

CITY COUNCIL STANDING COMMITTEE  
**Planning & Development Committee**  
Wednesday, March 16, 2011 – 6:00 p.m.  
**1<sup>st</sup> Fl. Council Conference Room – City Hall**

**-Minutes-**

**Present:** Councilor Joseph Ciolino, Chair; Councilor Robert Whycott, Vice Chair; Councilor Greg Verga  
**Absent:** None.

**Also Present:** Councilor Mulcahey; Fire Chief Phil Dench; Police Chief Michael Lane

The meeting was called to order at 6:04 p.m. Items were taken out of order.

**1. Continued Business:**

- A) CC2011-006 (McGeary) Request to change St. Anthony's Lane listing from private to public Street (Cont'd from 03/02/11)

**Councilor Ciolino** announced that the DPW and the Legal Department asked for another continuance in order to be sure all paperwork is in order and asked for a continuance until the next regularly scheduled Committee meeting.

**This matter is continued to April 6, 2011.**

- B) Letter from Ronald Benjamin requesting a sewer line acceptance re: Beachcroft Road (Cont'd from 03/02/11)

**Councilor Ciolino** explained that the DPW has asked for a continuance on this matter to be sure all paperwork is in order for the April 6, 2011 Committee meeting where at that time it is anticipated all documentation will be complete and presented to the Committee.

**This matter is continued to April 6, 2011.**

- C) Request from St. Peter's Fiesta Committee for use of City Land (Cont'd from 03/02/11)

**Joe Novello, St. Peter's Fiesta Committee** again came before the Committee to continue the conversation with the Committee regarding the plans for this year's St. Peter's Fiesta. They brought Gene Dean, Jr. of Fiesta Shows, Inc., the company who provides and runs the rides for the St. Peter's Fiesta. Questioned by **Councilor Ciolino, Mr. Dean** stated it is a handshake agreement between himself and Mr. Bell, the owner of the Birdseye property for its use during Fiesta. The Councilor asked for a letter from Mr. Dean stating that fact in writing to be on file before the event. Also he noted the kiddie rides are at the altar area and the adult rides at the Birdseye property. He felt it was dangerous to have "kid" oriented rides at the Birdseye property. They're also looking to see lighting at the crosswalks from St. Peter's Park to the Birdseye property. There were also heavy cables on the ground making the footing unsure. They would also like to see a more organized opening entry to the Birdseye property.

**Mr. Dean** noted the rides are classified for use by the height of a person. He noted the kiddie rides were at the altar area. Some 10-12 year olds considered more "tween" rides were on the Birdseye property. **Chief Lane** and **Mr. Dean** discussed asked what determines the height and location of the rides with Mr. Dean noting the heights are governed and set by the State. The Chief thought rides oriented to 12 years old and up could be across to the Birdseye property. They agreed that terminology was at issue. The Chief suggested that Mr. Dean work with Lt. Aiello of the Police Department to determine what the

height of the child would be to delineate which rides go where. Mr. Novello also contributed to the conversation.

**Councilor Ciolino** went through the conditions and reminded that the music was not shut down during opening and closing ceremonies.

**Councilor Mulcahey** felt that the rides running during the religious ceremonies made it impossible to hear at all during that time. Mr. Novello and Mr. Dean would look at the matter and make a best effort to remedy the situation, especially during the opening night.

**Police Chief Michael Lane** noted the \$3,000 cost to the Fiesta Shows, Inc. (a condition of the permit) covered extra police for the Birdseye property.

**Chief Dench** spoke to the first aid station issue. At any type of an event in the City, the felt the City should be working towards NIMS compliance. To do that they have to “buy into” incident command which includes the DPW, Fire, Police, and Board of Health all being represented. He noted an incident several years ago with the Port-A-Potties at Fiesta, as an example of why incident command would have been extremely helpful; and that the City should be working towards that. For Fiesta this year he has put in money for an ambulance with two paramedic EMT’s for the Friday and Saturday nights for six hours with an incident commander (one officer working with Lt. Aiello). He felt there should be a command post with representatives from each of those City Departments believing it will benefit the City moving forward with grants etc. He would put more money into the budget, but he felt there should be contribution towards the coverage. It worked well at the Triathlon, Run Gloucester Race and felt it would do so also here. **Chief Lane** added traditionally the Police have a command post.

