



The Town of Barnstable
Affordable Housing Growth & Development
Trust Fund Board
367 Main Street, Hyannis MA 02601
www.town.barnstable.ma.us



Office: 508-862-4610
Fax: 508-790-6226
Email: mark.ells@town.barnstable.ma.us

Mark S. Ells, Chairman

Friday, June 25, 2021
Affordable Housing Growth & Development Trust Fund
Fund Board Meeting APPROVED Minutes
9:00 A.M.

Pursuant to the passage of legislation extending certain COVID-19 measures adopted during the state of emergency, this meeting was closed to the public.

Alternative public access to this meeting was provided by utilizing a Zoom link or telephone number, both provided in the posted meeting notice.

Board Member Attendees: Mark Ells, Chairman, Andy Clyburn, Mark Milne, Laura Shufelt, Wendy Northcross.

Other Attendees: Ruth Weil, AHGDT Staff; Attorney Charlie McLaughlin, Senior Town Attorney; Kaitlyn Maldonado, Assistant Director, Planning & Development; Arden Cadrin, Housing Coordinator, Planning & Development; David Anthony, Chief Procurement Officer; Councilor Paula Schnepf; Jake Dewey, Applicant; Andrew Nahmias & Timothy Love, Utile development consultants; Ellen Swiniarski, CPC Coordinator, Planning & Development.

Call to Order

With a quorum present, Chairman Mark Ells called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. and stated that today's meeting is recorded and in accordance with M.G.L. Chapter 30A, s 20 he must inquire whether anyone is recording this meeting and to notify the Chairman that a recording is being made. No one came forward.

Member Introduction

By roll call (present): Laura Shufelt, Wendy Northcross, Mark Milne, Andy Clyburn and Mark Ells.

Topics for Discussion

1. Public Comment

None.

2. Approval of minutes for the 6/4/21 meeting.

Motion was made by Wendy Northcross and seconded by Mark Milne to approve the June 4, 2021 meeting minutes as amended by Laura Shufelt. Roll Call Vote: Wendy Northcross (yes), Laura Shufelt (yes), Mark Milne (yes) Andy Clyburn (yes) Mark Ells (abstains).
Motion carries.

3. Discussion with Utile, development consultants, on the Trust's expectations for the development of affordable housing on the portion of the property now addressed as 1200 Phinney's Lane, Hyannis, MA (Map 274, Parcel 031) which was formerly owned by the Disabled American Veterans (DAV).

Ruth Weil reminded that the purpose of this analysis by the development consultants for Utile is for the Trust to provide feedback regarding proceeding with the development of this Town owned property with affordable housing.

Tim Love and Andrew Nahmias of Utile narrated a PowerPoint presentation depicting the different potential development layouts seeking feedback from the Trust. A preliminary overview was presented regarding the existing zoning as well as utility concerns and easement constraints with very preliminary test fits for potential development which test the site capacity, parking configuration and the maximum number of that units that can be accomplished under current zoning.

Utile made the following initial assumptions for lot development:

- Affordable low-income development
- Target unit count 40-45 units
- Parking ratio 1.5 per unit
- Building height as-of-right 2.5 stories, 3 story maximum with zoning change
- Sewer line setback requirements TBD.

Utile consultants explained the zoning for the site:

- The site is at the line between the Business District and RC-1 Residential District with a far corner of the lot lying in the Business District. Setback requirements from the road itself and setbacks from the side property lines are constraints. The parcel is joined with the abutting police station lot also owned by the Town, so there may be more flexibility with this line which can be determined. Development is constrained by the existing driveways leading to the parking areas for the police station. Under present zoning only a single family detached residential house is allowed on the site, with a special permit provision for an affordable housing development. Maximum height limit is 30 ft or 2.5 stories whichever is less. Utilities are straightforward for the gas and water lines that are parallel to Phinney's Lane. The consultant, Tim Love noted a potential constraint with the sewer line that crosses the northern border of the site, and the setback requirement will need to be determined and also any easements in place. This is still being researched and could affect where the parking is located and how close development can be to the sewer line.

Utile consultants explained the various housing types:

- Housing types studied were based on past studies for housing types appropriate for this area which are duplexes, townhouses, and walk ups that are dense enough to accommodate or meet the desired unit count while also staying at a small enough scale to fit in with the context and zoning requirements.

