

RECEIVED
2022 MAR -9 A 11: 23

**PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES
CITY OF BEVERLY**

BOARD OR COMMISSION: Community Preservation Committee
SUBCOMMITTEE: N/A
DATE: January 20, 2022
LOCATION: Remote Access Only via Google Meet
MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairperson Heather Richter; Vice Chair Derek Beckwith;
Nancy Marino; Marilyn McCrory; Thomas Bussone, II;
Christy Edwards; Robert Buchsbaum; Wendy Pearl;
Robert Buchsbaum arriving at 8:28 PM
MEMBERS ABSENT: Amy Benjamin
OTHERS PRESENT: Darlene Wynne, Planning Director; Emily Hutchings,
Assistant Planning Director ; Bruce Doig, Director of
Beverly Parks and Recreation Department; Jon Paddol,
Assistant Director, Parks and Recreation Dept.; Diane
Swierczynski, Esq., President, Rotary Club of Beverly;
Marshall Handly, Esq., Handly and Cox, former President
of the Rotary Club of Beverly; Susan Goganian, Executive
Director, Historic Beverly; Andrew Leonard, Project
Manager, Harborlight Community Partners.
RECORDER: Stacia Chamberlain

Call to Order

Chairperson Richter calls the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Richter reads a statement regarding public participation for this virtual meeting.

1. **Welcome and Introduction**

2. **Approval of Minutes**

i. **Minutes from November 18, 2021**

Members offer recommended edits and changes to the draft meeting minutes.

Beckwith moves to approve the minutes as amended. Seconded by Bussone. Deschamps takes a roll-call vote. The motion carries 6-0, with McCrory abstaining due to technical difficulties.

ii. **Minutes from December 8, 2021**

Members offer recommended edits and changes to the draft meeting minutes.

Beckwith moves to approve the minutes as amended. Seconded by McCrory. Deschamps takes a roll-call vote. The motion carries 6-0, with Pearl abstaining due to her absence at the December 8, 2021 meeting.

iii. **Minutes from December 16, 2021**

Members offer recommended edits and changes to the draft meeting minutes.

McCrory moves to approve the minutes as amended. Seconded by Beckwith. Deschamps takes a roll-call vote. The motion carries 7-0.

3. **Review and approval of calendar year 2022 meeting schedule**

Members discuss the proposed annual 2022 meeting calendar.

Beckwith moves to accept the 2022 meeting schedule as presented. Seconded by Bussone.

Deschamps takes a roll-call vote. The motion carries 7-0.

4. **Review and approve Massachusetts Community Preservation Coalition notice for membership approval**

Beckwith moves to approve payment of membership dues to the Massachusetts Community Preservation Coalition in the amount of \$3,500 for the year 2022. Seconded by Bussone.

Deschamps takes a roll-call vote. The motion carries 7-0.

5. **Review of CPA Funding Round 9 full applications**

McCrorry asks members whether they ranked their preferences; none present have done so.

Deschamps notes that Robert Buchsbaum did submit his scoring for the applications given that he is unable to attend this evening's meeting. Pearl asks about the account balance of CPA funds. Deschamps replies by reading an email message from Bryant Ayles, Finance Director, listing the CPA funds available, which reflect funds available post award of CPA monies for the acquisition of the conservation restriction for parcels at Moraine Farm. McCrorry brings to the attention of those in attendance that Mayor Cahill, discussed at the December 2021 special city council meeting that he was committed to submitting a proposal to buy parcels from the Housing Authority as well as other out-of-cycle projects. In light of the proposed Conservation Restriction/land acquisition at Moraine Farm, Committee members discuss the dollar amounts left for the following project proposals and the remaining balance in the CPC fund if all applications are funded.

i. **City of Beverly Planning and Development Department requesting funding for Historic Resources Survey of residential neighborhood located between Cabot and Rantoul Streets**

