

NANTUCKET AFFORDABLE HOUSING TRUST

~~ MINUTES ~~

Tuesday, September 13, 2022

Remote Meeting *via* Zoom – 12:30pm

Trust Members: Brian Sullivan (Chair), Reema Sherry (Vice Chair), Brooke Mohr, Penny Dey, Meg Browsers, Dave Iverson, Shantaw Bloise-Murphy

ATTENDING MEMBERS: Brooke Mohr, Reema Sherry, Meg Browsers, Dave Iverson, Penny Dey, Brian Sullivan

ABSENT: Shantaw Bloise-Murphy

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE: Tucker Holland (Housing Director); Hayley Cooke (Housing & Real Estate Office Manager); Vicki Marsh (Town Counsel)

Public Present on Zoom: Anne Kuszpa (Housing Nantucket), Elizabeth Blair (Housing Nantucket), Mary Mack, Billy Cassidy, Laura McCloskey

I. Call Meeting to Order

Brian Sullivan called the meeting to order at 12:34pm & reads Public Participation Guidelines

I. APPROVAL of Agenda

Agenda is **AMENDED** to move items V and VI to the next meeting on September 20th.

Penny Dey moved to approve the agenda as amended. Reema Sherry seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL of those participating:

1. Reema Sherry Aye
2. Brooke Mohr Aye
3. Meg Browsers Aye
4. Penny Dey Aye
5. Dave Iverson Aye
6. Brian Sullivan Aye

Agenda adopted by 6-0 vote.

II. APPROVAL of Minutes

- Minutes from 8.16.22 and 8.23.22

Dave Iverson moved to approve the agenda. Meg Browsers seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL of those participating:

- | | |
|-------------------|-----|
| 1. Reema Sherry | Aye |
| 2. Brooke Mohr | Aye |
| 3. Meg Browers | Aye |
| 4. Penny Dey | Aye |
| 5. Dave Iverson | Aye |
| 6. Brian Sullivan | Aye |

Motion adopted by 6-0 vote.

III. PUBLIC COMMENT for items not otherwise on the agenda

IV. CCAP/CFAP – ACTION

- CCAP Application – Delgado, 6 Essex Rd., #1
- CCAP Application – Thapa, 37 Beach Grass Rd.

Dave Iverson makes the motion to approve the Delgado CCAP Application at 6 Essex Rd. #1 for up to \$15,000 pending final closing costs. Seconded by Reema Sherry.

ROLL CALL of those participating:

- | | |
|-------------------|-----|
| 1. Reema Sherry | Aye |
| 2. Brooke Mohr | Aye |
| 3. Meg Browers | Aye |
| 4. Penny Dey | Aye |
| 5. Dave Iverson | Aye |
| 6. Brian Sullivan | Aye |

Motion adopted by 6-0 vote.

Brooke Mohr: [Regarding the Thapa CCAP Application]: I noticed they said they had not taken the First Time Homebuyer’s class. It’s on the application, so I assume it is a requirement. I want to be sure we are consistent with all applicant in terms of requirements.

Dave Iverson: Can we approve it with the condition that it’s not released until they take the class?

Brian Sullivan: I think so. Going back – is it an actual requirement?

Tucker Holland: One of the items says you must complete an approved buyer training course. I like Dave’s suggestion.

Anne Kuszpa: Our next first-time homebuyer class in-person start on the 5th of October (5, 12 and 19th). You can register on our website. But you take the class anytime online, so if that did not work

for someone, they can do it through our website online.

Dave Iverson makes the motion to approve the Thapa CCAP Application at 37 Beach Grass Rd. for the up to \$15,000 pending final closing costs, conditional upon the completion of the New Home Owner’s Class. Applicant must take class and provide proof to staff before receiving funds. Seconded by Penny Dey.

