

Planning & Development Standing Committee
Wednesday, February 2, 2022 – 6:00 p.m.
REMOTE MEETING
-Minutes-

Present: Chair, Councilor Jason Grow; Vice Chair, Councilor Val Gilman; Councilor Tracy O’Neil

Other Councilors Present: Councilor Jeff Worthley

Also Present: Public Health Director, Max Schenk; Zoning Enforcement Officer, Greg Cefalo; Clerk of Committees, Sherry Karvelas

Applicants: Joe Novello and Anthony Cusumano for St. Peter’s Fiesta; Attorney Meredith Fine for SCP2022-001: Beacon Street #32; Attorney Mark Nestor for RZ2021-004

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

Meeting called to order at 6:00 p.m.

Councilor Grow announced: “Consistent with Chapter 20 of the Acts of 2021 this meeting will be conducted by remote participation. 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 and participate when necessary. If you are calling in on a phone, you can press Star 9 (*9) to request to speak. If you are watching on a computer or device, there is a “raised hand” button that you can tap or press to request to speak. Please use either of these options to be recognized to speak.”

Councilor Grow announced the names of the P&D Committee members in attendance (Councilors Gilman, O’Neil and himself), and City staff who were attending via Zoom.

Matters were taken out of order.

1. *Letter from St. Peter’s Fiesta Committee requesting permission to use St. Peter’s Park and Rogers Street on June 22-26, 2022.*

Summary of Discussion: Joe Novello, with Anthony Cusumano, of the St. Peter’s Fiesta Committee explained that they were requesting the use of St. Peter’s Park and the surrounding areas. He read an excerpt from the letter submitted: *“The St. Peter’s Fiesta Committee is hereby requesting the Gloucester City Council to confirm the use and control of St. Peter’s Park at Rogers Street, the streets and sidewalks of Rogers Street, from Mansfield Way to the entrance of Commercial Street, including the dock and deck area behind 11 Rogers Street, which was the former Brewery; Commercial Street up to Fort Square, 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 on the water side of Stacey Boulevard from The Tavern, to the Fishermen’s Memorial and the Ciaramitaro/Gemellaro Playground at Fort Square for the purpose to conduct the St. Peter’s Fiesta on the days and dates mentioned.”*

Mr. Novello stated that he had spoken to the **City Clerk** and the event had been approved by the Special Events Advisory Committee and added that this request was the same exact request as in prior years.

Councilor Gilman offered a motion, seconded by **Councilor O'Neil** regarding this matter. **Councilor Gilman** stated she was a longtime member of P&D and had worked with **Mr. Novello** and his team throughout the years. She applauded the hard work of the St. Peter's organization and stated he, and his team, were a pleasure to work with. She added that she would be supporting this matter.

Councilor O'Neil asked **Mr. Novello** to explain the location of Mansfield Way. **Mr. Novello** explained that Mansfield Way was an alley located between the St. Peter's Club and Virgilio's Bakery. **Councilor Grow** stated that Fiesta was an intrinsic part of the City's identity and that he was delighted to participate this year.

Mr. Novello thanked the **Members of the P&D Committee** for their kind words and support.

MOTION: On a motion by Councilor Gilman, seconded by Councilor O'Neil, the Planning & Development Committee voted by ROLL CALL 3 in favor, 0 opposed, to recommend that the City Council allow the 2022 annual St. Peter's Fiesta, commencing on Wednesday evening, June 22, 2022 through Sunday, June 26, 2022, for the purpose of conducting the St. Peter's Fiesta on the days and dates mentioned herein and allowing the St. Peter's Fiesta Committee from June 22 through June 26, 2022 to have the 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, including the dock/deck area behind 11 Rogers Street; Commercial Street up to Fort Square, 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 on only the water side of Stacey Boulevard from The Tavern to the Fishermen's Memorial 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 with the following conditions:

