

**MINUTES OF MEETING  
COMMUNITY PRESERVATION COMMITTEE**

**March 21, 2022**

**Location: Online Meeting**

The Community Preservation Committee (the “CPC” or the “Committee”) convened a regular meeting, duly noticed, on Monday, March 21, 2022, at 7 p.m. via the videoconferencing platform Zoom. CPC members present were Steve Ober, Chair; Nina Danforth; Nathalie Thompson; Steve Wagner, Leslie Glynn, Marcy Dorna, Neil Levitt, and Barry Tubman. Recreation Commission Chair Eric Rosenthal, Recreation Commission members Adam King and Maija Cirulis-Gooch, Recreation Director Christopher Fitzgerald, Tree Advisory Group (“TAG”) Chair Lori Hess, Tree Advisory Group member Carol Lee, Regional Housing Service Office (“RHSO”) employee Elizabeth

Valenta, Affordable Housing Trust Chair Sarah Rhatigan, Elderly Housing Committee Chair Tom Timko, Historical Commission member Al Aydelott, Historical Commission Co-Chair Phyliss Halpern, Planning Board Chair Alicia Primer, Merriam Village Board President Tod Foote, Merriam Village Board Member Ken Newberg, Merriam Village Property Manager Lynne Friedman, Merriam Village resident Lynne Lazaro, Finance Committee member Bharath Venkatraman, Permanent Building Committee Chair Jim Polando, Weston residents Adrienne Giske,

Henry Stone, Glen Harley, Joe Berman, Keith Glazier, Lori Glazier, Rob Mosher, Adam Clutz, Elly Draper, Katarina Anderson, Weston Media Center Videographer Jim Tremble and CPC Administrator Cheri Amour Mahan were also present.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

Steve Ober read a statement explaining the need for a meeting conducted by remote participation in light of the emergency orders issued by Governor Baker in response to the COVID-19 global pandemic, noted that the meeting was being recorded, and invited public comment. Mr. Ober reported the CPC would consider seven applications for at least the second time. Mr. Ober stated that there was a lot of ground to cover, and CPC would keep it moving as efficiently as possible. After each presentation, CPC members and others will have time for questions and observations. Mr. Ober stated that the first few applications are likely to be on the Consent Agenda and, therefore, might not need to be presented at Town Meeting. Further, Mr. Ober indicated that if there was a strenuous objection to any item being included on the Consent Agenda and not being presented at Town Meeting, those involved should please let the CPC know and the Select Board will be informed.

**Public Comment**

None

**PRESENTATIONS BY PROJECT SPONSORS SEEKING FY23 CPA FUNDING**

**Open Space**

• **Tree Advisory Group – \$42,000 for Case Park Restoration and Rehabilitation, Phase 2**  
Lori Hess, Chair of the Tree Advisory Group (TAG), introduced herself and presented a

PowerPoint slide deck on the sustainable restoration project at Case Park. Ms. Hess started by providing background on Phase 1, noting that the project encountered some unexpected setbacks, which resulted in the 2021 planting being deferred to 2022. Despite this, significant progress has been made, including soil tests, soil and lawn improvements, purchase of a replacement plaque, a new landscape architect hired in 2021, new plans/plant lists developed with DPW, and water access secured from the Scouts organization.

The goal of restoration is to make Case Park a destination while showcasing the beauty and benefits of sustainable landscaping design. Ms. Hess stated that the work had been divided into three phases. The intent is to create a dynamic landscape that is impactful both as one drives by and when you walk through the interior of the park.

Dr. Carol Lee, a TAG member, provided the Phase 2 focus: improve plantings along School Street that will emphasize primarily native species with benefits to pollinators and birds, continue to maximize appeal, minimize maintenance, provide educational materials, add seating, chess table, and make Case Park a “destination.” Dr. Lee noted that the objective is to have more cohesive planting along the edges, improve the space and increase usage. Dr. Lee described the project budget, with Phase 2 being a little less than the Phase 1 budget. Dr. Lee spoke about the Phase 2 project timeline starting with the Fall of 2022 final planting plan, Winter of 2023 bid process, and Spring 2024 planting.