Utile consultants explained the Preliminary Test-fits:

- Test fits are based on what the parking requirements are for the unit counts and what fits within the site itself and the limitations there might be with the sewer line in place. Using the assumptions for the site they are following, and a 10 ft setback from the sewer line, the two housing types tested are a double loaded interior corridor and a six unit building called a six pack. The size of the double loaded corridor is determined by the parking spaces that can fit on the site along with the building. In compliance with current zoning, only 2 stories are allowed as of right resulting in a maximum of 31 units. The addition of a 3rd story allows for 36 units with the required 55 parking spaces calculated at 1.5 spaces per unit. Tim Love said that parking layout and capacity is the tail that wags the dog and that the layout proposed depicting 55 spaces is the most efficient way to accommodate parking because it is a short drive off Phinney's Lane, has a center drive aisle that is wide enough for cars to back into from perpendicular spaces. In terms of area, Tim said that they created the most efficient parking lot and worked backwards to determine the maximum number of units using the remaining space to fit the building within the setbacks required by zoning.
- Also tested out was if the parcel line can be adjusted to utilize an unused portion of the abutting police station parcel to possibly provide additional parking spaces for the site and therefore providing for more units. Tim explained that a three story double loaded corridor building needs to be 33 to 34 ft in height because a floor to floor height of 10.6 ft minimum is needed with typical wood framing plus the extra dimension needed for the roof and a parapet. Tim noted that another parking layout tested was one in which the parking goes over the sewer line itself, but the feasibility of this will depend on what the requirements for the sewer line are. With the additional spaces on the abutting lot, and 3 stories, the unit count could reach 41 possibly with the double loaded corridor house type.
- Test fit - six pack model. The 6 pack is 2 units per floor, 3 stories with units is to either side. This model allows for individual unit packs to be scattered along the site keeping the same optimal parking layout. 36 units are possible with this option with a cluster of 6 buildings. Tim explained that in all of the three story scenarios, half of the 3rd floor can be tucked up into the pitch of the roof. The cornice line where the roof breaks, really happens 6 feet above the 3rd floor so there is not a full three-story expression on the façade; it is considered that the façade is 2.5 stories, this however would have an impact on the size of the units on the top floor and noted that the buildings would be gable end like a village, with the gable end facing the parking lot. With these initial tests, the big take away is that the limitation is how much parking can fit on the site. Starting with the most efficient parking layout, the variations are based on the possibility of the property line changing, if development can occur over the sewer line, and then determine what housing type fits best on the site with the zoning limitations.
- Tim explained that Utile does a lot of affordable housing projects for CDCs and reaching 40 – 45 units makes projects more attractive for financing and he considers this unit count to be the sweet spot for a housing project. He noted that this consideration also influenced what Utile was aiming for along with an opportunity to develop affordable housing at maximum density and he asked if there was a unit count that the Trust had in mind for the site and if unit count is a determining factor.

Chair Ells asked David Anthony if the flexibility of property line between the two municipal parcels had been researched at this point and if there were any conditions that would limit flexibility. David said he had met with Town Engineers Griffin and Shane and relayed that the line between the two parcels is flexible for whatever we would like to do because of the way the parcels were acquired and then assembled. David noted that as indicated by the consultants, the limiting factor is going to be working around the driveway that currently exists rather than relocating driveways. David said Griffin had indicated that parking and driveways were okay to place over the sewer line, however structures or buildings are not. The sewer line represents a challenge if the proposal is to separate a piece of land and transfer it to another ownership entity; the Town will want to keep control of the sewer line on a municipal parcel. With a 10 ft buffer, if the balance of land to the south was then transferred, the Town would retain complete control of that sewer line and access it without easements. Tim said as a next step that they should have a follow up conversation to pinpoint precisely where the town would like that line to be relative to an easement they are comfortable with. Mark Ells said he wants to know when we researched how we purchased both of these parcels, if there are there any conditions at the time of purchase that would limit the line between the DAV lot and police station lot from being a flexible property line, and noted that he did not think this has been determined yet. Mark Ells explained that he wants to know if use limitations exist before getting to the next level of decision making. Mark noted the 2-story townhouse design with cedar shingle and stepped back entryways on the abutting parcel to the south and asked the Utile consultants if what they designed is aesthetically consistent with the 2-story town house or is it more than this, explaining that he would like to maintain the character of the residential neighborhoods. Tim explained that what they are proposing is a much denser building type because the row houses to the south only provide 1/3 of the units they are getting with other housing models and he offered to test fit the row house model on the site also. Mark noted that it will be important for the Trust to determine what the priority is, whether it is density, maximizing number of units on the site, or providing affordable or work force housing that adds to inventory in town, but also anticipates some of the neighborhood challenges that have previously been experienced and prioritize that as well.