**Councilor Ciolino** asked who would do first aid when the ambulance was not on scene.

**Mr. Novello** stated they were told they could not do much other than have band aids available. **Mr. Dean** confirmed that all they have is a first aid kit available, and their staff has some minimal training. They have not had any other requirements. **Chief Lane** stated the police have a variety of things in their jump kits which are usually sufficient. Many policemen have EMT training.

**Councilor Verga** asked if they’re looking for reimbursement for the Fire Department as there are closed stations in the City. He asked what donation he would suggest.

**Chief Dench** stated this coverage at the Fiesta would be done on overtime. He felt there should be medical staff on scene every single day. It is \$45/hour. He has \$3,500 set aside for the year. That would get him through the Triathlon, Run Gloucester Road Race and two nights at the Fiesta. The bigger the event, the presence needs to be there. They need to work gradually towards that.

**Councilor Verga** thought it would be good to recognize where this money would come in the future.

**Chief Dench** stated going forward there is a need to recognize on the bigger events that they should look to have organizers contribute towards the funding of the paramedic coverage with a committed ambulance. There needs to be an ambulance dedicated to that function and an incident command dedicated also; suggesting it may take the enactment of a City ordinance.

**Councilor Mulcahey**, Chief Lane and Mr. Novello discussed the issues of the public consumption of alcohol reportedly on Pavillion Beach, as well as trash and also encouraged sawhorses to restrict access to more residential areas of the Fort. **Mr. Novello** and the **Chief Lane** confirmed signage would be posted to state restricted access to the more residential areas of the Fort. The Councilor believed many underage drinkers were to be found at the playground also, and asked for police vigilance in that area also.

**Chief Lane** stated they had many policemen from other areas, not just Gloucester, filled out their numbers during Fiesta with State Troopers, officers from adjoining towns. He assured his department would make their best effort.

**Councilor Whynott** reminded that there are no money prizes and no coins to be used for money.

**MOTION: On motion of Councilor Verga, seconded by Councilor Ciolino, the Planning and Development Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed to recommend to the City Council to allow the 2011 annual St. Peter’s Fiesta commencing on Wednesday evening, June 22 through Sunday, June 26, use and control of St. Peter’s Park on Rogers Street, the streets and sidewalks of Rogers Street, from Mansfield Way to the entrance of Commercial Street; Commercial Street up to Fort Square**

**to include the use of the Birdseye property; and from the intersection of Main and Washington Streets to St. Peter's Park; and on Friday, June 24, Saturday, June 25, and Sunday, June 26 only the water side of Stacey Boulevard from the "Tavern" to the Fishermen's Memorial (to the extent allowable by law) and the Ciaramitaro/Gemellaro Playground at Fort Square; for the purpose of conducting the St. Peter's Fiesta on the days and dates mentioned above. Further that vendors not be allowed on the right-hand side of Commercial Street nor on the streets and sidewalks from Tally's to the Chamber of Commerce and in addition, that all peddlers, canvassers, solicitors and others who encroach upon or occupy in any way these areas without the express consent of the St. Peter's Fiesta Committee are to be considered trespassers and to be in violation of Gloucester City Ordinances, Chapter 14, Section 14-6; Trespass; and with the following conditions:**

- 1) That the kiddie rides (children of a height of 42 inches or under) be kept at the St. Peter's Square Park not at the Birdseye property;**
- 2) That the enlarged footprint be drawn out on a plan showing locations of, but not limited to, Comfort stations and first aid stations to be placed on file (with the City Clerk's office no later than 14 days in advance of the start of the 2011 St. Peter's Fiesta);**
- 3) That the music be shut down at the opening and closing ceremonies on the closest rides to the altar area;**
- 4) That a temporary fence be erected at the very back of the area known as the "Birdseye Parking Lot" to prohibit entrance to Pavilion Beach from that parking lot;**
- 5) Temporary lighting shall be placed illuminating the area used as a crossing between St. Peter's Park and the Birdseye parking lot;**
- 6) That Fiesta Shows, Inc. contribute \$3,000 for the added police coverage due to the expansion of the rides to the Birdseye property payable to the City of Gloucester in care of the City Clerk's office to be paid 14 day in advance of the opening of the St. Peter's Fiesta.**

