

GLOUCESTER CITY COUNCIL MEETING

Tuesday, August 27, 2019 – 7:00 p.m.

Kyrouz Auditorium – City Hall

-MINUTES-

Present: Chair, Councilor Paul Lundberg; Vice Chair, Councilor Steven LeBlanc, Jr.; Councilor Melissa Cox; Councilor Valerie Gilman; Councilor Kenneth Hecht; Councilor Jennifer Holmgren; Councilor Scott Memhard; Councilor Sean Nolan; Councilor James O’Hara

Absent: Councilor Hecht

Also Present: Joanne Senos; Jim Destino; Amit Chhayani; John Dunn; Chip Payson; Mike Hale; Harbormaster T.J. Ciarametaro; Jill Cahill; James Pope; Vanessa Krawczyk

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. The Council President announced that this meeting is recorded by video and audio in accordance with state Open Meeting Law.

Flag Salute & Moment of Silence. Councilor Memhard dedicated the Moment of Silence in honor of Helen Ann Lind, whom he called a spirited artistic force in Gloucester whose studio for many years was in East Gloucester Square. He described her also as a designer of local distinctive logos, creating many of the Cape Ann Chamber of Commerce’s logos as well as for Cape Pond Ice. He expressed that she was one of a kind and will be truly missed.

Oral Communications:

Name: Ross Burton

Address: 1193R Washington Street

Subject: Asked that the Council address the evacuation plan of the island if there were to be a disaster. He reminded the Council of the gridlock on the A. Piatt Andrew Bridge when both lanes closed due to a vehicular accident. He urged the enforcement of GCO Sec. 2-654 on Emergency Management, and to be compliant with that ordinance, in place since 1988.

Name: Patti Amaral

Address: 14 Myrtle Square

Subject: She spoke to her membership on the city’s Open Space & Recreation Committee and that Committee’s efforts to preserve open spaces not only for recreation. She mentioned Mattos Field and other named parks currently designated as reserved city open spaces. She urged saving Mattos Field, the Green Street recreational area and similar spaces in East Gloucester. She asked that her emails to the DPW regarding mowing of Mattos Field be addressed.

Name: Charlotte Ohannessian

Address: 32 Fort Square, 2RGT

Subject: The need for emptying cigarette butlers on an on-going basis in the city

Name: Mary Ann Albert Boucher

Address: 93 Mt. Pleasant Avenue

Subject: Opposition of the consolidation of elementary schools.

Name: Catherine Ryan

Address: 17 High Rock Terrace

Subject: Spoke in opposition to consolidation of elementary schools citing a lack of success of such efforts in many Massachusetts communities. She expressed concern that there be an economically and socially diverse representation on building committees.

Presentations/Commendations:

Brad Nicoll, Senior Project Manager, MassDOT, gave the Council the following update on the Railroad Draw Bridge construction replacement over the Annisquam River (PowerPoint Presentation placed on file):

- A presentation about one year ago was made to the Council (on file);

- Components of the bridge as it is today was shown as well as conditions of the bridge's deterioration;
- Construction staging: Stage 0 – preliminary repair work to maintain service;
- Temporary works were described for demolition and in the water foundations – strengthening and bracing the structure with live load testing/monitoring;
- Installation of construction trestle structure for stage two;
- Stage 3 will see the replacement of the bridge;
- A schedule of upcoming activities from present to fall of 2020 was touched on with the beginning of Stage 2 to start in the fall of 2020.
- Two planned weekend diversions remain in 2019 on Weekends only with free bus shuttles provided to Gloucester and Rockport stations;
- Stage 2 will see the rail bridge “locked down” for six months and that it is anticipated that the completion is in the summer of 2022.

COUNCILOR QUESTIONS:

Councilor Gilman expressed concern for the indicated six month “lockdown.” **Mr. Nicoll** advised the bridge won't able to operate during the construction of the bascule stand and so will remain open for the duration of that portion of the construction project in coordination with the U.S. Coast Guard to enable marine traffic to pass freely. (NOTE: A bascule bridge is a moveable bridge with a counterweight that continuously balances a span, or "leaf", throughout its upward swing to provide clearance for boat traffic.)

Councilor Cox mentioned that it's hoped there wouldn't be another weekday shutdown of the MBTA rail line to and from Gloucester, but if necessary it would be 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. avoiding the morning and afternoon rush and leave the bridge up for marine traffic. She noted the summer shutdown was supposed to be two weeks turned into five weeks. She pointed out MBTA bus service was reported as unreliable with West Gloucester station parking inadequate. She asked that if there are plans for a shutdown affecting commuters that there is some of forgiveness on parking fees charged for the MBTA parking lots(s). She reported that the buses had problems getting in and out of the West Gloucester parking lot which created more of a shortage of parking to give the buses turnaround space. She expressed her expectation of better service citing commuters driving to Beverly where parking was less costly in MBTA parking lots there and more plentiful than in Gloucester. If the job (to replace the bridge) takes longer so that it doesn't impact commuters then that is helpful, she conveyed. **Mr. Nicholl** assured that the MBTA will do a much better job.

Councilor O'Hara also asked about the two weeks that stretched to five weeks disruption of train service that affected thousands of people on Cape Ann that use the train for commuting to Boston, which he termed as unacceptable. Maintaining schedules is very important during outages of service that people rely on, he highlighted. He asked for assurance there wouldn't be a continuation of such issues. **Mr. Nicoll** advised when the MBTA can't provide trains, they will provide buses saying that they will do their best for the ridership and commuters.

Councilor Holmgren asked what the difference is between the March 2019 presentation and this one to the Council. **Mr. Nicoll** advised not much has changed; this is just an update highlighting that the project is now moving into Stage 1.

Councilor LeBlanc asked that if there's expected delays that there are emails to the Council and the city's Administration so that the information can be conveyed to their constituents.

Council President Lundberg offered his thanks for the presentation and expressed appreciation to the MBTA for working on the bridge to maintain service.

Confirmation of New Appointments:

Gloucester Housing Authority

Irene Frontiero (Cont'd from 08/05/19)

TTE 05/28/24

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: On a motion by Councilor O'Hara, seconded by Councilor Nolan, the Ordinances & Administration Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed, to recommend that the City Council appoint Irene Frontiero to the Gloucester Housing Authority, TTE 05/28/24.

DISCUSSION:

Councilor LeBlanc noted that Ms. Frontiero has extensive experience in the housing industry for a long time, saying she'd be an asset to the Housing Authority.

MOTION: On a motion by Councilor LeBlanc, seconded by Councilor Nolan, the City Council voted 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 (Hecht) absent, to appoint Irene Frontiero to the Gloucester Housing Authority, TTE 05/28/24.

Historical Commission Sandy Barry (fulfilling unexpired term & to full member) TTE 02/14/20

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: On a motion by Councilor O'Hara, seconded by Councilor Nolan, the Ordinances & Administration Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed, to recommend that the City Council appoint Sandy Barry to full member of the Historical Commission, TTE 02/14/20.

DISCUSSION:

Councilor LeBlanc reminded the Council that Ms. Barry previously served as an alternate to the Historical Commission for three years, and is well known to the Council. She is also on the City-owned Cemeteries Advisory Committee, he added.

MOTION: On a motion by Councilor LeBlanc, seconded by Councilor Nolan, the City Council voted 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 (Hecht) absent, to appoint Sandy Barry to full member of the Historical Commission, TTE 02/14/20.

Consent Agenda:

- **CONFIRMATION OF REAPPOINTMENTS**
- 1. Historic District Commission William C.S. Remsen TTE 02/14/22
- **MAYOR'S REPORT**
- 1. Memorandum from the Auditor re: request acceptance of donations related to the restoration of the Avis R. Murray Boulevard Tennis Courts in the amount of \$89,734.03 (Refer B&F)
- 2. Memorandum from the Auditor re: request from Community Development Department to pay FY19 invoice with FY20 funds (Refer B&F)
- 3. Memorandum from the CFO re: request to pay FY18 invoices with FY20 funds (Refer B&F)
- 4. Memorandum from the Assistant DPW Director re: request to pay FY19 invoices with FY20 funds (Refer B&F)
- 5. Memorandum, Grant Application and Checklist from the Police Chief re: request acceptance of a FY20 State 911 Support and And Incentive Grant in the amount of \$8,795 from the Executive Office of Public Safety and Security (Refer B&F)
- 6. Letter from Gloucester Housing Authority Executive Director re: vote of the GHA Board of Commissions to designate member Jennifer-Lee Levitz Aronson as the GHA's member to the Community Preservation Committee (Info Only)
- **APPLICATIONS/PETITIONS**
- 1. Application of NSDJ Real Estate LLC to amend the license granted June 12, 2018 for the storage of ammonia, gas and oil at 159 East Main Street, Map 63, Lot 26, pursuant to MGL Ch. 148, §13 and GCO Ch. 8, Sec. 8.1 "License for storing inflammables" (Refer P&D)
- **COUNCILORS ORDERS**
- 1. CC2019-029 (Gilman): amend GCO Ch. 2 "Administration," Art. IV, "Boards, Commissions, Councils and Committees," Div. "Council on Aging" by amending Sec. 2-440, "Established; composition; appointment and terms of members" and Sec. 2-442 "Designation of officers" (Refer O&A)
- 2. CC2019-030 (LeBlanc): amend GCO Ch. 22 "Traffic and Motor Vehicles," Sec. 22-284 "Service or loading zones" by DELETING "Commercial Street" from a point 20 feet from its intersection with Washington Street for a distance of 22 feet" (Refer O&A)
- 3. CC2019-031 (Gilman/LeBlanc): Request City Council based on a Traffic Commission Speed Study, petition the MassDOT to Reduce the speed limit on Poplar Street from 30 MPH to 25 MPH (Refer O&A)
- 4. CC2019-043 (Gilman/Holmgren): request City Council adopt MGL Ch. 90, Sec. 17C re: establishing a speed limit of 25 MPH on any roadway inside a thickly settled or business district in the city or town on any way that is not a state highway (Refer O&A)
- 5. CC2019-033 (Gilman): request the Police & Fire Departments, the DPW and the Traffic Commission review and comment on Art. V, "Stopping, standing and parking," Sec. 22-145(a), (b) and (c) specifically as it pertains to the question whether additional Ordinances and/or signage is needed to improve public safety and public safety enforcement
- **APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS COUNCIL AND STANDING COMMITTEE MEETINGS**
- 1. City Council Meeting: 08/13/2019 (Approve/File)
- 2. Standing Committee Meetings: B&F 08/22/19 (), O&A 08/19/19, P&D 08/07/19 (Approve/File)

