

Community Preservation Committee
Meeting Room A
October 4, 2005
9:00 a.m.

Members Present: Elaine Anderson, Mona Anderson, Eric Dray, Stephen Milkewicz,
Nancy Jacobsen, and Winthrop Smith.

Members Absent: Bill Dougal and Tim Hazel

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

Agenda:

Public Comments

There were none.

Presentation of Hawthorne School of Art Request for CPC Funds

Nancy Jacobsen presented her findings on the proposal. The Hawthorne Barn was visited by Nancy and she did call Laura for advice. The outcome of the advice was that public money for private property needs more research. Eric Dray said that we need a set of standards before we give anyone money. Eric continued by saying that we need a full disclosure on their financial position. Elaine Anderson said it's clear from our guidelines that we need to be provided with a lot more information from the applicant in order to grant this request.

When the question was raised by Eric about CPC money being given to private individuals, Mona countered by saying, "Isn't all the money that we're going to be giving going to private individuals? How do we weigh this?"

Eric's thoughts ran to wanting some guarantee that they will be putting in a certain kind of historically approved windows. Eric's understanding is that whenever you give out money – there has to be easements of some kind especially since the Hawthorne School is not in the district. Elaine said that the CPC would rely heavily on the Historic Committee for their directives in this case. Mona wondered if economic need is a qualifier for the CPC money? Steve mused that if she is incurring an economic loss by renting an affordable apartment on her property, could this be a consideration?

Eric Dray, in response, said that if individuals do something that causes them a financial problem, then this goes into the mix, as well. Mona posed another question: "If you know inherently that someone has money in the bank..... is this a deterrent?" Dr. Anderson said, "I'm looking at the worksheet and this never takes into consideration whether or not the people have the money." When a private property owner requests CPC money to lock in an apartment for affordable housing or a private developer requests money to construct a housing development What is the difference?

Win felt it should be based on the cost per unit i.e., \$50K or what? Elaine also felt that unless the developer can get his project in the ballpark for unit price then we may not consider it. Mona thought

that we should ask Laura Shufelt if there are guidelines for amounts of money we expend?

For future reference the following phone numbers were noted:

Consultant:

Laura Shufelt 508/221-5364 cell

Committee:

| | |
|-----------------|-------------------|
| Mona Anderson | 508/274-6251 cell |
| Eric Dray | 508/487-4449 |
| Nancy Jacobsen | 508/487-0332 |
| Steve Milkewicz | 508/487-4515 |
| Win Smith | 508/487-8155 |

Back to the Hawthorne School..... It was thought that some of these historic buildings that hopefully will be restored should have plaques on them.

Win felt that the proposal for the Hawthorne at \$12K might just be patching; if we really want to preserve this structure then we need a professional assessment. Mona agreed saying that at some of our earlier meetings we talked about having someone knowledgeable go over properties and make some judgments. So maybe we should talk to Bill Ingraham. We (the CPC) can't look at a building and determine what is wrong. Eric said that this reinforces the fact that we still have a lot of work to do before we grant any project.

It was agreed after this discussion that Doug Taylor (and a volunteer, perhaps Bill Ingraham) go over the Hawthorne School and see if \$12K is really going to preserve it and not just provide a "band-aid." The Committee then agreed to ask Nancy J. to draft a letter to Olga, informing Olga what is needed. Also, the letter should encourage Olga to go over page 11 of the application form and specifically look at #s 2, 3, and 4. (This reference is to the Historic Preservation section of the application.)

Eric Dray also suggested to Nancy Jacobsen that in her letter to Olga Opsahl she should mention that Olga needs to make an appointment with the Historic District Commission to arrange for a site visit. Also, Eric continued, we need to advise her that the satisfaction of this grant will mean an Historic easement for the property. Eric will ask Dorrie Pizzelle, the Executive Director of Community Preservation Coalition, how this case might be handled.

Motion: Put this project into the January 7th deadline. Also go to the Historic application, page 11, #s 2, 3, and 4. Olga should also understand that a deed restriction on this property may involve legal fees. Too, we would like Doug Taylor and a volunteer (Bill Ingraham?) to give us a report and a finished review of the property.

**Motion by Elaine Anderson Second by Eric Dray
Approved unanimously.**

Eric said that this is becoming the template of future applications. He also said that we have to review our application form and especially address the obligations that we want them to incur. Eric ruminated on a rewrite of the form.

Dr. Anderson said that the Committee will have to run through the full year with the form as written and then - before the next round - the Committee will have to work on this form. Elaine further felt that this meeting was an excellent practice session. And there's quite a bit more to be done before our

January 7th proposal.

PRO Proposal:

Mona Anderson who is the point person for this project said that she received a phone call from M.J. King who had been told that no project is even going to be considered without site control. Napi was told this and there is now a purchase and sale agreement being generated. Win Smith said that it should be made clear that anyone goes forward at their own peril and there are no guarantees even if you do obtain site control. Mona said that once we get the completed package – then we will make a determination. Also, she agreed with Win, site control doesn't mean that you're a shoo-in. Eric wants to be in on the Historic Preservation aspect of this project. Mona replied that once we have, at least, a P&S in hand then we'll move on to the next thing. Now that the project has gone from 11 units to 14 units, the concern is the size of each unit.

Clem/Deb Proposal

Elaine will be meeting with Deb in the near future to talk about the Clem/Deb proposals.

Prepare Warrant for Special Town Meeting

There will be no warrants from the CPC for the November Special Town Meeting.

Approval of Minutes

Motion: Approve the minutes of the September 27th meeting as amended.

Motion by Win Smith Second by Steve Milkewicz Approved 5-0-1 ab ED

Interviews for the brochure are ongoing.

Next meeting will be held on October 11, 2005.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:05 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted

Evelyn Gaudiano

E. Rogers Gaudiano

Approved by: _____ on _____
Elaine Anderson, Chair Date