D) 2011-0001: Application to amend Gloucester Zoning Ordinance re: 77 Langsford Street  
(Cont'd from 01/19/11)

**Attorney J. Michael Flaherty** spoke representing the applicants Gregory Gibson and Ann Marie Crotty who own property at 77 Langsford Street which is in the Neighborhood Business district (NB) on the upper end of Langsford Street as you approach the Rockport line. The property was first divided in 1982. At the time it was a division of land under what used to be called Sec. 3.18 of the Zoning Ordinances. The section of the ordinance allowed that if you had a piece of land with one or more buildings on it and those buildings predated the adoption of the subdivision control regulations in 1961 then you were allowed to divide that property into one or more parcels with one or more buildings on each of the lots. Without that specific provision many of these lots with multiple buildings on them could not be divided without extensive relief. It is still in the GZO in Sec. 3.15. The lot the Gibson/Crotty's own was created in 1982 almost 10,000 sq. ft., triangular in shape. The adjacent lot was divided at the same time and is only slightly larger just making the 10,000 sq. ft. requirement. This request is under the ordinance and under the State Statute c. 48, Sec. 5. The Gibson/Crotty property was destroyed in January storms of 2010 by an 80 ft. fallen tree. The building on the property was used for commercial purposes as a gallery and book store. The Building Inspector condemned the building due to extensive damage. There are 9 of these hybrid poplar trees. They grow with a shallow root structure and are susceptible now at full growth of coming down. They sought to rebuild the structure and wanted to put a two-story building and create an apartment above of two bedrooms, kitchen and one bath with a back porch; and a retail gallery on the first floor. The proposed building is 42' long 27' deep. The applicants went to the Board of Appeals for relief and were awarded the relief. However, there has been much "noise" made about one neighbor appealing this. This ordinance is putting undue burdens not just on his clients in this instance but also for a number

of people over the years. He suggested petitioning the Council on these burdensome sections and is why they filed.

In their proposal as noted in their application's second page, he spoke to Section VI – Definitions, pg. 166 in the GZO and read the definition of dwelling:

“Dwelling, Multi-Family or Apartment: A structure containing three (3) or more dwelling units, whether for rental, condominium ownership, or other form of tenancy, including row or townhouse structures; or a structure containing one or more permitted non-residential uses on the ground floor, or on the ground and other floors, and also containing one or more dwelling units above the ground floor.” He explained there are two classifications. If there are three dwelling units, it's a multi-family dwelling. There are special rules for single and two-family dwellings; treated differently in the ordinances and treated very differently in the state zoning code. The issue with this definition, he felt, even if you have just one residence above a retail use on the first floor it becomes by definition a multi-family dwelling even though it doesn't have three dwelling units. His research showed it came into the Ordinance in 1984 without comment by the Planning Board with no record in the City Council minutes or Planning Board minutes or report as to why the ordinance was amended. Up to 1984 it said three or more units, its multi-family. Then in 1984 the second clause appeared. He argued it should go back to the pre-1984 definition that it is three or more dwelling units whether for rental, condominium ownership or other form of tenancy including row or townhouse structures.