Items to be added/deleted from the Consent Agenda:

Councilor Gilman asked to pull under Councilor Orders, Item #3, CC2019-031(Gilman/Holmgren): request City Council adopt MGL Ch. 90, Sec. 17C re: establishing a speed limit of 25 MPH on any roadway inside a thickly settled or business district in the city or town on any way that is not a state highway. She requested that the City Clerk ask the department heads to weigh in on the decrease of speed on Poplar Street, such as Police, Fire, DPW and Traffic Commission Chair, if possible. She mentioned a speed study and the paving of the street that are coming up. CC2019-031 was voted unanimously by the Council to be referred to the O&A Committee.

By unanimous assent of the City Council the Consent Agenda was accepted as amended.

Committee Reports:

Budget & Finance: August 22

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: On a motion by Councilor Hecht, seconded by Councilor Memhard, the Budget & Finance Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed, to recommend that the City Council in accordance with MGL c. 44, §64 approve payment of a prior year invoice for claims processed by the Massachusetts Executive Office of Labor and Workforce Development, Department of Unemployment Assistance EAN Number 78303680, dated July 9, 2019 for the purpose of paying for June 2019 claims for city employees to be paid with FY2020 General Fund – Human Resources Department budgeted funds for a total of \$292.02.

DISCUSSION: None.

MOTION: On a motion by Councilor Cox, seconded by Councilor Memhard, the City Council voted 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 (Hecht) absent, in accordance with MGL c. 44, §64 to approve payment of a prior year invoice for claims processed by the Massachusetts Executive Office of Labor and Workforce Development, Department of Unemployment Assistance EAN Number 78303680, dated July 9, 2019 for the purpose of paying for June 2019 claims for city employees to be paid with FY2020 General Fund – Human Resources Department budgeted funds for a total of \$292.02.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: On a motion by Councilor Hecht, seconded by Councilor Memhard, the Budget & Finance Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed, to recommend that the City Council accept under MGL c. 44, §53A, a federal grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services passed through the Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners, a Library Services and Technology Act Grant Program entitled “Civic Hub” for \$7,500 for the purpose of establishing the Sawyer Free Library’s role as a civic hub in the community. The grant period is from October 1, 2019 through September 30, 2020. There is no local match for this grant.

DISCUSSION: None.

MOTION: On a motion by Councilor Cox, seconded by Councilor Memhard, the City Council voted 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 (Hecht) absent, to accept under MGL c. 44, §53A, a federal grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services passed through the Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners, a Library Services and Technology Act Grant Program entitled “Civic Hub” for \$7,500 for the purpose of establishing the Sawyer Free Library’s role as a civic hub in the community. The grant period is from October 1, 2019 through September 30, 2020. There is no local match for this grant.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: On a motion by Councilor Hecht, seconded by Councilor Memhard, the Budget & Finance Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed, to recommend that the City Council approve Supplemental Appropriation 2020-SA-2 in the amount of \$30,000.00 (Thirty Thousand Dollars) from Highway Force-Transfers to General Fund Account #32085-596001, to DPW-Public Services, Purchase of Services, Account #0147052-520000 for the purpose of funding various sidewalk, curb and street completions in the city.

DISCUSSION: None.

MOTION: On a motion by Councilor Cox, seconded by Councilor Memhard, the City Council voted by ROLL CALL 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 (Hecht) absent, to approve Supplemental Appropriation 2020-SA-2 in the amount of \$30,000.00 (Thirty Thousand Dollars) from Highway Force-Transfers to General Fund Account #32085-596001, to DPW-Public Services, Purchase of Services, Account #0147052-520000 for the purpose of funding various sidewalk, curb and street completions in the city.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: On a motion by Councilor Hecht, seconded by Councilor Memhard, the Budget & Finance Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed, to recommend that the City Council approval Supplemental Appropriation 2020-SA-3 in the amount of \$60,000 (Sixty Thousand Dollars) from the Capital Projects Stabilization

Fund-Undesignated Fund Balance, Account #7600-359000 to Capital Project Stabilization Fund-GHS Building Improvements, Account #760025-582003 for the purpose of replacing water-damaged carpet in the Gloucester High School Library.

DISCUSSION:

Councilor Cox advised that the library carpeting was damaged due to an area of the High School roof being damaged and leaked. Now that the roof is replaced, the DPW needs to replace the carpeting, she noted.

MOTION: On a motion by Councilor Cox, seconded by Councilor Memhard, the City Council voted by ROLL CALL 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 (Hecht) absent, to approval Supplemental Appropriation 2020-SA-3 in the amount of \$60,000 (Sixty Thousand Dollars) from the Capital Projects Stabilization Fund-Undesignated Fund Balance, Account #7600-359000 to Capital Project Stabilization Fund-GHS Building Improvements, Account #760025-582003 for the purpose of replacing water-damaged carpet in the Gloucester High School Library.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: On a motion by Councilor Hecht, seconded by Councilor Memhard, the Budget & Finance Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed, to recommend that the City Council accept Massachusetts General Law, Chapter 64G, Section 3D. (a) as follows:

“Section 3D. (a) A city or town that accepts section 3A may, by a separate vote and in the same manner of acceptance as set forth in said section 3A, impose a community impact fee of 3 per cent of the total amount of rent upon each transfer of occupancy of a professionally managed unit that is located within t that city or town.”

DISCUSSION:

Councilor Cox conveyed the following information: With the proliferation of third-party rentals such as Airbnb, there was an option for a 3% impact fee to be given to the city. At first the state said that the cities and towns would have to manage the collection and tracking of the fee, and so the city decided to wait a year to see what kind of income would have resulted to see if the city could afford to manage the money. The state has now reconsidered and are going to manage the fee for the city rather than the city having to pay employees to manage this collection function. She advised she decided to pursue this request now to adopt the state law and set the 3% impact fee. If the Council adopts this state law, a portion of the 3% will be on the overall rental base of an Airbnb; part of that 3% returned to the city by the state will go to affordable housing per the Administration. The money will be in the General Fund, and the Administration will have to put forward to the Council moving the impact fee funds to Affordable Housing.

Councilor Memhard expressed his thanks to Councilor Cox saying that given the number of Airbnb rentals in the city, this can now be recovered funding for the betterment of the city to subsidize the cost to the city.

Councilor Gilman asked how this change will be communicated to residents who do Airbnb rentals.

Councilor Cox advised that when the property owner files their taxes with the state it will automatically be tied in. She reported there was an informational session earlier this year that conveyed this information. Many people are following this issue closely, saying that she has been in communication with the Board of Health and Building Inspector who manage the third-party rentals also.

Council President Lundberg advised that when the state law was passed on Airbnb's this was an option that that cities and towns were left to manage on their own which caused much consternation because most municipalities aren't set up to do that kind of billing, and so many opted to wait until the state assumed that responsibility.

Councilor Cox extended her thanks to Jill Cahill, Community Development Director and Vanessa Krawczyk, Assistant to the CAO, for their vigilance in following this issue as to changes in state law. She spoke to the adverse effects of third-party rentals to the city's overall housing. She suggested that 3% wasn't enough, but at 3% the impact fee wouldn't affect the homeowner as it is an automatic pass-through fee paid by the renter.

MOTION: On a motion by Councilor Cox, seconded by Councilor Memhard, the City Council voted 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 (Hecht) absent, to accept Massachusetts General Law, Chapter 64G, Section 3D. (a) as follows:

“Section 3D. (a) A city or town that accepts section 3A may, by a separate vote and in the same manner of acceptance as set forth in said section 3A, impose a community impact fee of 3 per cent of the total amount of rent upon each transfer of occupancy of a professionally managed unit that is located within that city or town.”

Councilor Cox explained that the Reconsideration of Vote is due to needing to send in the paperwork to the state immediately so that the city can recoup one entire quarter of the 3% impact fee from the city’s third-party rentals.

MOTION: On a motion by Councilor Cox, seconded by Councilor Memhard, the City Council voted by ROLL CALL 0 in favor, 8 opposed, 1 (Hecht) absent, to reconsider the vote to accept MGL Ch. 46G, Sec. 3D (a).

