

**Planning & Development Standing Committee**  
**Wednesday, September 2, 2020 – 5:30 p.m.**  
**REMOTE MEETING**  
**-Minutes-**

**Present: Chair, Councilor Val Gilman; Vice Chair, Councilor Jen Holmgren; Councilor Barry Pett`**

**Also Present: Mayor, Sefatia Romeo Theken; Assistant City Clerk, Grace E. Poirier; Planning Director, Gregg Cademartori; Councilor John McCarthy; Councilor Scott Memhard**

**Applicants:** Eliason Law Office LLC representing SCP2020-003

*This meeting was conducted remotely through ZOOM, All votes by ROLL CALL*

**Meeting called to order at 5:30 p.m.**

**At 5:41 p.m, there was a quorum of the full City Council.**

**Chairperson Gilman** announced, “This meeting is recorded by video and audio in accordance with state open meeting law. Consistent with the Governor's orders, suspending certain provisions of the open meeting law and banning gatherings of more than 25 people, this meeting will be conducted by remote participation to the greatest extent possible. The public may not physically attend this meeting, but every effort will be made to allow the public to view and listen to the meeting in real time. Persons who wish to do so are invited to view the meeting and you have the information that was on the posting. If you are calling in on a phone, you can press \*9 to request to speak. If you are watching on a computer a device, there is a raised hand button that you can tap or press to request to speak. Please use either these options to be recognized to speak.”

- 1. SCP2020-003: Atlantic Road # 163 (formerly part of #171), Map 73, Lot 41 (a portion of former Map 73, Lot 26), GZO Sec.'s 1.8.3 “Standard to be Applied,” 1.10.1(a) “Jurisdiction of the City Council and Zoning Board of Appeals-City Council,” 2.3.1(8) “Conversion to or new multi-family or apartment dwelling, seven or more dwelling units,” 3.1.6(b) “Building Heights in Excess of 35 Feet,” 3.2.2 “Dimensional Requirements for Multi-Family Dwellings and their Accessory Uses (other than signs)” and 5.7.5 “Special Permit Criteria” in the R-20 Low/Medium Density Residential District INCLUDING modified plans received 8/11/2020, and scheduling of site visit (Cont. from 5/6/2020)**

**Chairperson Gilman** announced that this was not a public hearing, however attendee questions were welcomed.

[This portion of the minutes is in transcript form]

**Chairperson Gilman:** So I'd like to welcome everyone to the Gloucester City Council Planning and Development Committee meeting of Wednesday, September 2nd, 2020. So just to give you a little history before we turn the meeting over to the applicant and ask them to introduce themselves to us again, or reintroduce themselves to us. A little bit about the history, on February 19th, 2020, the applicant submitted their initial application, along with all the requirements under 1.5.3 to the City Clerk, the Building Inspector, and the Planning Director, and all were signed off on.

**Councilor Pett:** Excuse me, Madam Chair, I'm just wondering if I should make my declaration before you start with that process.

**Chairperson Gilman:** All I'm doing, Councilor, is just reading the history, so before we get started, I will turn it over to you. On May 6, 2020, there was a P and D meeting, and finally, on August 11, 2020, we had a modification that was submitted, and we're back here to review that modification. So at this point, I'd like to turn the meeting over to Councilor Pett who has a declaration.

**Councilor Pett:** OK, thank you, Madam Chairperson, and through you to everyone. A number of years ago, there was a group called Save Our Shores, which formed to oppose development directly across the street from this location, and they raised their funding through the Gloucester Fund, which I am the president of. I just wanted to declare that I was part of that process only as the fiduciary agent, through the Gloucester Fund. I have no problem in participating today, and I thank you for hearing that.

**Chairperson Gilman:** Great, thank you, Councilor. Councilor Holmgren.

**Councilor Holmgren:** Speaking of Save Our Shores, we donated a small amount at that time. I don't know if I need to declare that as well, but I'd like to just to say that that will not influence my decision one way or another with regard to this development.

