

**Ordinances & Administration Committee**

Monday, October 20, 2014 – 6:00 p.m.

1<sup>st</sup> Fl. Council Committee Room – City Hall**-Minutes-****Present: Chair, Councilor Robert Whycott; Vice Chair, Councilor Sefatia Theken; Councilor Bob Stewart****Absent: None.****Also Present: Councilor Cox; Councilor Verga; Councilor Fonvielle; Councilor LeBlanc; Councilor McGeary; Linda T. Lowe; Suzanne Egan**

**The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. Agenda items were taken out of order. There was a quorum of the City Council. Councilors Verga and Fonvielle left the meeting at 7:05 p.m. Councilor Cox left the meeting at 6:05 and returned at about 7:05 p.m.**

**1. New Appointment:****Historical Commission****(TTE 02/14/17)****Mary Ellen Lepionka**

Under direct questioning of the Committee, **Mary Ellen Lepionka** spoke to her appointment to the Historical Commission saying that she was very interested in the city's city, and as a retiree and with history was her first love, she felt she could make a good contribution to the city. Her state Ethics Certificate is on file with the City Clerk, she noted.

All Committee spoke highly of Ms. Lepionka academic and teaching background and accomplishments, and all agreeing that she will be a good addition to the Historical Commission.

**MOTION: On a motion by Councilor Theken, seconded by Councilor Stewart, the Ordinances & Administration Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed, to recommend that the City Council appoint Mary Ellen Lepionka to the Historical Commission, TTE 02/14/17.**

**2. CC2014-043 O&A to review& adopt final recommendations of Ad Hoc Dog Ordinance Committee under GCO c. 4 Animals, Art. 2 "Dogs" except as applied to GCO Sec. 1-15 fines for Running at Large and that the matter of fines for violations of Sec. 4-16 "running at large" most recently amended June 24, 2014 delete \$100 per offense and adding \$25 first offense, \$50 each subsequent offense**

**Councilor Whycott** reminded those present that this was a public meeting and not a public hearing. He explained there would be questions from the Councilors present and discussion between them and the Committee. He said that the public hearing resulting from any O&A Committee action this evening will be a new, not a continuation of a previous public hearing on the dog ordinance, which was confirmed by **Councilor McGeary**, Council President, who added that the public hearing is scheduled for November 18.

**Councilor LeBlanc**, who chaired the Ad Hoc Dog Ordinance Committee, indicated that nothing has changed from the last time O&A reviewed the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee.

**Councilor Verga** prefaced his remarks on the dog ordinance amendments by citing that the Police Chief has stated he is obligated enforcing the city's ordinances, and said he felt sure that the Chief won't come back to the Committee (scheduled for November 10 to present data from Animal Control violations) showing harmful acts by dogs on humans or other dogs at the beaches. He said any amendments put forward, highlighting allowing dogs to run off leash on two city beaches in the off season, should be with an eye to a one-year trial so that the city can see how it works and if it needs adjusting. The law has to be fair to all, he pointed out. He said if dogs are off leash on a beach, those folks who don't want to be involved with off leash dogs will have to consider scheduling their time accordingly once an ordinance amendment is in place.

**Councilor Whycott** also pointed out there has been a six foot leash requirement on the books since 1976 the institution of a dog ordinance affecting all public property, but that Dogtown Common was exempt as was Ravenswood Park, all Essex County Greenbelt Association properties, and the Dog Park at Stage Fort Park which are already off-leash dog friendly.

**Councilor LeBlanc** said of two recommended options for the Committee to choose from, that the second option for dogs on the beach off leash in off season was preferred as it allows for times in the off season, designated

from October 1 to April 30. He noted in option two the recommendation was sunrise to 9 a.m. and 2 p.m. to sunset each day in order to give some time to those who didn't want to deal with off leash dogs.

**Councilor McGeary** added that his concern about the hours for dogs off leash on beaches suggested by the Ad Hoc Committee, pointing out that people who work and are not dog owners wanting to walk on a beach would prohibit them from walking the beach. He suggested one end of the day or the other, rather than two times per day for unleashed dogs to run, so that people who are legitimately afraid of dogs running off leash or for whatever reason, have a time of day where they can be on the beach without dogs off leash. **Councilor Whynott** suggested sunrise to 11 a.m. as a good compromise, agreeing with Councilor McGeary. **Councilor Theken** spoke about the number of dog owners on the beach in the colder months versus walkers without dogs and weekend hours. **Councilor McGeary** said that having one single longer period gets around other objections due to the issues of losing the beach to the times of high tide. **Councilor Whynott** expressed his agreement also.

