

COMMUNITY PRESERVATION COMMITTEE
MINUTES
March 10, 2020

A meeting of the Community Preservation Committee (CPC) was held on Tuesday, March 10, 2020 at 6:00 pm at 98 Washington Street, Salem, MA. Present were Chair Bart Hoskins, Ed Moriarty, Deborah Greel, John Boris and Mark Pattison. Also present was Jane Guy of the City of Salem Department of Planning & Community Development.

Chris Burke arrived later in the meeting.

Public Comment

Ward 2 City Councillor Christine Madore stated that she was advocating for the Curtis park proposal. She noted that the park has not been updated for decades. It serves as the playground for Carlton School and is also the neighborhood park for that side of Bridge Street.

Mr. Burke jointed the meeting at this time.

Councillor Madore stated that the park was completely neglected in the ADA transition plan and only briefly mentioned in the Open Space and Recreation Plan. She noted that the CPA application has the support of PTO of Carlton School, the Carlton School principal, the neighborhood association, the neighbors and Trish O'Brien. She stated that she felt that the value of the investment will be felt beyond the neighborhood. She added that many diverse families have birthday gatherings there. She added that it is connected to the bike path and provides kids with an accessible, safe way to a park from the bike path.

Review and Vote on Determination of Eligibility Applications Received

Charles R. Curtis Memorial Park Improvements – Carlton School PTO/City of Salem Park & Recreation/Bridge St. Neck Neighborhood Assoc.

The application is for improvements to the park due to concerns of mulch cover not being ADA compliant, poor condition and accessibility of play structures, basketball court needing repaving and graffiti and vandalism.

Mr. Hoskins asked who is submitting the proposal.

Ms. Madore stated that the co-applicants will be Park and Recreation and the PTO.

Ms. Greel stated that she felt that any time there is talk about ADA compliance, there is a need to talk about equity and inclusion. She added that a lot of people don't have a back yard; they have a park.

Ms. Madore stated that she did not think CPA will be the only source of funding.

Mr. Burke asked if this will be design or construction.

Ms. Madore stated that she felt it would be in phases and that this is first phase. They will work with students and the neighborhood to see what they would like to see for the park.

Ms. Guy stated that unless there is a plan in place, they are going to need someone to design it. She suggested that the application be for design first in order to get real cost estimates.

Ms. Madore agreed that design and engagement with the community is the first step and that the whole project will take a few years to be completed.

VOTE: Ms. Greel made a motion to find the proposed project is eligible, to be submitted under a CPA funding application under Recreational Land: Rehabilitation/Restoration. Mr. Boris seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Approval of Minutes

VOTE: Mr. Burke made a motion to approve the minutes of January 30, 2020. Mr. Moriarty seconded the motion. Mr. Hoskins, Mr. Moriarty, Mr. Burke, Ms. Hamilton, Mr. Boris and Mr. Pattison voted in favor. Ms. Greel abstained from voting. The motion so carried.

VOTE: Ms. Greel made a motion to approve the minutes of February 11, 2020. Mr. Boris seconded the motion, all were in favor and the motion so carried.

Next Meeting Date

She stated that the next regular meeting date is scheduled for Tuesday, April 14, 2020, where the CPC will ranking applications High, Medium or Low priority – or to ask for additional information from applicants or request that they be present at the next meeting.

There will be a second April meeting held on Tuesday, April 28, 2020, where the CPC recommends funding recommendations.

Other Business

Mr. Moriarty stated that he was concerned about injecting the terms equity, inclusion and diversity into the process, noting that they are not standards that govern the CPC's operation. He stated that he felt it would not be prudent for the CPC to suggest that there are additional factors that the CPC will take into consideration when evaluating applications, whether public or private. He felt it would be better to get guidance from the Community Preservation Coalition in terms of what experience, if any, other communities have had in utilizing similar guidelines for consideration of projects. He stated that did not see how it could be a consideration, however meritorious or relevant it might be to our community. He noted that if it were a standard, it would be a different issue. He noted that it could be an issue for an applicant that is or is not consistent with certain values.

Ms. Guy agreed that it if is not in the guidelines or plan, it cannot be made a consideration for applicants in this round. She noted that for the next round, the CPC look at its criteria during the process of developing the next CPC plan.

Mr. Hoskins believed there may be certain language already in the CPC's current criteria, such as whether enough people will be able to access the site.

Mr. Moriarty stated that he was concerned with using those specific terms, which may not be grounded in any particular station. He agreed with the requirement for public access, but stated that he felt the terms of equity, inclusion and diversity are not well defined, and was concerned that they are not contained in our enabling statute or regulations.

Ms. Guy stated that if the criterion is to say "inclusive", there needs to be a definition of what inclusive means.

Ms. Greel stated that this is not new language, such as ADA compliance, but that she did not want to hamper the process.

Ms. Guy believed that the concept is currently addressed in some way in the CPC's guidelines, that that the CPC can look at again, but that we should move forward with the criteria that is in place.

Mr. Hoskins stated that these concepts may already be incorporated, but when we work on next year's plan, we can review the language.

Ms. Guy suggested all members re-read the evaluation criteria in the CPC plan before going into the next meeting, as this has the criteria that they should be using to make determinations.

There being no further business, Mr. Burke made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Greel seconded the motion; all were in favor, and the motion so carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Jane A. Guy
Administrator