Nina Danforth asked what happened to the \$45,000 for Phase 1. Ms. Hess replied they are working against the \$45,000 and have used around \$6,000.

Mr. Ober asked Ms. Hess and Dr. Lee if they are comfortable with this item being on the Consent Agenda. Ms. Hess stated that they are.

### **Community Housing**

#### **• Weston Affordable Housing Trust/Select Board – \$39,000 for Support of Community Housing (Regional Housing Services Office & Housing Trust Staff Support)**

Sarah Rhatigan, Weston Affordable Housing Trust (“WAHT”) Chair, introduced herself. Ms. Rhatigan reminded the Committee that this was an annual request to fund support from the Regional Housing Services Office (“RHSO”) for all the Town’s affordable housing needs. Ms. Rhatigan noted that the Town had contracted with the RHSO to provide housing expertise since 2011 and that Liz Valenta (a Weston resident, former Trust member, and current RHSO employee) had been providing that expertise since 2011. Ms. Rhatigan explained that Ms. Valenta’s work involved supporting the Town generally as well as the Trust and included monitoring and maintaining the Town’s existing affordable housing units and answering the Select Board’s and Town Manager’s technical questions.

Mr. Ober stated that the request amount she had used was a bit inconsistent with the application form. Ms. Rhatigan noted that \$39,000 is the correct amount of the request.

Mr. Ober asked Ms. Rhatigan if she was comfortable with the item being placed on the Consent Agenda. Ms. Rhatigan stated that she was comfortable with the item being placed on the Consent Agenda.

□ **Weston Affordable Housing Trust Affordable Homeownership Opportunity Funds – \$1,000,000**

Ms. Rhatigan then presented on an application to the CPC to replenish the Affordable Homeownership Opportunity Fund, which was initially funded at the 2017 May Town Meeting for \$950,000. Ms. Rhatigan noted that the Trust’s purpose is to create affordable housing options in Weston. She highlighted that, according to the 2020 census, the median home sales price was \$1.8 million; however, individuals at 100% of the area median income would only be able to afford a \$500,000 house, which is difficult to find in Weston. In reviewing the Weston Housing Production Plan (“HPP”) income levels in Weston, approximately 23% of households earn less than 80% of the area median income.

Ms. Rhatigan explained that the inspiration for the homeownership opportunity program was to partner with a group such as Habitat for Humanity as a non-profit developer who could help the Trust create homeownership units. The Housing Trust has a particular niche in its overall housing strategy: to leverage the CPA funds in partnership with private non-profit organizations to create smaller, scattered sites around the Town for affordable homeownership projects. It is anticipated that the Trust will roll out a project at the corner of Boston Post Road (0 Wellesley Street), a property that the Trust holds, and where Habitat for Humanity was the winning development bidder. Habitat for Humanity is currently in the process of applying for a friendly 40B project that will allow for six units in three houses on the 0 Wellesley Street site.

Of the \$950,000 previously allocated to the Trust in CPA funds, \$450,000 will supplement the Habitat for Humanity development at 0 Wellesley Street, and Habitat will fund the remainder. All units built will be sold to income-eligible households at affordable prices, and the properties will be deed-restricted to be resold to eligible buyers.

Funding the Trust as proposed allows the Trust to act quickly when the opportunity arises. The Trust’s goal for the requested funds is to identify a potential site and do a feasibility analysis on it, and, if feasible, to use the funds to acquire the property and develop guidelines for future housing development with community input. A Request for Proposal (“RFP”) would be sent for a private developer to do the construction and resale to eligible buyers. All funds will be used to support permanently deed-restricted affordable homes.