MOTION FAILS.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: On a motion by Councilor Hecht, seconded by Councilor Memhard, Budget & Finance Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed, to recommend that the City Council accept Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 64G, Section 3D. (b) as follows:

“Section 3D. (b) A city or town that votes to impose a community impact fee under subsection (a) may, by a separate additional vote and in the same manner of acceptance as set forth in section 3A, also impose the community impact fee of 3 per cent upon each transfer of occupancy of a short-term rental unit that is located within a two-family or three-family dwelling that includes the operator’s primary residence.”

DISCUSSION:

Councilor Cox commented that this is the other part of the state law related to the third-party rental impact fee to be accepted.

MOTION: On a motion by Councilor Cox, seconded by Councilor Memhard, the City Council voted 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 (Hecht) absent, to accept Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 64G, Section 3D. (b) as follows:

“Section 3D. (b) A city or town that votes to impose a community impact fee under subsection (a) may, by a separate additional vote and in the same manner of acceptance as set forth in section 3A, also impose the community impact fee of 3 per cent upon each transfer of occupancy of a short-term rental unit that is located within a two-family or three-family dwelling that includes the operator’s primary residence.”

MOTION: On a motion by Councilor Cox, seconded by Councilor Memhard, the City Council voted by ROLL CALL 0 in favor, 8 opposed, 1 (Hecht) absent, to reconsider the vote to accept MGL Ch. 64G, Sec. 3D. (b).

MOTION FAILS.

Ordinances & Administration: August 19

Councilor LeBlanc conveyed that due to Councilor Hecht’s absence he asked that the matter of the Straw ban be continued to September 10, 2019. **By unanimous vote of the Council the matter was continued to September 10, 2019.**

Planning & Development: August 21

There are no matters for Council action under this heading.

Scheduled Public Hearings:

1. **PH2019-040: Amend GCO Ch. 11, Sec. 11-10(f) “Special Events; transient vendors; parades” by ADDING the following sentence: “Further, the Special Events Advisory Committee and/or Licensing Commission shall refer all special events/parades requests that involve the use of Stacy Boulevard or Stage Fort Park to the City Council for final approval.”**

This public hearing is opened at 7:48 p.m.

Council President Lundberg conveyed this public hearing is continued to September 10, 2019.

This public hearing is continued to September 10, 2019.

2. **PH2019-042: Amend GCO Ch. 11, Sec. 11-10(a) “Special events; transient vendors; parades” by ADDING the following sentence: “The committee shall also include a member of the City Council appointed by the City Council President or another Council designee.”**

This public hearing is opened at 7:49 p.m.

Council President Lundberg conveyed this public hearing is continued to September 10, 2019.

This public hearing is continued to September 10, 2019.

3. **PH2019-043: Loan Authorization to amend Loan Order 2018-007, in the amount of \$1,600,000 by increasing it to \$2,000,000 for the improvements to the Harbormaster Facilities:**

This public hearing is opened at 7:50 p.m.

Those speaking in favor:

John Dunn, CFO, explained as follows: About a year ago the Council approved a loan order of \$1.6 million for improvements to the Harbormaster facility which at that time was early in the project timeline. That loan order allowed the city to hire an engineering and development firm. The bids are on the street, and the scope of the project refined as well as the cost of the project. It was realized that \$1.6 million may not be enough to get this facility’s renovation completed. A decision was made, after the DPW Director expressed concern for the vertical construction, and due to recent trends in the cost of construction overall, to seek an increase for the loan authorization to \$2.0 million, with cost estimates now at \$1.8 million and rounding the number up. This will allow for the contract award to the lowest bidder upon bid openings.

Those speaking in opposition: None.

Communications: None.

Councilor Questions:

Councilor O’Hara asked for an explanation of the scope of the project and how this project will help Gloucester residents. **Harbormaster T.J. Ciarametaro** expressed his thanks to the Building Committee, especially its Chair, Jill Cahill, Community Development Director. He conveyed that much thought went into the design of the facility. He pointed out that the facility’s water side a few years ago was improved by help from National Grid, the city, and the Seaport Economic Council. He reported that those improvements have not only brought many more visitors to the city’s waterfront, but residents as well are using the Harbormaster’s facilities. What is before the Council is Stage 2 to improve the facility for transient boaters by installing restroom facilities; an area for a community room which will be used for teaching safe boating and to hold meetings, as well as an indoor area to conduct repairs and maintenance of Harbormaster assets and improve overall security and upkeep of the facility. **Councilor O’Hara** asked if there are facilities the residents can use. **Harbormaster Ciarametaro** advised that most of the docking facilities are frequently used by Gloucester residents and are open to the general public.

This public hearing is closed at 7:55 p.m.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: On a motion by Councilor Hecht, seconded by Councilor Memhard, the Budget & Finance Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed, to recommend that the City Council approve the following amendment to Loan Order 2018-007 for an additional \$400,000 for a new total loan authorization of \$2,000,000 as follows:

Ordered: That Loan Order 2018-007, Certificate of Vote 2018-129 of this Council approved July 24, 2018 authorizing the borrowing of \$1,600,000 to pay costs of improvements to the Gloucester Harbormaster facilities and establish a visiting boater center, including costs incidental or related thereto, is amended in its entirety to provide as follows:

Ordered: That the City of Gloucester appropriates Two Million Dollars (\$2,000,000) to pay costs of improvements to the Gloucester Harbormaster facilities and establish a visiting boater center, including costs incidental or related thereto. To meet this appropriation the Treasurer, with the approval of the Mayor is authorized to borrow said amount under and pursuant to M.G.L. Chapter 44, Section 7, or pursuant to any other enabling authority. The Mayor and any other appropriate official of the city are authorized to apply for, accept and expend any grants or gifts that may be available to the City to pay costs of the projects. Any premium received by the City upon the sale of any bonds or notes approved by this vote, less any such premium applied to the payment of the costs of issuance of such bonds or notes, may be applied to the payment of costs approved by this vote in accordance with Chapter 44, Section 20 of the General Laws, thereby reducing the amount authorized to be borrowed to pay such costs by a like amount.

Further Ordered: That the Treasurer is authorized to file an application with the Municipal Finance Oversight Board to qualify under Chapter 44A of the General Laws any or all of the bonds authorized by this order and to provide such information and execute such documents as the Municipal Finance Oversight Board may require for these purposes.

DISCUSSION:

Councilor LeBlanc explained that, as the Council Liaison to the Waterways Board, this project has been worked on and well thought out for several years by the Waterways Board, the Community Development Department and the Harbormaster. Not long ago, he recounted, the city's water sheet was only used by residents, and transient boaters passed by the city because the city wasn't welcoming and lacking facilities. With the new Harbormaster this has changed, and the city is more of a boating destination. He reported that the upgraded Harbormaster's facility will have many amenities that the city doesn't have available now, making it more appropriate to the size of its water sheet. This facility will now be inviting to all, he pointed out, and offered his support.

MOTION: On a motion by Councilor Cox, seconded by Councilor Memhard, the City Council voted by ROLL CALL 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 (Hecht) absent, to approve the following amendment to Loan Order 2018-007 for an additional \$400,000 for a new total loan authorization of \$2,000,000 as follows:

Ordered: That Loan Order 2018-007, Certificate of Vote 2018-129 of this Council approved July 24, 2018 authorizing the borrowing of \$1,600,000 to pay costs of improvements to the Gloucester Harbormaster facilities and establish a visiting boater center, including costs incidental or related thereto, is amended in its entirety to provide as follows:

Ordered: That the City of Gloucester appropriates Two Million Dollars (\$2,000,000) to pay costs of improvements to the Gloucester Harbormaster facilities and establish a visiting boater center, including costs incidental or related thereto. To meet this appropriation the Treasurer, with the approval of the Mayor is authorized to borrow said amount under and pursuant to M.G.L. Chapter 44, Section 7, or pursuant to any other enabling authority. The Mayor and any other appropriate official of the city are authorized to apply for, accept and expend any grants or gifts that may be available to the City to pay costs of the projects. Any premium received by the City upon the sale of any bonds or notes approved by this vote, less any such premium applied to the payment of the costs of issuance of such bonds or notes, may be applied to the payment of costs approved by this vote in accordance with Chapter 44, Section 20 of the General Laws, thereby reducing the amount authorized to be borrowed to pay such costs by a like amount.

Further Ordered: That the Treasurer is authorized to file an application with the Municipal Finance Oversight Board to qualify under Chapter 44A of the General Laws any or all of the bonds authorized by this order and to provide such information and execute such documents as the Municipal Finance Oversight Board may require for these purposes.

MOTION: On a motion by Councilor Cox, seconded by Councilor Memhard, the City Council voted by ROLL CALL 0 in favor, 8 opposed, to reconsider the vote to increase the loan order for the Harbormaster Facility from \$1.6 million to \$2.0 million.

MOTION FAILS.**4. PH2019-0044: Loan Order 2019-008: Loan Authorization Request for the permanent repairs and paving of Englewood and Lake Roads in the amount of \$400,000**

This public hearing is opened at 7:59 p.m.

Those speaking in favor:

Mr. Dunn explained that two months ago there was a loan order for water (infrastructure) improvements for Englewood and Lake Roads area that was voted forward by the Council for \$1.8 million. This loan is for the repaving of the private ways, Englewood and Lake Roads, through the city's betterment process. This loan is for \$400,000 for the paving of these roads after the water work is completed paid for by betterments at 100% to the property owners of Englewood and Lane Roads.

