

**Community Preservation Committee
Minutes
November 7, 2002
Town Hall**

Present: Mark Kablack, Sigrid Pickering, Carole Wolfe, Steve Swanger, Judy Sheldon, Kirsten Roopenian, Chris Morely, Sheila Stewart, Paul Griffin, Jody Kablack (Town Planner)

M. Kablack opened the meeting at 7:35 pm. The committee reviewed the minutes of Oct. 30, 2002 and approved them with minor corrections.

New Business

Annual Town Report will be drafted by the co-chairs and circulated at the next CPC meeting.

Proposals

Cutting Land

Lisa Eggleston representing the Planning Board presented the proposal. The Planning Board feels strongly that this parcel should be given serious consideration and that is why they are submitting this to the CPC. The landowners are following a process that the town developed and encouraged. Negotiations are on-going between the Town and the landowner on the terms of the offer, and as those progress the CPC will be kept informed. The Planning Board is not wholly supportive of the original offer, but hopes that changes can be made that benefit the Town. The deadline in the offer is the 2003 Annual Town Meeting, however the landowner is willing to be flexible as long as the 2 parties are working toward a mutually acceptable offer.

Sudbury Housing Authority

Proposal revised slightly and new cover page submitted. A memo from JoAnn Howe, Executive Director of the SHA, was submitted which answered several questions asked at the last CPC meeting. The definition of affordable housing, as provided by Citizens Housing and Planning Association, includes households that earn no more than 80% of the area median at a cost to that household of no more than 30% of the total household income. 80% of greater Boston median income is \$53,800 for a family of 4; \$52,500 for a family of 3; \$46,650 for a family of 2. Can housing be built on property leased to the SHA, instead of being owned, which requires ATM action? Answer is that it could be built on leased land as long as it is a long term lease. TM action still required to lease though. Still 2/3 vote needed as well.

Public feedback solicited in meeting held on Nov. 6th, however only 2 members of the public attended. SHA wondering how much input is now needed, given that there were 2 newspaper articles written about the subject and still no concerns voiced.

M. Kablack asked if the housing constructed under this proposal would meet the requirements for the Town's 10% requirement? Yes.

J. Sheldon noted questions from the ConCom. Several parcels have wetlands which may put restrictions on development. Offered to work with SHA and walk the sites. Specific

parcels are North Road parcel, Hudson Road parcel, and Washbrook parcel. SHA is aware of some of these resources, but would like to visit the sites with the ConCom. K. Roopenian commented that she has received phone calls from residents who are upset that the CPA is going to be used for projects other than open space. Unfortunately, what ultimately happens, is that opposition may only come at the end, even though other avenues for public comments are offered. She questioned whether the SHA will pursue development of their complete list of parcels submitted with the proposal. S. Swanger commented that they will continue to pursue development of affordable housing, but that which parcels they pursue will be determined by public opinion over time. They chose their top 5 parcels because they were under control of the Board of Selectmen and the SHA and do not have use restrictions on them, such as Park and Rec and School properties. Their final proposal to the 2003 ATM may not include all 5 parcels. M. Kablack asked if funds are available on July 1, 2003, when would the project begin? S. Swanger anticipates that the project would begin within 6 months, groundbreaking in about 1 year and completed within 2 years. M. Kablack asked whether other projects would be initiated while this project was still under construction? The SHA would most likely not start another project during that time, but other groups may. Given the minimum amount allotted to community housing under the CPA, there will be additional funds available for housing projects over the course of the 5 year term of the CPA.

Hosmer House

Additional materials submitted. FY03 budget submitted for Hosmer House. Total budget for Hosmer Memorial Fund is currently approximately \$3100. Money comes from donations and sale of cup plates, etc. Funds expended under the authorization of the Board of Selectmen. Historical Commission budget goes to upkeep of the Hosmer House and other committee expenses. They are attempting to get level funded for FY04, but not sure. Selectmen pleased at fire and safety improvements to the building. Mass. Historical budget for art restoration. Once this is expended, there will be no more. This was a 1 time grant from Mass. Historical Commission. Quote from Madison Corporation corresponds to item D on their project submission form.

A Survey - \$23,000 (quote)

B Building Rehab and Restoration - \$15,565 (quote)

C Climate Control - \$3,500 (estimate, won't know full extent until survey is completed)

D Fire Safety/Security - \$3,600 (quote)

Fixed quotes = \$42,165, plus estimate and contingencies bring figure to \$51,600.

