proceeding? David D. yes and that provision has been included in the application. It is unlikely the archeological survey will change the position of the cannons. John F. suggested it would make more sense to put in an off-cycle application for the landscaping plan and separate that project from the cannon restoration. The Committee agreed that the landscape plan should be separated from the Cannons and be submitted as an off-cycle application.

**MOTION:** John F. moved to amend the 2017 Stage Fort Park Advisory Committee's CPA award for archaeological study and cannon restoration to transfer funds in the amount of \$9,245.00 for the Parrott gun restoration explicitly; Pamela T. seconded. 7 in favor, 1 abstained.

Barbara S. requested that a letter from the National Park Service stating that this restoration plan is approved be included with the 2018 application. There was discussion regarding the plan to build the carriage out of aluminum.

### **Item #3 – Magnolia Historical Society Application Review**

Lisa Ramos and David Faye presented on behalf of the Magnolia Historical Society. They stated the following:

- Current electrical is mix of new, knob and tubing, and other electrical systems
- There are 4 panels in basement with 100 amp service which is insufficient
- Goal is to bring in one 200 amp service and move meter to exterior of building
- Improved electrical is necessary to move restoration forward and allow for the school to serve as an historical museum due to needs for climate control
- Part of plan is to have elevator in schoolhouse to make it accessible this requires lock out voltage of 150 amps
- All other updates are on hold until electrical is updated
- Wiring will be run underground

Barbara S. asked if there has been a discussion about installing 400 amp panels, which is the new standard. John F. stated that if this was intended to make the building ADA compliant, it would be easier to digest and more in line with the mission of the CPA. When it comes to the amperage needed for the elevator, it makes it more relatable. Catherine S. asked for clarification regarding applications for additional funding from other sources. Lisa R. stated they are applying for support from the Bruce J. Anderson fund and a private donor. They are also planning a variety of fundraisers. Holly C.S. asked if they will move the archival collection into the school building once the electrical is updated. Lisa R. confirmed they will. The heating system is set up to have humidity control, but the electrical needs updating to run the necessary additional components. Barbara S. asked that they submit their HVAC plan to the Committee. Catherine S. asked why the electrical is being run underground. Hank M. stated that the money to do underground electrical was received independently. Lisa R. clarified that the underground electrical is to help maintain the historical aesthetic of the building. Also, where the wiring would have to go above ground would cause problems for access of large vehicles. John F. added that underground wiring is safer during storms and will come with lower maintenance costs. There was discussion regarding the value of installing a 400 amp panel. John F. asked if other steps have been taken to

make the building accessible and are there other interior alterations that need to be made. Lisa R. confirmed that there are some interior alterations necessary. John F. asked if it is possible to separate the portion of the plans that need to be completed in order to be ADA compliant from the rest of the project. These changes should be submitted to Jaimie C. Barbara S. asked why the first scheduled presentation was missed. Lisa R. stated that life happens and she missed it. John F. stated that a lack of communication from applicants is a frustration for the committee. Lisa R. expressed her appreciation for the opportunity to present.

Jaimie C. will be following up to schedule a site visit.

#### **Item #4 – Backshore Open Space Project**

Barbara S. recused herself from the meeting at this point. Catherine S. stated the original open space application was for acquisition of the land on the back shore, but a successful GoFundMe campaign managed to raise the funding for acquisition. At that time, it was determined the \$50,000 CPA award could be used to record the conservation restrictions. Land Conservation and Advocacy Trust (LCAT) has conveyed the property to Greenbelt. Catherine S. has discussed the matter with representatives of Greenbelt and LCAT. Ed Becker of Greenbelt is going to put a conservation restriction on the property and is not seeking payment. The question posed to the Committee is: should the funds be recalled or dispersed? If they are to be dispersed, what is necessary?

John F. stated his understanding was the contract was for purchase and conservation, not just conservation. Greenbelt covering the cost of the conservation restriction does not change that Save Our Shores (SOS) has met their obligations and should still be receiving the full \$50,000. Mark Poulin stated that SOS does not want the full \$50k and that this has been perceived as a CPA project all along. He briefly discussed the mission and long term goals of SOS. The purchase price of the parcel in question was \$75,000 and SOS raised \$103,000. Any funds received from the CPA would be used to further the mission of SOS and conserve additional land on the backshore. Mark P. briefly discussed the maintenance and ongoing costs that have been incurred throughout the process. There was discussion regarding the dispersal of funds awarded to SOS. Mark P. stated there have been costs incurred by SOS related to the conservation restriction and would like to at least recoup those costs. Catherine S. stated the contract was for purchase and conservation, so those charges should be eligible for reimbursement. John F. asked that any costs that can fairly be attributed to the original award be submitted to the Committee for review. There was discussion regarding which costs may be eligible. Catherine S. reiterated that any funds are still contingent upon the successful completion of a conservation restriction.

#### **Item #1 – CPA Round 9 Discussion/ vote**

John F. discussed the importance of having everyone's input on the applications. Everyone should bring their expertise to the conversation. There was discussion regarding items still outstanding for 2018 Round 9 Applications.

**MOTION:** John F. moved to continue the review of 2018 Round 9 applications to the August 21 meeting; Holly W. seconded. 7 in favor, 0 opposed.

There was discussion regarding materials necessary for application review.

#### **Item #5 - Discussion regarding affordable housing**

Catherine S. stated that there is no instruction on how to assess the strength of affordable housing projects. She asked if the Committee would like to have someone speak at a meeting on this topic. There was discussion regarding having a presentation on assessing affordable housing project applications. It was suggested the Committee consider asking applicants to use 60% AMI to assess affordability. This will take further research and discussion. There was discussion regarding whether there is a need for community meetings prior to approving affordable housing projects.

**MOTION: Motion to adjourn by John F., seconded by Catherine S. APPROVED unanimously.**

**Meeting adjourned at 7:44 pm.**

**List of Documents reviewed**

None

Respectfully submitted,  
Jaimie Corliss