Those speaking in opposition:

Communications: None.

Councilor Questions:

Councilor Nolan commented that this program has been great for private roads that have public access to get their roads paved. He noted that while it is a long process, in the end it works out well and has been a great improvement to many private ways. He expressed that he looked forward to more, similar projects in the future.

This public hearing is closed at 8:01 p.m.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: On a motion by Councilor Lundberg, seconded by Councilor Holmgren, the Budget & Finance Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed, to recommend that the City Council approve the following a loan authorization of \$400,000 as follows:

Ordered: That the City of Gloucester appropriates Four Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$400,000) to pay costs of permanent repairs, including paving to private ways in the Englewood Road and Lake Road area, including costs incidental or related thereto. To meet this appropriation the Treasurer, with the approval of the Mayor is authorized to borrow said amount under and pursuant to M.G.L. Chapter 44, Section 7(5), or pursuant to any other enabling authority. Although any borrowing by the City to meet this appropriation shall constitute a general obligation of the City and a pledge of its full faith and credit, one hundred percent (100%) of the amount needed to repay any borrowing pursuant to this order shall be raised in the first instance through the assessment of betterments upon the abutters of the private way, in accordance with M.G.L. Chapter 80, and any other applicable authority. The Mayor and any other appropriate official of the city are authorized to take any and all actions necessary to assess the betterments described above, the term of which will not exceed 10 years, or such shorter time as proscribed by Massachusetts General Law. Any premium received by the City upon the sale of any bonds or notes approved by this vote, less any such premium applied to the payment of the costs of issuance of such bonds or notes, may be applied to the payment of costs approved by this vote in accordance with Chapter 44, Section 20 of the General Laws, thereby reducing the amount authorized to be borrowed to pay such costs by a like amount.

Further Ordered: That the Treasurer is authorized to file an application with the Municipal Finance Oversight Board to qualify under Chapter 44A of the General Laws any or all of the bonds authorized by this order and to provide such information and execute such documents as the Municipal Finance Oversight Board may require for these purposes.

DISCUSSION:

Council President Lundberg explained that when private ways owned by the abutters but are open to the public to pass and repass, there is an opportunity for a public/private paving program process that the abutters then pay back through a 100% betterment. The betterment is paid through the abutters' tax bills, he advised. He commended the work of Councilor Nolan working in tandem with the Englewood and Lake Road residents on this project.

Councilor Gilman added her support saying that it has been Councilor Nolan who has had a key role in improving this (process) for citizens to be able to work in partnership with the Public Works Department.

MOTION: On a motion by Councilor Cox seconded by Councilor Memhard, the City Council voted by ROLL CALL 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 (Hecht) absent, to approve the following a loan authorization of \$400,000 as follows:

Ordered: That the City of Gloucester appropriates Four Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$400,000) to pay costs of permanent repairs, including paving to private ways in the Englewood Road and Lake Road area, including costs incidental or related thereto. To meet this appropriation the Treasurer, with the approval of the Mayor is authorized to borrow said amount under and pursuant to M.G.L. Chapter 44, Section 7(5), or pursuant to any other enabling authority. Although any borrowing by the City to meet this appropriation shall constitute a general obligation of the City and a pledge of its full faith and credit, one hundred percent (100%) of the amount needed to repay any borrowing pursuant to this order shall be raised in the first instance through the assessment of betterments upon the abutters of the private way, in accordance with M.G.L. Chapter 80, and any other applicable authority. The Mayor and any other appropriate official of the city are authorized to take any and all actions necessary to assess the betterments described above, the term of which will not exceed 10 years, or such shorter time as proscribed by Massachusetts General Law. Any premium received by the City upon the sale of any bonds or notes approved by this vote, less any such premium applied to the payment of the costs of issuance of such bonds or notes, may be applied to the payment of costs approved by this vote in accordance with Chapter 44, Section 20 of the General Laws, thereby reducing the amount authorized to be borrowed to pay such costs by a like amount.

Further Ordered: That the Treasurer is authorized to file an application with the Municipal Finance Oversight Board to qualify under Chapter 44A of the General Laws any or all of the bonds authorized by this order and to provide such information and execute such documents as the Municipal Finance Oversight Board may require for these purposes.

5. PH2019-045: Loan Order 2019-009: Loan Authorization Request for the complete replacement of the Concord Street Bridge over Walkers Creek in the amount of \$1,000,000

This public hearing is opened at 8:06 p.m.

Those speaking in favor:

Mike Hale, Public Works Director, explained that this is a \$1 million loan request for the replacement of the Concord Street Bridge (over Walkers Creek). The city has received a MassDOT Small Bridge Replacement Program grant of just under \$500,000 so the city's portion will be \$500,000; but that the total authorization is for \$1 million. He recounted that the bridge was constructed in 1900 and reconstructed in 1972. He reported that the 1972 bridge construction utilized "hand-me-down" components such as, MassDOT gave the city decking off of a bridge in Newburyport. The bridge is well past its life expectancy, and he noted correspondence that indicated the bridge needed replacement 20 years ago. Recent winter storm events have greatly impacted the bridge's abutments which caused jersey barriers to be installed; saying that the bridge needs to be replaced now.

Deborah Cramer, 318 Concord Street, mentioned that the bridge has been destroyed by rising tides and storm surges. The temporary jersey barriers installed several years ago, she reported, has increased tidal damage which has deteriorated the surrounding road even further as well as to the bridge. She also mentioned that the bridge was determined 20 years ago to be slated for total replacement. She expressed a request of the neighbors that the design keep the aesthetic of the neighborhood in mind. They also asked that the bridge be named to honor Lawrence Parsons a neighborhood resident who served in Vietnam and died. She further conveyed that the neighbors are also asking that design of the bridge accommodate the rising sea level either by elevating it or finding other means of increasing resilience for water flow. She mentioned a concern that the Conservation Commission hadn't followed recommendations of the 2015 Klinefelder Report, and the added concern that if the bridge design doesn't take the rising tides into account, the (replacement) bridge will continue to deteriorate.

Those speaking in opposition: None.

Communications: None.

Councilor Questions:

Councilor LeBlanc asked if there are any designs yet. **Mr. Hale** advised they aren't at this point. He explained that this loan order will enable the design process. **Councilor LeBlanc** noted that the bridge is one lane and asked if they can keep the design to maintain a small town feel to it. **Mr. Hale** pointed out that it comes down to a cost analysis as to the design but that they will do what they can to preserve the neighborhood aesthetics.

Councilor Holmgren asked about the DPW's plan for dealing for 100 year storm tides with regards to the construction of the bridge. **Mr. Hale** advised that the dollar equivalent to make the city resilient against rising sea level would be exorbitant. He spoke briefly to the issues to raise structures and that through the design process they will address what they can suggesting it would cost 10 times the \$1 million loan order to accommodate what the Councilor is asking for. He pointed out all of Western Avenue from Stage Fort to the Tavern would be under water as would this particular area. Priorities will have to be determined by the city soon, he highlighted.

This public hearing is closed at 8:14 p.m.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: On a motion by Councilor Hecht, seconded by Councilor Memhard, the Budget & Finance Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed, to recommend that the City Council approve the following a loan authorization of \$1,000,000 as follows:

Ordered: That the City of Gloucester appropriates One Million Dollars (\$1,000,000) to pay costs of the complete replacement of the Concord Street Bridge over Walkers Creek, including the payment of all costs incidental or related thereto. To meet this appropriation the Treasurer, with the approval of the Mayor is authorized to borrow said amount under and pursuant to M.G.L. Chapter 44, Sections 7 or 8, or pursuant to any other enabling authority. The Mayor and any other appropriate official of the City are authorized to apply for, accept and expend any and all grants or gifts that may be available to the City to pay costs of this project. Any premium received by the City upon the sale of any bonds or notes approved by this vote, less any such premium applied to the payment of the costs of issuance of such bonds or notes, may be applied to the payment of costs approved by this vote in accordance with Chapter 44, Section 20 of the General Laws, thereby reducing the amount authorized to be borrowed to pay such costs by a like amount.

DISCUSSION:

Councilor Nolan explained that this bridge has been in disrepair for a long time; that 20 years ago it needed to be repaired. Two years ago there was damage to the bridge, and the DPW did the best they could to secure the bridge by placing jersey barriers to restrict water flow. The DPW and the city has found a way to replace the bridge, working hard to get \$500,000 (in grant funds) to offset the loan which includes the design plan. He expressed his faith in the DPW's engineering division and the DPW for creating a safe replacement for the bridge, doing what is right for the environment and the neighborhood. He thanked the city for putting this forward and offered his support for the loan order.

MOTION: On a motion by Councilor Cox, seconded by Councilor Memhard, the City Council voted by ROLL CALL 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 (Hecht) absent, to approve the following a loan authorization of \$1,000,000 as follows:

Ordered: That the City of Gloucester appropriates One Million Dollars (\$1,000,000) to pay costs of the complete replacement of the Concord Street Bridge over Walkers Creek, including the payment of all costs incidental or related thereto. To meet this appropriation the Treasurer, with the approval of the Mayor is authorized to borrow said amount under and pursuant to M.G.L. Chapter 44, Sections 7 or 8, or pursuant to any other enabling authority. The Mayor and any other appropriate official of the City are authorized to apply for, accept and expend any and all grants or gifts that may be available to the City to pay costs of this project. Any premium received by the City upon the sale of any bonds or notes approved by this vote, less any such premium applied to the payment of the costs of issuance of such bonds or notes, may be applied to the payment of costs approved by this vote in accordance with Chapter 44, Section 20 of the General Laws, thereby reducing the amount authorized to be borrowed to pay such costs by a like amount.