**Councilor LeBlanc** spoke about the added burden this ordinance amendment would place on the Animal Control Officers and the Police Department in general, citing the recent public safety building response time study that said that 7,572 residents. **Councilor Whynott** said that it has always been nearly unenforceable but has always been a fact, and if left the way it is very few fines would be given out for violations. **Councilor McGeary** pointed out that under the Police union contract police officers are not required to enforce the animal control ordinance – they can – but they are not required to. He pointed out that a second Animal Control Officer has been funded who will have part of their duties aimed at enforcement. **Councilor Whynott** added that he believed that unless it is for the safety of a person, that officers don't have to respond under their current contract.

**Councilor Theken** expressed her concern for the hours designated for off leash times on the beach pointing out if one goes to work early or comes home after 5 p.m. that puts the beaches off limits to them. She said that those who have dogs and train them, running dogs off leash is about the mental health of the animal. **Councilor McGeary** clarified that he and **Councilor Whynott** are saying that it is one time either in the morning or evening.

**Councilor Fonvielle** said the hours present a problem and that the days get progressively shorter and then starts to lengthen in late winter. He suggested dedicated days rather than dedicating hours. **Councilor LeBlanc** said that dogs have regimens, and that dogs walk every day and that is a consideration. **Councilor Verga** offered that it could be all day on one beach, one day all day on another.

There was a discussion about using Wingaersheek Beach for off leash dogs noting that the Committee had received communications (on file) citing the objections from the Shellfish Commission about the clam beds surrounding Wingaersheek Beach which is a commercial clamming issue and that there are piping plovers nesting on the beach which is an endangered species. It was pointed out that the parking lot is closed during the winter.

**Councilor Theken** touched upon leash lengths, choosing which days dogs could be unleashed all day, and voice control by dog owners of their dogs and the difficulties that can present. She suggested one whole day on each beach for off leash dogs was a good option.

**Councilor McGeary** expressed his appreciation for the work Councilor LeBlanc did with the Ad Hoc Committee, and suggested that even days would be dog days off leash on the beaches for one beach, and odd days with dogs for another. He said whatever option is chosen not everyone will be happy. The ordinance has to be reasonable and enforceable, he added. **Councilor Theken** agreed that but that on the advice of the Shellfish Commission and Conservation Commission she suggested it may be best to leave Wingaersheek out of it.

**Councilor LeBlanc** said that in the proposed ordinance amendments there are restrictions that make sense for dogs on the beach. He suggested this be tried and to revisit the ordinance in a year.

**Cindy Dunn**, member of Ad Hoc Committee and Director of Cape Ann Animal Aid, said the Ad Hoc Committee spoke of the odd and even day options but in their discussions the Assistant Chief indicated he wasn't comfortable with that option. She asked that Wingaersheek Beach be left on the table.

**Councilor Theken** said that if the Conservation Commission and the Shellfish Constable have raised objections to Wingaersheek Beach it is best to leave it off. **Councilor LeBlanc** said if the dog owner is responsible they should be picking up after their dogs and suggested that the dogs may not be as impactful on the beach as originally believed.

**Councilor Verga** reiterated that the amendments would have a trial period of one year. **Ms. Dunn** said she liked the odd days and even days. If Wingaersheek is off the table she asked if other beaches could replace it could be added and pointed out that 98 percent of dog owners are responsible and pick up after the dogs.

**Councilor Fonvielle** offered that there should be a dog friendly beach year round at Crab Beach on Western Avenue below Stacy Boulevard which starts around the tennis courts. He pointed out that some of the time the beach is underwater and would naturally regulate the dogs there. If Wingaersheek Beach is off the table, he pointed out, it gives the dog owners another option. **Councilors Theken** and **Whynott** pointed out that Crab Beach is not a city beach but simply exposed sand at low tide although it has a local name.

**Councilor Theken** offered that the odd and even day system may make the enforcement situation perhaps better for the Police Department.

