

**Joint meeting
Ipswich Housing Partnership
Ipswich Affordable Housing Trust Fund Board
Wednesday, July 27, 2016, 7:30 AM
Room 129, Planning Dept. Conference Room, Town Hall**

Members of IHP present: Jim Warner, Jim Kroesser, Ed Dick, Don Greenough
Members of AHTFB present: Jim Kroesser, Ethan Parsons, Jim Warner
Staff present: Ethan Parsons, Terry Anderson, Glenn Gibbs

MINUTES

1. Citizen queries

None.

2. Approval of minutes of May 25 by IHP and minutes of June 22 by IHP and AHTFB

Warner asked to have his name added as attending both the May and June meetings as a member of IHP as well as the AHTFB. With those changes, Kroesser moved and Parsons seconded approval of the June minutes for the Trust, with a unanimous vote in favor. For the Partnership, Kroesser moved and Greenough seconded approval of the May and June minutes, with a unanimous vote in favor.

3. Discussion: new zoning bylaw amendment

Gibbs presented an overview of the proposed amendment to the bylaw:

This article would revise four separate housing-related provisions in the zoning bylaw to enhance their effectiveness and utility. First, the article would modify footnote 11 to the Dimensional & Density Table, which allows a developer in certain instances to build more multi-family residential units than allowed by the Table, in exchange for providing a public benefit. The proposed revision provides an expanded description of the public benefit requirement and a guideline for its application, addressing concerns expressed by the Planning Board, staff and developers about the current footnote's lack of specificity as to what constitutes a public benefit.

Second, the article would expand the applicability of the infill housing provision, which is currently limited to double-lot parcels in the IR District created by a recorded, pre-zoning subdivision plan. The provision, which is footnote 28 to the Table of Dimensional & Density Regulations in Section VI, has been successful in creating moderately-priced housing, but the narrow applicability has limited its use (four houses have been created since the provision was adopted in 2003). The proposed modification would establish three separate overlay districts within the IR District, within which about 20 additional properties would meet the threshold requirements for creating an additional house lot. To ensure that infill lots are consistent with the development pattern of the surrounding neighborhood, the proposed language, which is contained within a new sub-section of IX Special Regulation entitled "S. Infill Single Family House Lots," would require that the area of any newly created lots be at least 70% of the average lot size in the relevant overlay district.

Given the rate of use for the known parcels which meet the current application threshold (four out of 23), it is estimated that the proposed modification would create between three to five additional single-family houses over the next ten years, all of which will likely be affordable to households earning

between 100 and 120% of the area median income (At present, this means households with total income between \$98,000 and \$119,000). This would help households, many of which are young families, who are excluded from the Ipswich housing market due to low inventory and housing prices beyond their means.

Third, the article would make the inclusionary housing option pertaining to subdivisions of ten or more lots in IX.I.3.b more flexible by making it the same as for smaller subdivisions (i.e., be an Open Space Preservation Zoning, or “Cluster,” subdivision, and provide either 10% affordability or make a payment-in-lieu to the Town). Currently, larger single-family cluster developments cannot satisfy the affordability requirement by making an in-lieu payment. Because the cost of providing affordability in a single-family context is much greater than for multi-family developments, the mandate to provide affordability may in certain instances exceed the benefit a developer gains from the extra allowed density, and thus undermine the incentive for using the option.

Finally, the article would modify the requirements in Section IX.P for converting accessory buildings into dwelling units by clarifying the community benefit requirement and the standards for building envelope and reconstruction, and by adding minimum lot size and occupancy requirements. The changes are being proposed to facilitate the Board’s consideration of proposed accessory building conversions, and to provide more guidance to property owners thinking about undertaking such a conversion. The impetus for these revisions comes in part from past conversion proposals that generated discussion about how to best protect the interests of abutters while also achieving the objectives of the zoning provision.

Dick recommended adding a definite benchmark to the public benefit requirement—e.g. ‘if 15% or 20% of the total number of new units are made affordable, the public benefit requirement will be met (without it having to be negotiated with the Planning Board)’. He also suggested that historic preservation of buildings be added as a public benefit.

4. Discussion: IHA interest in support for accessible units

Charlie Allen, Chair of the Housing Authority, had submitted a request that the committees consider making a cash contribution to supplement the \$100,000 grant they had received for the project of making two of their apartments fully handicapped accessible. However, this will not be possible since the Trust has so little money left. Instead, Warner suggested that they consider making the units ‘adaptable’ instead of fully ADA-compliant.

5. Discussion: consideration of replacement of Charlie Allen

Allen had also offered to resign his membership in the Partnership if we could find a suitable replacement because he anticipates not being able to attend meetings for the next 18-36 months due to jury duty. Rich Kallman was suggested as a replacement.

6. Discussion: additional PR efforts, especially regarding Habitat and 6-8 First Street

Warner recommended gathering interviews, testimonials from the buyers of 6-8 First Street and rehab loan program clients for use in our PR efforts. Others suggested we get press coverage in [Ipswich Neighbors](http://IpswichNeighbors.com) and www.thelocalne.ws. Greenough suggested a banner to be used in such events as the VFW/YMCA barbecue and Open Door.

7. Discussion: draft of policy on over-income tenants

Warner had a favorable impression of this draft. Gibbs promised to review it with Parsons and send comments for our next meeting.

8. Discussion: re-capitalization of Trust

In his presentation on the bylaw changes, Gibbs mentioned that a new source of revenue would be the inclusion of the option for the developer to make a payment-in-lieu when developing a sub-division of ten or more units. Currently, this is not an option: the project must include 10% of the total as affordable units. There was no discussion following.

9. Goals for FY 2017

No discussion.

10. Community input/new business

I read a thank you note from the owner of 8 Brown Street regarding her gratitude for the rehab loan. It was well-received.

Gibbs mentioned that staff are working on updating both the Community Development Plan and the Housing Production Plan and combining them into one comprehensive document. He said that members' review of the draft, when completed, would be welcome.

11. Next meeting date

The next meeting will be held at 7:30 AM on Wednesday, August 24.

12. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 9:00 AM.

Respectfully submitted by
Terry Anderson
Housing Coordinator

Adopted _____