6. PH2019-046: Loan Order 2019-010: Loan Authorization to repurpose completed Water Capital Project Funds in the amount of \$98,129.86

This public hearing is opened at 8:17 p.m.

Those speaking in favor:

Mr. Dunn advised that this isn't, in fact, a loan order, but is various loan orders previously approved and consolidating the remainder of loan orders from completed water projects which in turn can be used for further water infrastructure projects. He pointed out that this has been done before, and assured that they will continue to

repurpose future loan order remainders, as they can by law, after projects are completed, particularly for general water and sewer infrastructure projects.

Those speaking in opposition: None.

Communications: None.

Councilor Questions:

Councilor Cox spoke with **Mr. Dunn** briefly to confirm this Council action actually isn't a loan order as the funds were already appropriated but is a realignment of funds, even though the language indicates as such and is considered correct. He reported that a new capital project fund will be established with these funds, and doesn't require review by Bond Counsel because it is an internal reallocation.

This public hearing is closed at 8:20.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: On a motion by Councilor Hecht, seconded by Councilor Memhard, the Budget & Finance Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed, to recommend that the City Council authorize the following loan order:

Ordered: That in accordance with c. 44, § 20 of the General Laws, the \$1,785.88 unexpended balance of Fund # 6001 initially borrowed to pay the costs of Magnolia Water Lines, the \$64,187.46 unexpended balance of Fund # 6009 initially borrowed to pay the costs of Water Treatment Plant improvements, the \$27,935.92 unexpended balance of Fund # 6010 initially borrowed to pay the costs of CIP Phase 3 Water Improvements, the \$3,255.11 unexpended balance of Fund # 6011 initially borrowed to pay the costs of Commercial Street Infrastructure improvements, the \$798.49 unexpended balance of Fund # 6013 initially borrowed to pay the costs of CIP Water Main & Valve Improvements, and the \$167.00 unexpended balance of Fund # 6014 initially borrowed to pay the costs of CIP Water Main Rehab Project, which projects are complete and such amounts are no longer needed for the projects, are hereby appropriated by this Council to a new Water Capital Project Fund #6018 for a total of \$98,129.86 to pay the costs of Miscellaneous Water Infrastructure Improvements within the City, including the payment of any and all costs incidental and related thereto.

DISCUSSION:

Councilor Cox expressed thanks to the Treasurer's Office, particularly Mr. Dunn and Mr. Hale for monitoring these accounts and unitizing the balances that were already borrowed to undertake new projects.

MOTION: On a motion by Councilor Cox, seconded by Councilor Memhard, the City Council voted by ROLL CALL 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 (Hecht) absent, to authorize the following loan order:

Ordered: That in accordance with c. 44, § 20 of the General Laws, the \$1,785.88 unexpended balance of Fund # 6001 initially borrowed to pay the costs of Magnolia Water Lines, the \$64,187.46 unexpended balance of Fund # 6009 initially borrowed to pay the costs of Water Treatment Plant improvements, the \$27,935.92 unexpended balance of Fund # 6010 initially borrowed to pay the costs of CIP Phase 3 Water Improvements, the \$3,255.11 unexpended balance of Fund # 6011 initially borrowed to pay the costs of Commercial Street Infrastructure improvements, the \$798.49 unexpended balance of Fund # 6013 initially borrowed to pay the costs of CIP Water Main & Valve Improvements, and the \$167.00 unexpended balance of Fund # 6014 initially borrowed to pay the costs of CIP Water Main Rehab Project, which projects are complete and such amounts are no longer needed for the projects, are hereby appropriated by this Council to a new Water Capital Project Fund #6018 for a total of \$98,129.86 to pay the costs of Miscellaneous Water Infrastructure Improvements within the City, including the payment of any and all costs incidental and related thereto.

MOTION: On a motion by Councilor Cox, seconded by Councilor Memhard, the City Council voted by ROLL CALL 0 in favor, 8 opposed, 1 (Hecht) absent, to reconsider the vote for a loan authorization to consolidate unexpended loan authorization water improvement balances to be consolidated to pay the costs of miscellaneous water infrastructure improvements within the city for a total of \$98,129.86.

MOTION FAILS.

7. PH2019-047: SCP2019-006: East Main Street #116, Map 59, Lot 53, GZO Sec. 2.3.1(8) & 1.8 for conversion to 8-unit residential dwelling, Sec. 3.2.2 fn (3) distance between principal buildings, Sec. 3.2.2 fn (a) minimum lot area per dwelling unit, Sec. 3.2.2 fn (a) minimum open space per dwelling unit

This public hearing is opened at 8:25 p.m.

Council President Lundberg reviewed the Council's Rules of Procedure for Public Hearings briefly. He acknowledged an impressive turnout of the public to help guide the Council in their deliberations. He outlined Zoning Ordinance requirements for new construction and touched on those procedures, depending on which zoning district the property is in follows the guidelines for setbacks and restrictions and those allowed by right. He recounted that sometimes applicants need exceptions to the Zoning Ordinance through the Zoning Board of Appeals and/or through the City Council. This applicant is before the Council to present their project and ask the Council to approve some exceptions. He indicated that the Council will be asked to vote if these exceptions meet certain standards. A standard to be met for the Council are the six factors under GZO Sec. 1.8.3 which he read. He noted three of the requests of the applicant are to approve reduced distance between the buildings; reduction of minimum lot area and open space per dwelling unit, and also noted the requirements of those exceptions.

Those speaking in favor:

Attorney Salvatore Frontiero, Frontiero Law Office, P.C., 46 Middle Street, representing the Bevilacqua Company, Inc. (Applicant), a buyer under a Purchase & Sale agreement to purchase the subject parcel from the current owner, Son LLC (subject to obtaining the necessary permits). He introduced the project team members: Daniel Oppenheimer, Mill River Consulting and Project Engineer; Bill Nolan, Savoy Architects, Project Architect; and Paul Bevilacqua, principal owner of the Bevilacqua Company, Inc. with his site manager, Dennis Sullivan. He then reviewed the application for a Special Council Permit as follows:

- **Present site conditions:** The property at 116 East Main Street is a 34,700 square foot (sq. ft.) panhandle in shape. The parcel abuts to its west a gas station/convenience store; to its east is a five-family residential structure which is taller than the proposed buildings. The nearest residence to the rear of the property is 453 feet away on Pilot's Hill and 75 feet higher in elevation. East Gloucester Elementary School is also to the rear of the property at 270 feet distance with an elevation of 30 feet. The property has been used for several decades as a restaurant unsuccessfully.
- **Zoning of the property:** The property is zoned NB (Neighborhood Business) which allows residential uses. The setback and dimensional requirements are governed by the adjacent residential district which is R-10 (medium/high density). There are three other parcels in this neighborhood cluster; and across the street from the property is zoned M/I (Marine/Industrial).
- **Prior Relief from the ZBA:** Setback relief for left, right and rear yard setbacks were granted; and in that proceeding the applicant was required to prove legal hardship to support the variance standard which was established and finalized. Hardship was already established and is not part of the Special Council Permit process.
- **Scale of Proposal:** The original proposal was scaled down due to neighborhood feedback. Originally the project was proposed as three buildings, each three stories in height with two-bay drive-under garages for a total of 10 units. This configuration would have required a height exception. There were two rounds of changes to the project, which is now two buildings with a total of eight units. The applicant removed one level of living space which eliminated a request for a height exception. With the loss of the third story to each building, the developer added a bump out to the rear of the building units for a sun room, not in view of the street.
- **Driveway safety:** The driveway was originally located at the right side of the lot which is now moved to the center of the lot thereby reducing a crisscross effect of traffic.
- **There is increased green space for the project due to its reconfiguration with frontage vegetative cover.**
- **Project Summary:** The current proposal is for eight units with two levels of living space with two-bay garages below. Three units will have three bedrooms, the rest are two bedrooms so as not to exceed 19 bedrooms which would place the project in the Major Project category. There are bump outs to the back of the units for a two-story sunroom and decks, as well as a rear yard recreational area.
- **Further parking amenities:** There will be an electrical charging station space and parking is over what is required in the R-10 zone which requires 12 parking spaces. There are two parking spaces provided in each unit's garage with an additional seven parking spaces on the property.
- **The project at eight units was able to maintain the inclusionary zoning with an affordable unit.**

GZO Sec. 2.3.1 (8) requires a special permit to allow an eight residential unit project. The standard is that the proposal will be in harmony with the general intent and purpose of the ordinance and not adversely affect the neighborhood, the zoning district, or the city to such an extent as to outweigh the beneficial effects of the use.