He then reviewed Section 2.2.3 Mixed Uses as seen on Page 27 of the GZO. Mixed uses are defined, “Where a building, structure or land is proposed to be used for more than one principal use, all of which are permitted in the zoning district in question and none of which is accessory to another, such mixed uses shall be allowed. In the event that a provision of this ordinance applying to one of such uses is inconsistent with a provision applying to another, the more restrictive provision shall apply.” **Attorney Faherty** interpreted this to say that if more than one use if both allowed then you can have both uses more than one use on that property. If something is more restrictive than the other the more restrictive applies. He believed the problem is that it stops there. The proposal they had was for two uses both of which are allowed in the NB district which says you can have a residence and you can have retail. Once you put one over the other now it is a multi-family dwelling which has additional consequences. He then read his proposal that, “The petitioners request that this section be amended by deleting the underlined words and adding in their place “but no more than two (2) principal uses, whether the uses are in separate buildings or in the same building either vertically or horizontally connected, each of which use is permitted in the zoning district in question and neither of which is accessory to the other, such mixed uses shall be allowed.” He believed this would make it clear that it didn't matter whether they were separate buildings, tied together, one on top of the other. If both uses were allowed they could be put in a structure or structures on the lot. He showed a diagram with blue, green and yellow lines of the lot with Langsford Street being at the bottom of the diagram. The lot on the left is the actual Gibson/Crotty lot and the other lots on the right showing a residential structure that was part of the two lot division in 1982. The green line represents set backs from the property line using the R3 standards which require a 20 ft. set back from the rear line; a 20 ft. setback from the front line and a 10 ft. setbacks from the side lines. The green triangle is the building envelope one would be able to build a structure permitted under the zoning ordinance. In 1999 the City changed the zoning and most of what was R3 went to R2. R2 requirements are 30 ft. on rear and front and 20 ft. on the sides. The blue triangle represents the extent of the building envelope under the R2 requirements which means that very is very little of the lot that can be used. In the ordinance change, there was a savings provision added that says if you have a building of one or two family dwellings that any expansion or extension of that building would be governed by the R3 standards in place when the zoning was changed. Had, for instance, the Gibson/Crotty's had a one or two family dwelling on that lot, they would have been able to expand or extend the building using the R3 setbacks. Unfortunately the ordinance doesn't allow for complete reconstruction of buildings. When you have a commercial building there isn't that exception for the one or two family buildings. All of the set backs are governed by the neighboring residential district. All of these setbacks for the buildings in the neighborhoods in the business section are governed by the neighboring residential district. Even though it

is a different district the intensity of use regulations are those established in the abutting property. Since the neighborhood has been changed to R2, R2 is the governing setback requirements for NB for both residential and commercial; not distinguishing between the two. If you go to multi-family dwelling there is a separate schedule for multi-family. Even in the instance they presented to the Board of Appeals, the setbacks become 30 ft. on the front, 40 ft. on sides and rear to have a multi-family dwelling. Any height of a building in excess of 15 ft. requires another foot of setback. A standard 30 ft. high building becomes 40 ft. plus 15 ft. or 55 ft. for rear and sides and 30 ft. plus 15 ft., or 45 ft. for the front yard. In a multi-family context are line setbacks that mark the rear yard setbacks which are further towards the front yard than the front yard setback and are down to "zero space" left. The next door house has the same problem. Setbacks cross over each other and there is zero space to do anything. Although a multi-family is allowable use with a special permit, by definition that says you're a multi-family, they have to apply for all this relief when, he contended it is a 42 ft. x 27 ft. building. It is not an extensive building and only 30 ft. high. In the Board of Appeals context it is typically with an existing building with a proposal of no change to the exterior but to place an additional unit inside the house. They're before them because they're going to a multi-family or retail with apartment above, which triggers the regulations. He didn't see how it makes sense with this extreme result from a definition as he believed there is no logical basis for it. It can be as little as one residence above [a retail unit.] An NB district, he contended, is to encourage business and residences in the same area. He felt it is something in these areas you want to protect and create to live and work on the property; but this is the problem they're presented with.