Andy said that he agrees with Mark that it appears there are competing demands every time we go through one of these iterations. Tim suggested looking at other fits in order to have an apples to apples discussion. Andy said he wants to know what we can do with the site because there is a significant difference between 2.5 and 3 stories. It seems possible to get some latitude with the property line because we own both parcels, but he asked if there was latitude on zoning that would help design something closer in character to the abutting 2-story townhouse. Tim said that the goldilocks scenario would be to make the buildings true 3 story buildings, but with 4-unit buildings not 6-unit buildings. Tim said Utile uses design as a tool for people to understand where the trade offs are and said he sees from this conversation that maybe the sweet spot is not 44 units, but something in between that resembles a village.

Laura Shufelt said that an affordable housing development should not be limited by the existing zoning and suggested that the Trust should maximize what can be done on the site with a Chapter 40B. She explained that the site was especially attractive because it fits in the category of the missing middle where there is a 3- story development across the street, a municipal building, and a large development right behind it with the Cape Codder, and the abutting two story townhouses, and single-family residences. Laura said that going up 3 or 4 stories is not going out of context because you are moving that towards a commercial corridor and municipal buildings. She said this was the design that the Planning Department did with the Cape Cod Commission and Union Studios. She said the Trust should look beyond what is right next door, look also at what is behind and across the street; there is a huge commercial corridor on the other

side of the police station that has varying sizes. We should not limit the size or the dimensions based on the existing zoning. Laura said there are a lot of opportunities to do this and hitting that sweet spot of 45 units would be great. She said she also wondered about putting parking under in certain places, although it is expensive. Tim said that the reverse engineering has determined the maximum number of units at 44 units which is a good number for the financing sources for these types of projects but noted that the line of funding from the state does not support the cost of underground parking unless it is a necessity. The maximum capacity of the site is probably 44 – 45 units because there is not enough room for parking to add another floor. This is where the tail is wagging the dog. Laura shared that she works at Massachusetts Housing Partnership and works with communities on affordable housing development projects and said she is seeing developers pushing the sweet spot to 50 units so that is where she thought it should be for this project.

Tim revisited the land swap idea where land triangles are traded and aligned where the zoning change is. He noted that the advantage is that you can take the already efficiently designed parking lot and extend it. The triangle cannot be used for buildings because it is too narrow. David Anthony said that the land swap adds an unknown to moving this project forward because we do not know how involved the process would be to accomplish it, explaining that when the Town acquired the DAV property it was a land swap that required state legislature involvement. With public procurement and other issues, it is not known how difficult it would be to swap those two triangles and may require it to go back up through the legislature. It is much easier to maneuver that common line between the police station parcel and the DAV parcel.

Mark Ells mentioned that if the answer regarding the flexibility of the property line was known, it would provide a bit more license to be creative in utilization of that area that falls onto the police department lot. Tim noted that the double loaded test fit maintains 10 feet from the sewer line for the reasons that David mentioned earlier. Even at 3 stories, the maximum number of units is 36 units, but can get back up to 41 units with parking on the police station lot. There is only a piece of drive over the easement for more parking. This would require an easement across and would be a very funny property line which Andy mentioned may be more complicated that it is worth.

Andy said he liked the 41 unit double loaded test fit. He said that moving the lot line seems like it is easier than the land swap that was discussed and did not see a huge issue. Mark Ells agreed that the Town owns both parcels so we should be able to create the easement with rights. Mark also said that the driveway could be modified to accommodate whatever the threshold unit numbers are and keep it in the flavor of the residential neighborhood even if it is 3 stories. With the use of more land area, we would be able to design something that does not create a large block type structure. Mark noted that it goes back to his question as to what barriers there are with land ownership of these two parcels. He said he is open to see what will allow them to reach the right numbers to work from a financial standpoint, number of units for housing, and for the neighborhood and thanked Laura for helping him envision the other varying uses that surround the property. Mark said that if the driveway could be modified and moved closer to the police department building, it may alleviate issues with neighboring properties. Tim agreed and said that the efficient row parking would have to jump the 10 feet to the other side of the sewer line which might be possible. The buildings could be split into two buildings and the gap between the two buildings could fall where the row houses are. Laura said that neighbors are usually most concerned about headlights disturbing them.

Laura Shufelt left the meeting at 10 a.m.