Richter invites staff member Hutchings to speak about this project; Hutchings offers that she is happy to answer Committee member questions on it. Pearl asks if the city has done an environmental justice study for the area; Hutchings replies that they have done so and that the results show that the majority of the area meets the criteria as an environmental justice community. McCrorry asks about the status of the letters of support for this project. Deschamps says that she received letters of support and emailed them belatedly to Committee Members. Beckwith says that he sees these letters of support and they include letters from the Mayor and Historic Beverly Director Sue Goganian. McCrorry asks if the current application was not successful and they had to go back for state grants, what would happen to funding for this project? Hutchings replies that they would re-apply for grants in a different grant cycle. Richter asks about bidding and whether or not the applicant would have to seek several bids; Hutchings replies that they would indeed have to solicit a request for quotes. Richter asks if the Massachusetts Historical Commission would fund their half of the project. Hutchings says yes. Richter asks why we need this project. Hutchings replies that it is a first step in understanding historic assets, it will inform the City and the City administration so they may decide on the need for any protective measures that will help preserve the uniqueness of the area. Richter clarifies that the city doesn't own these properties, that they are private properties. She asks if it affects how and whether homeowners can make changes to their properties. Hutchings refers to a completed survey on Fish Flake Hill that helped homeowners understand what resources are available to them, and that the survey encouraged owners to

preserve and maintain their properties. She adds that it also can help decision makers when demolition of properties of questionable historic value is being decided. Pearl adds that this neighborhood has been overlooked in terms of development and preservation and it may be helpful for local protection of the character of that neighborhood and help support appropriate planning tools. Bussone asserts that this decision could restrict the rights of owners and wishes it to be reflected in the discussion. Hutchings replies that creating a historic district is a major policy choice and would require further decision-making among city boards and committees. Marino says that the challenge of this section of the city is that it is subject to a variety of zoning permitted by right. Marino thinks that this survey would be a critical first step for this district in managing overdevelopment and appropriate planning of parcels of mixed land use. Beckwith reminds the Committee members of the Beverly Depot 2 project. He discusses housing affordability and asserts that a survey will help the city to make better informed decisions about development. Edwards adds that as a homeowner in the proposed project area, she is in support of this project and says that it aids the Committee in addressing some of their stated goals vis-a-vis neighborhoods and communities. Hutchings shares an illustration of the Environmental Justice Populations in the proposed project area on screen. Richter solicits final questions and comments on this project proposal. Richter states that she has issues with using CPC funding for this project. She feels that the city should have the information it needs to make informed decisions about neighborhood development but is not convinced that CPC funds should pay for the project. Bussone says that he feels the same way. Richter doesn't know if it provides a clear public benefit. McCrory counters that this project meets the criteria for CPA funding, and they frequently fund studies that can lead to further projects. Pearl concurs that the CPC has previously funded studies like this. She also says that evidence suggests that these types of studies and their awareness have provided benefits to the neighborhood and the community. She also highlights that this application is unique in that it has a grant match: the MHC grant covers 50% of the project cost. Beckwith adds that in some decision-making circumstances, from the standpoint of a member of the city's Planning Board, it is helpful to have background information and data on which to base recommendations and decisions. It could provide important context for a variety of city boards in the future. Richter invites a motion. Deschamps would like clarification as to whether the monies would come out of the Historic Resources Fund of the Beverly CPC.

****Buchsbbaum arrives to the meeting at 8:28pm****

Beckwith moves to approve the application from the Beverly Planning Department for the funding for Historic Resources Survey of residential neighborhood located between Cabot and Rantoul Streets in the amount of \$20,000, as amended. Seconded by Marino. Deschamps takes a roll-call vote. The motion carries 6-2, with Bussone and Richter voting against.

ii. City of Beverly Planning and Development Department requesting funding to pursue a National Register of Historic Places nomination for Lynch Park

Richter invites Members to ask questions of Hutchings regarding this project proposal. Buchsbbaum asks if the CPA budget can support both projects. Richter replies that they have had this conversation before he joined the meeting and the budget can support both projects. McCrory asks for clarification on funding if the grant is not successful in this round of funding. Hutchings says that they would apply again to both the CPC and the MHC. Pearl says that she is in support of the project but wishes to bring up the impact of climate change. She asks if the city has climate resilience plans for Lynch Park and specifically the Carriage House; would national register listing inhibit the city's ability to do any climate mitigation on

the property? Hutchings replies that the city would like to do a resilience study and climate impact analysis to include the Carriage House, but national register listing would not inhibit their ability to implement extra protections on the property. Buchsbaum adds that the seawalls at Lynch Park have been very negatively affected in the last few storms. McCrory asks if national register listing would have any impact on the types of recreational activities they are allowed to conduct on the property. Hutchings replies that it would not. Pearl comments that it might bolster recreational activities on the property as those features have become historic to the property's use over time. Richter invites final comments and questions on this project proposal.