Bill Place, Director of Public Works, supports project.

K. Van Dijk questioned the charter of the SHC, particularly concerned with spending public funds for restoration of Florence Hosmer's art. J. Fraize replied that SHC is charged with keeping public historical monuments and sites in good keeping for Sudbury residents. CPC members noted that the art restoration is not one of the components of the proposal to the CPC.

Indian Grinding Stone

Project has not progressed enough to complete project for this CPC funding round. SHS will be working with landowner to pursue long term preservation of the site (get property listed on state and national registers) first, before development of the park.

Memorial Congregational Church

Spoke with Mass. Historical Commission and found out that they are eligible to receive public funds under the Mass. Preservation Fund. This means that churches would also be eligible to receive public CPA funds. New quotes submitted which are 25% less than anticipated. Church budget submitted. Reviewed precedent of other local churches receiving funds. Spoke about possibility of placing a preservation restriction on the improvement funded by the CPA. Church Bylaws can be amended to restrict modification of restored towers if funded. Congregation would ensure future maintenance of bell tower by establishing an endowment fund in the annual budget.

C. Wolfe asked when the clock tower was revised. Cited a picture in The Pictorial History of Sudbury which shows a turret. 1881 building constructed. 1891 bell tower constructed. Any thoughts to restoring it to its original construction? Could possibly get matching funds from Mass. Historical Commission. They have not considered it.

M. Kablack asked whether the proposal is now to request \$8,575.00 (new quote)? Do they expect to do more work? Yes, but they don't have a specific list of other work. Can anticipate extraordinary conditions when working on such an old building.

Park and Recreation Proposals

Curtis Fields – School Committee response forthcoming still. No exact quotes yet, but could be obtained easily.

Davis Field – ConCom has concerns with migration of contamination with digging and irrigation.

Rail Trail - \$25,000 would fund design of greater than this length. Proposal can either be scaled down with a formal quote, or balance of funds can be used to design other sections of rail trails. Questions outstanding regarding long term use of the corridor from the state, and whether design is an eligible expense of CPA funds.

P&R interested in pursuing Curtis Fields. They will direct D. Mannone to contact Debbie Dineen. Bond for school project probably not to be used for fields. Other “exterior” work covered under the bond.

Davis Field probably not a viable project at this time.

Requested DPW Director to come in and discuss the rail trail proposal.

Friends of Water Row

Submitted supplemental information and revised budget. No comments from Safety Officer or consideration of legal issues. ConCom has endorsed the proposal, but Park & Rec has not. Is this eligible? Not creating a permanent recreation site.

Proposal List

Committee reviewed all proposals and made the following preliminary determinations:

- ◆ Northwood (O'Brien Meadows) is not eligible under the Act.
- ◆ Community Housing Options was not an actual proposal.
- ◆ Indian Grinding Stone was withdrawn by the proponent.
- ◆ Memorial Congregational Church is encouraged to complete more research on restoration of the building to its original construction, and preservation restriction should be in place before funding is approved. Encourage them to submit in a future funding cycle. Work with SHC and other historical groups, both local and statewide.
- ◆ Davis Field was withdrawn.
- ◆ Water Row was not favored by P&R. Precedent setting for neighborhoods. High personnel costs. Not sure it is eligible. Look for other funding sources.
- ◆ Curtis Field – Is \$50,000 adequate for improvements? Irrigation system and water source (well). Will additional funds be necessary? Plan should include all aspects of developing as multi-use field (loam, fencing, screening). Proponents should pursue additional information.
- ◆ Rail Trail – want more information regarding design standards, feasibility of access to fields, abutter notification. This will be kept on the list, but might not be ready for 2003 ATM.

J. Kablack will draft boilerplate letters to send to project proponents. Once language is discussed, letters will be sent to the above proponents indicating the CPC's decision if project has been taken off list.

S. Pickering will investigate the eligibility of design for the rail trail and the Water Row proposal. J. Kablack will investigate eligibility of painting of Hosmer House.

Next Meeting

Nov. 14th, Town Hall

Meeting adjourned at 10:10 pm.

Minutes taken by J. Kablack. Minutes approved 11/14/02.