Tim asked if the police parking lot requires two access drives because if only one is needed to provide access, the internal loop could be used to circulate around and would open up possibilities for more parking on the police lot for the housing project. He said he would recommend that the sewer easement not have a parking lot centered on it because he thought it might drive away developers who might see that as a complication. If more parking could be moved north of the sewer line to lie sideways, the amount of parking south of the sewer line could be reduced leaving a much larger buildable area south of the sewer line and a more interesting building form would be available. Mark Ells said it is worth the exercise at the conceptual stage and will make engineering and architect staff available for discussion and to look at access. Mark said there are a lot of scenarios we can run assuming we have a clear path to use the lot for the intended purpose and said they should come up with what the best scenario would be for the police, and the number of units you are referring to on the site to see if we can get there. Mark said he and Andy will talk to the Police Chief and noted that the lot is the staff and service parking lot and with a little more of a control point out on the existing drive on the top of the street, maybe it would help us to alleviate concerns of access of others going the wrong way.

David Anthony said that staff has received what was needed today to understand some of the issues and kick ideas around. Staff can reconnect with Utile offline and come back to the Trust at a future date and in the mean time will address some of the land limitation questions. Ruth Weil said that there is now an appreciation that in order to fill the housing gap, it is more accepted that the creation of density is necessary, but in a way that fits into the community. Ruth agreed with Andy that they need to maximize the land we have with every opportunity. With all the constraints we talked about, we should see how we can achieve all of those goals. In terms of the use, the legislation indicated that this was to be used for police purposes, but we have already discussed with Charlie and others that this would just require a 2/3s vote of the Town Council to change that use. Ruth said she did not know whether any grants were obtained for the construction or the acquisition of the police facility.

Andy said at the next meeting he wanted to have a discussion about timing. He said that although this is a unique opportunity and he wants to get the density and greatest number of units, he wondered if there are there any unintended negative consequences regarding timing. Could it take 5 years for an optimal project versus 2 years if you do something different. Ruth said with all of the federal funds that have gone to the state, it is anticipated that the tax credit process is going to be quicker, but there is no guarantee. Mark Ells said he has received information from the state outlining how they intend to have the funds used and will share it as soon as it is tightened up. Tim said it would be helpful for Utile if the town can do a little bit of work regarding the feasibility of reducing to one driveway before they put a lot of time into studying this option. Mark Ells said he would have a discussion with engineering and the police chief to look at safe access/egress combined with functionality for the PD. Legal will also be involved in the discussion regarding use the police parcel for access or parking. If there is a limitation there, we need to know it now. David Anthony and Charlie McLaughlin will work together on this question.

4. Applications for Funding:

Review of the application submitted by Jake Dewey for pre-development funds to support the redevelopment and development of the following parcels located in Hyannis, MA: 560

West Main Street, 4 Elis Drive, 14 Elis Drive, 15 Elis Drive, 20 Elis Drive, 30 Elis Drive, 31 Elis Drive, 35 Elis Drive, 39 Elis Drive, 40 Elis Drive and 44 Elis Drive.

Ruth Weil explained that this Application is under the Trust NOFA for predevelopment funds on private property. Because it is private property using public funds, it would need to have a mortgage, a grant agreement, and a promissory note, with terms included that if the property were not developed for a certain percentage of affordable housing, the money would have to come back to the Trust. If after this predevelopment exercise, the property is developed with affordable housing, then the mortgage could be forgiven depending upon the number of units that the Trust identifies. Jake Dewey, Developer, owner of Midpoint Property LLC explained that he has been doing small scale developments and learning along the way. He acquired this property in series with the front parcel 560 West Main which is the Midpoint Motel, a 4 unit apartment building, and about 1 ¼ acres of land in total. He said that he has also worked with Utile a little on this unique piece of land and wants to ensure he is doing this right. There are few pieces of land available for development for housing in town. He noted an infrastructure limitation, as there is no sewer on Lincoln Road that can be tapped into. However using the motel parcel, the sewer can be accessed from West Main Street. A significant portion of the funds will be to figure that out. A pump may be needed at the rear of the property to bring all of the sewage from the back parcel out to West Main Street. Utile also had some ideas of possibly reconfiguring the existing road which will require engineering to figure out the limitations there. To move forward, Utile would like to be able to determine some of those parameters similar to the 1200 Phinney's Lane project. Utile will also create a test fit model to figure how to reach a reasonable density and maximize the parcels available. The zoning analysis will also need to be done as well and it may end up being a 40B project. The projects will result in a relatively high density as the location lends itself to it and would not have a huge impact on abutters.