Sec. 3.2.1 footnote g – Page 50 is a savings provision which only applies to one or "two-family dwellings and accessory structures thereto which: (1) were in existence on or before March 9, 1999 or for which a building permit was issued on or before March 9, 1999; and (2) are located in these portions of R-20 and R-30 districts identified by street lists...." The setbacks are governed by the residential requirements and asked what can be justification if you have a business use building in the district that it shouldn't have the same protection accorded one and two family dwellings since they're governed by the same standards. They're asking that exception which would only allow the buildings to be governed by the R3 standard that this section be amended to include for business or commercial use buildings. The dimensional requirements on this other section that they would have the words "and commercial buildings" following the words "two-family dwellings" (in Appendix to Section 3.2 page 56). This is the relief they're requesting. While his clients brought forward this petition, this will affect other properties. He handed out a group of documents (submitted and on file) which was a study from the Mill Pond north on Washington Street which encompasses 11 NB districts. The first is the pumping station at Mill Pond. There are a total of 23 lots which are zoned NB, 18 of those are used as residences. Four are used as businesses and one is vacant land. In Lanesville there are a couple of commercial buildings on Langsford Street and some in that immediate area of his client's property. He noted where, for instance, Vicari's market was located as well as the former Shea's Market. They're all used for residential now. He believed the proposed changes were not going to change the landscape in the area but will allow more diversification. He could only speculate if storefronts would be restored. What used to be Shea's Market has apartments in use above; but if they tried to put retail on the first floor it would trigger the multi-family regulations. He noted this same presentation was made before the Planning Board and reviewed his perception of that presentation and discussion to the Committee. He also noted the Board of Appeals generally defer to the City Council's judgment on these types of matters. He pointed out a drawing (on file) noting the setbacks. On a 30' house if required to have a 40' setback from each sideline and a foot for everything over that is 15 feet. You would need a lot with frontage of 110 feet. This is just to satisfy a multi-family setback. You need to be 100 ft. in depth in the rear. Almost 11,000 square feet is taken up just in setback requirements. He did not think that to be appropriate. In the group of research he presented to the Committee in all of these district maps they won't find a lot that will satisfy those parameters.

**Councilor Ciolino** stated that the Planning Board will meet tomorrow evening. They will not take a vote until they have reviewed the Planning Board recommendations. He would like to do a site visit also which was arranged by the Committee and Attorney Faherty for Monday, March 21, 2011 at 77

Langsford Street. He also asked about the line drawing provided with the colored line drawings and asked where they proposed building would go. **Attorney Faherty** noted that would be in the northerly most corner. No building will fit in the R2 triangle.

**This matter is continued to April 6, 2011.**

E) Update: Fishtown Horribles Parade (cont'd from 02/16/11)

**Al Kipp** of the Fishtown Horribles Parade Committee informed the Committee that he received a letter to be in compliance with NIMS which he looked up the data on and was not sure where the Committee wished to go with it.

**Chief Dench** stated the incident command is a command post and you need coordination. His people do that well and have communications but don't talk to Fire and don't know about it immediately. He felt it was important to have a central location that the parade committee provides one person to stay there along with one from Fire, one from Police, one from DPW and then they can coordinate from that location. He also felt there should be an ambulance dedicated to that event. Again, as with the St. Peter's Fiesta, he noted they need to start working towards the incident command system and at some point they have to do it and find ways to fund it, perhaps through contributions by large events.

**Chief Lane** thought recently through Homeland Security grant they received some multi-band radios which they can speak on different frequencies. He and **Chief Dench** discussed the technicalities of incident command and possible use of multi-band radios. **Chief Lane** believed it was a matter of swapping radios with the emergency departments and didn't necessarily think they needed a stationary command.

**Mr. Kipp** stated they use ham radio operators, one who goes out with the first police cruiser at the head of the parade. He noted this person has the ability to radio back to the fellow stationed at the high school. They agreed it was not ideal.

**Councilor Verga** thought it would be something that the Fire and Police could coordinate with Mr. Kipp. **Councilor Whynott** stated if they keep adding City personnel it will become costly.

**Chief Dench** remarked they pull away services away from the City and the amount of money it costs is becoming prohibitive. To be compliant with NIMS, personnel must be dedicated and there is the matter of finding the funding. The problem they face is how to provide for these large events and still cover the rest of the City. More and more large events are starting to tax the system. He urged it has to be considered for the future.

**Councilor Verga** thought they needed a policy; although he agreed with the Chief, they have to have a clear statement going forward.

**Councilor Ciolino** reminded Mr. Kipp about the Mass Mudders to keep them in order. He asked the Parade Committee hand out literature or flyer that no candy will be tossed to the public; and reminded about "no wheelies" which in response **Mr. Kipp** stated he would create a document for policies, which are being revised, and provide it to the Committee and the Chiefs in the next several weeks.