ROLL CALL of those participating:

- | | |
|-------------------|-----|
| 1. Reema Sherry | Aye |
| 2. Brooke Mohr | Aye |
| 3. Meg Browers | Aye |
| 4. Penny Dey | Aye |
| 5. Dave Iverson | Aye |
| 6. Brian Sullivan | Aye |

Motion by 6-0 vote.

Brian Sullivan: I just have one question on that application. For the property, what does that unit qualify for as far as Richmond’s units?

Anne Kuszpa: It’s a 175% AMI unit.

V. Violet Place Acceleration– REVIEW & APPROVAL

Moved to next week.

VI. 7 Amelia Drive RFP – REVIEW & APPROVAL

Moved to next week.

VII. 135 + 137 Orange Street RFP & 12 + 12R Bartlett Rd. RFP – INITIAL DISCUSSION

135 + 137 Orange St.:

Tucker Holland: Looking for the Board’s thoughts about what we want to achieve here. A few things to point out at the start of the discussion: we think we can not only address housing needs, but also a transportation role – an opportunity for a turnout (and possible bus shelter) for the Wave. It presently stops in the middle of Orange St. right near our location, and it completely stops traffic. You will see something in that regard included in the draft. Ken and I met with the Executive Director of the Landbank recently and wanted to explore the Board’s thoughts on whether it might a reasonable idea

to support a small residence on the 141 site, which would serve year-round housing for the Landbank. This is something they would create – they have an opportunity to move a very small cottage to this location. The intent is still to maintain a decent sized greenspace between this house and the housing development that we are pursuing [at 135/137].

The overall objective for the property [135/137] is in CMI Zoning and can allow up to 32 units across the two properties and we are looking to get some attractive proposals for creating rental year-round housing here. We are bringing both this and the Bartlett Rd. RFP forward at the same time. Potentially attracting a greater pool of interested proposers.

Brian Sullivan: I open the floor to Board Members for questions and thoughts.

Penney Dey: I thought that piece that the Landbank purchases was supposed to stay as open space?

Tucker Holland: That was the original intent. We had approached them as a park opportunity for them and an easement for us. This is an opportunity that has come up on their radar recently. Given the nature of what we are doing next door, this is something they wanted to get early feedback on.

Reema Sherry: Are they allowed to do that? Within their mission, can they turn their piece into a residential piece and not just a park? Also, we had talked briefly about having elderly units possibly and that is not part of it [135/137 RFP] and got lost in the shuffle. In the scoring, can we add a higher score for one or more ADA units? I think the developer should include at least one accessible unit, that is a need here.

Brian Sullivan: Thank you Reema, I agree. In terms of the Landbank aspect. In the vacuum of an overall plan or proposal, I also thought it was an open space park going into it. I understand the idea, but if it were any property they could do this to, they have a vast number of options in comparison to us at the moment.

Vicki Marsh: I can look at the Deed that they used to acquire this property. If they acquired it for open space purposes, then this property is Article 97 land and may not be suitable for residential site. I'll look at the Deed and the wording as well as their act to see if it allows them to switch Article 97 land to residential. There are a couple of potential issues there that we need to make sure of.

Brooke Mohr: This was a new opportunity for co-acquisition. The first time. I think the Landbank stretched themselves to do this for us, so I am inclined to be open to a conversation about what they

are thinking about and how it fits in with what we do.

Penny Dey: I want to be thoughtful that there is some outside space for the people that are going to be living at this property.

Dave Iverson: I think we should continue a relationship with the Landbank. I'd hate to foul any opportunities down the road. But also, open space is important, too.

Brian Sullivan: Have we vetted the condo association about any access off of those private ways that the property abuts?

Tucker Holland: They are not interested in having an access into the private ways. The one thing they would like to include is they want to mutually address parking. They would like to see a fence of some sort in to discourage people in both directions to park in each other's lots.

Brian Sullivan: Is it outlined in the RFP?

Tucker Holland: It is something we would include.

Reema Sherry: The GIS pages that you included show the outlines of the old buildings that are not on there anymore. If those pages were switched out for the aerial photographs with lot lines, it would be less confusing if someone did not know and think they had to demo buildings.