**Chairperson Gilman:** Great, thank you, Councilor. So just to confirm who's on the call tonight; I'm the Chair, Councilor Holmgren is the Vice Chair, and Councilor Pett is our third member. We also have Councilor John McCarthy who has joined us, and I'm expecting Ward 1 Councilor Scott Memhard to be on the call. At the point where he is on, as soon as he gets on one of you, if I don't notice that, please let me know, because that will make a quorum of the full committee. So in addition, we have staff member Gregg Cademartori, and our Assistant City Clerk, who is recovering from an awesome job yesterday at the polls and for the past weeks and we're so proud of her and the whole team. So we won't hear her yawn, but I'm sure when she's muted, she might yawn, but thank you for your hard work. So, I'd like to turn the meeting over to the applicant so you can give us an understanding of the modified plans, and then we'll have a brief discussion and see if we have questions, and hopefully get to the point of scheduling a site visit. So take it away, Attorney Eliason, thank you.

**Attorney Deborah Eliason:** Thank you very much, Madam Chair. For the record, Deborah Eliason, Eliason Law Office, 63 Middle Street Gloucester. With your permission, I'd like to share my screen.

**Chairperson Gilman:** Absolutely, it started to share, here it is.

**Attorney Deborah Eliason:** I'm going to try and put it in this slide format here.

**Chairperson Gilman:** OK, and before you get started, would you just introduce the team that is on the call with you?

**Attorney Deborah Eliason:** Yes, I will, so on the call tonight are the owner of the property, Bryan Melanson, manager of the LLC that owns the property. The architect is Andrew Sidford, and he's also on the call, as well as the engineer, John Morin. So what we'd like to do tonight is to give you general background on the modification, and I will ask John to give a presentation about the changes with regard to the site plan. Andrew will talk about the changes to the buildings, and then I will address some of the questions that have been brought to the Planning and Development Committee prior to this meeting, and we'll be happy to answer any other questions that you might have. So, by way of background, we met with P and D. We've had discussions with the neighbors on a couple of occasions, and individual neighbors on several occasions, and it became clear that it was very important to the neighbors that the

buildings be compliant with the 30-foot height requirement. The buildings have been modified to meet that requirement because of those requests. The five-unit building has also been slightly rotated to preserve and augment a distant view of one of the neighbors on Links Road, and because of these changes, we will no longer require a special permit for height, and no longer require a special permit for the distance between buildings. So the only permits that will be required are approval of a multi-family exceeding seven or more units, and a major project. Otherwise, it meets all dimensional requirements of the zoning ordinance. So now I'd like to ask John Morin to give you a brief explanation of the site plan changes.

**Chairperson Gilman:** Thank you.

**Engineer John Morin:** Good evening Madam Chair, and members of the committee. For the record, John Morin from the Morin-Cameron Group, we're the design engineers for this project. Pretty much as Deb has summarized, we've made some modifications to the plan so that the building height now meets the 30-foot height requirement, and by rotating the five-unit building, we're now actually meeting the setback between buildings as well. So what you see on the screen before you is we superimposed the original design onto the current proposed design, so what you see in red is what was previously proposed. One other item, the two buildings, actually, by reducing the height, we actually reduce the size of the buildings a little bit as well, and Andrew will get into that, but the buildings are slightly not as deep as they were before. So, for example, you can see on the six-unit building, which is roughly parallel to Atlantic Road, the back of the building is actually forward a little bit. You can see the old building in red, but you can't see the front because it's still the same. So that building, you know, the buildings get a little smaller. So the five-unit building was rotated slightly counter-clockwise again to open up a view for an abutter over on Links Road, and in order to fix that, you know, to accommodate that, we obviously had to make some changes in the pavement configuration. The proposed project still results in the reduction of impervious surface on the property of about 9,400 square feet. The drainage system still works, no modifications required for the drainage system. We've submitted revised plans to the Conservation Commission, which we'll actually be meeting with them tonight. So, again, in the grand scheme of things, very minor changes with regards to building location, but for the abutters, you know, it was a big deal, and Mr. Melanson was willing to make those changes and adjust the plans accordingly. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

**Assistant City Clerk:** Excuse me, Madam Chair, Councilor Memhard is on the call now.

**Chairperson Gilman:** Oh, great, thank you. So that means that we do have a quorum of the full committee, so any comments by the extra members of the committee need to be questions only, so let's just keep that in mind. So continue, thank you, Grace, appreciate that.

