

Housing @ Hildreth House Committee (H@HHC) Meeting Minutes – July 6, 2017

Members Present: Pablo Carbonell, Sue Guswa, Rick Maiore, Fran Nickerson, Victor Normand, Lucy Wallace

Guests: Bill Scanlan, Planner; Tim Bragan, Town Administrator; Marie Sobalvarro, Assistant Town Administrator

Meeting was convened at 8 AM.

Administrative: Minutes of June 22, 2017 were approved.

Revised Preliminary Site Plan:

Rick Maiore announced that Ben Osgood had revised the preliminary site plan in accordance with the discussions at the Committee's last meeting, Planning Board input and following a meeting with the Fire Chief. The changes made to the plan included: enlarging the radius of the curve in the private roadway to 75 feet; adding screening around the Fire Department's storage tent to the east side and front, along the road; clarifying the common areas; defining the areas to be sold; and adding the communal mailboxes and adjacent parking for 2 cars on the right side just at the entry onto the roadway (opposite the drive into the Fire Department tent). The Committee is scheduled to meet with the Planning Board on Monday, July 10th, for final review and, hopefully, approval of the preliminary site plan. Bill Scanlon confirmed that no additional comments had been received from Planning Board members since the prior meeting.

Tim Bragan reminded the Committee that drainage from a portion of the Hildreth House parking area was currently routed to a drainage swale on land to be included in the development. According to state law, the town cannot surplus land it still has a need for and, therefore, the drainage area has to be excluded from the development parcel. Ben Osgood will be asked to adjust the boundary line accordingly and to confirm that the closest units (#15 and 16) meet the 10' setback requirement. Pablo asked about access to the swale for maintenance by the town. Tim replied that the town could access the swale from the Hildreth House side and would not, therefore, need to retain additional access within the development parcel.

There was considerable discussion about the location of the mailboxes and adjacent parking spaces. Would the Fire Department be restricted or impeded in getting the boat out of the tent if a car was stopped at the mailboxes? Would there be an issue with plowing the entrance to the development or the tent? As currently designed, the mailboxes and pull out are located on town land (Hildreth House property). Is that allowable or must they be on the development parcel? Given that the mailboxes can be located on the town land and that a pull out is needed for safety, they can stay where shown on the plan. However, Pablo suggested and it was agreed that the location of the mailboxes and adjoining parking spaces should be moved closer to the property line between the town and development parcel, and there order be flipped so that the parking pull out comes before the mailboxes.

Bill will meet with the Fire Chief to confirm that the location of the mailboxes and pull out are not an issue and then contact Ben Osgood to let him know the additional revisions that need to be made to the plan before submittal to the Planning Board next Monday. He also will ask Ben to confirm the acreage of the two parcels and let Marie know so she can include it in the description of land to be surplus.

Status of the RFP:

Victor reported that he and Bill have completed an initial draft of the RFP which Bill will send to Committee members later today. Victor asked that Committee members pay particular attention to the sections on submissions requirements and design requirements when reviewing it.

Victor then walked the Committee through an exercise in determining estimated unit sales price and potential proceeds to the town in the sale of the land. He noted that the total *liveable area* (excluding garages) allowed in the 17-unit project is 25,500 sq. ft. Assuming the average unit size is 1,500 sq. ft. and current market sales based on \$300/sq ft., he estimates the sale price to be \$450,000/unit. Pablo estimated the cost of building the private road and installing utilities at \$1 million (excluding blasting). Excluding the cost of the land, he estimated it will cost the developer \$180/sq.ft. to build each unit, resulting in building costs of approximately \$4.6 million. Adding soft costs, such as insurance and carrying costs over the time to complete the development, the cost to the developer would be close to \$6 million. Assuming an estimated gross sales income of nearly \$8 million for the 17 units (at \$450,000/per unit), the developer might net \$2 million. Based on this amount, Rick felt it was reasonable assume \$1 million for the cost of the land, giving the developer a \$1 million profit (~17%). However, these are all estimated costs and values, which need to be verified by both the market and an appraisal. It could be that potential developers estimate their costs to develop to be higher and the returns lower, which would drive down the amount they are willing to pay for the land. The Selectmen, in accepting an offer are going to have to agree in a minimal purchase price to be met in order for the sale of the land to be recommended to town meeting for approval. Fran sought assurance that proceeds from land sale would be used to offset some of the cost of Phase 2 of the Hildreth House project. Tim explained that there would be such language in the motion to sell the land.

Pablo felt the greater the certainty with the project, the higher the developer's comfort level and, therefore, the better the price the town could get for the land. He suggested making a list of minor modifications that would be allowed within the scope of the approved preliminary site plan and, therefore, not require refile for approval. This is a matter to be raised with the Planning Board when the Committee meets with it on Monday. Bill felt it would be feasible to develop such a list.

It was also suggested that general design guidelines be developed and included in the RFP. Sue Guswa and Fran Nickerson have visited several similar developments in the surrounding towns and have photographs of preferred architecture that could be included as well. The zoning for this property requires that the development be in keeping with traditional New England architecture.

Victor reported that he had looked into the cost of sprinkler systems and thought requiring them would add another \$2,000 to the price of a unit, but would also result in a 3% - 13% decrease in homeowners' insurance. The Fire Chief would prefer to have the units fitted with sprinklers and had even indicated he might drop the requirement for widening the distance between the beehives if the units were so equipped.

Lucy Wallace asked about the proposed Land Disposition Agreement which would have to be included in the RFP. Victor noted that the purpose of such an agreement would be to assure this Committee's involvement and design review of changes to the project after the sale of the land. For instance, it would require that the developer always have 1 unit available for purchase, thereby avoiding the project being half built and then stalled.

Appraisal:

Once the Planning Board has signed off on the plan we should then seek an appraisal of the property, which Victor and Pablo both believed would not exceed \$2,000. Bill has a list of appraisers to contact and he and Marie Sobalvarro have developed a script to use in contacting appraisers for a bid. Lucy will confirm the amount of funding left in the account for this project and advise Bill and Marie. After some discussion it was agreed that the appraisal should be completed before responses to the RFP are received. As the current timeline for receipt of responses would be late September, the appraisal should be done as close as possible to then in order to be as accurate as possible. Given their busy schedules, it was agreed the appraisers should be contacted as soon as possible next week so that an appraisal can be completed by mid-September.

Timeline:

- July 10 – Meet with Planning Board to finalize preliminary site plan
- July 11 - Marie notify town departments of potential property surplus – 30 days to respond
- July 20 - H @ HH meeting to finalize RFP and set evaluation criteria
- August 22 – BOS vote to surplus property
- Late August – Publish RFP – 30 days to respond
- Mid-September – Appraisal due
- Late-September – Review proposals and recommend buyer to BOS

Next meeting: July 20th at 8 AM.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 AM.