Tucker Holland: We will make that change. We are also following up further with the coastal resiliency folks to make sure to incorporate their standards.

Vicki Marsh: I wanted to clarify a few things. The percentage of affordability - it will just be 80% of less? You're not looking for any other specific AMI preference?

Tucker Holland: Well, it needs to qualify on SHI list. It's a question – how prescriptive can we be in what we include here? Without triggering 30B complications.

Vicki Marsh: You can make it as broad as you want, as long as we get SHI compliance with DHCD. If you want to limit it to 80% or less and then when you negotiate with these parties you could try to get other income levels.

Tucker Holland: We don't want it totally be 80% or less.

Brian Sullivan: I think we should be somewhat prescriptive. At least 25% units 80% AMI or less, with the rest up to 240% AMI. I'm confused about the workforce housing line – are they all year-round units?

Tucker Holland: Yes, 100% of the units have to be year-round.

Brooke Mohr: Do we want to prescribe any lower income units? Tucker, do you remember on the Tacoma Green RFP if the steps were laid out?

Tucker Holland: It was not prescribed other than they all had to be SHI eligible and a mix of incomes.

Brooke Mohr: Can we give a higher score if they include some units at 60% or below?

Brian Sullivan: This is the only project or property we own that someone could potentially go for LIHTC financing with 60% units. So, if a developer chose to come to us with 20 or more units at 60% they can apply for financing. Do we need to note that somewhere to encourage it?

Dave Iverson: Do we start to take possible applicants out of the mix when we prescribe too heavily? Will that scare a bunch of developers away and is that a good or bad thing?

Brian Sullivan: Potentially, yes. Probably bad because this is a beginning of RFP's at this size, so we don't know who all the players are.

Dave Iverson: That's my fear. I would love to get many units at 60%, but I fear we will scare people off. Maybe we can negotiate when we get hooks set.

Brooke Mohr: I agree, I was just raising the question for informational purposes.

12 + 12R Bartlett Rd.:

Brooke Mohr: Is there an estimated unit count?

Tucker: It's sort of contained in the evaluation spreadsheet. Up to one dozen.

Reema Sherry: Again, possibly a bonus of one or more ADA units.

Tucker Holland: Yes, I should have brought this up when you mentioned it before. They are going to be required to have a certain number of ADA units in order to on SHI list, but I will confirm the

exact number for you. It is probably more than one.

Brian Sullivan: Any other commentary?

Conversation goes back to 135 + 137 Orange St.

Tucker Holland: I wanted to note that we've had Laura McCloskey join the meeting. She's representing the neighbors at the Orange St. condominium association. Laura, did you want to add anything?

Laura McCloskey: Parking mid-island is always an issue. We do end up towing people, people think we are a community lot, which we are not. We think a fence would be a deterrent.

Meg Browsers: When I read through the proposal – you wanted this to be a walkable, community involved, workforce housing. So, you won't be able to put a fence around the whole thing, you'll want those people to be able to walk out and go to the pharmacy, grocery store, etc. I just question the message it sends to put up a big giant fence on that side to keep them out of the condo association's lot. To me, this fence sends a negative message. Rather than using signage for parking or messaging to the tenants that they have their own parking. To me that feels jarring, and that is coming from someone who is working in the condo association lot.

Brian Sullivan: My only concern about it [the fence] going into the RFP is the HDC and creating and RFP that has a requirement that another Board may or may not approve, I caution that. I don't want it to become a roadblock.

Dave Iverson: I appreciate what Meg is saying. I think with proper landscaping and a footpath going through the Landbank, a break can be created, and it can still be appealing. I agree, you won't want a big fence, but we can soften it.

Brian Sullivan: We understand that the condo association is concerned about parking, and the use – are there way to discourage that? Whether they create signage on their property, or we offer signage or landscape. The conversation and intent has been made and can be conveyed to anybody that applies for the RFP. But making it a requirement of the RFP could be limiting.

