MEETING NOTES - FINAL November 18, 2021 (via ZOOM)

Present for the Housing Committee and attending the zoom meeting were Jim Feiner, Andrew Goldman, Ann Wallace, Allison Cameron Parry, Nettie Kent Ruel and Alison Kisselgof. Peter Cook and Kara Shemeth were also in attendance. Bill Rossi was not in attendance.

The meeting came to order at 9:11 AM.

PEAKED HILL PASTURES UPDATE: Ann said that the Planning Board Subcommittee is finalizing a draft report to send to the Select Board. The report will include the Subcommittee's recommendations for information to include in the Peaked Hill Pastures (PHP) Request for Proposals (RFP).

Peter recounted a discussion with Dukes County Regional Housing Authority (DCRHA) Executive Director David Vigneault and how this conversation helped the refine the parameters of PHP. Peter would like to look at RFPs from other affordable housing projects on the island to create a template for the PHP RFP. He stressed that the project should keep moving forward and not get sidetracked by divergent discussions.

Andrew offered that the Middle Line Road RFP was originally rejected by the Select Board to the chagrin of the Housing Committee and so this RFP should not be used as a template. He went on to say that perhaps looking at RFPs from other towns would be useful.

Peter asks if the structure of the Middle Line Road template could be used with the details of PHP entered. Andrew agreed this would be a reasonable starting point. Peter questioned what details should be included in the RFP such as the project being turnkey or the specific number of unit proposed. Peter would like copies of RFPs for the next Subcommittee meeting.

Alison offered to look for RFPs. Ann suggested that RFPs are public records and they should be available. Ann also suggested that Andrew help write the outline of the RFP.

<u>TOTAL DEVELOPMENT VALUE DISCUSSION:</u> Ann talked about the difficulty in establishing appraisal values of Nab's Corner and Middle Line Road properties. She refers to the ground lease for the Caton property where the development value determination is defined. These development values have not be calculated for any of the affordable housing units in town. She wonders if this needs to be done.

Andrew recalled that the reason for the development value was to control the resale and make sure the property is retained into the affordable housing pool. He went on to say that the development value was calculated using the federal formula of 35% of income as a cap for property maintenance and that a mortgage that did not exceed this number would be acceptable. Andrew also said there have been several instances where affordable housing properties have raised the mortgage values, prompting the Committee to evaluate whether these appraisals affected the affordability and resaleability and make sure the property would be retained in the affordable housing pool. He questioned whether this needs to be done now due to the fact that numbers may change in the future.

Alison asked if the development value is relevant to both turnkey and in instances when applicants would build their own house. Andrew confirmed that it would be for both types of housing. Andrew mentioned that in previous projects applicants preferred to build their own and asked if PHP was going to be designed turnkey. Peter confirmed that the Subcommittee is proposing PHP be a turnkey development. Peter offered that the

Smalley's Knoll project left room for occupants to make improvements to the property and therefore value could go up over time even in a turnkey setting.

Andrew recounted the differences in development of turnkey vs build-your-own. He talked about phasing the project and how in the past this was done because there weren't enough Chilmark residents to fill the housing units. He does not feel that phasing should be used for the PHP project to get the units up as fast as possible. Andrew added that he didn't mind if housing was utilized by non-residents of Chilmark since the housing issue is island-wide but understands that not every Chilmark resident would agree. Jim added that the PHP development could done in two phases which would allow addressing future housing needs as well as dispel current concerns of overdeveloping the site right now. Peter said that regardless of phasing, PHP will not solve the housing problem.

There was a brief discussion about phasing of building. Allison asked whether rentals and home ownership housing would be done at once or in two parts. Ann offered that the current recommendation is all at once for the least disruption to the neighborhood and to make a commitment of the town to the project. Peter added that, in the first public session, the notion of a unified community was introduced and that building all at once would better support this goal. That being said, Peter acknowledged that the contractor may present a plan for phased building and it could be considered at that time.

Allison was concerned that the process of determining total development value may take months and delay owners ability to resell. Peter said that the PHP project could incorporate this determination and could provide guidelines for prior housing projects. Allison asked if this topic was brought up because an owner was requesting it. Ann answered that nobody had asked recently but it had come up in the past when owners wanted to refinance.

SHORT TERM RENTAL TAX DISCUSSION: Alison opened this discussion by recounting her discussion with Christine Flynn at MVC. Christine said that the other towns had not yet discussed using the short term rental tax for housing. The consensus among towns was to wait and see how much money was generated first. The income in the funds were higher than originally expected. Alison asked what steps could be taken to have Chilmark approve these funds for affordable housing.

Andrew mentioned that the Housing Committee had discussed putting the money in the Molly Flender Affordable Housing Fund. Ann offered that the money goes to the general fund at the moment. Wendy Wolf from Isand Housing Trust had emailed the Select Board about putting half of the short term tax in the affordable housing fund and will be attending their next meeting to discuss. Jim said that the Select Board would need to be convinced that the funds should be allocated to affordable housing and that Wendy Wolf was intending to start this process. Jim went on the say that the town has surplus this year and that it should be an easy decision to put the short term tax funds aside for housing. Andrew wanted to know why the Housing Committee isn't bringing up this topic with the Select Board and felt a resolution should be made to put 75% of the funds. A motion was made to write a letter to the Select Board in support of the short term tax money being allocated to the Molly Flender Affordable Housing Fund. The vote was unanimous. Alison was asked to draft a letter.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES: Ann made a motion to accept minutes from 9/16/21 as presented. The motion was seconded and a vote to approve was unanimous (Andrew did not vote because he was not present at the 9/16/21 meeting). Andrew made a motion to approve the 10/21/21 minutes as presented. The motion was seconded and passed by unanimous vote.

<u>OTHER TOPICS:</u> Nettie said that she was happy that the Planning Board had passed the change to the Homesite bylaw allowing for properties under an acre. She would like to discuss the Homesite sale price cap of \$40,000 at the next meeting.

DOCUMENTS:

Middle Line Road Request for Proposals Caton Ground Lease 11/5/21 Email from Wendy Wolf to Select Board

NEXT POSSIBLE MEETING: December 16, 2021 @ 9:00am via Zoom.

With no further business to conduct the meeting adjourned at AM.

Respectfully submitted by Alison Kisselgof, board administrator.