**Attorney Deborah Eliason:** Are there any questions for John before we go ahead?

**Chairperson Gilman:** Questions from Councilor Pett? Oh, I see, his hand is raised, Councilor Pett, yes.

**Councilor Pett:** Just to clarify again, the modification in swinging the five unit-building, so I would say the Atlantic Road end of the building to the east is done to accommodate the request of an abutter neighbor on Links Road, and the reduction in the height on both the buildings is to again accommodate the requests of the neighbors, abutters, etc. and then by doing so, you've taken that part out of the application. Is that correct?

**Attorney Deborah Eliason:** That is correct.

**Councilor Pett:** Thank you.

**Chairperson Gilman:** Could we do something just for a second, because I think Councilor Pett's question is really good. Grace, can you upload the August 11th request letter from Attorney Eliason's office, so we can just see that, because I think it was very articulate, and very helpful to review maybe.

**Assistant City Clerk:** Yeah, let me try to get that up while Attorney Eliason also has hers. All right, so this screen will have to go away and then I'll upload. I'll share my screen.

**Attorney Deborah Eliason:** OK, I'll stop sharing.

**Chairperson Gilman:** Thank you Deb, and welcome to our Mayor, Sefatia Romeo Theken, who has just joined us. OK, yeah, so this letter is very thorough, and I think it's helpful to read, and that was submitted on August 11th. This was the request for the modification, in case anyone's on the phone:

Dear President LeBlanc: Enclosed please find for filing, the amended plan set of 171 Atlantic Road LLC "Applicant" regarding SPC 2020-003. The height of the buildings have been reduced to comply with the zoning ordinance. Building 1, the six-unit building has been reduced from 35.8 feet to 30 feet, and Building 2, the five-unit building has been reduced from 37.4 feet to 30 feet. Furthermore, Building 2 has been slightly relocated to remove a view obstruction from one of the neighboring properties. As a result of the height reduction and the slight relocation of the Building 2, the buildings are now also compliant with the required distance between buildings. Therefore, the Applicant withdraws its request for the following special permits: Number One, Building height in excess of 35 feet pursuant to GZO Sections 1.8.3 and 3.1.6(b); and Two, Reduction in distance between buildings pursuant to GZO Section 3.2.2 footnote E. The remaining special permits before the Council are: Number One, New multi-family with 7 or more units pursuant to GZO Section 2.3.1 Section 8, and Number Two Major Project pursuant to GZO Section 5.7.5. Four (4) full size copies of the revised Architectural Plans, Site Development Plans, Landscape Plans plus three reduced size copies are submitted for your consideration. If additional information or copies of any documentation are needed, please contact me. Very truly yours, Deborah Eliason.

So I thought that was kind of helpful because that was what started this whole process of the modification, and it certainly is thorough, so thank you. So, Grace, thank you for putting that up, and Deborah, you can take the screen over again.

Councilor Holmgren, do you have any questions so far?

**Councilor Holmgren:** [microphone was not on, she shook her head in the negative.]

**Councilor Gilman:** OK, all right, so let's continue with the presentation.

**Attorney Deborah Eliason:** So next I'd ask Andrew to talk about the changes that have been made to the buildings, and we also have some renderings of the two buildings, one showing what was originally proposed, and also showing how it has changed. Thank you Andrew.