**Councilor Stewart** said there was a composite of the three issues in reviewing the Ad Hoc Committee's recommendations. He expressed the concerns of Ward 4 residents that it takes an hour of time to get back and forth from even the middle of Lanesville to Wingersheek or Good Harbor Beaches, and for those who work it is difficult to do. He noted that people do run their dogs at Lane's Cove. He said he was told that is a perfectly adequate option for Lanesville, and suggested to the Committee there could be certain times designated for off leash dogs. He questioned why the Council didn't just allow all beaches in the off season to be off leash. He said he understood the considerations for Plum Cove Beach in conversation with Councilor LeBlanc which was a safety issue with the beach so close to a busy street, but that Lane's Cove hadn't been part of that discussion. He said he believed a majority of Lanesville, Annisquam and Riverdale dog owners would have difficulty with only the options of Wingersheek and Good Harbor beaches. He also addressed that Ward 4 residents would also prefer no time limit for dogs off leash on beaches as expressed to him, but he said he understood there are people who are uncomfortable around dogs. He added that he was pleased to hear there is some flexibility by the Committee.

Speaking to the enforcement of the ordinance, he pointed out there are only so many police vehicles and officers for enforcement, as clearly shown in the public safety building time study, and that there is nothing in the ordinance that speaks to emergency situations. He cited the Newburyport dog ordinance which defines what constitutes an emergency and what does not, in that if a dog is running loose it is not an emergency, but that if a dog attacks a child it is an emergency. He said there are five or six different events that are recognized as emergencies that a dog officer should respond to immediately in the Newburyport. He said the Gloucester ordinance sets no such priorities. He said he'd like to see something similar in the ordinance amendments that enumerate this matter more clearly. He suggested that the language Newburyport has incorporated in their ordinance should be incorporated into Gloucester's Code of Ordinances.

**Councilor McGeary** reminded the Councilors that it is contractual that police are not required to respond to non-emergent animal issues. **Councilor Theken** read GCO Sec. 4-20 which she and several Councilors said does give that authority at this time but simply didn't state it in the same way. **Councilor McGeary** reiterated that there are now two Animal Control Officers and that one of the arguments to raise the fines for dogs running at large is that it does act as a deterrent and that second officer is available to add to enforcement with the now stiffer penalties.

**Councilor Whynott** said that there has to be some discretion on the part of the Police Department, and that he appreciated Councilor Stewart's effort.

**Suzanne Egan**, General Counsel, said that the Code of Ordinances ascribes to saying how there should be action, and suggested that specific discretionary acts contained in an ordinance can be restricting. **Councilor Stewart** said he assumed this defining section from Newburyport is in their ordinance. **Councilor LeBlanc** said this essentially this is what is already in GCO Sec. 4-20, and that Newburyport has discretion as well written into its ordinance. She also assisted the Committee in crafting an ordinance amendment to be added to Sec. 4-20 to further expand upon enforcement issues that Councilor Stewart raised.

**Councilor Theken** said that she understood the residents of Ward 4's concern for only the two beaches available for off leash dog activity, but that with this ordinance amendment there is a lawful off leash beach available to dog owners for an entire if the amendments are approved.

**Ms. Egan** responding to Councilor Stewart's request to open Lane's Cove to off leash dogs said that Lane's Cove is a public landing and under the care and custody of the Conservation Commission. She pointed out that would be the first step to be taken to utilize Lane's Cove as an off leash area and also the Waterways Board, and those two bodies would have to review that, and then the matter could come forward to the Council. She also clarified that part of Plum Cove is a public landing, and so is also under the jurisdiction of those two bodies as well.

**Councilor Verga** expressed that utilizing the even and odd days to run dogs on Good Harbor and Wingersheek beaches is an enormous compromise and it will be for a one-year trial period, to which **Councilors LeBlanc, Theken** and **Whynott** added their agreement.

**Councilor Verga** then spoke to the fines for dogs running at large saying that there is no one who would defend not picking up after their dog and is why he said he would want the dog fouling violation to remain at \$100, but that all other offenses should have two tiers and that the new fine instituted in June by the Council as a flat \$100 was inconsistent with that practice. He urged the passage of a two tier fine system for dogs running at large. **Councilors McGeary, LeBlanc** and **Theken** agreed with **Councilor Verga**. **Councilor Whynott** suggested that the fines should be \$50 first offense and \$100 for second and subsequent offenses in a calendar year. **Councilor Fonvielle** reminded the Councilors that the reason they did away with "in a calendar year" was because it would be difficult to administrate.

**Councilor Whynott** spoke to leash lengths and that dog owners need to use their discretion and adjust the leash lengths to conditions such as walking on Stacy Boulevard versus walking a dog in Stage Fort Park where a longer leash length would be appropriate.

**Councilor Stewart** said that in a year's time that the Council can come back and review the ordinance as to what other beaches can be opened for dogs off leash.

