

Meeting Minutes—December 16, 2015

Wayland Town Building

Attendance: Mary Antes; Jacqueline Ducharme; Stephen Greenbaum; Brian O’Herlihy; Jennifer Steel

Absent: Kevin Murphy; Susan Weinstein

Materials Distributed:

- Drafts of the MAHTF’s November 4, 2015 and December 3, 2015 minutes
- Minutes of the December 3, 2015 combined housing group meeting
- December 16, 2015 MAHTF Agenda
- The Wayland Housing Partnership’s response to the Wayland Real Assets Planning (WRAP) Committee’s questions/ survey
- MAHTF’s audited financial statements for the period of October 8, 2014 (commencement of operations) to June 30, 2015
- Financial Statement—(unaudited) as of November 30, 2015
- Invoice for the MAHTF’s financial statement audit for 10/8/14-6/30/15
- The Village Bank’s current interest rates as of 12/15/15

Open Meeting: Mary Antes called the meeting to order at 7:30 PM

Public Comment: None

Notes:

1. The November 4, 2015 minutes were reviewed. Stephen Greenbaum moved the minutes be approved. Mary Antes seconded the motion. Motion approved 3-0-2.
2. The December 3, 2015 minutes were reviewed. Brian O’Herlihy moved that the minutes be approved as amended; and the minutes from the December 3, 2015 combined housing group meeting be attached to the MAHTF minutes. Mary Antes seconded the motion. Motion approved 3-0-2.
3. The Trustees debriefed the December 3rd combined housing group meeting.
 - A. There was a discussion of the three housing groups and their primary functions:
 - Wayland Housing Authority administers several housing programs for the Town of Wayland, including elderly and disabled housing, family scattered site housing, and Section 8 voucher rental assistance programs.
 - The Municipal Affordable Housing Trust Fund was established for the purpose of creating and preserving affordable housing in Wayland

- The Housing Partnership advocates and advises the Board of Selectmen (BOS), making recommendations for the implementation of affordable housing policy, including but not limited to Section 40B.
 - B. The Trustees also discussed the need for a work plan that identifies short, medium and long-term objectives, with specific projects. The Trustees indicated that we have obtained some plans from other communities, and have begun a policy for small grants.
 - Liz Rust, an affordable housing consultant and head of the Regional Housing Services, attended the 11/4/15 Wayland MAHTF meeting. Ms. Rust submitted a proposal for buy-down housing program.
 - C. The Trustees discussed the three town housing groups and how to develop plans and work together.
4. Colleen Sheehan, a member the WRAP Committee, discussed the committee's mission and the questionnaire provided to various town boards and committees, including the housing groups, to complete. WRAP will develop a long-range, capital funding plan for projects \$500,000 and above, determining the best use of town-owned land and buildings.
- WRAP reports to the Planning Board, and communicates with the BOS.
 - Town Meeting will be informed of WRAP's recommendations.
 - The Trustees also discussed the Housing Partnership's responses to the WRAP questionnaire and whether or not the MAHTF should provide similar responses in a separately submitted questionnaire.
- ACTION: The Trustees are to review the Housing Partnerships responses/ additions/ revisions to the questionnaire, and send to Mary by 1/1/16.
5. Treasure's Report:
- A. Brian O'Herlihy reported that the MAHTF received its first invoice (\$2500), for services provided by the outside auditing firm in connection with the MAHTF's financial statement for the period 10/8/2014-6/30/2015. Stephen Greenbaum moved to approve payment to Melanson Heath for services rendered. Jennifer Steel seconded the motion and it passed unanimously (5-0).
 - B. Brian O'Herlihy reported that we should begin considering investing a portion of our funds. Brian O'Herlihy distributed the Village Bank interest rates and CD yields.
6. Mary Antes requested that we begin considering the MAHTF goals and timelines for 2016.
7. Future meeting dates were tentatively agreed to as follows: 1/6/16; 2/3/16; 4/6/16; 5/4/16; and 6/1/16.
8. Jennifer Steel moved that the meeting be adjourned at 9:35 PM. Stephen Greenbaum seconded the motion. It passed unanimously (5-0).