Ms. Rhatigan explained that the request for \$1 million would supplement the estimated \$350,000 remaining in the homeownership opportunity program funds, which represents the portion of the original funding that is not spent and not otherwise earmarked for the 0 Wellesley Street project. Ms. Rhatigan indicated that the Trust could not do much with the balance of \$350,000, such as make an offer on any property. In terms of community involvement and input, the Trust has been in front of most groups in Town with respect to the 0 Wellesley Street project. It will continue to take this approach to do public outreach, including with neighbors and abutters of a potential project. Habitat for Humanity is also engaging with several individual and group outreach efforts. Ms. Rhatigan also reminded the CPC that the Trust would notify the Select Board in advance of any potential project and wouldn’t proceed on a project without the Select Board’s approval.

Mr. Ober asked Ms. Rhatigan if she had done a presentation for the Finance Committee

("FinCom"). Ms. Rhatigan stated that she had a conflict and had not been able to make the FinCom meeting, but that Ms. Valenta had attended. Mr. Ober noted that he had seen an email from the Town Manager, Leon Gaumond, that the item was voted down by FinCom. Ms. Rhatigan stated she was a little surprised that the vote was taken without the opportunity for her to do a presentation and answer questions. Ms. Rhatigan also said that even when she went back to watch the FinCom meeting, she could not tell what reasoning was behind the negative vote.

Mr. Ober asked Ms. Valenta if she had a comment. Ms. Valenta stated that she had attended the FinCom meeting and presented the proposal, although there were not a lot of questions asked by FinCom members. Ms. Valenta also was unsure why this item was voted down by FinCom.

Leslie Glynn asked about the fact that they were looking to hire a broker to help with finding and purchasing properties and wanted to know where that stood. Ms. Rhatigan stated that they went through a process of interviewing brokers, which did not work out. Ms. Glynn asked about the pictures that Ms. Rhatigan had shown in her presentation and if she had beat the bushes going through Geographic Information System ("GIS") to see what municipal land is available. Ms. Rhatigan stated that they need to do another revitalization of that effort. That was partly the process they went through with the Housing Production Plan and it should be revisited concurrent with looking for private opportunities.

Ms. Danforth commented that she thinks it is a good thing to be prepared to have the money ready when a property or land becomes available. Ms. Danforth stated that the CPC has its own cycle timetable that is often too slow and asked Ms. Rhatigan if that is part of the issue. Ms. Rhatigan said yes, the CPA timeline limitations did not allow them to react quickly.

Neil Levitt commented that because of the civic nature of the Trust it must move slowly and mitigates against being able to turn around on a dime, which private developers can do.

### **Weston Historical Commission**

#### **• 669 Boston Post Road - \$306,000**

Al Aydelott of the Historical Commission ("HC") conducted a slide show presentation. Mr. Aydelott described how the HC asked for funds to enable the Town to purchase a preservation deed restriction on this property, subject to an appraisal and Town Meeting authorization. The house at 669 Boston Road is on the corner of Warren Avenue and Boston Post Road. The house is a Queen Anne-style house built in 1891 and is approximately 1,500 sq. ft. with a carriage house that together is a focal point in the neighborhood context. The house is part of the Boston Post Road National and State Historical Districts. The inside of the house has original features. It was built for the grandson of Isaac Jones, the proprietor of the Golden Ball Tavern. The property owner came to the HC in 2021 proposing to demolish the home and carriage house. The HC delayed the demolition by a year to June 22, 2022. Mr. Aydelott stated that the HC made a comparison to other houses around 669 Boston Post Road to confirm if additions have been made, and said it would not be uncommon for an addition to be made to a house like 669 Boston Post Road.

Mr. Aydelott summarized the financial implications of a Preservation Deed Restriction ("PDR") on the subject property: current appraised value of 669 Boston Post Road - \$875,000; value after exterior maintenance restriction with limited expansion and preservation of the existing buildings -

\$575,000; diminution in value after a PDR - \$300,000; administrative costs of drafting/filing - \$6,000; funding request from CPC - \$306,000.

Steve Wagner stated that there are ongoing conversations with the property owner, and the owner would need to agree to accept the restriction on his property.

