

Community Preservation Committee
Minutes
Wednesday, November 17, 2004
Town Hall

Members Present: Mark Kablack, Tara Reed, Carole Wolfe, Steve Swanger, Dick Bell, Peter Glass, Sheila Stewart, Chris Morely (7:45 p.m.)

Not Present: John Drobinski

The meeting was called to order at 7:40 p.m.

Presentations were made by the proponents for the following proposals that were accepted at the October 20, 2004 meeting for FY05 CPA Funds

Davis Field Athletic Field Development

Dennis Mannone, Park & Rec Director, submitted a proposal to develop two rectangular fields to be used for youth sports.

The presentation was made by Bill Seymour of Gale Associates, to renovate Davis Field by creating two rectangular fields made from a synthetic turf material. He detailed the need for additional fields by using the statistics from the team usage on all of the Town's fields. He noted that currently these fields are over scheduled and the new fields will relieve this problem. The two new fields will be used for youth programs including Pop Warner football, cheering, lacross, and soccer, as well as provide space for adult recreation programs and sports teams at LSRHS. The proposed use of a synthetic turf will increase the scheduling ability from early spring through fall at Davis Field. Currently, this field is not available for use in the spring due to drainage issues on the property. The synthetic material allows the fields to be used without periods of rest and little maintenance.

Dennis Mannone stated that one of the benefits of the rectangular fields will allow him to schedule horizontal practices for three teams at a time. High School teams will be able to use the fields from 2:30-5:30 and other youth groups will be able to use the fields from 5:30 to dusk.

Carole Wolfe asked about the capability of irrigating artificial turf. Mr. Seymour responded that irrigating the fields is not necessary, however, water can be used in the event that the owner wants to wet down the field.

Steve Swanger asked if the proposed costs to develop this project could change. Mr. Seymour responded that the cost noted in the proposal is a conservative estimate and that

it may change if, for example, ledge is found or there are problems with site contamination, etc.

In response to Mr. Swanger's question on the warranty of the turf, Mr. Seymour replied that the manufacturer's warranty would be full replacement within the first 8 years. He also noted that test data suggests that the surface will last from 14-18 years. Currently, there are no fields older than 7 years. The cost of the turf averages about \$4.50/sq. ft.

In response to a question about quality of the turf, Mr. Seymour noted that the field surf pro series is used in many high schools, Division 1 colleges, and in the major leagues. He noted that there are other materials available but they are a lesser quality material.

Debbie Dineen, representing the Conservation Commission, noted that she spot checked the property and found two wetland channels that were noted on the proposed drawing presented by Gale Associates. She stated that the Conservation Commission will make sure discharge points for drainage will not affect property and that the addition of water to the fields will be provided from an offsite source. She also stated that she believes that the use of synthetic turf will improve the property conditions by eliminating herbicides and pesticides .

Steve Swanger asked about the potential use of lighting at the fields. Paul Griffin responded that although lighting has not been addressed in this funding request, it would certainly increase the use at the fields. He further noted that if lighting were to be added at a later date, any neighborhood issues and funding would be addressed at that time.

Mark Kablack asked if there were other sites in town that could be used for rectangular fields. Dennis Mannone noted that the Master Plan had identified Mahoney property, Gravel pit, and Davis field as possible sites to increase field usage. Davis Field makes the most sense for this project as the area is all ready for construction. He added that there are two phases for the development of Davis Field. The first phase is for the addition of the rectangular fields and the second phase would be for concession stands and bathroom facilities. They will seek fundraising efforts for the second phase of construction.

Mark questioned why the request for funds was not for the design phase this year and then request funds for the construction phase next year. Mr. Seymour responded that funding could be requested separately as the design and permitting phase will take some time to complete the process and the field construction is typically done from June through September. He acknowledged that April 2005 Town Meeting could be acceptable for requesting funds for the design phase of the project. The completion of the design phase will then allow a construction figure to be presented at the following Town Meeting with the actual construction to start July 1, 2006.

The public forum is scheduled for December 15 and at that time additional information will be provided for the breakdown of design/permitting costs and construction costs.

Community Housing

Maureen Valente, Town Manager, and Jody Kablack, Housing Committee representative, presented a proposal for funding to purchase affordable housing units. The original proposal request has been amended from \$2,000,000 to \$500,000.

They told the Committee that the Town has received two applications from developers for Comprehensive Permits for the development of 40B Housing. This funding request is to set aside funds for the Town to purchase up to 5 units between the two proposed projects. One project is for 24 units of housing on North Road and the other project is for 40 units on Old County Road.

Tara Reed asked what was time frame for the expenditure of these funds as neither project has been submitted for approval yet. Jody responded that the expenditure would not be before the end of FY06 or FY07. However, in order to enter into negotiations with the developers, a commitment for the funding must be made from the town.

Carole Wolfe asked what happens to the funding if the two projects fall through. Jody noted that the funds could be set aside for other housing projects.

Carole also asked about the economic impact on the town if these units are purchased by families and if the town could request the project be an over 55 development. Jody responded that the Selectmen have requested that the units be restricted to residents over 55 years old. However, she also noted that the statistics show townhouse type units are not typically sought after by people with small families. Also restricting the age of the tenants would prohibit many town employees from being able to acquire these housing units.

Chris Morely noted that a Sudbury Lottery would allow preference to Sudbury residents. Jody further explained how the units would be priced in order to offer the lower priced units and that the builder cannot make more the 20% profit on affordable units. The town will require financial accounting of the developers to ensure that the project profit is not greater than 20%.

