

CITY COUNCIL STANDING COMMITTEE  
**Planning & Development**  
Wednesday, May 4, 2011 – 6:00 p.m.  
1<sup>st</sup> Fl. Council Conference Room – City Hall  
-Minutes-

**PRESENT: Chair, Councilor Joseph Ciolino; Vice Chair, Councilor Robert Whynott; Councilor Greg Verga** Absent: None. **Also Present: Councilor Hardy; Councilor McGeary; Fire Chief Dench; Bill Sanborn**

**The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m.**

**1. Continued Business:**

- A) SCP2010-012: Kondelin Road #16, GZO Sec. 5.13 PWSF & SCP2010-013: Rogers Street #127 GZO Sec. 5.13 PWSF – Updates from Fire Chief & David Spaulding USAi.net (Cont'd from 04/20/11)

**Councilor Ciolino** reminded the Committee that on November 11, 2010 the City Council approved two Special Council Permits under §5.13 PWSF for Kondelin Road and Rogers Street to USAi.net. The purpose now is to hear of the progress of the service and installation of high speed internet microwave equipment for the outlying fire stations of West Gloucester, Magnolia and Bay View as well as Central Station by USAi.net as per Condition #2 of the special permits that this be done in lieu of a \$5,000 donation to the Fire Training Fund (§5.13.12.1) totaling an in-kind donation of \$10,000.

**David Spaulding**, president of USAi.net informed the Committee his company has been waiting for the towers to go up at the fire stations and continuing discussions on the types of technology to be deployed. They've waited for the FCC to release a low frequency radio for cutting through trees for more rural areas; however, it appears those frequencies will not be released in time for this project, and so will go with 900 MHz product. He showed the Councilors the piece of equipment which he brought with him. They anticipate proceeding to completion within the next 60 days. They're waiting for a final permit from American Tower to use that frequency on the tower on Kondelin Road. **Fire Chief Phil Dench** agreed they were waiting on the towers. It wasn't until February when they could begin work. Magnolia and West Gloucester stations now have installed 50 ft. towers, and Bay View has a 60 ft. tower, this being the most critical of the three as that station has no internet connectivity at all. He advised the Committee he and Mr. Spaulding have been in frequent contact throughout the process. It has taken a while to get to this point; but he thought they were on a good schedule and satisfied with the progress.

**Mr. Spaulding** showed the Councilors on his laptop topographical maps and photographs of the conditions they were dealing with at the outlying stations. He informed them they were looking at radios that work on very low voltage so that telecommunications can stay up for extended periods of time even with power outages and generator failure. They've created multiple paths from Kondelin Road tower to the outlying stations. He explained that headquarters can be reached by either the Kondelin Road or Rogers Street tower (located on the Gorton's property). They might look to bring two radios to headquarters to bring in a layer of redundancy should something go wrong. They believe it all should be operational well before 90 days forward. **Councilor Verga** expressed he was pleased to see this project happening. **Councilor Hardy** asked about the units that would be on the poles; and also asked if the substations, once able to communicate through the internet, that the connectivity would be limited to just the stations and not the neighborhoods. **Mr. Spaulding** showed her an example of a unit with a radio built into the antenna and explained an alternative is available if needed with an external antenna; and also that the internet would only be available to the stations and not the neighborhood. These radios they're installing not only allow for a private network so the stations can talk to each other without encryption, and they can privatize circuits between them and headquarters and deliver an internet feed on the same radio. **Councilor Hardy** inquired as to who owned the units; and was there a contract and if so

the length of it. **Mr. Spaulding** stated the units are owned by USAi.net. He also had assumed that the amount of money they were speaking of was \$5,000 per permit, but he had offered a total of \$20,000 in kind which works out to two or three years of service. Additionally, they do have the ability to address wi-fi in open areas in parks or the downtown area because of the Kondelin Road tower. However, the primary need was to meet the needs of the Fire Departments. **Councilor Hardy** asked that the contract they create would be set up so there is a definite timeframe for it with an end date which **Councilor Ciolino** asked to see a written agreement when he comes back to the Committee noting the City has a \$20,000 credit. **Mr. Spaulding** confirmed he would provide an as-built drawing for the Chief submitted as well as a copy of the contract at that time.