**MOTION: On motion by Councilor Verga, seconded by Councilor Whynott, the Planning & Development Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed to recommend to the City Council to permit the 2011 Fishtown Horribles Parade on Sunday, July 3, 2011 starting at 6:00 p.m. from the Gloucester High School parking lot to Centennial Avenue onto Stacy Boulevard to Main Street to Washington Street proceeding down Rogers Street to Manuel F. Lewis Street to Main Street to Pleasant Street to Prospect Street to Railroad Avenue to Washington Street to Centennial Avenue to Emerson Avenue to Lincoln Avenue returning to the Gloucester High School parking lot with the following documentation to be on file in the City Clerk's Office 7 (seven) days in advance of the parade date as follows:**

1. A Certificate of Insurance naming the City of Gloucester as the certificate holder;

2. **A Letter of Understanding between the 2011 Fishtown Horribles Parade Committee and the City of Gloucester School Department indicating permission to use the grounds of Gloucester High School as a staging area for the parade;**
3. **That Memorandums of Endorsement with the Fire and Police Departments for the parade;**
4. **A written plan of the parade route with attendant map indicating times of start and estimated Finish.**

2. *Request from Downtown Block Party Committee for street closures re: Downtown Block Parties*

**Erica Hansen** spoke on behalf of the Downtown Block Party Committee stating that their plans were essentially the same from last year except that they had reduced the number of events down to three dates with no rain dates.

**Chief Dench** stated all was complied with and well run last year. He did note one restaurant that had issues staying within the lines. Ms. Hansen stated sometimes it's the clientele that creates those issues moving ropes outward to accommodate more room for their chairs. They would see that it is contained. **Chief Lane** added that they will have three staff members with shirts indicating as such to be sure of compliance with the conditions as they did last year, as it as very effective. The police department would make an effort to supply a police officer for the duration of each block party.

**MOTION: On motion by Councilor Verga, seconded by Councilor Whynott, the Planning & Development Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed to recommend to the City Council to grant a permit to the Downtown Block Party Committee to temporarily close Main Street from the open driveway of Bank Gloucester to Washington Street on the following dates between the hours of 4:00 p.m. and 11:00 p.m.: Saturday, July 16 Saturday, August 20 and Saturday, September 17 to hold three block parties with the following conditions:**

1. **No vendor/merchant set ups on the sidewalk blocking entrance ways to retail or residential units, hydrants, crosswalks or handicap ramps;**
2. **All vendor/merchant set ups in the street are to allow for no less than a 10 ft. unobstructed, drivable area along the entire route – slightly wider at the curve of Palazola's Sporting Goods to maintain adequate access for emergency vehicles. Failure to provide this 10' unobstructed margin of drivable area may necessitate the removal or relocation of the vendor/merchant at the discretion of the Fire Department, the Police Department or the Block Party Committee;**
3. **The organizers shall allow the Fire Department drive-through access with the fire engine at the convenience of the Fire Department;**
4. **Any restaurant/merchant set up of tables and chairs, tents or area enclosures should extend into the street no further than the lines painted on the street for vehicular parking;**
5. **That all of the side streets – Short, Porter, Center and Hancock Streets be kept open and not blocked by vendors, food establishments, tables, chairs, enclosures, equipment or vehicles, so emergency vehicles may enter and exit Main Street as needed;**
6. **Vendor/merchants shall be responsible for their own trash removal;**
7. **Signs indicating the location of comfort stations shall be the responsibility of the Committee;**
8. **Plumbing Codes and regulations shall be adhered to regarding use of Restaurant bathroom facilities;**
9. **Special lighting and electrical requirements necessitate approval of the Inspector of Buildings and the Electrical Inspector;**
10. **The closure of the street at the intersection of Main and Duncan Streets shall be by means of sawhorses or the like, as directed by Lt. Joseph Aiello of the Gloucester Police Department;**
11. **It is the responsibility of the committee to procure all other Federal, State and local permits and approvals associated with this event;**

12. **That the committee makes reasonable notification to all residents and merchants along the route that will be affected by the closure;**
13. **Restaurants or vendors wishing to serve food outside must notify the Board of Health 7 (seven) days in advance for approval;**
14. **Conditions imposed by the Gloucester Liquor Licensing Board may also apply to the above closure and shall become incorporated herein;**
15. **All other laws, City ordinances and/or regulations are in full force.**

3. *Request from Gloucester Downtown Group for street closure re: Gloucester Sidewalk Bazaar*

**Grace Giambanco**, event planner, **Linda Palazola** of Palazola Sporting Goods and event co-chairperson with **Christine Orlando** of Kids Unlimited and event co-chair, spoke on behalf of the Gloucester Downtown Group regarding the Gloucester Sidewalk Bazaar (GSB) stating they would like to have the GSB again this year, with the same parameters as were in place in 2010. Ms. Giambanco has all the paperwork from the Fire Chief with his parameters and that everything was complied with. She hoped to improve from last year.