Review of GZO Sec. 1.8.3 six criteria of a Special Council Permit:

1. Social, economic and community needs: The city's Housing Production Plan (HPP) identified the need for multi-family housing in the city, and that there is a need for more affordable housing. This project addresses the need to meet those goals. The affordability element meets a social and economic need. It was suggested the affordable unit would likely be one of the three-bedroom units in order to attract a family. The unit will be identical in quality and appearance to the other units.
2. Traffic flow and safety: The Institute for Transportation Engineers data shows that for the restaurant with the square footage involved about 23 vehicle trips during peak p.m. hours. The Institute determines that with the residential use it would be 4.2 trips during peak p.m. hours trips. The Project Engineer was able to determine that ambulance and emergency vehicle access can be achieved from both directions. The project will also eliminate the concern of vehicles backing out onto East Main Street. This will also eliminate a cross-over of vehicles in and out of the adjacent gas station/convenience store property through 116 East Main Street. It is suggested that large truck deliveries will be decreased significantly as eight residences don't require nearly as many deliveries as restaurants.
3. Adequacy of utilities and other public services: This site is already served by city water and sewer services, with gas and electricity. It was suggested that the proposed use is less intensive use of water than a restaurant as well as eliminate grease trap issues from restaurants. There will be a stormwater collection and drainage system installed on the property to connect with the city system thereby ending the water sheeting over East Main Street preventing the roadway's further deterioration from water inundation off of the property.
4. Neighborhood character and social structure: The neighborhood is a mix of uses – a gas station on one side; 5-unit multi-family to the other side of the property; M/I uses; retail, function hall, marinas. The project will fit into the character of the neighborhood and be visually attractive to the area and eliminate a use that doesn't fit the neighborhood character and social structure as it is a rundown building with items and garbage being dumped on the property.
5. Qualities of the natural environment: The parcel is mostly paved. This use will have greater green space with protection to a wetland area adjacent to the property. The project will add more green space and will comply with the vegetative cover requirement. There will be a greater permeable area making it much more beneficial to the environment
6. Potential fiscal impact: Short term construction jobs will be created; the taxable value of the property will be much higher than it is currently; there is a positive fiscal impact to the city anticipated.

It was asked that the eight units of residential housing be permitted as they met the Zoning Ordinance criteria.

GZO Sec. 3.2.2 fn (e) Reduction of space between principal buildings which requires the space between buildings be equal to their respective heights: By the Ordinance the space between buildings would have to be 57.2 feet. The proposal is for 16.9 feet between buildings. Lesser spacing is allowed by Special Permit providing that the lesser space isn't detrimental to view obstruction, overshadowing, service access and visual crowding.

- View obstruction: View of the ocean is important– one property behind is 270 feet away and 30 feet higher in elevation (East Gloucester School) and the other is over 450 feet away, 75 feet higher in elevation. Therefore there is no obstruction of views from these properties. No other views on East Main Street will be affected.
- Overshadowing: The closest point of this structure is the convenience store, 77 feet away from the gas station and 27.5 feet away from the five-family structure at 114 East Main Street which is about 42 feet above the ground. The proposed buildings will cast shadows mostly to the front and rear of the property.

- Service Access: All pedestrian and vehicle access will face the front of the buildings. No equipment or other components will be located between the buildings and so there is no need for service access between the buildings, and there will be no vehicular access between buildings.
- Visual Crowding: The buildings will be staggered and set back far from the street. One of the two buildings will be partially screened by the shape of the lot and vegetation.

GZO Sec. 3.2.2 fn (a) Reduction of minimum lot area per dwelling unit: The Ordinance specifies 5,000 square feet per dwelling unit is required. The application is for 3,809 square feet. The Council can make a determination that this reduction is in keeping with the neighborhood character and structural density the relief is allowed. Many properties around this property are much denser and 125, 131, 135, 110, 114 and 122 East Main Street are all undersized lots. The applicant analyzed the residential properties between Chapel and Hammond Streets, and found that this property will be far better in terms of lot area per dwelling unit. The average lot is 1,309 square feet per dwelling unit, and this project is better from a structural and density perspective.

GZO Sec.3.2.2 fn (a) Reduction of minimum open space per dwelling unit: The same exact standard applies as it did for minimum lot area per dwelling unit. Noting it is difficult to determine a comparison to the properties in the neighborhood but using the same analysis the applicant proposes 1,479.5 square feet per dwelling unit rather than the requirement of 3,500 square feet. The neighborhood average for open space per dwelling unit is 1,101 square feet. The project is consistent with neighborhood character and its structural density.

Mr. Frontiero asked that the Reduction of minimum lot area and open space per dwelling unit for the reasons put forward be permitted.

Mr. Frontiero then addressed a communication that raised an issue about a Bevilacqua Company project on High Popples Road. He conveyed that some of the communications indicated that the Bevilacqua Company isn't being courteous to neighbors. He reported he spoke with Paul Bevilacqua about that and that Mr. Bevilacqua indicated that he knew of only one incident that he learned about after the fact which involved one of the contractors going on site on a Sunday. He advised he spoke to Mr. Bevilacqua, his Site Manager (present) and assured that there will be no issues at East Main Street saying that they will create a communications system to address neighborhood concerns immediately. He also recounted that the property is 1.5 times the minimum size required for multi-family dwellings. Density-wise, for 30,000 square feet, **Mr. Frontiero** mentioned that at 10,000 square feet per lot there could be two-family dwellings, three at two dwelling units each for a total of six units as a matter of right. He concluded his remarks by saying that this application is asking for only two more units over what can be done by right.

Rob Russell, 40 Rockport Road, mentioned a development in his neighborhood that added to it and rid it of an abandoned garage. He pointed out that the former restaurant at 116 East Main Street is a visual blight saying that this project will help to revitalize the area.

Attorney Joel Favazza, Seaside Legal Solutions, 123 Main Street, representing Son LLC, owner of the property through Susan O'Neal highlighted that this property has been for sale over 700 days. He noted there aren't a lot of buyers for purchase the property as there's no longer a liquor license associated with the former restaurant making a restaurant use less appealing. He asked that this property be allowed to be revitalized.

Larry Oakes, 4 Clay Court, offering support of the application, reminded that there are two abandoned restaurants on East Main Street in close proximity. He advised this property is located next to a CATA bus stop, with proposed vertical townhouses which will offer affordable housing. Traffic for the proposed use is less of a burden on the neighborhood than a restaurant, he indicated. He noted that people dump their garbage on the site; cars are left on the property adding a further burden to the neighborhood. He asked the Council to grant the relief sought to move the project forward.

Those speaking in opposition:

Rev. Richard Emmanuel, 153 East Main Street, advised that the city is being burdened by projects such as this and doesn't represent the residents. Early last year East Gloucester residents were presented with a larger project that would be to the detriment to their values. He opined that this project reflects corporate greed. He proposed 10 units were far over the zoned density; the applicant changed the project to eight units lowering the height of the buildings from three to two living levels. He spoke to the ZBA process expressing his concern about it. The public are not saying "Not in My Back Yard" (NIMBY), but are concerned with the precedence of what is happening to the city with such proposals. East Gloucester has been told what is worth doing is what is gained in money to the city, but the real costs are ignored, he highlighted. Each Council's vote represents a sacred trust citizens' place in them. Proposals that don't protect the health, safety and quality of life in the city shouldn't be permitted, he conveyed. The Council must not reward poor design. He urged that the Council not fail the trust citizen's place in them and that money will not be the sole criteria for permitting projects. He ask that the Council establish faith between its government and telectorate (Written statement placed on file).

Brenda Malloy, 43 Rocky Neck Avenue, mentioned that there are two failed restaurants near each other. The purpose of the Zoning Ordinance is to promote the health safety, quality of life and convenience of the city of Gloucester and recounted the section of the GZO for the Council. She expressed she's not in favor of the project saying that the Zoning Ordinance isn't being met.

Pamela Steele, 10 Pilot's Hill, noted she lives behind the subject property, and that she's lived in Gloucester her entire life, advised she was a part of the lawsuit against the developer. She listed increase of traffic flow by the project to a very congested area as problematic. She expressed that by reducing the space between buildings than allowed will block the breeze that flows to her home from prevailing southwest winds. She asked they preserve the city's natural beauty and diversity. She also requested a written decision of the Council be sent to her (written statement placed on file).

Henry Ferrini, Director of the Gloucester Writers Center (GWC) located at 126 East Main Street, and the Maud Olsen Library, located at 108 East Main Street, and lives at 5 Wall Street. He asked for a copy of the Council's Decision be sent to him. He conveyed the GWC was part of the lawsuit against the developer, and that this project is a "degradation" of their shared environment which will change the city adversely. He noted the lot is zoned for three units not eight. This development doesn't fit in East Gloucester. The GWC when suing the developer had to show how it harmed them, saying that the view of the granite face of Pilot's Hill connects all to the landscape. He indicated that values have more meaning than money. This wall of buildings will be a loss to the neighborhood. He concluded his remarks by closing with a quotation from Charles Olsen's "Scream to the editor, Maximus to Gloucester, Peter Anastas (Written statement placed on file)."

James Hand, 36 Rocky Neck Avenue, asked for a written decision of the Council's vote this evening as required by law. He spoke in opposition to the project because of density and traffic. He mentioned GZO sections that pertained to public safety and reduced space between buildings as well as visual crowding (written statement placed on file). He asked the Council to protect and preserve the quality of life that contribute to the well-being of citizens.

The Councilors with the City Clerk spoke to the issue of providing people's name and address/email address in order to send a copy of the Council's decision on this matter, which the Legal Department has up to 90 days to produce after the Council vote for the final vote of the adoption of the decision.

Martin Ray, 22 Rockwood Lane, read a letter he wrote to the ZBA dated March 21, 2019, that cited, for reasons of scale and closing off of views to the landscape of Pilots Hill, that the ZBA application for variances for 116 East Main Street be rejected, and asked the Council to do the same (written statement placed on file).