Respectfully Submitted,

MAHTF Minutes—December 16, 2015

Jacqueline Ducharme

**Combined Housing Committees
Minutes -- December 3, 2015
(12/4/15 draft, Rachel Bratt)**

In attendance:

Sarkis Sarkisian, Town Planner

Wayland Planning Board:

Kevin Murphy (also representing Housing Trust)

Daniel C. Hill (also representing River's Edge Advisory Committee)

Andrew Reck.

Wayland Housing Authority:

Susan Weinstein (also representing Housing Trust)

Mary Antes (also representing Housing Partnership and Housing Trust and member of BOS)

Jackie Ducharme (also representing Housing Trust)

Katherine Provost (employee).

Wayland Housing Partnership:

Chris DiBona (also representing River's Edge Advisory Committee)

Armine Roat

Rachel Bratt

Municipal Affordable Housing Trust:

Brian O'Herlihy

Jennifer Steele (soon-to-be appointed member, as representative of Housing Partnership)

Rachel Bratt called the meeting to order shortly after 7:30.

Each of the committees with a quorum convened their respective meetings:

Planning Board, Housing Authority and Housing Trust.

Each participant then introduced themselves.

Update on the three housing working groups that were formed as a result of the January 2014 meeting:

Visions group, chaired by Katherine Provost, has completed a draft report.

Katherine reported that the major need in town is for rental housing, with at least 2 bedrooms, targeted to households at the lower income ranges: 30-80% AMI, not just the state standard of 80% AMI. She noted that 80% AMI requires an income of \$49,000 – a pretty robust figure. Katherine also emphasized the numbers of people on wait lists for “Section 8” vouchers and for housing authority units. For example, last spring there were 78 households on the former wait list; 12 vouchers have been given out since then, but there are now 90 on the wait list. She also noted

that data from last spring indicated that 349 households were on waitlists for scattered site public housing and 148 were seeking 1-BR public housing units (60% seniors and 40% adults with disabilities).

Dan questioned whether there was a need for more low-income senior housing. Katherine said, “yes.”

In that context, there was a brief discussion of the River’s Edge development, and the fact that no bids had been received by developers; the deadline was Dec. 1. Sarki was questioned why he thought there were no bids: he explained that, perhaps, mid-size developers had gotten “scared away,” feeling that it was not worth their while, because Avalon had attended one of the site tours. However, Avalon did not end up submitting a bid, perhaps Sarki thought, because they are interested in developing the Raytheon site in Sudbury. Another explanation for no bidders was that the RFP was very long and requested a huge amount of detailed information. It is very costly and time consuming for developers to put together these types of proposals.

Dan explained that the REAC had met the prior evening and that they would be soliciting information from developers about why they did not bid. They are also interested in creating a 2-tiered process, so that developers can submit relatively brief conceptual proposals and then a group would, presumably, be asked to submit full proposals. The committee cannot, however, at this point in the process engage in 1:1 conversations with any single developer.

Monitoring group, chaired by Brian, who was not in attendance. Mary reported that the group had met once or twice and that Brian had been working on a draft report.

Zoning group, chaired by Sarki. It had been agreed that this group would follow the work of the other two groups. In addition, Sarki suggested that the potential need to change zoning by-laws should be combined with the work that the WRAP committee will be doing—identifying possible town-owned parcels for development. Sarki commented that the limitations of septic access make development in town difficult. This issue has to be considered along with any type of large-scale development/ redevelopment.

In that context, there was a conversation about Whole Foods moving from the center of town, since they are planning on relocating to Sudbury in 2016. The owner may be signing a 15-year lease with Fresh Market. His current plan is to take down the existing structure and build a new store on the existing footprint, from the foundation up. There was also some discussion about the potential for a more ambitious mixed-income development on the site, but the owner would likely be wary about the almost certain long time-frame required to get such a proposal through Town Meeting. Sarki reported that the owner likely wants to have a decision by September 2016. This type of project would need to access the town’s excess sewer capacity. It could also provide a greater profit to the owner/developer and Dan noted that state funding for housing would likely be available (chapter 40R and other funds).

