

CPC Meeting Minutes  
Tuesday, April 13, 2021  
VIRTUAL MEETING

ROLL CALL OF ATTENDEES: Suzanne Brennan, Ann Burbine, Jill Caffrey (*arrived late*), Skyler Chick, Dan Fennelly, Penny Scott Pipes, Doug Smith, Meg Stillman (*arrived late*) (*absent: Mike Connors*)

Additional Attendees: Kayla MacLeod, Michael Sacchitella

Meeting was opened at 7:00 pm

Acceptance of Agenda – Mr. Fennelly made a motion to accept the agenda for April 13, 2021; Seconded by Ms. Burbine; unanimous vote (6-0).

*Roll Call Vote: Suzanne Brennan – yes, Ann Burbine - yes, Skyler Chick - yes, Dan Fennelly - yes, Penny Scott Pipes - yes, Doug Smith - yes*

Acceptance of March 8, 2021 Minutes – A MOTION was made by Ms. Burbine to accept the minutes from March 8, 2021 as presented; seconded by Ms. Brennan; unanimous vote (6-0)

*Roll Call Vote: Suzanne Brennan – yes, Ann Burbine - yes, Skyler Chick - yes, Dan Fennelly - yes, Penny Scott Pipes - yes, Doug Smith - yes*

## **DISCUSSIONS:**

Discussion – Land Acquisition at 11 Pineview Drive (1 acre vacant lot) – Michael Sacchitella (owner)

Michael Sacchitella said that his parents purchased the house in the 60's and bought the additional lot next to their home in 1985; it was transferred to their sons when they sold the house in 1998. Originally it was a buildable lot but, due to uplands and zoning changes over the years, it is not considered buildable now and they were turned down for a variance. He noted that the property abuts Town-owned Conservation land along First Parish Road across from 3A. It would provide public access to the Town land. He said the Town has it assessed for \$61,380 as an unbuildable lot. If they succeed in changing the Town's recent ruling to a buildable lot they believe it could be worth about \$200,000 due to its location and size.

Mr. Fennelly explained the complex process for CPC land purchases. He cautioned that CPC could not pay market value if it was a buildable lot.

Ms. Caffrey asked if the land has perked and Mr. Sacchitella said it did perk back in the late 1990's.

Ms. Brennan asked Ms. Scott Pipes some questions about the property and she responded that she will need to do more research on this lot. She will need to meet with the Conservation Commission to determine if this lot is valuable for conservation. She also has concerns about what it could it sell for. Usually the appraisals for open space are different than a building lot. It is also unclear how much is wetlands. She will do more research.

Mr. Chick said it looks like wetlands cover about 40-50% of the back part of the property. He also questioned whether the Town needs additional access to the Town owned land.

Mr. Smith said he would like to hear from the Water Department because it is near the tributary that feeds into 1<sup>st</sup> Herring Brook.

Mr. Fennelly said that they will do some research and have another discussion at the April meeting.

### **Discussion – Administrative funds and history – Dan Fennelly**

Mr. Fennelly said that he wanted to discuss the administrative funds because they are often asked how much is allocated and how much is spent. Every year, there is a 2 1/2 percent minimum and 5 percent maximum – they go for the minimum. This year it is 56,000+.

They spend way less than is allocated. For example, in 2020 they spent \$25,600; in 2019 they spent \$19,000; in 2018 they spent \$7,300 and in 2017 they spent \$15,000. Most of the expenses are for the administrative assistant. In the last 10 years, they have never gone over \$10,000. Whatever isn't spent, goes back into the General Fund.

### **Discussion – Project planning/Input from town organizations - Fennelly**

Mr. Fennelly told the Board that he is aware that some towns seem to do more planning regarding funding allocations. In Scituate the CPC is not proactive in determining how CPC funds could or should be spent. He suggested asking the Town departments that usually come to CPC for a list of projects that may be coming up in the next five years. He would like to be able to ensure that the money is there to fund something that may be in the planning stages.

Ms. Brennan said that it is difficult for CPC to plan because they never know what is going to come before them and she noted many of these groups also have difficulty looking long term. That said, she has wondered how CPC can get more people aware of how CPC funds could be used. They are typically at the whim of whatever project comes before them.

Ms. Scott Pipes agreed that is difficult to plan for many of the requests, but she said it would be a good idea to reach out to see what different organizations may be planning to present to them.

Mr. Smith likes not having an agenda especially in light of the perception that they function as a reserved bank for the town and cited the Gates School project [*which was not funded*]. He does like the idea of marketing CPC to a wider audience. He agreed that it would be a good exercise to reach out to these groups but, ultimately, the project has to stand on its merits. He would like to avoid the perception that they may be stockpiling funds for future projects.