Throughout the discussion there were several inquiries made by members of the audience allowed by the Chair, including which included the clarification that on the days a beach is not available in the off season for dogs off leash that dogs are allowed to be on the beach so long as they are leashed. There was also an inquiry received for clarification regarding General Counsel's information on Plum Cove and Lane's Cove being under the care and custody of the Conservation Commission and Waterways Board as both had public landings.

Note: Language highlighted in red indicates changes to the standing ordinance sections.

**MOTION: On a motion by Councilor Theken, seconded by Councilor Stewart, the Ordinances & Administration Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed, to recommend that the City Council Amend GCO c. 4, Animals, Art. 2 "Dogs" Sections 4-15, 4-16, 4-19, and 4-20 as follows:**

Section 4-15. Running at large prohibited.

- (a) No person owning or keeping a dog in the city shall permit such dog at any time to run at large in the city **(unless expressly authorized under Sec. 4-16a or Sec. 4-16d)**. Each incident in which a dog, licensed or unlicensed, is on public or private property without authorization and is not under the direct control of its owner by a leash not exceeding six feet in length shall be a violation of this section.

Section 4-16a. Dogs **allowed on public** beaches at certain times.

**Unleashed dogs shall be allowed on Good Harbor Beach and Wingersheek Beach from: October 1 to April 30, annually subject to the following conditions:**

**Off leash all day on even days at Good Harbor Beach and odd days at Wingersheek Beach.**

1. Owners must remain with and monitor their dogs. Owners, per the below conditions, define person with direct care, custody, and control of a dog while in a designated off-leash area.
2. Dogs must be licensed and vaccinated as required by applicable law and ordinance.
3. Dogs must wear their tags and have no contagious conditions, diseases or parasites.
4. Dogs must be leashed when entering and exiting a designated off-leash area.
5. Dogs and humans are not allowed in the dunes.
6. Dogs with a history of dangerous or aggressive behavior as determined by the Animal Control Officer are prohibited.
7. Dogs younger than four (4) months are not allowed.
8. Unaltered male dogs or female dogs in heat are not allowed.
9. Owners must immediately remove dogs who are exhibiting aggressive behavior.
10. Owners must carry a leash; one leash per dog is required.
11. Maximum of two (2) unleashed dogs per owner.
12. Owners must have in their possession an adequate number of poop bags, or other appropriate device for removal of their dog(s) waste.
13. Owners must clean up after their dogs and dispose of the waste in an appropriate waste container.
14. Owners must fill in any holes dug by their dog(s).
15. Any violation of the above conditions shall be subject to a fine of \$50.00 for a first offense, \$100.00 for any subsequent offense(s); and dog(s) may have off-leash privileges revoked by Animal Control.

**Fines for violations will be double in season for beaches and other off-leash areas as determined.**

Section 4-16d. Off-leash dog areas.

Unless otherwise expressly authorized under this ordinance, the department of public works director may designate, with the approval of the mayor and the city council, specific lands for use as off-leash dog areas, with their operation being subject to regulations enacted pursuant to Section 7-16(b) of the City Charter.

Section 4-19. Redemption of impounded dogs.

- (a) No dog confined for a violation of this article shall be released to its owner or keeper except as provided herein. The dog officer shall issue to the owner or keeper of any such dog a citation for the violation of this article. The violations shall bear a fine of the following:
- (1) For the first offense: \$50.00
  - (2) For any subsequent offense(s): \$100.00
- (b) In the case of the first and each succeeding violation, no dog shall be released prior to the receipt by the dog officer of due notice of the payment of the fine for all outstanding notices of violation or of the deposit of the amount of the fines as a security for the payment of said fines and proof of valid license. In every case in which the owner or keeper refuses to pay such fines or a deposit for security for such fines, the dog shall be held until a hearing on the charged violation has been held and the owner shall be liable for all confinement charges as provided herein. As used in this subsection, the term "outstanding notices of violation" shall include only those notices of violation resulting in confinement.

Section 4-20. Pound; dog officer.

- (a) The city shall make provisions to shelter stray dogs, dogs impounded due to violations of this article, or dogs rescued from danger or distress. The operation of the shelter shall incorporate the regular services of a licensed veterinarian.

