

**Joint meeting
Ipswich Housing Partnership
Ipswich Affordable Housing Trust Fund Board
Wednesday, February 28, 2018, 7:30 AM
Room 129, Planning Dept. Conference Room, Town Hall**

Members of IHP present: Jim Warner, Rich Kallman, Don Greenough, Jim Kroesser, Stacey Pedrick, Judy Field

Members of AHTFB present: Jim Warner, Nishan Mootafian, Jim Kroesser

Staff present: Terry Anderson, Ethan Parsons

MINUTES

1. Citizen queries

None.

2. Approval of minutes of January 24, 2018

For the Trust Fund, Mootafian moved and Kroesser seconded approval, with a unanimous affirmative vote. For the Partnership, Warner moved and Kroesser seconded approval, with a unanimous affirmative vote.

3. Discussion: rehab loan application from Ann Savre, 4 Sawyer Street

Greenough commented that we should consider whether our loans should be made to an elderly person who might remain in the home for a shorter period than a younger person—resulting in a longer delay in being able to re-use funds that have been re-paid by earlier borrowers. No objection was heard to reimbursing Ms. Savre for work that has already been completed. Warner recommended that this loan be made with Coburn money, if she qualifies by age. Mootafian moved and Warner seconded approval of a \$14,673 loan using Coburn money if Ms. Savre qualifies by age, and if not, Trust money should be used. The vote was unanimous in favor. Anderson will determine whether she qualifies according to Coburn rules.

4. Discussion: forgiveness policy & Barbara Keenan Mahoney

Anderson reported that HUD rules require re-payment of loans less than five years old (although this does not apply in Mrs. Mahoney's case). The Consortium recommends that a written policy be adopted that deals with re-payment issues, although there appears to be no prohibition against treating forgiveness requests on a case-by-case basis. A wide-ranging discussion ensued. Two especially compelling points were a) the fact that the terms stated in the Loan Conditions require re-payment and b) the fact that re-payment represents a contribution to the Trust Fund's ability to continue to assist others who share the kind of need she had when she received the benefit of the down payment assistance in 2003. Greenough suggested that a blanket policy is not needed and that an exception to the terms of the Loan Conditions is not justified in this case. Kroesser moved and Mootafian seconded denial of Mrs. Mahoney's request to be reimbursed for the loan re-payment which she has already made.

5. Discussion: Joel Crane, first-time buyer of multi-family building

Mr. Crane had not submitted the supporting documentation for his down payment assistance request. Therefore, full consideration of his application was deferred until our next meeting.

6. Discussion: Riverbend—eliminate family-support payments from candidate's income

Anderson mentioned that the original MOU with Riverbend referenced the Low Income Housing Tax Credit program as a guideline for its criteria for qualifying applicants by income. However, since Riverbend did not use funding from the Tax Credit program, we are not legally constrained to follow all of their policies. Kroesser pointed out that a relative's decision to contribute financially to an applicant is negatively influenced to do so if the facility will dis-qualify the applicant because such support would result in too much income. The consensus was that the concept of eliminating consideration of family support should be pursued with Riverbend and if they agree, that we should present the notion to the Planning Board for their approval.

7. Update on 40B projects (Bruni, Essex Pastures; Mayer, Pleasant Street; Little, Town Farm Road)

Everyone was aware that the Bruni project had been approved by the state, with much dismay expressed. Parsons said there is nothing to report on the Pleasant Street project. On the Town Farm Road project, Kallman reported that a peer review of the engineering plans was underway, a waiver of the local conservation requirements was possible but adherence to the state wetlands law would still need to be met, and the project had been reduced from 40 units to 32.

8. Discussion: 300 High Street—development potential for Town-owned parcel

Members agreed that we should pursue the possibility of developing this parcel—indeed, it is our duty, said Mootafian--recognizing that there will undoubtedly be substantial resistance from the Board of Selectmen because of the potential revenue to the Town from its sale.

9. Community input/new business

None.

10. Next meeting date

The next meeting will be held on Wednesday, March 28.

11. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:45 AM.

Respectfully submitted by
Terry Anderson
Housing Coordinator
February 28, 2018

Approved March 28, 2018