Ms. Glynn asked about the status of the property as a possibility for affordable housing. Alicia Primer of the Planning Board stated that the property owner did not approve after the appraisal information became available. Ms. Glynn asked what the largest preservation restriction amount has been for a house in Weston. Ms. Primer indicated that it was \$250,000. Mr. Levitt commented that the Town could not pay more than the appraisal, and the owner thinks it is worth more. Ms. Primer indicated the primary goal is to save the house and then possibly inquire about affordable housing in the future.

Adrienne Giske, Weston resident, commented that she has been watching this situation as it has been developing. Ms. Giske commented that Ms. Primer has been working conscientiously hard with the owner and the group, and she thinks this is the solution that will be most supported by the neighborhood. Everyone in the neighborhood wants this house saved because it's at a key point in the Historic District.

• **Merriam Village Building Preservation and Envelope Replacement Project - \$195,000** Tod Foote, the President of the Board, provided a slide presentation of the Merriam Village Siding and Envelope Project. The project involves the five (5) original buildings built in the late 1970s. These are two-story structures with four apartments each; the buildings have additional one-story single units at each end (in different configurations) called Cottages. There are a total of ten (10) Cottages that will require siding replacement. Mr. Foote clarified that the estimate included in the original application from November was \$140,000; however, they were subsequently advised of additional work required to tightly seal the units at a new total cost of \$195,000. Mr. Foote also provided an update on some of the work that has already started on the five main buildings, which included residing, new roofs, installing a solar panel, replacing the windows, resurfacing the sidewalks, as well as ongoing projects to update the bathrooms and kitchens in the buildings.

Mr. Foote provided a brief history of Merriam Village from its formation in the late 1970s, including the transfer of Town-owned land to the newly formed 501(c)(3) organization. The original 30 units were occupied in 1978, with 32 additional units becoming occupied in 1995. Private citizens put up \$100,000 in seed money and guaranteed a loan to allow for the original construction. The transferred land represents the only Town funding provided to date to Merriam Village. Mr. Foote also summarized the eligibility guidelines for occupancy at Merriam Village and the formula used for setting rents.

Mr. Ober stated that the CPC asked Town Counsel to confirm Ken Newberg's legal conclusion that this project qualifies for CPA funding.

Ms. Danforth stated that she had visited Merriam Village for a visit with Nathalie Thompson and was very impressed with the layout. The sense of being in a village was there, and the grounds were very neat. Ms. Danforth agreed that there was rot and also saw cracked shingles. Ms. Danforth stated that despite the opinion of Town Counsel, she does not agree that the project should be CPA funded.

Barry Tubman asked if rent payments are used to cover long-term capital reserves. Mr. Foote indicated that is the case. Mr. Newberg stated that they have spent reserve money over the years and they are at the end of their reserves now, and he was the one that suggested going to the CPC for the funding. Mr. Newberg commented that Merriam Village is a Town asset and needs to be preserved for the Town.

Mr. Ober recalled that Mr. Foote had projects on their agenda that were not CPA-eligible. Mr. Foote confirmed that there is a long list of such projects. Ms. Glynn asked for an idea about those projects. Mr. Foote listed repaving as an example of something that would not be eligible for CPA funding. Mr. Wagner asked if they had any other future requests for CPA funding. Mr. Foote said not anytime soon. Mr. Levitt asked about work on windows and doors. Mr. Foote stated that they are not asking for windows or doors, only for work to be done around them.

Mr. Ober asked Ms. Thompson if she had any observations from her visit. Ms. Thompson stated that it is clear what they are asking, and she supports it.

Henry Stone, Weston resident, asked how CPC defines preservation. Mr. Ober read from the prior DHCD ruling from 2013 that Mr. Newberg cited, noting that the CPA allows for preservation of community housing. Ms. Danforth commented that there is a beautiful piece of land behind Merriam Village and asked if they could add it to Merriam Village. Mr. Foote commented that it was deemed not possible. Ms. Glynn suggested that Weston Affordable Housing Trust might want a second look at the land in the context of its Opportunity Fund. Mr. Levitt asked who owned the land. Mr. Foote said Weston Community Housing, Inc. Ms. Rhatigan commented that these topics are a discussion for another day for WAHT.