**Architect Andrew Sidford:** Good evening everyone. For the record, my name is Andrew Sidford. I'm an architect licensed in Massachusetts, my office is at 44 Merrimac Street in Newburyport, Massachusetts, as well as Boston, and yes, John pretty much stole all my thunder, as he usually does. There's not a whole lot to add to this, really the letter sums it up where the intent here is to accommodate the neighbors wishes as much as possible, and my job is to try and make it look like it did originally in a much smaller height, which is quite a challenge, but you can see how much the building has dropped in. We were always trying to make it look sympathetic to the neighborhood, and to the original mansion on the site, and so the

sloped roof at the top, the gables, were meant to essentially reduce the apparent volume of the buildings, and in this particular case, we've dropped it to meet the 30 feet, and we've dropped the floor-to-floor heights. A lot of the attic spaces won't be usable, but the intent was still to keep that sloped gable roof looking like the original because it's such an important part of appearance of the architecture in that area. As John mentioned in the floorplan, Deb, if you could go back to the first floor plan. In order to make it have the same feel of a sloped gable roof going back, if we just dropped the height of the ridge to 30 feet, then it would have been very, well, would have been a much more shallow roof, so in order to keep at least a similar sloped roof, we had to reduce the width of each of the units from front to back, and so that's where the four feet came. It's just an attempt, it's a concession to try and keep the buildings having the same appearance as the original structures. That's the reason for it, and then I would say, Deb, if you could go to the model image, the 3-D model image. Yeah, so the intent is still to keep a volume that looks like a single-family house or volume of the mansion from the street, which is why on the units that face the street, there are no garage doors, and we've used decks and gables and such to try and make it look like it's much less than the amount of units in there, and the garage on these are pulled back to the sides, and the parking is provided in front and on-site, and in the units that are perpendicular to the street, each of the units has been provided with a garage door because that helps with the parking requirements, obviously, of the site by hiding it, and you won't see that driving past because the back side of that building is what you'll see, which maintains, again, the massing and intent of mimicking the original volumes of mansions on that row, on that street. So I'm happy to answer questions, but it's really, those are the key elements. We dropped the height, we dropped the width, and we moved the orientation, and our intent was to make it look as much like the original design as possible.

**Chairperson Gilman:** Great, thank you. Before we ask our Planning Director to speak, do any of the councilors have any questions for Mr. Sidford? OK, so, Gregg, if you could update us on the Planning Board's review of this modification.

**Gregg Cademartori:** Sure, so the Planning Board, similar to probably a presentation that it was initially made at P and D, was made several months back, and I'm not sure if you had a chance to review that recording. The project was very well received. I think there were very few questions or concerns related to the project. There was also a fair amount of discussion about the architectural character of the project in the initial review, and then kind of touched on that again when they came to the Board on August 20th with the revised plan set that you have in front of you. So it was a unanimous recommendation to the City Council to approve the Major Project special permit. I think, again, there are probably some individual members that expressed and perhaps, you know, it's one of those things where I think sometimes we get really focused on height, and sometimes that may compromise appearance or appeal. You know, there was a lot of thoughtful process into the architectural design of the initial project, and again, just, you know, I understand the issues that were raised, the concerns that the applicant is trying to address with those surrounding the project, but I think, you know, when you look at that comparison of the two, you know, there's definitely some dramatic elements that are lost with the reduction in height, but again, I don't think that detracted from the Board's support for the project as it was proposed. Substantially, there has not been much change from an engineering perspective. I'm not sure if you received an updated review from the Engineering Division of the Department of Public Works, but, you know, they were satisfied with the initial review. I'm not, I can't recall whether there was a slight increase in impervious area with this configuration, but again, I think similarly, the project was well received at the Conservation Commission, and they'll likely conclude their review this evening. So that's a general summary. I don't know if there's any more specifics you're looking for, but again, I think it was a thorough application from the beginning, and I appreciate, you know, Mr. Melanson's attention to the neighborhood, because I think even from the initial site plan that was presented, there was a lot of consideration for what he had already understood, and perhaps done some outreach, what the neighbors were concerned about from the get go. So, again, it was a unanimous recommendation from the Planning Board to support the project.