Jennifer suggested that an important next step regarding the Whole Foods site would be to hold discussions with the owner about his plans/septic issues, etc. Mary indicated that she would raise this issue with the BOS; Sarki also indicated that he would be holding conversations with the owner. Several people mentioned their interest in a mixed income development for the site, since that would provide some affordable housing.

During the above discussion, Armine arrived. Rachel noted that the Housing Partnership could be considered to have a quorum with 4 members (since they currently have 8 members, not 9), so she called the Housing Partnership meeting to order, to be on the safe side.

How affordable units in Conservation Cluster are to be calculated

Sarki noted that the Planning Board would be meeting on Dec. 8 and was interesting in getting feedback about this issue. The Conservation Cluster by-law is not clear and needs to be re-worked, partly because this by-law pre-dated the passage of the town's Inclusionary Zoning by-law. The Conservation Cluster allows owners to cluster units on a site, thereby leaving a significant portion of the land as open space. So, in a 1-acre zone, for example, rather than having the each unit on its own 1-acre site, frontage and lots size requirements are waived. The same number of units can be built through a Conservation Cluster development as would be allowed under a "normal" zoning scheme. But clustering the units gives the developer flexibility in design, reduces costs to the developer by the lesser road construction needed and the ability for there to be shared driveways. Costs to the town can also be reduced since there are less public roads to maintain. And, of course, additional open space is provided.

There are some options about how the Conservation Cluster by-law can be clarified. Before presenting the options, Sarki said that a developer must first figure out the yield of the particular site. Or, in other words, how many units can be developed by right, under "normal" zoning? Next, there is a calculation about how many units must be affordable, under the Inclusionary Zoning by-law. This is where the Conservation Cluster by-law, as currently, written is unclear.

Sarki also noted that in developments with more than 10 units in a Conservation Cluster, one additional (market-rate) lot is allowed, thereby giving the developer a density bonus.

Sarki presented several maps and explained the two general approaches the Planning Board is considering.

One way to calculate the affordable units is to determine how many units can be built on site. In a 12-unit development, the Inclusionary Zoning by-law states that 16.7% of the units in any development with more than 6 units must be affordable. Therefore,

following this approach, 2 of the 12 units would be designated as affordable, 10 would be market-rate.

A second way to do the calculation would be to essentially give the developer a density bonus by calculating the total number of units permitted on site, 12, and to add the 2 units of affordable = 14 units total. The bonus would be that the developer would then get an additional 2 market-rate units.

Participants generally felt that, under the latter scenario, a “bonus” would only be desirable if additional affordable units were required, not simply increasing the number of market-rate units.

Several people felt that if the Conservation Cluster by-law can be used to increase the number of affordable units, that would be desirable. Others felt that, perhaps, it is best to keep the Inclusionary Zoning by-law consistent, whether in a Conservation Cluster or not. Having different rules for the two could be confusing. The Conservation Cluster could be revised first, and the Inclusionary Zoning by-law could be revised at some later point, to be consistent with the former. Alternatively, under the first option, the Inclusionary Zoning by-law would probably not need further revisions.

It will be up to the Planning Board to sort out the various options and decide how to proceed.

Update on Housing Trust

Brian reported that the Trust currently has \$829,571; \$2,500 is owed to the auditor. The Trust committee is assessing ways to use the money. Mary explained that one possibility is a program modeled after Sudbury’s “buy-down” program. Lower-cost homes are identified and matched with a potential lower income homebuyer. The home is then bought, renovated as needed, and sold at an affordable price to the buyer. The difference between purchase price + renovation and the final sale price is covered by the Trust. Beth Rust, from Sudbury, would be available to serve as a consultant to Wayland to implement a similar program.

Brian explained that another possible use of the funds would be for a “small grants” program, whereby about \$2,000 would be available to lower income homeowners through grants or loans to undertake modest repairs. No recapture of these funds would be anticipated. Rachel noted that more significant loans, with the funds recaptured upon the sale of the house, could be provided to do more extensive repairs. Dan noted that this approach is used by several other towns he has worked with.