**This matter is continued to August 17<sup>th</sup> or will appear prior to that date should Mr. Spaulding notify the Committee of the project's completion prior to that date.**

## **2. SCP2011-001: Decatur Street #14, GZO §5.2 Earth Fill and Removal Regulations**

**Councilor Ciolino** stated this is a Special Council Permit application after the fact for Decatur Street #14, GZO §5.2 Earth Fill and Removal Regulations, §1.5.3 and §1.8.3, Map 56, Lot 11, Zoning Classification R-10. This application is signed off by the Building Inspector and the Planning Director. All appropriate documentation is on file at this time, including the Affidavit of Notice to Abutters. No action will be taken tonight. The Committee will be doing a site visit on Saturday, May 7<sup>th</sup> at 8:30 a.m. He also announced there was a quorum of the City Council as **Councilor McGeary** entered the meeting at 6:10 p.m. **Councilor Verga** also disclosed he represented the seller of 14 Decatur Street to the current owners about two years ago. As he had no agreements with the Baldassano's, he did not see a conflict of interest on the matter before the P&D Committee now.

**Frederick J. Geisel, P.E.**, Geisel Engineering, 15 Steep Hill Drive, Gloucester representing the applicant, Salvatore Baldassano, 14 Decatur Street, Map 56, Lot 11, Zoning Classification R-10 was before the Committee for a Special Council Permit under GZO §5.2 Earth Fill and Removal Regulations. He would submit a drainage analysis which was a primary concern was over drainage and runoff to the Building Inspector, the Engineering Department and to the City Clerk's office the following day. The fill was placed on the property without the benefit of a City Council permit under GZO §5.2; and this is an after-the-fact application for permission to construct a boulder retaining wall and fill to create a useable yard. Once though the City Council, if there is any fill left in place that exceeds the height restriction of a retaining wall, at that time they will apply for a permit from the Building Inspector for the boulder retaining wall. What had been reported to him both by the applicant and neighbors is there was fill on site prior to the property's purchase by the Baldassano's. That fill last year was graded off. There was some fill at the intersection this property and that of Joseph Unis' property. Fill was removed from that location and placed back on the site. Additional fill totaling about 190 yards of excess fill from some of the operations in the City last fall (a water line installed by Cardillo Construction). There were a considerable amount of boulders there used to create a retaining wall with clean fill. That fill was spread on the site. It was done to create a useable back yard which slopes from front to rear over 20 feet from street level to the rear portion of the property. The back portion of the property also had a ridge of ledge that comes through the property which continues onto the neighboring property. Because of the ledge and slope it was not very usable land for recreation purposes. The applicant in future would propose a garage on the back portion of the property. This would create the opportunity some time in the future to do that and to create some recreational area on the lot. He then reviewed the six criteria from §1.8.3 as follows:

A) **Social, Economic or Community Needs:** The project will allow better utilization of an existing oversized (20,400 sq. ft. and zoning calls for 10,000 sq. ft.) lot, which will improve the property value for building and recreational purposes as well as all properties in the neighborhood.

B) **Traffic Flow & Safety:** The improved driveway will allow for parking of all resident cars at this property to be parked off of this narrow street.

C) **Adequacy of Utilities and Other Public Services:** No additional utilities or public services will be utilized for this project.

D) **Neighborhood character and social structure:** The neighborhood consists mostly of single family homes on smaller lots with some condominiums in the area. The social structure of the neighborhood is working families. The project will not change any of the neighborhood characteristics or social structure.

E) **Qualities of the natural environment:** The natural environment consists of steeply sloped lots with many ledge outcrops and limited treed areas. Lots have been built up as terraced. The project is consistent with the existing natural environment.