**Chairperson Gilman:** Great, thank you, Gregg. I would just like to follow up on Gregg's question about if we've received letters on, we've received letters from Engineering dated August 19th from Ryan Marques, and he said the plan is acceptable based on the drainage, and grating, and the storm water management. We received a letter from the Fire Department Chief Smith, on August 18th, and there was no comment, routine permitting. He also had a first letter of March 17th that was in the records, and on August 19th, we received a letter from Public Health Department, Karin Carroll, there were no objections for granting permits. However, we still do not have the letters for the City Building Department, Conservation Commission, and it sounds like that will be coming after tonight's meeting, and Public Works so I'll ask through our Assistant City Clerk to get another round of reminders out to those three department heads, because it's important that we hear from all of them before we start talking about getting this up for a public hearing and Council vote. So I just wanted to mention that

**Gregg Cademartori:** Madam Chair.

**Chairperson Gilman:** Yes.

**Gregg Cademartori:** I just wanted to add one comment to that. I know Bill's not present this evening, but the two of us met with Mr. Melanson before the submission of the revised or modified plans just to confirm the calculation of height, that it would be compliant with the 30-foot height limit. So aside from that, I believe all the dimensional requirements have been stated that they're satisfied, but certainly reach out to Bill for a report.

**Chairperson Gilman:** Great, thank you, so Councilors Pett and Holmgren, do you have questions for our Planning Director?

**Councilor Holmgren:** Not at this time, no, thank you. This is very thorough. I appreciate all the work that's been done, and that includes on the part of the architect and the applicant. You clearly listened to the neighborhood feedback, so I certainly appreciate that. Thank you, Gregg, and thanks to the Engineering Department as well.

**Councilor Pett:** That would be my general feeling as well. Again, a lot of times when an applicant comes forward, they have their views of what they want and think is appropriate, and then you get to meet your neighbors and the abutters, et cetera, and I'm very appreciative of the Melansons listening to all the neighbors' input. I know we do have the Ward Councilor on the call, and only as being able to answer a question, but my guess is that I have not heard any negatives at this point, and I think I just want to express my appreciation for the Melansons making those adjustments, and also to Gregg, Bill, and all the other city departments for working with them and being very thorough and going through this application, so thank you.

**Chairperson Gilman:** Great, so Councilor Memhard, who is the Ward Councilor, and Councilor McCarthy, do you have any questions? Councilor Memhard might need to be allowed to talk. Grace, I just hit Allowed to Talk, so Councilor Memhard, do you have any questions to ask?

**Councilor Memhard:** No, I don't. Thank you very much.

**Chairperson Gilman:** OK, and Councilor McCarthy, any questions to ask?

**Councilor McCarthy:** I have none Val, thank you.

**Chairperson Gilman:** OK. Terrific. All right, so, Attorney Eliason, I wanted to ask you, I know Doug Smith had asked some questions that you were going to answer. Are you able to do that at this point, and

then we can see if anyone else on the call has questions only, this is not a public hearing, but we're willing to entertain questions on this presentation, the modifications.

**Attorney Deborah Eliason:** Yes, I am. I'm happy to answer those questions that were raised. The first question had to do with whether we could include the entire 6.6 acres in the calculation of lot area or the density, and the answer to that is no. We can only include a portion of the property because a lot of it is, or part of it are wetlands, and so 90 percent of the wetlands have to be excluded from the lot area calculation. We can only include 10 percent, so the lot area calculation, the proposed area is 166,983 square feet, the required lot area is 40,000 square feet, so we have four times the required lot area. In addition to lawn area, however, the city has a lot of other controls on density. It looks at open space per unit, it looks at lot area per unit, as well as lot coverage, and in each of those instances, this project also exceeds, and in many instances, significantly exceeds those requirements. With regard to lot area. The proposed land area per unit is 15,180 square feet, required 10,000 square feet, so each unit is 5,000 square feet over the required lot area.