Gordon Baird, 27 Fort Hill Avenue, addressed neighborhood character by building eight units in 30,000 square feet versus three units. He suggested that this wouldn't be done in other areas of the city, adding that four units would be acceptable he suggested.

Dennis McGirk, 283 Concord Street, urged adherence to the Zoning Ordinance and that the project be voted down.

Farah Bates, 10 Davis Street, highlighted that architecturally this project doesn't fit East Gloucester.

Karen Boudreau, 33 Chapel Street, voiced her objection to the project citing the purpose of the Zoning Ordinance and traffic issues.

Ellen Sibley, 17 Rocky Neck Avenue, noted her opposition to the Special Permit based on eight residential units saying that it was too dense for the property and the city.

Alberta Hill, 236 East Main Street, mentioning she was also speaking for her mother, advised she lived across the street from 116 East Main Street, and asked that the project not be permitted.

Mary Ann Albert Boucher, 93 Mt. Pleasant Avenue, also owner of 75 Eastern Point Road, noted a nearby high density residential project on Eastern Point Road. She suggested she could build an equally dense project on her Eastern Point Road property but was not in favor of such projects. She urged the Council to vote no.

Kim Estes, 108 Bass Avenue, spoke of her objections to the project.

Michael Faherty, 83 Mt. Pleasant Avenue, suggested that this is a protected neighborhood of small lots. This lot only has about 80 feet of frontage. For the Applicant to gain 120 feet of frontage is difficult, he pointed out, as it is covered by an easement. As to the variances, the ZBA made reductions of certain setbacks which he conveyed (on file). In spite of the ZBA relief, the Applicant has returned for three more exceptions. He spoke to the standards of the reduction of space between buildings voicing his objection citing visual crowding. The requirements of physical findings indicate that a project is not to be a detriment to the neighborhood and in keeping with the neighborhood characteristics, and he proposed that standard was not met. This project doesn't fit, he added.

Linda McCarristen, 16 Quarry Street, spoke in opposition to the project.

Colleen Apostolos, 110 East Main Street, spoke in opposition to the project.

Catherine Ryan, 17 High Rock Terrace, spoke in opposition to the project.

Jacqueline Kelly, 1 Lendell Street, owner of 98 East Main Street, voiced her opposition to the project.

Ken Sullivan, 114 East Main Street, noted his objections to the project.

Ashley Sullivan, 114 East Main Street, spoke of her objections to the project.

Joe Stone, 265 East Main Street, cited his objection to the aesthetics of the project.

Ellen Solomon, 8 Haskell Street, enumerated her objections to the project.

Naomi Graham, 1 Bickford Lane, spoke to the topography of the property and its impact on the project.

Greta Bagshaw, 2 Clarendon Street, spoke to the high cost of residences in the city saying she objected to the project.

Marsha Hart, 2 Fremont Street, expressed agreement with those who objected to the project.

Marie Valente, 103 East Main Street, cited the 2017 Housing Production Plan that spoke to limitations of East Gloucester as to a “carry” issue. She urged that a study be conducted on East Gloucester before any further development in that area. She further enumerated her objections to the project.

REBUTTAL:

Mr. Frontiero mentioned those that spoke of precedent being set by this application saying that each project is judged on its merits and that no precedent is being set with this application. The developer is making a profit, which he indicated isn't wrong. The developer is employing people and does make money. He reiterated that this project is less dense on average than the neighborhood, as this is a 30,000 square foot lot. He indicated that 10,000 square feet can comprise a single lot with two units as a matter of right; six can be a matter of right (if the lot is divided into three parcels). He added that if the lot was divided in two the developer could build four units by right. He pointed out that the applicant is asking under the Zoning Ordinance to expand what is allowed by right with certain conditions and under certain criteria. He further added that Pilot's Hill is private property and not public land. He expressed that the applicant and this application has met the Special Council Permit criteria.

REBUTTAL OF THE REBUTTAL:

Mr. Hand advised no hardship was ever enumerated. He recounted here was testimony on frontage; and it was said by the applicant that there was enough frontage for three lots. The applicant's attorney advised the right of way gives them the extra frontage, he highlighted.

Communications: In support of project: Karen Gorczyca, 28 St. Louis Ave.; Bob Gillis, 31 Sayward St.; Hugo Burnham, 24 Edgemoor Rd.; Larry Oakes, Clay Ct.; Harry Kumm, 3 Eastern Point Road; Deana Fay and Stephen Anaya, 3 Barberry Lane. **In opposition of project:** Rev. Richard Emmanuel, 153 East Main St.; Brian H. McKinnon and Joanne Sheedy-McKinnon, 4 Lantern Lane; Elizabeth Lewis, “a Ward 1 resident”; Mary Grazen-Browne, 12 Wiley St.; Cynthia Smith, 2 Mayflower Lane; Allen Bates, 10 Davis St.; Rita A. Stapulonis, 5 Highland St.; Gordon Baird, Fort Hill Ave.; Eric MacCuish, a property owner on Lighthouse Way but not a resident; Betty Pijut, 7 Rackliffe St.; James Hand, 36 Rocky Neck Ave.

NOTE: A poll of the audience by show of hands resulted in 9 in favor, 49 opposed to the project.

Councilor Questions:

Councilor Cox noted on one set of plans there was a bedroom restriction which says that the number of bedrooms are not to exceed 20. She indicated that with the eight units with two bedrooms plus an office equals 16 bedrooms, but with eight offices there is the possibility the offices could be converted to bedrooms. **Mr. Frontiero** advised the plans call for a total of 19 bedrooms. The unit owner would have to comply with the law, and he noted that the offices are open with no door. He explained that in order to convert the office space into a bedroom, it would require a permit be in compliance with the law. The unit owner would be denied such a building permit, he conveyed. **Councilor Cox** commented this is the first project her eight years on the Council that she's seen extra parking included.

Councilor O'Hara noted during the Site Visit they walked along the back of the building towards the convenience store, and came upon a running refrigerated truck. He asked how the project would deal with the noise of that abutting property. **Mr. Frontiero** advised they would put something in the condominium documents that owners would have to acknowledge acceptance of the use abutting the property.

Councilor Holmgren asked what the major abutters felt about the project. **Mr. Frontiero** advised that he represents the owner of the five-family residence next door to 116 East Main Street; they had no objection to the project. The other major abutter next to the convenience store/gas station asked for no blasting, and pursuant to the ZBA decision there will be no blasting. The abutter to the rear of the property, at 14 Pilot's Hill doesn't oppose the project. He disclosed that the property owner is also his client.

This public hearing is closed at 10:33 p.m.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: On a motion by Councilor Lundberg, seconded by Councilor Holmgren, the Planning & Development Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed, to recommend that the City Council grant a Special Council Permit (SCP2019-006) to The Bevilacqua Company, Inc., for a property owned by Son, LLC at East Main Street #116, Map 59, Lot 53, zoned NB (Neighborhood Business) to build two buildings on the property consisting of four dwelling units each for a total of eight dwelling units under GZO Sections 1.8.3; Conversion to or new multi-family or apartment dwelling, seven or more dwelling units for an 8-unit residential use, Sec. 2.3.1(8); Distance between principal buildings, Sec. 3.2.2 fn (e) for two buildings to be spaced at 16.7 square feet apart; Minimum lot area per dwelling unit, Sec. 3.2.2 fn (a) from 5,000 square feet to 3,809 square feet; and Minimum open space per dwelling unit, Sec. 3.2.2 fn (a) to be reduced from 3,500 square feet to 1,479.5 square feet pursuant to a plan submitted with the application, rendered by Mill River Consulting, Gloucester, MA signed by Raymond L. Willis, P.E., entitled, "Development Plan for 116 East Main Street, Gloucester Massachusetts, Map 59, Lot 53 dated April 4, 2018. This Special Council Permit is in harmony, intent and purpose of the Zoning Ordinance.

DISCUSSION:

Councilor Gilman explained that on August 7th was the first P&D meeting with a thorough narrative given by the applicant of the project (minutes on file). At that meeting the relief required was enumerated which she read. The Committee held a Site Visit on August 15th. The Applicant made a display of the plans and the Committee walked the property with two other Councilors in attendance. All Councilors have viewed the application and plans, she noted. She advised that on August 21st there was a second P&D meeting where the applicant answered questions from the Site Visit and benefits of the project were discussed. P&D vetted this project thoroughly, she advised.

Council President Lundberg mentioned that 9 people raised their hand in favor of the project, 49 raised their hand in opposition.

Councilor Holmgren made the following statement for the record (written statement placed on file): "After receiving the feedback from residents on both sides of this issue over the past year or so, I've put a lot of thought into my responsibility when it comes to this proposal. It's been an emotional issue for everyone. I want to thank you for your civic engagement, and regardless of tonight's outcome, I wish we had more interest at all of our meetings. This city is changing. It has never been static. We are constantly trying to reconcile the past with the future.

I'm going to cite my great-grandfather Halfdan Hanson, a local architect, as an example. Hanson was born in Norway and came to the United States as a toddler. He and his wife lived the majority of their lives at 54 East Main Street.

As I'm sure many of you know, he worked with Henry Sleeper for 27 years as the architect of the Beauport, Sleeper-McCann house. He worked on many other houses and properties in East Gloucester, designing everything from elegant summer homes, porches, and even a poultry house.