F) **Potential fiscal impact:** This project will increase the utility of the property and enhance property values.

**Mr. Geisel** reviewed the nature of the relief for the Committee by stating under §5.2 of the Zoning Ordinances allows the City Council through a special permit to fill with the placement of earth fill in quantity greater than 200 cubic yards. This quantity includes both materials which were previously on site. The earth/gravel fill that was brought into the site and boulders, retaining walls and structures like that were included in that fill. He reiterated this is an after-the-fact permission to construct a boulder retaining wall and fill to create a useable yard. Additional work to be completed would include a crushed stone driveway extension, stone infiltration trenches with stormwater chambers, loaming, seeding, landscaping with trees, and fencing around the boulder retaining wall as shown on the plan (on file). The boulder retaining wall was not completed when construction was halted last winter, due to lack of permits. The retaining wall will be reinforced with existing boulders on the site, the slope of the wall will be flattened and the height of the wall will be reduced by removal of boulders lining the top of the wall. The special permit requested will be in harmony with the intent and purpose of the Zoning Ordinance as upon completion of the stormwater infiltration trenches and storage chambers, runoff from the fill area, which they measured out to 5,800 sq. ft. plus allowing for an additional several hundred square feet for the driveway extension of the existing driveway to the fill area, for a total of 6,000 sq. ft. This area would be totally stored and contained on site allowing for infiltration slowly over a period of time. This was analyzed for a 2 year, 25 and 100 year storm and to be contained for all those situations. All the flow off of the existing fill area is analyzed as being basically a gravel road. Under current conditions they will be able to contain the flow from a 100 year storm with the infiltration chambers on the site. That does not take into account that with the loaming and seeding of the adjacent areas with turf the area would retain more water than currently runs off. They would achieve more than 100% of storage. The boulder retaining wall is consistent existing wall with the lower portion of the property which has been in existence for at least 30 years or more. They would reinforce the intersection of the two walls and have permission from that landowner to flatten the slope of the wall so that the wall will last “many lifetimes”. Also the additional requirements – the boulder retaining wall will be reconfigured to reduce the wall slope and reiterated the infiltration system will contain 100% of the runoff from all storms including 100 year storm from all of the fill areas. The fill area will be surrounded by rail fence and arborvitae plantings. The entire fill area will be sloped towards the infiltration system. Currently it slopes slightly from west to east along the long side of the retaining wall but the back portion of the wall slopes off. They will change the grade by removing fill from the center of the fill area and have all the flow sloping towards the infiltration galleries. All exposed soil areas (except for those areas that are driveway and infiltration area) will be loamed and seeded to further absorb water.

**Councilor Ciolino** noted on file there was an invoice from Cardillo & Sons for the amount of fill, 190 yards delivered. Gateway Consultants was a previous engineering consultant, and a letter from Mr. Geisel, and a letter from the Building Inspector dated January 20th. The Councilor noted in the second paragraph of that letter regarding a violation notice and how to rectify that situation. He was interested to know if all that had been enumerated by the Building Inspector in his letter had been done and/or received in by him within the 20 day timeframe. Councilor Ciolino further noted a professional engineer was before them as part meeting the criteria. The certified site plan, according to **Mr. Geisel**, was submitted by Gateway Consultants. The applicant has records for 190 yards of fill and was what he was charged for. There was additional fill that had been on the site prior to the applicant’s purchase of the property

along with the boulders. He noted the estimate was based on existing conditions in January/February 2011 versus 1957 topographical maps. Gateway estimated over 1,000 cubic yards of fill. He thought that was considerably overestimating the amount of fill because the topographical maps have been superseded by work done on the site when it was originally developed including the sewer system in the rear yard. His estimate is between 500 and 600 cubic yards of total fill material. **Councilor Ciolino** reiterated when they meet again in two weeks, he wants documentation of what Mr. Geisel's estimate of fill was as well as the drainage plan, and show how the drainage was changed with the fill.