Tucker Holland: We will include something in the next draft that gets to the intent.

Brian Sullivan: Tucker, can you define the process and rollout for us to publish these RFPs so the public understands our goals for timing?

Tucker Holland: We've gotten feedback today, we have a draft we will incorporate that feedback into, Vicki will provide her own feedback. We will send it to the Procurement department to get their input. We would expect to come back to the Board with something that is at the next level for further or potentially final input. And subsequent the Board being happy with it, we would then have the Procurement Department issue the RFP through the COMBIS public process.

Vicki Marsh: Once we have a final RFP that you've approved, we would have you authorize us to publish it. A notice goes in the central registrar, there are notices in the newspaper about it, if you wanted to put it into any other publications, you can do that as well. We're looking for a little way off – if we can get this done in the next few weeks, that would behoove us. The idea is to get it done sooner rather than later. I know we might also be interested in what access we have in those roadways. I'm going to determine what access is any is available.

Conversation goes back to Bartlett Rd. RFP.

Tucker Holland: At the Bartlett Rd. location we are working on the availability of access to Thirty Acres Lane.

Ken Beaugrand: That's a real issue. I'm starting to talk to the people involved with homeowner's association.

Reema Sherry: Is there any mention of family friendly aspect to the Bartlett project, given the proximity to the schools? Maybe a higher score for more 2-3 bedrooms? Something to consider.

Brian Sullivan: I was going to bring that up too. Is the ground cover ratio on that property more significant per unit than others? Meaning, could the units be bigger? Within the same unit count? If you get more sq. footage, is it more family friendly?

Tucker Holland: We can prioritize that in the evaluation criteria.

Brian Sullivan: Does anyone else have thoughts or comments on that?

Brooke Mohr: My mind goes in two directions. More family units, with small units. Or larger families in bigger units. I could argue either side of it.

Penny Dey: Are we keeping track of size of units overall somewhere?

Tucker Holland: We can pull that information together. It would probably make sense for this discussion to have that going forward.

Dave Iverson: Do we have a sense of the demand as far as size or families or single units?

Anne Kuszpa: The two bedroom is the most versatile unit and there is a lot of demand for it, because you can fit a variety of household sizes in it, depending on the gender of the children. I know 10% of units are required to be 3 bedrooms.

Dave Iverson: It sounds like 2 bedrooms are a more functional size. Maybe we can attract families with other things – like swing sets, etc.

Brooke Mohr: It would be good to note, to Penny’s point, what is the bedroom count, number of units and bedroom size, we have coming up in the pipeline? Is there a need to push in one direction or the other?

Vicki Marsh: We need to revisit the bylaw regarding number of units.

Tucker Holland: It’s 57 per 60,000 sq. ft.

Brian Sullivan: What I’m confused about is, neither 135/137 Orange St. is 60,000 sq. feet?

Tucker Holland: Combined, they meet the minimum lot size. For our next round, let us bring back the table Penny was talking about. That will help facilitate the discussion.

VIII. Other Business

Upcoming Meetings:

- Regular AHT meeting: September 20, 2022 at 12:30pm (via Zoom).

IX. Board Comments

X. Executive Session, Pursuant to MGL C. 30A § 21(A)

- Purpose 6: To consider the purchase, exchange, lease or value of real property where an open meeting may have a detrimental effect on the negotiating position of the public body.

XI. Penny Dey makes a motion to adjourn the regular meeting and go into Executive Session.
Seconded by Reema Sherry.

ROLL CALL of those participating:

- | | |
|-------------------|-----|
| 1. Reema Sherry | Aye |
| 2. Brooke Mohr | Aye |
| 3. Meg Browers | Aye |
| 4. Penny Dey | Aye |
| 5. Dave Iverson | Aye |
| 6. Brian Sullivan | Aye |

Motion by 6-0 vote.

Meeting adjourned 1:35pm.