That's twice the size of most people's homes, so that's quite a significant difference. The same with open space per unit, the requirement is 11,847 square feet, and the proposed is 11,847 square feet required. 7,500, that is approximately 4,300 square feet more for each unit. Lastly, with lot coverage, we're proposing 8.4 percent lot coverage, and the allowed is 25 percent, so again, it's a mere fraction of what is allowed under the ordinance. There's no legal basis to support an argument that says that just because this is multi-family, it's more dense, you have to look at the zoning ordinance, you have to look at the requirements under the zoning ordinance, and in each of the instances that go to density, we meet those or exceed those by quite a significant amount, so I would suggest to you that there is no issue regarding density in this project. There was also of questions of whether the Council had to consider the fact that the property abuts two other lots with two-families on them. The fact that there are two-families on abutting lots to a multi-family project does not prohibit you from approving the multi-family project. It's really an irrelevant subject.

The next question was whether the community needs more expensive, high-end condo housing. According to the Housing Production Plan, the community does need more multi-family housing, and it needs diverse housing. We have 57% of the units in Gloucester that are single family homes, 31% are either two-family or four-family, and only 3% are 10-19 multi-family units. So according to the Housing Production Plan, a diverse housing stock is advantageous because it creates a variety of housing, making it available in numerous price points. The project will also comply with inclusionary zoning, and it will provide the affordable unit that is required for that on-site. Zoning doesn't control the cost of units, that's controlled by location, so even if this project consisted of single-family homes, or consisted of two-family homes, it would still be high-end because of the location. That's the fact of the real estate market, it has nothing to do with zoning. I did address in our first hearing, the social, economic, and community needs, and I can go through those again if you'd like me to briefly.

**Chairperson Gilman:** Councilor's, I'll ask you, would you like that? OK.

**Attorney Deborah Eliason:** OK, so briefly, the proposed use is consistent with the uses that are allowed in the R-20 District. It's also consistent with the existing mix of commercial and residential uses along Atlantic Road. The site has been in a state of deterioration, in disrepair for many, many years, and while it was in operation, it was the source of numerous neighborhood complaints. Mr. Melanson has cleaned it up, he's bringing it back to life, and the site will once again be safe, useful, and esthetically appealing. The proposed residential use, in addition, is also more conforming with the current zoning ordinance than the prior hotel and conference center. There's no dimensional relief being requested, and it's consistent with all of the other uses along Atlantic Road, so for those reasons, I would suggest to you that it does meet the social, economic and community needs of the city.

The other question had to do with the neighborhood character and social structure, and the question stated that the project is located within a low-density residential neighborhood with mostly single-family dwellings, and I would suggest to you that that's not entirely correct. This neighborhood for this project is along Atlantic Road, and its access is Atlantic Road, it fronts on Atlantic Road. At the last hearing, I showed you numerous pictures of buildings along Atlantic Road. They were a mix of single-families, very large single-families, many on very small lots, also commercial developments and mixed businesses. So this project is entirely consistent with what is along Atlantic Road, and I would suggest to you that in many places along Atlantic Road, it's actually quite dense, and the houses are abutted right next to each other. So I would say that this project is consistent with the uses, and very consistent with the neighborhood character. Those were the questions that had been asked, and we're happy to answer any others that the Council may have.

**Chairperson Gilman:** Great, thank you. Any questions, Councilors? OK. So we have Jim Towne, Brendan Roach, Karin Theo, Mark and Pam Pullen, and Phil Puma. If any of you have a question, please keep in mind this is not the public hearing, and I really cannot allow for deliberation right now, but we certainly, I am respectful of questions, and I think the applicant has been very good about answering questions. So I can see that Mr. Towne would like to talk, so if you could introduce yourself, Jim, and your address, and ask your question, that would be great. Thank you.