**Bill Sanborn**, Building Inspector confirmed that Gateway Consultants were the first engineers of record and provided him with all the information he had requested in his letter to the Baldassano's of January 20th. **Councilor Ciolino** asked if he got the soil test which **Mr. Sanborn** noted that to be missing which **Mr. Geisel** stated had been done and documentation would be on file by the next meeting. **Mr. Sanborn** confirmed he had the information of where the fill came from on file. There is engineer certification as to the structural integrity of the retaining wall. The effect of fill to neighboring properties, weight loads, drainage, etc. was submitted from Gateway Consultants which answered these questions. He suggested that he and Mr. Geisel meet to make sure all is in order and would do so before the Committee's next meeting.

**Councilor Hardy** asked if there was any documentation to substantiate the drainage report which **Mr. Geisel** confirmed there was.

**Jacqueline Baldassano** stated they bought the property because of the lot size to expand their land. When they have a family the house would not big enough. She felt they tried to do everything they could to do it the right way. She noted she and her husband intend to stay at this location to raise their family.

**Muriel Wonson**, 12 Decatur Street expressed the Baldassano's are good neighbors.

**John Sultan** 30 Eastern Avenue whose father owns #7 and #9 Blake Court stated his father had concerns and signed a petition that the process wasn't done correctly. They had a meeting at the lot the previous Sunday with a professional presentation and noted his father was more than satisfied. There was no absorption previously. It funneled through to Blake Court. What is now planned would slow the runoff. Done professionally with 100% absorption, he, his father and the neighbors were satisfied.

**Salvatore Baldassano**, applicant wished the permits could have been in place previously. He expressed he wanted to do things right and didn't wish to negatively impact the neighbors and to raise his family there.

**Mark Hood**, 9R Blake Court, abutter stated he had lived there for 35 years. He had to have his house moved to get it out of the water and will look forward to the site visit. He opposes the way it has been done but is pleased to see it on track now. However, he didn't believe the plan addresses all the drainage issues. What's there now has caused much water to come across the back of his property. There was no appropriate barrier there before for this as well to prevent major runoff.

**Councilor Ciolino** asked permission to come onto his property during the site visit scheduled for Saturday, May 7<sup>th</sup> which Mr. Hood gave. **Mr. Hood** stated the City in 2003 recorded 253 cubic yards that had been put on the property which was construction fill that extended onto his property. It is now back on 14 Decatur Street.

**Councilor Ciolino** asked if this drainage plan will relieve Mr. Hood's issues. **Mr. Geisel** confirmed it would and was confident in the plan. He related he has been doing this work for 40 years and expressed confidence this will alleviate the drainage problem.

**Councilor Ciolino** related to the neighbors that this permit is discretionary by the Council, and it is not by right. The assurance is that if down the road whatever the drainage solution is and neighbors feel it is not working; they can come back to the Council to seek relief.

**Manuel Gaipo**, 37 Taylor Street stated he had done an addition for Mr. Hood about 20 years ago. There was a brook in the backyard. When he went to Mr. Baldassano to do work, he stated there was a lot of fill supposedly on Mr. Hood's property. He dug out the fill back into the Baldassano's property to the existing wall. Since that has been done, he believed Mr. Hood's property was drier. He expressed his feeling that the Baldassano's will do what is right so they can be there to stay and develop their property.

**Clarence Leveille**, 15 Blake Court stated the water runoff has changed. It used to drain off of 14 Decatur Street into his cellar and out through it. That water is now diverted around his property. He sold his house and built a condo attached to his house. He built a drain to draw the water away from the house. He now doesn't get the water in the middle of the property; it is now underneath his shed. The water he's getting is diverted which he could accept. He expressed his concern about the wall as too high and not safe as children play in those woods in and around that same wall.

