

SUDBURY HOUSING AUTHORITY

55 HUDSON ROAD
SUDBURY, MASSACHUSETTS 01776
director@sudburyha.org

PHONE: 978-443-5112
FAX: 978-443-5113

SHEILA M. CUSOLITO
Executive Director

MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING

April 19, 2022

The SHA met by remote participation open session at 4:07 p.m. Those present were: Chair: S. Cline; Vice Chair: S. Swanger; Treasurer: T. Vitvitsky (until 5:15 p.m.); Assistant Treasurer: J. Cowan; Member: A. Lepak; Executive Director: S. Cusolito

NEW BUSINESS

Bulk Flooring Purchase: A motion was made by S. Swanger, seconded by T. Vitvitsky, and unanimously voted, to approve the bulk purchase of LVT flooring from Post Road Carpet Center, Inc. at a cost of \$6,456.56 including shipping.

SHA Community Preservation Committee Appointment: A motion was made by A. Lepak, seconded by S. Swanger, and unanimously voted, to recommend reappointment of S. Cline to the Community Preservation Committee as the SHA's representative.

Development/Redevelopment General Discussion: S. Swanger received information from the Cambridge Housing Authority development team, the focus of which, is the Nobscot property. In a follow-up call, an outline of services and costs for SHA's feasibility work was requested. For both Nobscot and SHA's work, the focus remains on early-phase work. When a more detailed plan for the various sites is outlined, the CHA can assist with identifying funding sources for any development effort.

Commissioners understand the complexity of considering all properties under study simultaneously and the added complexity that any of the state units that are vacated, such as Great Lake Drive, cannot remain vacant while the project scope is developed. Significant investment will be needed, not only directly related to the development effort, but to rehab units that are vacated in this interim.

Regarding the Nobscot proposal, some of the work outlined by CHA for Nobscot is work already under the scope of work for Beals and Thomas and might be requested of the firm by CHA once engaged. Additional work that could be accomplished by either Beals and Thomas or CHA is also outlined. It remains unclear whether the upper portion of the parcel can be developed. Commissioners consider this information essential to informing the overall viability of a development effort. The omission of soil testing from the Beals and Thomas scope of work is also of concern as it relates to the number of units that can be built. At its upcoming joint meeting with the SHT, Commissioners agreed that an assessment of the Beals and Thomas work should be matched to the questions around what can be built, where on the site building is possible, and the number of units that the site can support.

J. Cowan noted the likely differences in development timelines for Nobscot, Frost Farm, and the 705 sites. Although the buildings favored for Frost Farm are comprised of one-bedroom units, removing age restrictions better serves the SHA's needs to relocate over-housed 705 or Duplex residents, but might not be favorable to the existing community. S. Cusolito also noted that, depending on the funding sources and operating conditions, it's possible that existing tenants could not afford to move to newly developed one-bedroom units. Requirements attached to the Duplex program that apparently relate to the program's

financing not only present administrative challenges to the SHA, but also limit the pool of eligible applicants. This is a concern for future development, which will likely require both development and operation subsidies, the latter necessary if the interest is in housing those at the lowest end of the income limits.

If the 705 units were converted to two-bedroom units, the Nobscot site might best be used for three-bedroom units or a combination of two- and three-bedroom duplex units, with a minimum of six units. Issues with the driveway continue to limit development discussions. Depending on the SHT's interests and the total number of units possible, it might also be an appropriate site for congregate housing or a group home.

With respect to the Hancock work, the 705 sites pose additional challenges related to inability to leave them vacant, and a need for significant improvements whether they undergo redevelopment or not.

T. Vitvitsky left the meeting. The time was 5:15 p.m.

The second concept plan for Frost Farm showed eight duplex buildings that would require reconfiguration of an existing sewer line and the parking area around the Meeting House. This reconfiguration would be avoided by reducing the development to seven duplex buildings. S. Swanger wondered if this plan could be shared with the Frost Farm community at this time, having recently heard from resident F. Chiodo. S. Cusolito noted that she was asked for a final report, which has not been received. Commissioners agreed to the benefit of sharing the second concept plan with Frost Farm residents.

Hancock offered to provide contact information for a structural engineer that could assess the existing 705 units for the ability to add to the existing structures; however, the contact provided is an architect. That function is served by the DHCD architect, whose site visit is pending. J. Cowan asked how the goal might change if the bedroom counts could not be increased on the sites, a question that depends on zoning considerations that are beyond the scope of Hancock's work.

ADJOURN

A motion was made by A. Lepak, seconded by J. Cowan, and unanimously voted, to adjourn the April 19, 2022 Special Session. The time was 5:35 p.m.

Yes: S. Cline

Yes: J. Cowan

Yes: A. Lepak

Yes: S. Swanger