Ruth asked for a breakdown of how Jake arrived at the \$65,000 ask having provided a more general overview, but said it would be helpful for the Trust to have the specific numbers involved. Jake went through a budget of what the anticipated total spend would be. He said after talking with two engineers, a range of \$50,000 to \$100,000 was determined so he put in a budget of \$65,000 for the initial phase for design. Working with Utile it is going to cost between \$25,000 and \$50,000 depending on how far they go. If a 40B is determined, the consultant fee for that process would be \$25,000, an architectural fee of \$100,000, an environmental study \$10,000 and an MHC historical documentation or determination review which is approx \$10,000. Jake said he anticipated legal fees could be \$35,000 if zoning relief is necessary. That is about a \$260,000 budget and the \$65,000 ask would be part of that.

Mark Milne noted that several of the properties are currently developed and asked if any are affordable rentals. Jake said he acquired the property in late April, 2021 and after quick renovations, he has rented the units out at market rates. Jake explained that the existing rental units are not deed restricted and are market rate rentals at this point and said incorporating these units is something that needs to be determined if it makes sense. The houses are not near the end of their life so most likely he would not be demolishing them unless it really made sense for the project. Jake said he will look to the consultant to determine the options. If a test fit requires removal of the houses and it adds 10 more units, he would consider it, but Jake said he prefers not to remove any existing housing stock if it is not necessary.

David Anthony asked if Jake was anticipating having traffic come out onto Lincoln Road and shared he was a resident of that area and said the Lincoln Rd intersection at Walgreens and the Old Craigville Rd. intersection, and now with some further enhancement at the gas station, that

intersection is a real challenge already and putting any more traffic constraints into that area is something that should be taken into consideration to move traffic through that area. Jake said he would defer to the consultants and what they find because they are the experts, but their initial thought was to connect to the motel lot on West Main Street and utilize wasted space on that lot for development. Jake agreed that there is a bottleneck at the Lincoln Road intersection with West Main Street and noted the Route 28 side of Lincoln Road is also very busy. Mark Ells said that access/egress is going to be something that the consultant will need to look at closely and also noted that Lincoln Road sewer is a force main that cannot easily be tapped into. West Main Street is a much better location to tap into for utilities, definitely sewer need to look at water on both, where one goes, both will go. Jake said the plan was to have a pump to gravity out to West Main Street. Arden said because Jake is requesting predevelopment funds, this is the appropriate time to make that ask. It will be a determination of what the land can handle.

Mark Milne said that Ruth had mentioned that the predevelopment funds could be forgiven if this property is developed. He asked if the Trust were to vote on this request, would it be appropriate to now define a percentage of the units that we would want to see affordable. Ruth said it appears there will be more than ten units in the project for which there is an inclusionary requirement of one affordable unit for every 10 units created. The question is whether the Trust will want to go over and above that requirement and this would need to be defined in the grant agreement to protect the Trust's investment. Ruth suggested that Jake's request of \$65,000 be broken down into categories not a lump sum, so that the disbursement of funds could be monitored. Charlie dovetailed on Ruth's comment that it would be important to have a discussion about what securities are being offered, against what equity so that if the project does not go forward for any reason, there would be a reasonable opportunity to recover the advanced funds. He said he is not aware of the details, but it may involve a quick appraisal to make sure there is equity. Ruth said the Trust should request that Jake provide a more detailed breakdown of the \$65,000 with categories for expenditures noting there are a number of costs for the project, but from the Trust's perspective, they need to know what the money will be paying for and then to Charlie's point, figure out where the equity is of \$65,000 and how this amount can be secured. Optimistically, this will be forgiven because sufficient affordable housing will be developed. Ruth said the Trust needs to consider if the percentage of affordable units required will be beyond the requisite 10% to be able to forgive this \$65,000 loan. Mark Ells said that staff should continue to work with Mr. Dewey to bring back the additional information for further discussion at the next Trust meeting and address some of the issues working with staff. Jake indicated that the properties have all been acquired recently, and offered that there is an existing appraisal available.

5. Discussion of how to interest developers who have multifamily projects in the development pipeline to apply for Trust funds to create additional affordable units over and above the required 10% affordable units required under Barnstable's Inclusionary Ordinance.