**Councilor Ciolino** asked as to where the water flows and neighbors confirmed it goes from Decatur Street to Blake Court onto Sayward Street. The neighbors also discussed the ways the water drained off Decatur Street down onto Blake Court and how some of the water has been diverted over the years by changes on various properties. **Councilor Ciolino** believed the water was going into the City storm drains.

**Councilor Hardy** asked about the culverts on Mr. Hood's if they were privately owned or was there an easement to the City. **Mr. Hood** stated there is no easement. He put in one culvert and one was preexisting.

**Councilor McGeary** asked about Mr. Leveille's concern regarding the height of the wall; was it the actual height or the belief of its instability. **Mr. Leveille** felt it was unstable, as it was just boulders sitting atop a ruffraff wall. **Councilor Ciolino** added the wall will be reconstructed. **Mr. Geisel** stated there are large boulders that are as big as cars. The wall will be shored up. The drainage patterns have changed and will mimic the existing conditions and will gentle the slope. **Mr. Gaipo** stated his belief the wall that will be shored up correctly.

**Councilor Ciolino** noted the neighbor's concerns are being addressed, in his view. He explained many times through the Special Permitting, conditions are placed on the Council's approval of the permit and must be met or the permit would be in jeopardy.

**This matter is continued to May 18, 2011.**

**3. SCP2011-002: Eastern Avenue #53, GZO §2.3.1.6 conversion to or new multi-family dwelling Units; three dwelling units, §1.10.1 and 3.1.6 building height over 35', §3.2.2(a) decrease in The minimum lot area and open space per dwelling unit**

**Councilor Ciolino** explained this matter is for Eastern Avenue #53 under GZO §2.3.1.6 conversion to or new multi-family dwelling units; three dwelling units, §1.10.1 and 3.1.6 building height over 35', §3.2.2(a) decrease in the minimum lot area and open space per dwelling unit, Map 49, Lot 1. This application is signed off by the Building Inspector/Zoning Enforcement Officer, Greg Cefalo and the Planning Director. All appropriate documentation is on file at this time, excepting the Affidavit of Notice to Abutters (which the attorney for the applicants handed to the Chair at this time and was placed on file). No action will be taken on this matter this evening as the Committee will conduct a site visit on Saturday, May 7<sup>th</sup> at 9 a.m.

**William Sanborn** declared to the Committee he was there as a citizen and has an interest in this property and was not appearing now as the City Building Inspector.

**Attorney Robert J. Coakley** representing the applicants, Ashley A. and Jackie L. Sanborn, with Jackie Sanborn in attendance, was before the Committee for the application of a Special Council Permit under GZO §2.3.1.6 conversion to or new multi-family dwelling units; three dwelling units, §1.10.1 and 3.1.6 building height over 35', §3.2.2(a) decrease in the minimum lot area and open space per dwelling unit. Ashley Sanborn found and purchased this property to allow for the potential ability to provide an income stream to pay the mortgage. This was a foreclosure sale and brought to her attention by a local realtor. When the house was inspected, it had all the attributes and fixtures remaining of having been a three-family at one time. In 1947, consistent with veterans returning from WWII, a permit was issued for the introduction of a third unit. He believed this was a form of a City sponsored housing effort at that time. **Mr. Sanborn** had that confirmed recently that during WWII were out of high school and came back and there was a housing shortage. The City took it upon them to help find housing for these young veterans

