**Development Committee Notes September 1, 2021**

Members Present: Bill Hebert, Dan Miller (signed off early), Alan Otis, John Skryski.

Guests: Elianna Bootzin, William Witt.

Scorecard Revisions

* Make a note of materials’ longevity (50 year) as well as compatibility.
* Porches – 6’ x 10’.
* Set aside CBA and Racial Impact study as needing prerequisite work before they can be incorporated in our scorecard.
* Include a point for commercial space on Lafayette instead.
* Proper handling of hazardous materials? Expected to be standard and beyond our purview. (Do not include.)

Scorecard Process

* We talked about our relevance and impact, especially in the context of Elizabeth Zeller’s recent statement to neighborhoods that our input is generally expected to be whether we support or oppose, with notes on what we would want to see changed, NOT going over a project repeatedly until they are “approved” by the neighborhood. We do see a likely endpoint of this scorecard creation process to be increased authority for the Community Development Committee from the NOBL board.
* Set basic thresholds of 10 and 15 as proposed. Can discuss whether to move to one side or the other as needed.
* Better define neighborhood engagement – a whole block. Call Elizabeth Zeller to see if they can generate those addresses.
* Use process as proposed:
	+ We strongly recommend developers engage with nearby neighbors first.
	+ They come to the committee for preliminary scoring and feedback.
	+ They make whatever adjustments are supported by the feedback.
	+ They host a neighborhood meeting (we should provide additional guidance on how to do so); the committee finishes scoring at this meeting, offering everyone present the opportunity to submit scores on the subjective items and collecting thoughts on shortcomings. Try to create a consensus number among attendees in relation to the thresholds listed above. If there is strong sentiment that a low scoring project should be supported (or vice versa), that decision could be rendered by consent of the group as well.

Looking forward, Elianna took a moment to explain the expanded 2022 role for the Community Development Committee. There will be a short application for both new and continuing members.

In short the tasks assigned to the committee are:

**Time (Target 30 hours annually)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Task** | **Hours** |
| Development Evaluation (recurring) | 9  |
| Participate in Master Planning Process | 2 |
| Learn about affordable housing (Community Land Trust) | 1 |
| Make 1 affordable housing policy suggestion (to some level of government)  | 1 |
| Determine audience and design communication about Community Land Trust | 1 |
| Distribute communication about Community Land Trust to sub-audience of property owners | 3 |
| Participate in Belknap Hill focus group(s) | 3 |
| Advocate for snow removal and trash can maintenance during City budget process | 3 |
| Meet with The Right Place | 1 |
| Meet with DGRI  | 1 |
| Meet with GR Chamber | 1 |
| Meet with Economic Development Team | 1 |
| Meet with Catherine’s Health Center | 3 |

The full document is being sent to committee members with these notes.

**Meeting Results**

The group felt ready to send the updated scorecard and process along to the board for approval and adjourned for the evening.

Note: Loren resigned from the Committee.