

DRAFT
PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES
CITY OF BEVERLY

CITY OF BEVERLY
RECEIVED
CITY CLERK
2022 MAY 26 P 1:11

BOARD OR COMMISSION: Community Preservation Committee
SUBCOMMITTEE: N/A
DATE: April 21, 2022
LOCATION: Remote Access Only via Google Meet
MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairperson Heather Richter; Nancy Marino; Marilyn McCrory; Wendy Pearl; Christy Edwards; Danielle Spang
MEMBERS ABSENT: Vice Chair Derek Beckwith; Robert Buchsbaum; Thomas Bussone, II
OTHERS PRESENT: Denise Deschamps, Economic Development Planner; Associate Planner Emily Hutchings; Suzie LaMont; Stacia Chamberlain
RECORDER:

1. **Call to Order**

Chairperson Richter calls the meeting to order at 7:07 p.m. Richter reads a statement regarding public participation for this virtual meeting.

2. **Review and Approve Minutes**
Minutes from March 17, 2022

Members offer recommended edits to the draft meeting minutes. McCrory moves to approve the minutes of March 17, 2022, as amended. Seconded by Spang. Deschamps takes a roll-call vote. The motion carries 6-0.

3. **Brief Presentation regarding Possible Small Historic Project Program**

Hutchings summarizes information in the document provided by the Historic District Commission to the CPC regarding recommendations for a new program, in outline form. Spang asks about the amount of funds to be allocated for the proposed preservation program. She also asked if the preservation restriction to be imposed would be permanent or a term restriction. Spang is particularly concerned with the claw back clause as described in Section 5 of the program outline, asking what would trigger the claw back, sale of the property to an entity that intended a different use or would it be refusal to maintain the historic integrity of the property? Hutchings replies that this outline is not an exhaustive description of the guidelines and recommendations and that there is room for revision. McCrory is concerned with setting aside money for this program because it will ultimately reduce the amount of funds available for other potential projects. Pearl adds that this program proposal is in response to a need for a framework for applications relative to properties of historic significance. She says that they were getting inquiries from private property owners for preservation funds. Marino thinks that the program needs to be able to fit within the existing application process created by the CPC, with applicants submitting applications during the annual funding round unless the project met out-of-cycle application criteria. Marino asks Hutchings about commercial properties, which are historically significant, that are located in a historically protected area, which is then rezoned and what would happen to the property. Hutchings responds that rezoning an area would not really impact the historical significance of a property. Hutchings goes into more detail regarding the ways in which historic properties are protected from significant alteration and demolition. As of now, if a property of historical significance is not located in a historic district

or does not have a preservation restriction placed on it then it may be demolished, although the HDC does have the power to institute a demolition delay for a 12 month period. A local historic district could be formed by the city to *try* to protect the property but the city would need to be willing to do so and it would need to be done quickly. Hutchings also responds that including commercial and/or industrial properties in the program could certainly be considered. She continues that there is need to create an eligibility threshold which may include an HDC Certificate of Hardship. It is mentioned by Spang that definitions for “historical significance”, “maintenance” and “preservation” as defined in the MA Community Preservation Act should be added to the document. Pearl thinks that the CPC should consider rolling out this new program during the next funding round. Richter thinks they should research more specific guidelines and recommendations. Pearl recommends that they refer to other models of similar plans in Somerville and Cambridge. Pearl notes that the HDC would be the entity determining if the work contemplated meets the US Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. Spang says that she could provide research and background information for informing further steps. Deschamps mentions Hutchings earlier comment regarding the need for further discussion amongst relevant City departments regarding the potential program such as the Planning and Development Department and the Mayor’s office. Hutchings thinks that this input would be beneficial. Richter recommends that they have a full discussion with all CPC members [given that several are absent from this meeting] before soliciting comments from the Mayor.

4. **Beverly Community Preservation Plan Update**

Discussion regarding direction of recent revisions to Community Preservation Plan. How frequently should a comprehensive update of the Plan be undertaken? Should the Community Preservation Committee begin preparations to hire a consultant? How “directed” should the Plan be?

Richter makes recommendations for the section she reviewed. She invites other members to add what recommendations they had for the other sections of the Plan. Formatting was brought up and that is be consistent throughout the Plan. Members discuss whether to include live links in the digital document for ease of use by the public. Richter prefers a list of resources not be in an appendix at the end of the document. They also discuss how persons could access these links if they only had access to a paper document.

Members discuss what they know of how consultants have been used to help complete similar plans in other communities such as in Manchester-by-the-Sea. They discuss whether the fee for a consultant could be covered by CPA administrative funds. Members discuss timing and strategy for soliciting a consultant. Deschamps to contact several communities to request information about cost associated with hiring a consultant and ask for any recommendations.

5. **Policy Questions being Considered**

The policy questions to be considered are: Use of CPA funds impacting school property; Challenges of establishing the ownership of some properties; Requiring conservation/preservation restrictions on property not purchased with Community Preservation Act funds and considering alternate means to protect investment of CPA funds; Use of CPA funds to support resiliency efforts, and; Funding parameters for projects.

Marino states that they should provide explicit guidelines for the public looking to apply. She says that the guidelines were not clear enough for applicants of public properties applying for

CPA funds.

McCrorry thinks that anyone from the public applying for funds should receive help from the City/municipal department with regards to their project proposal if it impacts public property. Deschamps suggests a committee representing relevant departments might be set up to review these types of pre-applications so as to determine earlier in the process, as opposed to later, if the project is compatible with the City's priorities, if there is capacity among City staff to provide project oversight or labor (DPS), would the City need to put the project out to bid, determine a budget and scope. Spang recommends a CPC liaison to this committee. Pearl agrees and suggests that applicants should come to the CPC and discuss it with them first before applying. Members also discuss providing an FAQ page or document for potential applicants. Pearl suggests providing 15 minutes for public comments and questions during public meetings as they have done in the past. Deschamps suggests that they should email persons who would be interested in participating in this comment period during regular meetings. Members will send their FAQ ideas to Deschamps by May 5, 2022.

Richter asks members if they believe that the CPC should allocate funds to support resiliency. Pearl replies that they could structure a grant round to respond to the immediate public need and should be flexible year-to-year.

6. Discussion of Massachusetts Housing Partnership's Housing Toolkit and ways in which CPA funds may be used to create affordable housing opportunities

Richter is not prepared to comment on the document yet. Deschamps suggests that it could be discussed at another meeting. Spang comments on her interest in the ADUs and the first-time homebuyer program. Members decide to table this discussion for another time.

7. Remote versus In-Person CPC meetings moving forward

Richter asks Deschamps for input on the state and local ordinances regarding holding remote meetings. Deschamps believes that they have the authority to hold public meetings remotely until mid-July 2022. Richter prefers to get back to in-person meetings. Others are open to public meetings held in person as well. Richter asks Deschamps to poll those members who are absent this evening. Members also discuss where to host the meetings outside of City Hall. Members decide to hold the next meeting in person in City Hall Chambers.

8. Relevant items of interest not known at time agenda was posted

Deschamps notes that the CPC may anticipate taking up two MOU's that are expiring during the next CPC meeting.

9. Adjournment

Marino moves to adjourn at 9:02 p.m. Seconded by Spang. Deschamps takes a roll-call vote. The motion carries 6-0.

The next regular meeting of the Community Preservation Committee will be held virtually on Thursday, May 19, 2022. The CPC will further consider whether or not the meeting will take place remotely or in-person.