His work was his life. He took pride in his ability to create things. He was fortunate enough to live out the American dream as an immigrant. He watched with excitement, as all of our parents and grandparents did, as Gloucester entered the 20th century. I'm not sure if he was concerned about anything except his work and his family.

I do know for certain he'd be as dismayed as we all are to see decrepit, broken-down restaurants on both sides of the street in his beautiful, unique neighborhood. A hundred years ago, he might have been perplexed at the idea of zoning laws, which started to take hold here in his twilight years. He would probably have competed to be the architect on this project.

I decided I would cite a less famous example of his work and ask you all to think about the building at 17 Rocky Neck Avenue, and I'm thankful Ellen Sibley came to speak as its current resident. The building is beautiful with delicate, intricate woodwork. In this day and age, this type of craftsmanship is more than most people could ever afford. It's in an incredibly congested neighborhood. But to me, density and lack of aesthetics do not mean we shouldn't allow people to build. As we've seen in other communities, there are other ways to become a part of a neighborhood. And thank goodness for that. That's Gloucester. Don't ever judge a book by its cover.

Our Housing Production Plan lays out our need for increased units of all types of housing. I intend to support these special permit applications because they fulfill a housing need - this will help decrease our property tax burden across the board and give more people the opportunity to live here. Retirees could vacate their current, perhaps smaller homes to move into these units and young families could fill that void.

And according to a report reviewed recently by our state legislature, a high barrier on development has prompted a dramatic slowdown in production of new housing, putting pressure on the market and inflating prices. Massachusetts has added 245,000 new jobs since 2010 but only 71,600 units of housing. We are in a housing crisis, and I have heard that from countless people.

One letter in opposition of this project asked if our children could afford to live here. I contend, as a child of Gloucester, I could not afford to live here if it weren't for housing like this. My household income - what my husband and I make annually - falls within the 80% area median income, which is the affordability of this property due to our current ordinance. Your children need housing like this. My high school classmates need housing like this. Creative entrepreneurs like Halfdan Hanson need housing like this. We need affordable housing if we want to truly kick start the Blue Economy in Gloucester, even if it is adding just one unit to our current housing stock.

You can't talk about diversity and character here without talking about economic and class diversity. That is my biggest argument in favor of this development. How can people benefit from affordable housing if it's constantly being opposed? And the City is addressing affordability regarding Area Median Incomes lower than 80%, so stay tuned for that because I hear Ms. Sullivan's comments.

If it's by way of building 8 units on this lot with one affordable unit, and adding to our tax revenues, helping to fund things like new schools to entice young families to settle here, then I intend to support it."

Councilor Memhard noted his personal connection to the site, recounting his rehearsal dinner was held at the then Down East Oyster House. As Ward 1 Councilor he conveyed he encouraged an open dialog among those in favor and in opposition to the project. Noting that while opponents are passionate and vocal in their opposition, many have also voiced their support. He mentioned he'd hoped the lot would have been acquired by the city for a new East Gloucester Elementary School building project with adjoining vacant land on Pilot's Hill used to create better traffic patterns for streets surrounding the school, but the cost of building and site restrictions was prohibitive. He highlighted that the property owners and developers have rights as much as the neighbors with concerns about development and change. He indicated his belief that it's important for those willing to make an investment to be able to pursue their plans within a legal framework of the city. He mentioned that the city needs affordable housing and expressed his disappointment when Marina Drive neighbors objected to Habitat for Humanity building an affordable home in that neighborhood. As a Ward Councilor he advised he would vote against the project.

Councilor Cox noted that the Council has made exceptions from the Zoning Ordinance for housing during her Council tenure. Zoning relief is as much a part of the law as the Zoning law itself, she advised. She recounted that there has been overdevelopment in Wards 2 and 3; and several projects denied in Ward 1, also citing the Habitat for Humanity project objections. She conveyed that any addition to the city's housing stock helps to lower demand; and that the city needs more affordable housing. She noted that several projects which will create affordable housing. She expressed her understanding of the project's opponents, but advised laws aren't being broken, reiterating that zoning relief is part of the Zoning Ordinance. She recounted that the Council can't take into account the issue of hardship as it isn't part of a Special Council Permit consideration. She conveyed she would vote in favor of this project because there has been more development in Wards 2 and 3, for whom she is basing her decision, and based on the number of proponents of the project.

Councilor LeBlanc explained he is in his eighth year as a Councilor and during that time has dealt with the Maplewood School for most of that time. He recounted briefly its history noting he lives nearby and that the Fuller Development is nearby to him, and that he's dealing with all the attendant construction issues. He expressed support for the project citing a dilapidated vacant building on the lot, and the issues it can cause the neighborhood which he recounted. He expressed he'd vote in favor of the project saying it will be a good fit for the neighborhood.

Council President Lundberg, noting he was on the Planning Board for six years prior to joining the Council, he advised he had a deep understanding of the Zoning Ordinance. He explained that the Zoning Ordinance sets rules for each city neighborhood and that there is no part of the Zoning Ordinance that "isn't controversial." The Zoning Ordinance has a procedure to allow for exceptions, he pointed out, that is, this plot of land doesn't accommodate the project as proposed unless exceptions are made. The reason they grant exceptions is that if there aren't any exceptions there is no use for the property, but that isn't the case for this property. While this proposal may work, he noted, it's not the only use the property could have and be developed under the existing Ordinance. He advised he would vote against the project because the property can be developed without Zoning Ordinance exceptions which isn't the case with this application.

Councilor O'Hara, thanked members of the audience for their participation this evening. This is a controversial project, he noted, saying that although this is a good piece of property, the project doesn't fit the site or the neighborhood as proposed. Expressing his respect for everyone involved on both sides, he advised he wouldn't support the project.

Councilor Gilman advised she had come to the meeting prepared to support the project but that several matters arose this evening to alter her view. She mentioned the comment about the Housing Production Plan about East Gloucester being at capacity and that a study needs to be done as noted by Ms. Valente. She expressed her familiarity with East Gloucester having lived there for many years and then expressed her concern that too much real estate would be involved in this neighborhood that is already at capacity. She expressed respect for the applicants, and respect and empathy for the speakers. She advised after listening to all the speakers this evening she wasn't able to support the project.

MOTION: On a motion by Councilor Gilman, seconded by Councilor Holmgren, the City Council voted by ROLL CALL 3 (Holmgren, LeBlanc, Cox) in favor, 5 opposed, 1 (Hecht) absent, to grant a Special Council Permit (SCP2019-006) to The Bevilacqua Company, Inc., for a property owned by Son, LLC at East Main Street #116, Map 59, Lot 53, zoned NB (Neighborhood Business) to build two buildings on the property consisting of four dwelling units each, for a total of eight dwelling units, under GZO Sections 1.8.3; Conversion to or new multi-family or apartment dwelling, seven or more dwelling units for an 8-unit residential use, Sec. 2.3.1(8); Distance between principal buildings, Sec. 3.2.2 fn (e) for two buildings to be spaced at 16.7 square feet apart; Minimum lot area per dwelling unit, Sec. 3.2.2 fn (a) from 5,000 square feet to 3,809 square feet; and Minimum open space per dwelling unit, Sec. 3.2.2 fn (a) to be reduced from 3,500 square feet to 1,479.5 square feet pursuant to a plan submitted with the application, rendered by Mill River Consulting, Gloucester, MA signed by Raymond L. Willis, P.E., entitled, "Development Plan for 116 East Main Street, Gloucester Massachusetts, Map 59, Lot 53 dated April 4, 2018. This Special Council Permit is in harmony, intent and purpose of the Zoning Ordinance.

MOTION FAILS.

The Council voted unanimously to continue its meeting beyond 11:00 p.m.

For Council Vote: None.

Other Business: None.

Unfinished Business: None.

Individual Councilor's Discussion including Reports by Appointed Councilors to Committees:

Update on the Tourism Commission by City Council Representative, Councilor Ken Hecht: Councilor Hecht was absent and so there was no report given.

Councilors' Requests to the Mayor:

Councilor Holmgren thanked the Mayor for a successful Riverfest this past weekend, and **Councilor Memhard** expressed he looked forward to the Administration's after report on Riverfest and how they'll build on this year's success.

Councilor Cox touted the upcoming Maritime Heritage Day on Saturday, August 31st, and the Schooner Festival.

Councilor O'Hara extended an invitation to the public to attend the Magnolia Library's Hot Dog and Bean Supper Dinner the following evening starting at 6:00 p.m.

A motion was made, seconded and voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 11:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dana C. Jorgensson

Clerk of Committees

DOCUMENTS/ITEMS SUBMITTED AT MEETING:

PH2019-047: SCP2019-006: East Main Street #116, Map 59, Lot 53, GZO Sec. 2.3.1(8) & 1.8 for conversion to 8-unit residential dwelling, Sec. 3.2.2 fn (3) distance between principal buildings, Sec. 3.2.2 fn (a) minimum lot area per dwelling unit, Sec. 3.2.2 fn (a) minimum open space per dwelling unit – written statements submitted from the following individuals:

- Rev. Richard Emmanuel, 153 East Main Street;
- Pamela Steele, 10 Pilot's Hill;
- Henry Ferrini, 5 Wall Street, Ferrini@comcast.net
- Martin Ray, 22 Rockwood Lane;
- James Hand, 36 Rocky Neck Avenue, jamesb.hand@verizon.net
- Councilor Jen Holmgren, 485 Magnolia Avenue