Pearl moves to approve the application for the pursuit of a National Register of Historic Places nomination for Lynch Park, in the amount of \$10,000, in the category of Historic Resources. Seconded by Bussone. Deschamps takes a roll-call vote. The motion carries 8-0.

Hutchings will include letters of recommendation for this project and make them available to Committee Members.

iii. City of Beverly Recreation Department seeking funding for new tennis courts at Kimball-Haskell (Cove) and Cahill Parks

Bruce Doig is on call to discuss the project proposal. He tallies additional funding support for court repairs in the sum of \$600,000. Richter asks about local neighborhood fundraising. Doig replies that the Cove neighborhood has in the past successfully raised money, around \$120,000, to renovate the Cove playground. Pearl asks if Doig can say where he got the cost estimates for the courts, and also if these courts are going to be handicap-accessible. Doig says that they can put in paths to the court entrances and would be decided in the final designs. He says that he received many estimates for repaving and fencing from people he has worked with in the past. He also highlights that cost of materials has increased. McCrory asks how he envisions the courts being used. Doig replies that in addition to tennis, they can be used by summer camps for all sorts of activities such as four-square and lacrosse, and at times it is used as a dry space on muddy days for outdoor camp activities. Pearl asks if he can clarify the timeline for the other grant money he has applied for from other resources (Land and Water Conservation Grant). He says that they are anxious to move forward without confirmation of the LWC grant, with funds from other resources. Beckwith believes that what this money will be spent on is essentially maintenance. Doig replies that a total replacement/rehabilitation is the goal, not maintenance. Beckwith wonders why CPC funds should be used when the city has a budget surplus, adding that he understands that this project application meets the CPA fund eligibility. Doig responds that he has asked the city for years for funding for basketball and tennis courts and has not received it. Marino adds that despite the Recreation Dept.'s funding being cut, the Committee still prioritizes recreational assets. McCrory discusses the differences between maintenance versus rehabilitation of assets in the CPC statute, highlighting that CPA funds are not designed to fill gaps in city funding. Bussone adds that CPA funds used by the Recreation Department have improved the city and benefit the public as well as property owners. He feels that if they have the opportunity to improve recreation, they should. Pearl says that it's necessary to upgrade the courts to current code and elements of the original build have caused the courts to fail. She supports this project for these reasons.

Bussone moves to approve the application of the Beverly Recreation Department seeking funding for new tennis courts at Kimball-Haskell (Cove) and Cahill Parks in the amount of \$250,000, out of the general fund. Seconded by Marino. Deschamps takes a roll-call vote. The motion carries 8-0.

Richter states that it is 9:26 PM and asks members if they would like to move to the next agenda item. Members would like to adjourn and address the remaining agenda items in the February meeting. Richter suggests that members submit questions they have regarding the remaining three applications that need review to Deschamps, Deschamps will compile the questions, share the list with CPC members for approval, and then submit the questions to the applicants. The applicants will not need to submit responses in writing. They should just be prepared to respond to these questions at the next meeting. Richter invites the remaining applicants to offer any comments they would like to at this time. Andrew Leonard of Harborlight Community Partners, adds that they have submitted their application to the state. McCrory asks Leonard to think about what is the backup plan if funds don't materialize and asks him to have answers for the next meeting. Sue Goganian says she has no questions but would welcome any concerns before the next meeting. Pearl asks her to speak about public use to the land and whether it is gated/fenced. Goganian replies that the property is stone-walled and the public is allowed on the grounds. Edwards says that she is unsure if a delay in addressing the remaining applications will adversely impact the applicants. Goganian says that the time-sensitive aspect of the application is that the trees need to be planted. Marshall Handly, (former) President of the Beverly Rotary Club, expresses his frustration at waiting to be heard. McCrory responds that perhaps it was unrealistic for the CPC to expect to discuss all six project applications in one meeting. Handly says it's discourteous to those on call who have gone unheard. Richter states that the published funding round schedule will not be affected by continuing the discussion to the March meeting.

6. Adjournment

Buchsbaum moves to adjourn. Seconded by Bussone. Deschamps takes a roll-call vote. The motion carries 7-1, with Beckwith voting against. The remainder of the agenda will be continued at the next meeting.

The next regular meeting of the Community Preservation Committee will be held virtually on Thursday, February 17, 2022, at 7:00 PM, via Google Meet.