



Community Preservation Committee

Wednesday June 24, 2026

Amesbury Town Hall Auditorium

6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.

MEETING MINUTES - DRAFT

1. Roll Call

Suzanne Egan (SE) called the meeting to order at 6:05 PM

Present: Suzanne Egan (SE), Joel Nice (JN), Andrew LaFleur (AL), Wayne Griffith (WG), Jay Williamson (JW) Joe Fahey (JF), Bob Manseau (BM)

Absent: Peter Frey (PF), Craig Hird (CH)

2. Administrative

Chair notes that Craig is off for the summer OS and rec John Sherwood is supposed to be filling in.

Minutes of May 27th, 2026, virtual meeting portion

Motion by Wayne Griffith to approve the May 27th virtual meeting minutes.

Joel second, motion passes 5-0 with Bob and Jay abstaining – VOTE: 5-0-2

Joel offers to take minutes for today's meeting.

3. Community Preservation Plan

SECTION 5: Application Process

Andrew LaFleur suggests we keep the section with the table as it looks good. He asks if this timetable will be kept the same every year going forward.

Howard Snyder responds saying the table timeline is for this year – next year it may adjust.

Suzanne Egan notes that the plan is made annually and can be flexible if need be.

Wayne Griffith commented that there are typos, and it was agreed that these will be fixed.

Jay Williamson commented that it looks ok so far.

Joel Nice thinks that in step one of the processes we will accept applications with all buckets included and at step two, the public meetings could be organized by bucket.

Joe Fahey states that under “Completed Project Applications” we should show other parties that are committed to help with the project. He asked if the funds committed will there be a time and performance expectation.

Wayne Griffith confirmed

Suzanne Egan said this will become part of the terms of the contract

Bob Manseau likes combining step 2 but is concerned for applicants who come in after the period.

Joel Nice said the CPC could make an exception; however applicants will get used to the process and can always apply the following year.

Suzanne Egan said to be eligible a 3rd party must have an agreement with the City in order to give authorization for the improvements.

Joe Fahey stated that the City department involved should give written support to the applicant on the completed project application, and that the letter of support should not be required for step 1 of the process.

Howard asked if site visits be together or each individually.

Andrew LaFleur and Suzanne Egan suggested that we have site visits as needed, and projects dictate.

SECTION 6: EVALUATION CRITERIA

Joe Fahey asks how the cost benefit value will be determined.

Howard Snyder said that the applicant can give facts or show examples on their application of how the project will give a cost benefit to the City or its residents.

Joe Fahey said that doesn't need to be technical, should be in laymen's terms

Joe Fahey wants to add verbiage for households with low and very low to moderate incomes to promote expanded affordable housing with rent and ownership opportunities.

Bob Manseau requested to add historic artifacts documents resources of historical significance.

Andrew LaFleur said that formatting of the information is confusing with bullet points and suggested to add a table, matrix or add a sub header to make it read easier.

Jay Williamson expressed interest to expand on work for the City's historic inventory through updating the HABS/ HAER documents which were last done in 1990. Funding for research and study of a specific historic location or area could be requested as well.

Suzanne Egan commented regarding open space that publicly owned and accessible land should have preference over private land.

Under recreation it was recommended to expand recreation from just "all ages" to "all ages, genders, and abilities."

Under historical resources it was suggested to give preference to projects recommended by the historic commission.

Under Community Housing Suzanne Egan suggested to remove the final bullet point "Give priority to local residents, city employees, and employees of local businesses" as it contradicts the previous bullet point "

Motion by Wayne to delete verbiage "Give priority to local residents, city employees, and employees of local businesses"

Second by Andrew: Andrew, Wayne, Susan, Joel vote Yes. Jay, Bob, Joe vote No.

VOTE: 4-3 Motion Passed.

Jay Williamson asks if an application process could be delayed due to public meeting posting requirements from other parties who may need to give approval through a public hearing.

Suzanne verified that only 48 hours needed to post a public meeting so there shouldn't be issues with posting causing delays.

Andrew LaFleur gave feedback regarding the website.

Peter Frey had comments emailed and those will be incorporated to minutes.

Suzanne said the next meeting date will be July 22nd.

Committee members will go over edits and each category for applications and preliminary draft by Howard.

Motion to adjourn by Bob 2nd by Wayne VOTE: 7-0

Meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m.