**MOTION: On a motion by Councilor Theken, seconded by Councilor Stewart, the Ordinances & Administration Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed to recommend that the City Council Amend GCO c. 4, Sec. 4-20 (b) by ADDING to the end of subsection 4-20(b) as follows:**

**"The dog officer shall have the authority to prioritize responses to complaints or other notifications of violations based on their emergency or non-emergency nature. Emergency complaints or notifications are those in which there is imminent threat to the life, health or safety of humans or dogs. All other complaints or notifications of violations are non-emergency."**

Councilor McGeary reviewed that in June the Council voted two fines – one for dog fouling and one for dogs running at large with both amended to be \$100 per offense. Now the amendment is that for running at large in Sec. 4-15 the violation will be a two tier system with \$50 for the first violation in a calendar year and \$100 for each subsequent violation in a calendar year. He reminded the Councilors that the Code of Ordinances on line has yet to be updated and doesn't yet reflect these changes.

**MOTION: On a motion by Councilor Theken, seconded by Councilor Stewart, the City Council voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed, to Amend GCO Chapter 1, Sec. 1-15 "Penalty for violation of certain specified sections of Code;" Chapter 4, by AMENDING Sec. 4-15 "Running at large prohibited" as follows;'**

**By DELETING: Penalty: \$100.00 per offense and ADDING: \$50 first offense, \$100 each subsequent offense in a calendar year.**

These matters will be advertised for public hearing.

Councilors Fonvielle and Verga left the meeting at 7:05 p.m.

3. *CC2014-040 (Verga) Request to review the matter of requiring that all meeting notices and agendas for all public meetings of all City boards, commissions and committees, including City Council and School Committee, be posted on the City's website (Cont'd from 10/06/14)*

City Clerk, **Linda T. Lowe**, briefly discussed a motion with the Committee referenced from the previous O&A meeting for consideration with regard to amending the Code of Ordinances on the matter of posting agendas and minutes on the city's website. She noted that she is conducting a survey of city boards, committees and commissions about this matter at the behest of Councilor Theken, and would have the results for the Council before the public hearing. She added that one of the reasons this ordinance amendment is reflecting only the website posting is that it is the third option for posting, and so if there is a posting error, it will not compromise anything with the Open Meeting Law.

**MOTION: On a motion by Councilor Stewart, seconded by Councilor Theken, the Ordinances & Administration Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed, to recommend that the City Council Amend the Code of Ordinances by ADDING a new Section 2-401 to GCO Chapter 2, "Administration," Art. V, "Boards, Commissions and Committees" to read as follows:**

**Chapt. 2, Art. V, "Boards, Commissions and Committees, Div. 1, Sec. 2-401 "Posting to city website"**

**"The meeting notices and agendas of all city boards, commissions and committees, including the City Council and the School Committee, shall be posted on the city of Gloucester website or the Gloucester School Department website at least 48 hours in advance of all meetings with the understanding that all boards, commissions and committees must continue to comply with all applicable provisions of the state open meeting law, MGL c. 30A, §18-25 and all regulations thereunder 940 CMR 29.00 et. seq. Each board, commission, and committee shall have assigned to them an appropriate city staff liaison to assist them in posting timely notices and agendas on the city or School Department website."**

This matter will be forwarded for public hearing.

**4. *Memorandum from Assistant General Counsel re: revision to the Community Preservation Committee ordinance***

**Ms. Egan** briefly explained that the suggested amendments before the Committee to the Community Preservation Act ordinance were brought forward to reflect the changes in state law and bring the Gloucester Code of Ordinances up to date. She pointed out that these changes allow for CPA funds to be used for the rehabilitation and restoration of recreational property uses and set money aside for that purpose, and prohibits CPA funds being used for maintenance purposes.

After a brief discussion with **Ms. Egan**, the O&A Committee voted to recommend the changes as follows:

**MOTION: On a motion by Councilor Theken, seconded by Councilor Stewart, the Ordinances & Administration Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed, to recommend that the City Council Amend GCO c.10, Art. V, Div. 12, Sec. 2-535 as follows:**

**Amend Section 2-535(a) by DELETING the period following the words regarding community preservation in the first sentence and by INSERTING in its place a comma followed by the words: ", including the consideration of regional projects."**

**DELETE subsections (d)(4) and (d)(5) of Section 2-535 in their entirety and REPLACE them with the following new subsections:**

**"(d)(4) The acquisition, creation, preservation, rehabilitation, and restoration of land for recreational use;"**  
**and**

**"(d)(S) The rehabilitation or restoration of open space and community housing that is acquired or created as provided in this section."**

**DELETE the period following the last sentence in Section 2-535 (f) and insert a semi-colon in its place followed by the words, "; provide however, that funds expended pursuant to this chapter shall not be used for maintenance."**

**DELETE** the word “every” in the first sentence of Section 2-535 (h) and **REPLACE** it with the word, “each”.

**DELETE** the words “not including” following the comma after the words “Open space,” in Section 2-535 (h)(l) and **REPLACE** them with the word “and”.