Sarki noted that Wayland has an allocation from the HOME consortium totaling \$6,000. It is not clear how this money could/should be used.

Connecting the need for affordable housing to the Wayland Real Asset Planning Committee's (WRAP) agenda

Colleen Sheehan, on behalf of the WRAP committee, has asked the WHA to tell her the number of additional units needed for housing. Unless a number is provided, there is a concern that the housing agenda could get lost.

Rachel suggested that we use the state-mandated 10% goal as a starting point. The town currently has 200 units listed on the state's Subsidized Housing Inventory; another 58 units are slated for inclusion, bringing the total to 258 or 5%. If River's Edge eventually produces 190 rental units, the total would come to 448 units, still about 50 units short of the 10% goal, using the 2010 year round housing stock total of 4,957 units. And, after the 2020 census, the number of year-round housing units will increase, and therefore, an increase in the number of affordable units needed to reach the 10% goal. Rachel suggested that we could tell Colleen that somewhere between 100 and 300 additional affordable housing units are needed. Furthermore, participants agreed that this is a minimum threshold and that we should aspire to more than 10% of our housing stock being affordable.

Jackie suggested that we need to do a better job of providing group home accommodations for developmentally challenged adults. Charles River, which operates the existing group home facility in town, would likely be interested in further projects. However, group homes typically need to be new construction, since adapting existing structures is very difficult.

Dan noted that he was interested in WRAP projects that could supply a significant amount of affordable units. This could be from a fairly large new construction project on a vacant parcel or by adapting an existing structure, such as the current town building.

Dan also noted that one developer with whom he has worked has said that it is difficult to sell affordable units targeted to households at 80% AMI, since this is a very narrow band of eligibility.

Mary said that there was a lengthy set of questions that the WRAP committee is asking and that she and Rachel could work on filling that out together, on behalf of the various housing committees, so that a single "housing" response could be provided.

WRAP is planning to report to BOS by the end of 2015.

Possible MetroWest meeting with Rep. Kevin Honan re: pending bills concerning possible changes in multifamily housing zoning requirements

Mary noted that a member of the Trust is a friend of Rep. Honan's and that he would therefore be likely to accept such an invitation. Several participants wondered whether we should "save" this invitation for another time, when there is a more visible issue at stake. Perhaps it is not wise to use our "chips" at this time. A future meeting could also involve our state representatives.

Next steps:

- 1) Brian to finalize report on monitoring of existing affordable housing. Mary noted that we should work toward getting a more local monitoring agent, rather than our current arrangements with a group in Barnstable and another on the Cape.
- 2) WRAP – information will be prepared by Mary and Rachel and submitted.
- 3) Zoning overlay – what was this about?
- 4) Katherine will provide updates to her report on housing needs and submit to Sarki/Colleen
- 5) Mary will discuss the issue of excess sewage capacity with BOS, particularly as it relates to the Whole Foods parcel
- 6) Planning Board will figure out next steps about changes in Conservation Cluster.
- 7) It was acknowledged that the accessory apartment by-law needs some changes, but that the Planning Board is not yet ready to work on that issue. Septic capacity is key to this issue.

Jennifer asked whether some of the housing trust funds could be used to hire a consultant to work on zoning issues. Several people felt that this probably would not be an appropriate use, but that CPA funds could be appropriate.

Rachel asked whether meeting yearly made sense for the combined housing groups. Jackie suggested that perhaps 2x/year would be preferable and linked to Town Meeting articles related to housing. She offered that it is a good idea for us to "be on the same page" regarding articles that pertain to housing. Participants agreed. This would mean that we would hold our next meeting in early February, in time for votes/opinions from the housing groups to be published in the Warrant. A meeting prior to the fall Town Meeting would likely need to be held in late September.

All groups, with the exception of the housing trust, adjourned at 9:30; they continued their meeting separately.

Housing partnership, motion to adjourn by Chris, seconded by Mary.
Planning board, motion to adjourn, Kevin, seconded by Dan.
Housing authority, motion to adjourn, Mary, seconded by Jackie.