**Councilor Whynott** noted the Chamber had nothing to do with it last year.

**Chief Dench** noted up until last year there was no compliance stating last year they did a great job with compliance. All issues there were was taken care of immediately. He hoped for continuing cooperation. He noted there was one vendor that was a problem last year and that Ms. Van Ness stated they would not be invited back this year. The group stated they would find out from Ms. Van Ness the name of that vendor so as to be sure he was not invited back.

**Ms. Giambanco** asked about street performers and saw horses for the blocking of side streets to be obtained from the Police Department. Ms. Giambanco would speak with Lt. Aiello to obtain them. Ms. Giambanco also confirmed they would try to get the ROTC cadets to stand at the sawhorses to help prevent vehicles from entering the closed areas.

**Councilor Ciolino** stated there was an email on file from the Salvatore Frontiero, President of the Cape Ann Chamber of Commerce endorsing the event and one from Bob Hastings, Executive Director of the Chamber also endorsing the event but also notifying that the Chamber is no longer running the event. All of the event planning and organization is now run by the Gloucester Downtown Group and their hired event planner (Ms. Giambanco). It was noted by the Councilor the Chamber was no longer the fiduciary agent.

**MOTION: On motion of Councilor Verga, seconded by Councilor Whynott, the Planning & Development Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed to recommend to the City Council granting permission for the Gloucester Downtown Group (GDG) through its agent, Grace Giambanco (name and contact information to be submitted to the Committee no later than July 1, 2011 as well as to the Fire and Police Chiefs) hired by the GDG, to close Main Street from Pleasant Street to Washington Street, including Hancock, Center, Porter and Short Streets to all vehicular traffic from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., Thursday, August 4<sup>th</sup>, Friday, August 5<sup>th</sup>, and Saturday, August 6, 2011 for the purpose of conducting the Gloucester Sidewalk Bazaar with the following conditions:**

1. **No vendor set ups on the sidewalk blocking either hydrants, crosswalks or handicap ramps. Vendor set ups are not to extend beyond the marked parking lines on the streets (The handicap access is at the crosswalk. This is where the curb cuts are.);**
2. **No vendor set ups in front of the police station other than the area designated by Lt. Aiello of the Gloucester Police Department;**
3. **All vendor set ups in the street are to be within the marked parking lines to allow for unobstructed drivable area along the entire Sidewalk Days route - slightly wider at the curve of Palazola's Sporting Goods to maintain adequate access for emergency vehicles. Failure to provide this unobstructed margin of drivable area may necessitate the removal or relocation of**

**the vendor at the discretion of the Fire Department, the Police Department or the event agent hired by the GDG;**

- 4. The organizers shall allow the Fire Department drive-through access with a fire engine once each day of the event, on or about 9:00 a.m., and one random drive through to be decided by the Fire Department;**
- 5. No parking or unloading of goods of any vehicles on any of the above-mentioned streets after 8:50 a.m. until 5:00 p.m. on each of the days of the Gloucester Sidewalk Bazaar;**
- 6. Signage showing the location of the comfort stations to be located throughout the event area.**

A motion was made, seconded and voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 7:43 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dana C. Jorgenson  
Clerk of Committees

**DOCUMENTS/ITEMS SUBMITTED AT MEETING:**

- From Attorney J. Michael Faherty re: Presentation to Committee on 77 Langsford Street Rezoning:
  1. Lot Map with green blue and yellow highlighted lines showing the Langsford Street Lot in a triangular pattern;
  2. Line drawing on lined paper if lot would be managed as a multi-family showing set backs;
  3. Five 8x10 packets each with a lot map and attendant documentation listing the various land parameters;
  4. Affidavit of Notice of Abutters.