This matter will be advertised for public hearing.

**5. CC2014-037 (Cox) Amend GCO Sec. 22-270 “Parking prohibited at all times” re: intersection of Prospect Street with Friend and Warner Streets (Cont’d from 09/15/14)**

**Councilor Cox** explained that when Warner Street was repaved the sidewalk heights were raised by several inches to inhibit vehicles from parking on the sidewalks and pointed out that was the only change, not the width of the street. She said she spoke to a handful of Warner Street residents this evening prior to the meeting, and that they want no parking on the street as there are many problems getting in and out of their driveways. The residents all have off-street parking, she said. She added that one of the neighbors said that sometimes people who live on surrounding streets that have inadequate parking, park on Warner Street. **Councilor Theken** said that it is the same for many other streets, but it is the inconsideration by drivers on Warner Street that have created conditions causing concern to the residents. She said that the site visit conducted by the Traffic Commission was very helpful.

**Councilor Cox** added with cars parked on Warner Street, coming off of Prospect Street makes for a bottleneck traffic situation.

**MOTION: On a motion by Councilor Theken, seconded by Councilor Stewart, the Ordinances & Administration Committee vote 3 in favor, 0 opposed, to recommend that the City Council Amend GCO c. 22, Sec. 22-270 “Parking prohibited at all times” as follows:**

**By DELETING: “Warner Street easterly side from its intersection with Prospect Street to a point 78 feet northerly thereof” and by:**

**And by ADDING: “Warner Street easterly side for a distance of 245 feet from its intersection with Prospect Street”.**

**Councilor Cox** said when a driver is coming up coming up from Flanagan’s this action is aimed at the right-hand side of Prospect Street. The houses on the right-hand side all have ample parking, she said, noting she has spoken to every single resident there. She said she spoke with five of homeowners on the opposite side (DES) of the street, and of those five homes only one has a car. She also noted she spoke with Linda Rogers from Our Lady of Good Voyage Church, who informed her that the DES Club is allowed to use the Church parking lot when having their functions as long as the church is not in session. Councilor Cox cited the fact that she had spent a considerable amount of time in that neighborhood watching the traffic and parking activity, and all the residents say they wouldn’t park on the side of the street being considered for a parking ban as it is dangerous to their vehicles having had mirrors clipped off of their cars. She said that it is not the residents parking there.

**Councilor Theken** suggested a compromise that there be parking in the area being removed for Sundays. **Councilor Whycott** said if measuring 20 feet from the corner there is still sufficient space for five parking spaces and by taking them away would not be fair. **Councilor Cox** reminded the Committee that the Our Lady of Good Voyage Church allows their parking lot to be used for DES Club functions. Residents have complained having their driveways blocked from church parking, she pointed out. She said it was cited that the church parking lot in those instances still has parking spaces available. She said she spoke with Mike Hale, DPW Director, who is willing to adjust the center line. However, with the parking spaces, changing the lines isn’t possible.

**Councilor Cox** said she was unwilling to accept a compromise exception for Sundays as that is the time that neighbors complain the most about vehicles blocking their driveways by churchgoers. Such a compromise would not be fair to neighborhood residents, she said, and added that if there was a fire on Taylor Street on a Sunday there is no way for emergency vehicles to access that area.

After a discussion between **Councilor Cox** and the Committee, and viewing photographs of the affected roadways from Councilor McGeary’s iPad, reviewing the Traffic Commission minutes of 10/16/14, the Committee voted as follows:

**MOTION: On a motion by Councilor Theken, seconded by Councilor Stewart, the Ordinances & Administration Committee voted 2 in favor, 1 (Whynott) opposed, to recommend that the City Council Amend GCO c. 22, Sec. 22-270 "Parking prohibited at all times" as follows:**

**By ADDING: "Prospect Street, parking prohibited on the northerly side from its intersection with Friend Street for a distance of 125 feet in a westerly direction.**

These traffic matters will be advertised for public hearing.

**A motion was made, seconded and voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 7:32 p.m.**

**Respectfully submitted,**

**Dana C. Jorgenson  
Clerk of Committees**

**DOCUMENTS/ITEMS SUBMITTED AT MEETING: None.**