Peter Glass asked about the types of housing that is being proposed and was informed that they are typical 2-bedroom townhouse units, possibly 3-bedrooms. Some units may be larger than others. The market value properties may be larger and may include higher quality materials than the affordable units.

Mark Kablack questioned who would control the funds from a Warrant Article for this type of request. He was told that the entity in control of spending this article would fall under the Town Manager.

Mark also questioned if the local set-aside for CPC financing units could be increased over the current state regulatory standard of 25%. Jody will look into this. Mark, also suggested that it would be prudent for the town to enter into a letter of understanding or option with both developers in order to obtain commitments regarding pricing criteria.

Jody also told the Committee that, at this time, buying the housing units currently being proposed is the best opportunity for the town to obtain affordable housing units. The only other alternative to buying these units is to buy down the lower priced houses for sale on the market.

Chris Morely noted that if this request went before Town Meeting, the Warrant Article would need to be written so that it applies to generally to any 40B development, not just the two named in the amended application, and that the purpose of this funding is to achieve a buy down of 5 units.

Steve Swanger questioned whether the Housing Authority could also purchase these types of units if they had funding. The Town Manager responded that the Housing Authority could be the buyer and the town could possibly support them with additional funding.

Further discussion on this request will be conducted at the Public Forum scheduled for December 15.

Libby Land

Debbie Dineen, representing the Conservation Commission, met with the committee to request funds for the purchase of the Libby Property. She told the Committee that Mr. Libby has indicated that he would like to sell his property to the town in phases and that he will continue living on the property for several years.

The value of the property will be determined after soil testing is completed. She noted that the soil testing is scheduled for November 30, December 1, and December 2.

She showed the Committee a map detailing the 30 acres of land that the town hopes to purchase. The parcel sits off Water Row in the middle of protected land and abuts the Dickson property. She noted that this piece of property is a major piece needed to protect the Sudbury River. Another unique feature of this property is that it includes a ravine and has a wilderness feel to the upland property. The parcel meets all of the open space criteria including wildlife habitat, corridor to the Sudbury River, preserves the rural feel, abuts historic property, protects fragmentation, and links existing trails.

The frontage for this property is on Water Row and could be subdivided. In addition, the property has a lot of ledge and may not be suitable for septic systems. Assuming septic systems could be built, the Town Engineer proposed 2 different scenarios for the possibility of subdividing the lots based on zoning requirements. The first scenario

would provide 9 new lots plus the existing lot. The back area of the first scenario is wetland and was not developed for this plan. The second scenario would create 19 lots with a bridge crossing over the wetland and would have a greater cost to develop. The appraisal of this property will factor in the costs for development. She noted that the final appraisal may not be ready for the Public Forum on the 15th, however, she should have an estimate for that meeting.

Dick Bell questioned how Mr. Libby intended to sell the other phases of this property. Debbie responded that the second phase would probably not be for another seven years.

Peter Glass asked if it were better to purchase smaller parcels to increase other individual conservation areas in town. Debbie noted that the Open Space Plan has set up a priority for the Commission and that this property will provide expansion of trails and protection of existing property. This is the only large parcel next to other conservation land.

Maureen Valente also noted that CPC legislation and guidelines require the Town to use funding to advance what the community has already identified in the protection of open space.

Mark Kablack requested that Debbie provide any additional information to the Committee prior to the public forum scheduled for December 15.

Housing Authority Clarification

Steve Swanger explained the Housing Authority's request, presented at the last meeting, was for an extension of the April 2005 deadline for property owned by or transferred to the Housing Authority and that construction of the housing units will be underway by April 2006. This extension request does not include any unnamed sites.

Mr. Heller's Request

Mr. Heller sent a letter to the CPC explaining that that application he submitted was insufficient because he did not understand the submittal process. He requested reconsideration of the prior finding by the CPC that the application submitted was deficient.

It was agreed that the Chairman will send a letter to Mr. Heller encouraging him to continue with his efforts to preserve private homes, but as part of his application, he will need support from other boards and committees to meet the guidelines of the Community Preservation Act in regard to the use of CPC funds on private property.

CPC Annual Report

The Community Preservation Committee Annual Report was reviewed by the members. The report was amended to add Kathy Plante as Recording Secretary to the support staff.

The Annual Report was signed as amended.

Strategy on Warrant Articles – December 30, 2004

At the next meeting scheduled for December 1, the Chairman requested that the committee strategize on the priority of various projects that have been presented so that the wording of the Warrant Articles can be drafted.

Tara asked if the Committee has the ability to change the amounts requested in the proposals. Mark noted that the Committee will work with proponents if it is suggested that revisions be made to their requests.

Public Forum

The Public Forum has been scheduled for December 15, 2004, at 7:30 p.m. at the Library. A request will be made to have Cable TV video tape the forum. A list of equipment needed for the presentations will be submitted to the Library staff.

Minutes of November 3, 2004 Meeting

The minutes of the November 3, 2004 meeting were reviewed. A change was noted in the Willis Dock Proposal Presentation to change the wording regarding access to Willis Pond as a great pond. The wording was clarified to explain that public access to Willis Pond is already available as Willis Pond is a great pond. Access rates were not expected to increase as a result of the new dock proposal.

A motion was made by Tara Reed, seconded by Carole Wolfe, to accept the minutes as amended.

Vote 8-0 Unanimous

The meeting adjourned at 10:15 p.m.