## **Recreation**

### **• Memorial Pool Renovation \$2,300,000**

Maija Cirulis-Gooch, Recreation Commission, presented a PowerPoint slide deck to the CPC for the Memorial Pool renovation project. She highlighted that the goals are to improve the recreational value of the pool, to expand membership across different ages, and invest the capital to ensure that revenues continue to meet the charge as an Enterprise Fund, as most of the operating costs of the Recreation Department are funded by the Town's recreation activities, with a smaller subsidy from the Town's General Fund. Ms. Gooch referred to other nearby towns that recently upgraded their pools, such as Belmont, Needham, and Salem, noting that Needham increased their pool revenue by 100% in 2019 following their renovation project.

Ms. Gooch discussed the areas of the pool and the pool complex that will be renovated, noting that family bathrooms will be added to the entryway, including a shower with hot water, changing tables for children, and ADA compliant access. There also will be additional capabilities at the concession stand to improve the space and increase revenues. There is some interest in having another water feature included in the pool. The sandpit will be reconfigured to provide better access to the bathrooms and give children an enclosed area to play, with additional seating for parents. Portions of the pool area are intended to be covered, and pictures showing the different types of shaded structures were displayed. There is a desire to add a fenced water play area with showers as an attraction for younger families. A water slide will generate interest and provide additional activity for children. Regarding accessibility, the stairwell going down into the pool at the deep end will be upgraded. Ms. Gooch also discussed the other areas to be upgraded,

including the concrete siding of the filter house, the current water filtration system, and the lifeguard house to improve the general aesthetics of the complex and increase the facility's overall safety.

The amount requested for the project is \$2.3 million, which is a conservative amount to enable modest improvement to the pool; however, ongoing input on features and types of upgrades will be solicited from the community. Ms. Gooch stated they have reached out to other communities. Eric Rosenthal, Recreation Commission Chair, stated that he wanted to make some additional comments on the presentation. An effort was made around hardscaping to keep as much of the look of the pool. They are expecting to have estimates in May for Town Meeting.

Mr. Ober commented on the opinion of Town Counsel, as shared by Leon Gaumont, Town Manager, on two items: that the filtration system is eligible for CPA funding, but the outside of the filter building is not eligible.

Mr. Ober asked if Mr. Levitt would like to give feedback from his PBC meeting last week. Mr. Levitt stated the PBC is focused on the importance of having firm bids in hand in time for Town Meeting. Mr. Rosenthal emphasized the important of getting this project approved at the upcoming Town Meeting so as to avoid losing a year on the construction timeline. What followed was an extended discussion about the cost estimate and the ongoing process, what is included and what might be missing from the budget, what contingencies should be, etc. Mr. Levitt is concerned that the cost estimate is out-of-date, while Mr. Rosenthal is not sure that the estimate is entirely out-of-date.

In an effort to illustrate the lack of certainty in the information, Mr. Levitt pointed to a number in the budget for design fees that the architect could not confirm. Chris Fitzgerald stated that the approved design fee was \$250,000, and the confirmed cost to date is \$180,000, so it is his impression that this appropriation would cover all the design-related costs.

Mr. Wagner asked if there is any other Town money to supplement any shortfall in funding. Mr. Rosenthal indicated there is about \$300,000-\$400,000 in some reserves in the Recreation Enterprise Fund, and that going back to Town Meeting for supplemental funding is not something they want to do.

Ms. Glynn agrees with Mr. Levitt that the Town has used actual bids, rather than cost estimates, for the past twenty years. Also, she is very disappointed that she still has not seen anything about sustainability. Mr. Rosenthal indicated that any reaction to the sustainability point raised seven days ago takes time. Mr. Rosenthal further indicated that some aspects of sustainability are evidenced in what they are not doing. Mr. Fitzgerald indicated that, in his view, there is not much they can do about sustainability beyond what they are already doing.