Mr. Fennelly said that the purpose was just to get a head's up on what might be coming down the road. He noted several projects that they know now will likely come back to them.

Ms. Burbine agreed that it is good to be able to act rather than just react. She also noted that some organizations do tend to use them for funding more often than others.

Mr. Chick agreed that marketing to the public would be a good idea and said there are many misconceptions about CPC out there that you can read about online. Many people do not seem to know what CPC's function is and what the Board does. He suggested building off of what other towns have done to offer more resources or post a presentation on our website about what CPC does. It would be helpful to be able to point people to a specific place where they can get information about CPC.

Mr. Chick noted that he is a planner and likes knowing what is happening but agrees that the Board cannot give people the expectation that they are going to do what is proposed.

He said that, when they receive applications for an \$80,000 open space project, it would be helpful to know how it fits into the open space and recreation plan for the Town, or if it doesn't at all. It would be helpful to evaluate projects if they have a better understanding about the priorities of other committees, commissions and boards.

Also, Mr. Chick said it is important to understand where they are spending the money. If they are putting a lot of money into one area of town or one type of project then they should be aware of that so they can think about how they choose to use funds going forward. He cited the recent Greenbush area projects that have been withdrawn or unable to be funded and thought perhaps they could look at a recreation project in that area because it has been done in other areas of town.

Mr. Smith cited the Community Preservation Act website which offers highlights of five towns and their CPC plans.

Ms. Burbine noted that, previously, a lot of CPC money was going to the west end of Town and now that are investing more on the east side of town with Mordecai Lincoln, Sunset Road, etc.

There was additional discussion on marketing and where and how to apply it. Mr. Fennelly and Mr. Chick will get together to start on a plan.

### **Discussion – Town Meeting update**

The projects were approved by the Town. Mr. Fennelly offered his thoughts on the meeting.

### **New/Old Business**

Ms. Scott Pipes mentioned that there is a new community garden being planned and she would like some guidelines on what kinds of funding would be available. Mr. Fennelly will look into it.

**Adjournment** - The meeting was adjourned at 8:03 p.m. by unanimous vote (8/0).

*Roll Call Vote: Suzanne Brennan – yes, Ann Burbine - yes, Jill Caffrey – yes, Skyler Chick - yes, Dan Fennelly - yes, Penny Scott Pipes - yes, Doug Smith - yes, Meg Stillman – yes*

*Submitted by - Mary Sprague  
Documents submitted – attached*

**Community Preservation Funds  
Administrative Expense**

<b>Fiscal Year</b>		<b>Expended</b>		<b>Total Revenue</b>	<b>%</b>
2008	\$	15,942.71	\$	1,929,556.52	0.83%
2009	\$	15,135.31	\$	1,745,838.05	0.87%
2010	\$	28,649.39	\$	1,403,325.06	2.04%
2011	\$	62,990.37	\$	1,327,440.33	4.75%
2012*	\$	31,469.46	\$	1,901,787.19	1.65%
2013	\$	15,572.61	\$	1,456,003.68	1.07%
2014	\$	28,093.19	\$	1,842,167.56	1.53%
2015	\$	8,420.10	\$	1,645,185.54	0.51%
2016	\$	13,228.51	\$	1,815,804.98	0.73%
2017	\$	15,444.33	\$	1,827,373.72	0.85%
2018	\$	7,349.61	\$	1,889,257.78	0.39%
2019	\$	19,323.12	\$	2,085,070.45	0.93%
2020	\$	25,658.52	\$	2,114,002.62	1.21%
<b>2008- 2020</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>287,277.23</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>22,982,813.48</b>	<b>1.25%</b>

2021 YTD	\$	8,131.61	\$	1,799,620.99	0.45%
----------	----	----------	----	--------------	-------

**2021 Budget**

Maximum Administrative Expense - 5% \$113,321

Alternate Administrative Expense - 2.5% \$56,660

\*- \$496,140.06 in grants, gifts & donations that year

Source: CP-1s filed with Department of Revenue; town

## CPC Planning

Select Board

Department of Public Works

Conservation Commission

Recreation Commission

Affordable Housing Trust

Scituate Housing Authority

Scituate Historical Commission

Scituate Historical Society

Scituate town Archives

Scituate Public Schools

PTO organizations ?

Friends of Scituate Recreation

Friends of North Scituate Village

Cedar Point Association

North Scituate Beach Improvement Association

Scituate Library Foundation

Scituate Beach Commission