by create apartments, many in attic conversions. There was a building permit on file showing 1947 for the City of Gloucester which then made sense. **Attorney Coakley** continued the applicants propose to re-introduce an additional dwelling unit to a building at 53 Eastern Avenue. Because Mr. Sanborn is the Building Inspector, he petitioned the Mayor to appoint a special Building Inspector so he would not be in a conflict of interest. In December Acting Mayor Hardy appointed Greg Cefalo, Assistant Building Inspector to that position for this purpose. The attorney informed the State Ethics Commission of Mr. Sanborn's connection and his role in the City to put them on notice as well. He described the house located on the corner of Neptune Place and Eastern Avenue. The existing structure is 39.6' (rounded to 40') as calculated under the requirements of the zoning ordinance. This is the existing height of the building and will not change as a result of the application. Because it is a change of use they must reapply for the recognition of the change of height. The specific relief is for 10 ft. in height. He showed the Councilors two of the same picture of the rear of the property. He pointed out there are new decks and stairs on the back of the property. The permit for that was issued prior to any application being filed to the ZBA for relief. The current two-family didn't meet the State building code for egress. They do not get grandfathered on public safety issues, however. Whether this permit is allowed or not, the decks are necessary just for the two family uses.

For their appearance before the ZBA he had Gail Smith, a local surveyor, give them a parking plan for the property. The rear of the property is the only open space for the property. It was hot topped by the previous owner. They've showed on the submitted plan 8 parking spaces which are more than they needed (1.5 per unit per zoning ordinance). The plan shows the footprint of the decks also. The neighbors on Neptune Place, who were notified of the ZBA meeting, two were at the ZBA meeting and expressed their concerns to Attorney Coakley who asked for a continuance before the ZBA opened the hearing and met with the neighbors to hear their practical concern of where would the snow go. He realized they didn't need six spaces at the rear of the property and could remove two for storage, and they would instruct the snow plow contractor to keep a snow berm from encroaching onto Neptune Place for clear access. The garage was originally part of the property but was split off and purchased by the people to the left on Eastern Avenue. The property hasn't been owner occupied but Ashley Sanborn plans to live on the third floor. Granite curbing exists now, and they propose they will put another piece of curbing in so those exiting the property onto Neptune Place will be appropriate and away from any bushes planted at the back of the property belonging to abutters. There is a tendency of some neighbors to park in front of this building on the sidewalk as do service providers. They would approach the Traffic Commission regarding this. After the ZBA gave them the relief, they did contact the Traffic Commission, but he can't go to them directly even as a private citizen. It needs to go through the Ward Councilor and has spoken to Councilor McGeary. He noted when the City widened the lanes there it helped somewhat. The problem coming up Neptune Place is that they can't see traffic on Eastern Avenue and is a hazard. Concern had been expressed for space #6, and Mr. Wright of the Zoning Board thought they could delete the space. The plan submitted shows that space removed.

One of the benefits of increasing the units from two to three is a living arrangement good for the neighborhood. Currently the second floor has four bedrooms and the first floor has one making five bedrooms in one apartment. The proposal is to have a one bedroom unit on the first floor, two on the second and one on the third floor. There is no green space and is not the type of apartments that would be attractive to families with children. They believe with the reconfiguration of the bedrooms there will be a maximum of five spaces. A single professional person has already applied to rent one of the apartments leaving only one other apartment to let out. They believe the parking configuration works better. The use of the three families actually also works better than the two and adds a housing unit to the City. They obtained all the necessary dimensional relief from the ZBA.

The applicants are also requesting an authorization for a decrease in lot area per dwelling unit of 1,200 sq. ft. per unit, collectively 3,600'. Further, the applicants request authorization for a decrease in the minimum open space per unit of 800 square feet or collectively 2,400'. Because they're adding another dwelling to the multi-family, they have to request this relief also. It is consistent with the size of the lots

in the area. He then explained to the Committee that this application meets the conditions as set forth in §1.8.3 as follows:

A) **Social, Economic or Community Needs:** The applicants' propose to upgrade the existing building and reintroduce a third apartment to an existing multi-family. A permit was issued in 1947 to allow for a third apartment.

B) **Traffic Flow & Safety:** The applicants' propose to formalize the existing parking on the site which can accommodate more than the required parking spaces. The applicants' worked with the surrounding neighbors to develop a parking plan that has minimal impact on the neighborhood and also are requesting permission to install a No Parking sign in front of 53 Eastern Avenue from the Traffic Commission. The parking configuration and dimensions have also been approved by the ZBA.