Ms. Gooch described how the presentation needs more polish for Town Meeting, and how she kept it short for tonight's CPC Public Meeting.

Ms. Danforth was very thrilled by her visit to Memorial Pool earlier in the day, and wondered if the entire \$250,000 in design fees has been spent. Mr. Fitzgerald stated that \$60,000 had been committed/spent, with another \$120,000 to be negotiated, for a likely total of \$180,000.

Ms. Danforth stated that the project does not make the pool any bigger, so when it is hot and crowded, it does not solve that problem, and crowding may drive people away from the pool. Also, when the pool closes in August, the seniors are very dissatisfied. Mr. Rosenthal is trying to ensure all residents in every category are being considered. Ms. Gooch commented that an extension through August to keep the pool open is their desire.

Jim Polando, PBC Chair, reiterated the PBC's discomfort about going to Town Meeting as things stand because they do not know what the project will cost.

## **Community Housing**

### **• Brook School Addition- Building E \$250,000**

Tom Timko, Elderly Housing Committee Chair, presented a slide show that provided an overview of the project and reported that Weston's over 65 population is the fastest-growing demographic according to the Council on Aging ("COA") survey. There are currently 137 such units in Weston; however, no new units have been added over the past 15 years. The need is projected to be for 220 units by 2030, so 83 new units would need to be added by that time. The purpose of the Brook School Apartments is to provide affordable housing to the elderly. Mr. Timko walked through the various metrics that need to be considered in providing affordable housing. The Brook School Apartments currently consists of 75 units and 88 residents, with an estimated 31 of those residents affiliated with Weston in some way.

The original feasibility studies in 2017-2018 identified several site options on the property from a technical standpoint, and the development cost was estimated at that time at \$6.9 million. The project size is limited by septic capacity; therefore, only 14 one-bedroom units or fewer twobedroom units (or a mix of both) could be accommodated. Mr. Timko described affordable elderly housing, Brook School Apartments, the opportunities for new sites, the project process, the community outreach program, and resident meetings.

Mr. Timko discussed project costs and schedules. Building D is the model for Building E. The funding is requested for the schematic design and design development process to determine the most desirable site, the potential for the new building, and preliminary cost estimates.

Mr. Ober asked the CPC members to share their thoughts and ask questions.

Ms. Rhatigan stated that the Housing Trust has heard about the potential Brook School addition for as long as she can remember. Ms. Rhatigan thanked Mr. Timko for involving the neighbors. When the Housing Trust looks at where to place senior housing in Town, there is an obvious need to find a places and have as efficient a model as possible. The cost per unit in expanding BSA would be a little more affordable than looking for a new site; accordingly, she thinks it is the right thing to do. Ms. Rhatigan is in support of the expansion.

Mr. Levitt brought up the study from 2018, noting that the purpose was to figure out if anything at all was possible on the site. The funding requested here is an effort to find a solution to the problem, which could then be reviewed and evaluated. As an example of the misconceptions around the work done to date, Mr. Timko shared his most common complaint is that they will destroy the tennis courts and build a ten-story building.

Mr. Wagner has received all the letters from the neighbors, and hears the voices of the neighbors loud and clear. Mr. Wagner asked Mr. Timko about the harm of waiting until Fall Town Meeting in order to engage with the neighbors over the next few months. Mr. Timko is not sure if waiting would give the answers, whereas the design work might be productive in order to bring something meaningful to residents and neighbors.

Mr. Ober asked if the residents or neighbors would like to comment.

Cameron Peters, Brook School Apartments neighbor, commented how it is ironic that the “never in my backyard” attitude is mentioned when he feels the neighbors have always welcomed the Brook School Apartments. The perspective is that there is a lack of equity in choosing this site over other sites. The misrepresentation is upsetting to the neighborhood. Glen Harley referenced the appropriateness of the conversation earlier tonight about 669 Boston Post Road and how important it is to preserve older homes. She feels the BSA is in a historic area that should be preserved and kept as a historic area.