**Neighbor Jim Towne:** Yes, good evening. Excuse me, Jim Towne, Links Road. Thank you for the opportunity to ask a question. Do we know, or is a lighting plan available? One of the things is the question that some of the buildings are what will the lighting plan look like? Obviously with a higher density in other areas, want to make sure it doesn't light up the whole sky with high-density lights, so is that going to be made available anytime soon and available for public view?

**Chairperson Gilman:** Thank you, great. Thank you, Attorney Eliason. All right.

**Attorney Deborah Eliason:** That's OK. I don't believe that there is a lighting plan available yet, but I would say that under the zoning ordinance, there are very strict rules with regard to lighting for multi-families, and so we would certainly follow all of those rules, and I don't know whether they actually require all dark skylights, but they definitely promote lighting that stays on the property itself.

**Engineer John Morin:** And if I can jump in there for a minute, a lighting plan was submitted with the landscape plan, so we do have a lighting plan, it shows the lumens on the lighting plan, and it's designed in compliance with the city's requirements.

**Attorney Deborah Eliason:** Thank you John.

**Chairperson Gilman:** John, is that in the packet?

**Engineer John Morin:** Yes.

**Chairperson Gilman:** OK, great. So, Jim, if you can't find that in the packet, get back to us, and I'll try to find out exactly where it is in the packet. It's pretty thick, I think the packet's up to about one hundred and forty pages.

**Neighbor Jim Towne:** Yeah, I might have I might have missed it, but that's directionally helpful, so thank you very much, and thank you for the response.

**Chairperson Gilman:** Great, any other questions from the rest of the attendees? OK. I don't see any hands raised, so I think we've had a good presentation of the modifications. We've been able to ask some questions of the applicant, our Planning Director was able to represent the voice of support from the Planning Board on the modifications. We know that there is some information that's going to happen tonight at the Conservation Commission meeting. We know that we're owed three out of six letters that need to get back to the City Council before the next meeting, it would be very much appreciated. And then at this point, I think councilors, if you're in agreement, I think we're ready to schedule a site visit. [End Transcript]

**Chairperson Gilman** continued this matter to September 16, 2020.

**Scheduling Site Visit Summary of Discussion:**

A socially-distanced site visit was scheduled for Friday, September 11, 2020.

Single-use masks and hand sanitizer will be available, attendees will be asked to remain six feet apart, and to wear masks on their faces at all times unless an attendee has a medical condition. Architect Andrew Sidford will not be able to attend, so Engineer John Morin will represent him. There will be three sessions with a maximum of 10 attendees per session. The 5:00 p.m. session will include Chairperson Gilman, Vice Chair Councilor Holmgren, and Councilor Pett, as well as **Attorney Eliason**, Mr. Morin, and Mr. Melanson, leaving space for up to four abutters. Remaining City Councilors will receive first priority in the 5:30 p.m. session, and the 6:00 p.m. session will consist of abutters in addition to Attorney Eliason, Mr. Morin, and Mr. Melanson. Chairperson Gilman will attend all the sessions.

**Attorney Eliason** agreed to draft a letter to the 25 listed abutters to notify them of the site visit and public hearing scheduled for Wednesday, September 16, 2020, as well as including a link to view tonight's meeting and packet. **Chairperson Gilman** will review the letter before it is mailed, and she will be listed as the contact person to schedule the site visit sessions.

**Councilor Pett** reiterated the fact that **Chairperson Gilman** has agreed to record all questions asked during each session, and the questions will be addressed and answered by the applicant on September 16<sup>th</sup> in the interest of transparency so that everyone has all of the necessary information even if they were not able to attend the site visit.

**MOTION: on a motion by Councilor Pett, seconded by Councilor Holmgren, the Planning & Development Committee voted by ROLL CALL 3 in favor, 0 opposed to adjourn the meeting at 6:21 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted,  
Brianna Komi  
Administrative Support  
City Clerk's Office