C) **Adequacy of Utilities and Other Public Services:** There are adequate utilities to the site to serve the proposal. All new utilities will be done inside the structure and exterior lighting for safety purposes.

D) **Neighborhood character and social structure:** The proposed three-family is consistent with the uses in the surrounding neighborhood of multi-families and mixed use buildings. The proposal will not obstruct views and will not be a detriment to the neighborhood. Rather, the proposal will improve the existing building and will be an asset to the neighborhood. Attorney Coakley noted that the applicants added deck and stairs to the rear of the building in order to provide a second means of egress to the building in order to comply with State building code. No other changes are being made to the outside of the structure.

E) **Qualities of the natural environment:** There will be no impact on the natural environment by this conversion.

F) **Potential fiscal impact:** The proposal will add one additional unit to an existing multi-family dwelling. The addition of this unit will not adversely impact schools or public safety and will provide additional tax revenue to the City.

**Councilor Ciolino** stated there would be no action taken by the Committee this evening on this matter as well. The Committee will conduct a site visit on Saturday, May 7<sup>th</sup> at 9:00 a.m.

**Councilor Hardy** asked what the second egress is for the third floor. **Mr. Sanborn** stated the deck egress will go up to the third floor. **Mr. Sanborn** added that the apartment they are adding is actually on the second floor. **Attorney Coakley** stated the egress is a better configuration as is the proposal for a three unit building versus a two-unit building.

**Councilor Hardy** asked if Neptune Place was public or private. **Mr. Sanborn** believed it to be a private way which **Councilor Whynott** believed it to be also plowed and maintained but not repaved by the City which **Councilor McGeary** confirmed to the Committee it is a private way.

**Councilor McGeary** asked if these would be market rate rentals which **Mr. Sanborn** stated they would **Councilor Hardy** wondered if the second floor has four bedrooms now why go to a two bedroom unit.

**Mr. Sanborn** stated the rooms are odd sized with one bathroom. The living room and kitchen have to be added as it didn't exist before on that level.

**This matter is continued to May 18, 2011.**

#### **4. *Communication from Downtown Development Commission re: I4-C2 Criteria***

**Councilor Ciolino** wished to discuss what the RFP process should be. **Councilor Hardy** understood the Mayor will create the RFP; and the Council will review it before it is released. It was not the job of the City Council or P&D to put the RFP together, but rather the Administration's. It will come to the Council for review so that they're in agreement of what is allowed so there is consensus before its release. It will be submitted to the Council for referral to P&D. **Councilor McGeary** asked what the action would be by the Council. **Councilor Hardy** noted would be their purview to review it and to give their suggestions for fine tuning the RFP. Her understanding is that a draft RFP would be coming forward soon.

**Councilor Ciolino** stated there is also another facet which needs to be addressed which are jobs and

taxes. **Councilor Hardy** encouraged any City Councilors if they have a suggestion to be incorporated into the draft RFP; she urged them to call the Administration with them to be sure they're incorporated. **Councilor Verga** noted in the Downtown Development Commission letter from John Orlando, he talks about incorporating the links to the harbor, Rogers Street, Main Street and "the downtown City campus";. He believed they've never really figured out there "the downtown City campus" is. He'd like to see that conversation continued as to its definition because there were still those who thought the campus should be in another location.

**Councilor Hardy** suggested to the Committee that perhaps they could put a request into the Mayor to come before them to it which **Councilor Verga** thought was a good idea.

**This matter is tabled until the draft RFP regarding I4-C2 comes through the Mayor's Report to the City Council and is referred out to the Committee.**

**A motion was made, seconded and voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 7:35 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted,

**Dana C. Jorgenson**  
Clerk of Committees

**DOCUMENTATION/ITEMS SUBMITTED AT MEETING:**

- **Affidavit of Notice to Abutters from Attorney Coakley re: Eastern Avenue, #53 as well as a color photograph of the rear of the building**