Joe Berman acknowledged his appreciation for the time that volunteers, such as Mr. Timko and the Elderly Housing Committee, put into these efforts, noting that it comes from a place of good faith, trying to do right by the Town. It is not easy, and it takes a lot of work. In summary, he does not believe the proposed funding to look at an expansion at the site is a good use of Town money and is concerned about what seems like always returning to the same location to add more housing.

Keith and Lori Glazer do not support the project based on the resulting density and the increased traffic. The idea of adding more to the Historical area is not desirable. Rob Mosher did not find anything appealing in any of the locations per the original study, noting that all options would change the whole look of the area.

Mr. Ober asked if more outreach in the next six months matters, noting that the same conversation seems to continue to occur from year-to-year. Mr. Peters indicated that any future outreach needs to be sincere and meaningful, but doesn't feel as though future outreach will change his view. Adam Clutz said that meaningful outreach would be helpful. Elly Draper concurred that six months of meaningful outreach would help. Katarina Anderson stated that she only knew about the community meeting due to her neighbors, and yes, she believes the next six months of outreach would be helpful.

### **CPA FUND STATUS**

• **Review of CPA Fund Status and Proposed Appropriations and Allocations for FY23** Mr. Ober presented slides showing the following: 1) an anticipated CPA Fund balance of approximately \$5.9 million at the end of FY22, 2) life-to-date sources of revenue through FY22, 3) a pie chart showing net appropriations, including the principal portion of committed debt service, in each CPA category, and 4) 7 applications for FY23 CPA funding totaling \$1,732,000. This number does not include Memorial Pool, as all of the debt service impacts of borrowing for the pool will fall in years after FY23. Mr. Ober presented a slide rolling forward the FY23 balance to an estimated \$6 million and then a side-by-side comparison of the projected CPA Fund balance at year-end FY22 and FY23. Mr. Ober noted that his slides assumed that all seven requests for FY23 funding were approved at Annual Town Meeting but did not consider any requests to be considered at a fall Special Town Meeting should one occur. Mr. Ober's last slide showed

proposed bucket allocations and an administrative allowance. Mr. Ober reported that proposed allocations covered existing debt service in two categories (less a beginning bucket balance in the Historic Resource category) and the statutory minimum of 10% of revenues in the Community Housing category (based on a state match exceeding the estimate used in Fund projections).

## MEETING

### Committee Business

- **Proposed Annual Allocations and Administrative Allowance for FY23**

**VOTE:** *Mr. Ober entertained a motion to approve the following FY23 allocations:*

- 1) *Open Space/Recreation – \$507,000;*
- 2) *Historic Resources – \$911,000;*
- 3) *Community Housing - \$363,000; and 4) Administrative Allowance - \$168,000.*

*Mr. Wagner made the motion, seconded by Mr. Tubman. The motion was approved unanimously by roll call vote.*

- **Projects Recommended to 2022 Annual Town Meeting (FY23)**

The Committee voted on pending applications to be placed on the warrant for the 2022 Annual Town Meeting as follows:

- 1) **VOTE:** *Mr. Ober entertained a motion to support the appropriation of \$42,000 for Case Park Restoration and Rehabilitation Phase 2. Mr. Levitt made the motion, seconded by Marcy Dorna. The motion was approved unanimously by roll call vote.*
- 2) **VOTE:** *Mr. Ober entertained a motion to support the appropriation of \$39,000 for Community Housing RHSO and Staff Support Funds. Mr. Wagner made the motion, seconded by Ms. Danforth. The motion was approved unanimously by roll call vote.*
- 3) **VOTE:** *Mr. Ober entertained a motion to support the appropriation of \$1,000,000 for Weston Affordable Housing Trust Affordable Homeownership Opportunity Funds. Mr. Levitt made the motion, seconded by Ms. Danforth. The motion was approved unanimously by roll call vote.*

Mr. Levitt asked about the basis for the Finance Committee’s negative feelings on this. Bharath Venkatraman, Finance Committee member, commented on the cost per unit. He also noted that the Finance Committee thinks the money is better spent on other Affordable Housing opportunities. Another question was about how the last appropriated funds were spent.