Ruth said that this was a topic that came up at a meeting she was not in attendance. The characterization was we want to develop as quickly as possible. There are a number of developments in the pipeline that will have to comply with the 10% Inclusionary Ordinance but the question is how to induce developers who are closer to getting a shovel in the ground than some of our theoretical projects, to increase the number of affordable units. This was an issue that Charlie made initially in the discussion, and Elizabeth and Arden have been talking about it as well. The question is, should the Trust offer a set number such as \$100,000 per unit or

\$50,000 per unit based on an affordability sliding scale. Planning staff input is critical because they are dealing with a number of these developers. Arden explained you have to put yourself in the shoes of the developer and consider the options: I can move this forward quickly and easily as is, or I can try to create some additional affordable units there. How much incentive is needed to provide to those developers to convince them to: a) lose significant revenue; and b) possibly extend the process. A simple calculation figures out how much revenue they are going to lose. To calculate this, take the difference between what they proposed to be their market rents versus what would be the required affordable rent and we can see what that loss in revenue would be over 30 years. If we offer them less of a subsidy than that amount, I do not see anyone coming forward. Unless there are people who really want to create affordable housing out of the goodness of their hearts, but those are not the developments that are happening right now. We are seeing market rate developers who are shocked and not quite competent in following through on their affordability requirement and it becomes a burden for them and for staff. The Trust would need to create a clear, concise, and swift process to provide developers with funding for affordable units, and it needs to be an amount that makes them want to do it. Andy agreed that this discussion of the cost of affordability has occurred often and said he would like some analysis as they have had these discussions at least a dozen times. Arden said she did an analysis a few years ago she could share that indicates the length of time each different subsidy would last. Andy said he would like to get to a point where a developer coming to the Trust knew up front the range for 80%, 75% or 50% AMI allowing the trust to be able to almost purchase the affordable units.

Mark Milne said this sounds similar to a town sponsored rental subsidy program as we are really providing a monthly subsidy to an affordable renter and by giving a lump sum of cash to a developer up front, you could achieve the same thing by providing a monthly subsidized rent payment. Arden said that is another good option because it helps the residents which is the goal. Ruth said that another part of the discussion is not a Trust discussion and is about the town's policy level, noting that a lot of affordable units are being created through Regulatory Agreements under Chapter 168, with creation of affordable housing being one of the mitigation options that a developer could provide. Development Agreements which are a voluntary contract, could be used to increase the number of affordable units. Although it is not a Trust discussion, affordable housing as mitigation was contemplated when the Town Council passed Chapter 168. In light of the housing crisis if affordable housing were part of the Development Agreement, there would be less negotiation with the Trust. We would be giving the developer some level of funding when negotiating these units. Mark Ells said they should take this under advisement and have practitioners take a look at whatever we are creating because we haven't achieved what we want to achieve with the current methods in place. He said he would like to hear from those experiencing this, and once it is understood what is being said at a point in time, it needs to be adaptable because obviously the market changes dramatically. Mark said this should be placed back on a Trust agenda once we have additional information that merits discussion.

6. Discussion on the Trust's participation in the One Plus Mortgage Program administered by the Massachusetts Housing Partnership Program (MHP).

It was decided this agenda item would be taken up at the next Trust meeting.

7. Correspondence:

None.

8. Discussion of topics for future meetings.

Ruth explained that Arden, who attended her last meeting with the Housing Committee, communicated that the Housing Committee is interested in initiating communications with the Trust. Ruth said she is unsure what format the Trust would like. Chair Ells asked Ruth to come back with a recommendation to the Trust for this.

Charlie said that the first canary into the Conservation Law Foundation coal mine has come back indicating problems. Mike Ford is spearheading some of the major developments over in Independence Park from a permitting perspective and is very concerned on behalf of his client regarding what impacts CLF will have in terms of sewer options and related matters and indicated it could make it problematic for financing and otherwise.

Adjournment

Motion to adjourn was made by Andy Clyburn and seconded by Wendy Northcross. Roll call vote: Mark Milne (yes), Wendy Northcross (yes) Andy Clyburn (yes) and Mark Ells (yes). Motion carried. Meeting adjourned.

List of documents/exhibits used by the Board at the meeting:

- Exhibit 1 – Affordable Housing Growth and Development Trust Fund Board Agenda 6/25/21.
- Exhibit 2 – Draft minutes for 6/4/21 Affordable Housing Growth and Development Trust Fund Board meeting.
- Exhibit 3 – PowerPoint Presentation by Utile – 1200 Phinney’s Lane, Hyannis Discussion
- Exhibit 4 – Affordable Housing Growth and Development Trust Application – Mid Point Landing \$65,000 Predevelopment Funds.

Respectfully Submitted,
Ellen M. Swiniarski
CPC Coordinator
Planning & Development Dept.