

Community Preservation Committee

Judge Welsh Hearing Room

September 27, 2005

9:00 a.m.

Members Present: Elaine Anderson, Mona Anderson, Tim Hazel, Stephen Milkewicz, Nancy Jacobsen, and Winthrop Smith.

Members Absent: Bill Dougal and Eric Dray (both excused)

Others: M.J. King and Laura Shufelt

The meeting was called to order at 9:05 a.m.

Meeting Agenda:

Public Comments

M.J. King, the chair of PRO, (25-27 Bradford St. project) spoke to the Committee. He's read the goals of the Committee and his application seems to further the goals of his organization. He spent some time in the library and indeed – Eugene O'Neill was involved with this property in the Barnstorm Theatre. He also would like the group to firmly establish the cost of units. Additionally, there are 13 units and not the 9 listed in the application. He will look into other financing. He hopes his application will be competitive and achieve the goals of the Committee.

Mr. King was thanked for his input.

Tim Hazel announced that he will step down as vice chair and would like to nominate Win Smith for the position.

Motion: Nominate Win Smith to become Vice Chair of the CPC.

Motion by Tim Hazel Seconded by Mona Anderson Vote in favor 6-0-0.

Continued Applications/Letters of Intent Review

At this time Elaine Anderson asked Laura Shufelt to present "Affordable Housing 101."

Laura had many hand-outs which served to simplify her presentation. She told the group that there are basically two schools in housing development: rental and home ownership by acquisition of existing homes or new construction.

The easiest projects would involve new construction and home ownership. Her many hand-outs clarified the process immeasurably. She had examples of real cases and told the group how the amounts were derived.

On site acquisition the land costs can be anywhere from 0 to \$50K/unit (maximum is 50K/unit for it to be affordable) and if you go over \$30K it means you have to have a lot more subsidy.

The valuable lessons went on and some of the hand-outs were thought to be guides for future projects. Laura said that she always works with one of the forms. EA feels it will be an extremely valuable worksheet.

She further explained that the county (Barnstable) will give you up to less than \$100K per project and you may be able to get \$50K per unit from the state. She also said that there are other sources out there that can provide you with money.

Some plans fail to attain fruition because the subsidies are not available.

Elaine Anderson was thrilled with the guidelines Laura presented and noted that, “Now we’ll all be on the same page with these guidelines that we have to work with.”

Laura cautioned (on funding) that no one town is going to get a lot of projects funded in any one year. It may just take a little longer and some times the market just won’t wait. If there are 7 units or less there are some local town subsidies that might provide funding. Usually it’s a rehab.

Elaine then asked about the other letters of intent. “I have a question for the CPC on letters of intent. If the applicants want to convert it into a full-blown proposal in time for the January 15th deadline, will this be allowed?” We need to be very clear on continuity, fairness, etc. So, are there any comments from the committee on the LCCDC application to change it into a January 15th deadline? It is a 6-unit proposal for 29 Alden Street. Do we want to hold to our original intent, that as a Letter of Intent (LOI) it is open for the January meeting. Any comments?

Win Smith responded by citing three reasons:

1. We are the bank and we are going to have to rely on all other boards in town to go over all these proposals so we can’t be rushed.
2. Anyone who saw the time deadline coming could have come before us and explained (that would have been the opportunity).
3. Legal problem: if we open the door to one applicant to change from a letter of intent to a full blown application... there just isn’t the time to allow this.

Mona Anderson agreed – “You can’t start making exceptions!”

Tim Hazel had a different view: “We’re here to do it – why become obstructionists – just accept the rush!”

Win said to Tim that we are not killing this deal. It is our first go round and this is where we iron out the kinks. There was anxiety to get some money flowing. Tim is anxious to start the ball rolling and maybe we need to be clearer.

Laura said that it’s less a position of obstructionist and more of time – we have 17 days to have a warrant open for the November town meeting. She thinks the application must be clear and that having been said that the application must be received by Sept 15th to be heard by town meeting. There is no site control so we can’t even be clear on whether this proposal should be considered. We have to say that they have to wait.

Motion: In order to be consistent with the announced date, time, and site control (one of the major points) we, therefore, based on time constraints, cannot support a conversion from letter of intent to a full proposal.

**Motion by Elaine Anderson Seconded by Mona Anderson
Voted 5-0-1 abstention (Steve Milkewicz).**

Laura's suggestion was that the Committee set up a grid stating how much is being asked in each category. That would be a good starting point. Laura further liked the idea of assigning projects to definite groups or committee members and having them take the project apart and look for all pertinent information.

Elaine would like to proceed with assigning projects that are viable to different committee members. It has to be made clear to applicants that we are their last step, meaning that other funding, site control, ZBA, etc. have to be cleared before they come with the final plan to the CPC. But Hawthorne School of Art looks as though they are the most complete. It was decided that Nancy Jacobsen would work with Hawthorne because there are time constraints.

Next the PRO – Mona will work with them and see if they will be able to meet the criteria.

Draft letters were handed out to committee members for their approval. They were drafted by Elaine and will be sent out to each applicant naming their liaison person. It was also decided that each proposal would be individually referred to in the letters.

Motion: The draft letters were approved by the committee with the stipulation that each project would be named in each letter with the liaison person identified.

Motion by Tim Hazel Seconded by Steve Milkewicz Voted unanimously.

The Provincetown Housing Group has two different proposals. It was decided that Tim Hazel would be their point person since he knows all parties in the Housing Group.

It was decided that Tim Hazel (possibly temporarily) would monitor the LCCDC project.

Steve Milkewicz will deal with the Kennedy Gallery.

PMPM will be handled by Eric Dray and if he's not available.... by Nancy Jacobsen.

Bill Dougal will be the liaison for the Falmouth 704 Main Realty Trust.

On Clem/Deb's two projects: Win will handle 83 Shankpainter and Elaine Anderson will handle their Cap'n Bertie proposal

All parties should be made aware of the January 7th deadline.

Prepare Warrant for Special Town Meeting

This was mainly a discussion but do we want to present anything on the warrant? Maybe Hawthorne School of Art? The warrant closes on October 7th. There's a possibility that we could make that