- 4) **VOTE:** *Mr. Ober entertained a motion to support the appropriation of \$306,000 for 669 Boston Post Road. Mr. Wagner made the motion, seconded by Mr. Levitt. The motion was approved unanimously by roll call vote.*

5) ***VOTE:*** *Mr. Ober entertained a motion to support the appropriation of \$195,000 for Merriam Village Building Preservation and Envelope Replacement Project. Mr. Levitt made the motion, seconded by Ms. Dorna. The motion was approved by 6 out of 8 members via roll call vote.*

Ms. Glynn has a reservation for the Merriam Village Building Preservation and Envelope Replacement Project. Ms. Danforth does not approve the project. Mr. Ober read from the DHCD ruling guidance.

6) ***VOTE:*** *Mr. Ober entertained a motion to not approve the appropriation of \$2,300,000 for Memorial Pool. Ms. Danforth made the motion, seconded by Ms. Glynn. The motion was approved unanimously by roll call vote.*

Mr. Wagner is concerned that the PBC is worried about this project. Mr. Levitt, speaking on behalf of the PBC, believes they can get a package together, keep the pool open and have a bid in place over the summer for a Special Town Meeting in early fall. Mr. Ober agrees with Mr. Levitt. Mr. Levitt stated that he is uneasy about not having any firm numbers. Ms. Dorna agrees with the notion of waiting until an early fall Special Town Meeting.

7) ***VOTE:*** *Mr. Ober entertained a motion to not approve the appropriation of \$250,000 to Brook School Addition- Building E. Ms. Dorna made the motion, seconded by Mr. Tubman. The motion was approved by 7 out of 8 members by roll call vote.*

Ms. Thompson is concerned about if there is a need for a schematic design or if not. Mr. Wagner commented that schematic design is needed, and they need more time for outreach to the neighborhood. Mr. Ober and Mr. Tubman agree that alternatives have not been fully explored or shared. Ms. Glynn commented that the property is not big enough for 14 more units.

#### □ **Minutes of the February 7<sup>th</sup>, 2022, Meeting**

***VOTE:*** *Mr. Ober entertained a motion to approve the meeting minutes of February 7th, 2022. Mr. Levitt made the motion with minor corrections, seconded by Ms. Thompson. The motion was approved unanimously by roll call vote, with two abstentions.*

#### **Tentative CPC 2022 Fall Meeting Schedule/Application Deadline**

- 1) Tuesday September 13 (Application deadline)
- 2) Monday, September 19<sup>th</sup> at 7 p.m. ;
- 3) Monday, October 3<sup>rd</sup> at 7 p.m. ;
- 4) Monday, October 17<sup>th</sup> at 7 p.m. ;
- 5) Monday, October 24<sup>th</sup>, at 7 p.m. (Public Hearing)

The meeting adjourned at 11:28 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, \_\_\_\_\_  
Cheri Amour Mahan

**Appendix A**

**CPC Public Hearing and Meeting  
March 21, 2022  
Document List**

- 1) Case Estates' Tree Preservation:
  - a) Application
  - b) PowerPoint
  
- 2) Community Housing-RHSO and Staff Support:
  - a) Application
  - b) PowerPoint
  
- 3) Weston Affordable Housing Trust
  - a) Application
- 4) 669 Boston Post Road
  - a) Application
  - b) PowerPoint
  
- 5) Merriam Village Building Preservation
  - a) Application
  - b) PowerPoint
  
- 6) Memorial Pool Renovation
  - a) Application
  - b) PowerPoint
  
- 7) Brook School Addition
  - a) Application
  - b) PowerPoint
- 8) CPC PowerPoint
- 9) Draft CPC Warrant Articles
- 10) Draft "Report of the CPC" for the Warrant Book:
- 11) Draft Minutes of the February 7<sup>th</sup>, 2022, CPC Meeting
- 12) CPC 2022 Fall Meeting Schedule