1. That the St. Peter's Fiesta Committee by June 6, 2022 file a Certificate of Insurance naming the City of Gloucester as the Certificate Holder with the City Clerk;
2. That the kiddie rides (those restricted to children of a height of 42 inches or under) be kept at the St. Peter's Square Park;
3. That the footprint of the Fiesta be drawn 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 by June 6, 2022;
4. That the music and rides closest to the altar area be shut down at the opening and closing ceremonies;
5. Vendors shall not be allowed on the right-hand side of Commercial Street nor on the streets and sidewalks from 2 Washington Street to 33 Commercial Street. Vendor trailers must be parked elsewhere as directed by the Gloucester Police Department with arrangements for such parking made in advance of the start of St. Peter's Fiesta.
6. One fixed vendor permitted by the City of Gloucester located on Stacey Boulevard is allowed to stay in place and vend during the Fiesta.
7. Vendors on Stacey Boulevard must stay on the sidewalk and use weights for their tents; stakes are prohibited.
8. Handicap parking spaces must be kept clear at all times.
9. Parking spaces can be used by vendors near the public landing on Stacey Boulevard but can't locate in the middle of the landing or block users of the landing in any way.
10. All peddlers, canvassers and 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 Code of Ordinances, Ch. 14, Sec. 14-6 "Trespass."

Councilor Worthley joined the meeting at 5:45 p.m.

2. **RZ2021-004: Concord Street #44R & #44, Map 229, Lot 2, from R-20 (Low/Medium Residential) to EB (Extensive Business) (Cont. from 01/05/22)**

Summary of Discussion: **Attorney Nestor** stated that both the P&D Committee and the Planning Board had visited the site and explained that the Planning Board voted against this matter. He stated he was here asking for the P&D Committee's consideration. He explained that he had been sent the site visit questions [which took place on January 13, 2022] that **Councilor Gilman** had scribed and that he would address those questions this evening.

Attorney Nestor offered a brief recap of the matter. He stated that his clients had owned the property since 2002 and that it had primarily been used as a tree farm. He added that the property had also been used, mistakenly, for landscaping which was discovered not to be allowed under the R-20 zoning class. He stated that the Building Department had informed his clients last spring that the landscaping use was not allowed and the owners then ceased operations. He stated the owners had been working with the Building Department on remediation to remove the equipment being stored on the property.

Attorney Nestor explained that the property was approximately six acres with about 600 feet that fronted Route 128. He stated that the property was adjacent to the Wingersheek Inn and Motel and that there were a number of residential abutters, with the primary abutters being Cape Ann Animal Aid and the City of Gloucester via the West Parish School. He stated that he had read and understood the opposition documents related to this matter and further stated that even if his clients were allowed to rezone to EB his clients would still need to request special permits for some of the tasks, such as a contractor's yard, to address hours of usage and traffic, for instance. He stated his client's position was that a bulk of the vehicles that would enter the contractor's yard, if rezoning was allowed, would then turn towards Route 128 upon leaving instead of down Concord Street into the City.

Councilor Grow asked the **Clerk of Committees** to share her screen to display the questions from the site visit. He explained that these questions came primarily from residents who attended the site visit.

RZ2021-004 Concord Street #44 and #44R, Map 229, Lot 2, from R-20 (Low/Medium Residential) to EB (Extensive Business)

Questions from the Site Visit 1/13/22 at 3:30 p.m.

City Councilors in attendance: P and D Chair Grow, Vice Chair Gilman and member O'Neil and At Large City Councilor Gross

City Staff in attendance: Bill Sanborn and Greg Cefalo

Attorney for Applicant: Mark Nestor

Co-Owner: Eric Holdsworth

Abutters: included Cape Ann Animal Aid Sinava Buck, Susan Krupanski, Caroline Benson; Jeannine Harris 47 Concord Street; William and Linda Harmon 40 Concord Street; Roger Minton 46 Concord Street (motel); Joanne and John Burlingham 36 Concord Street; Marianne and Isaiah Smith 38 Concord Street

Questions: Can you describe the dumping that has occurred over the years? How much of this was specifically from the landscaping business?

What are the future expectations for the property if allowed to be zoned as EB?

Can you describe the current use of each of the two properties? 44 R and 44?

What is the status of the septic system and water usage as well as the status of the conditional approvals recently granted?

Will our inspectors continue to monitor the owners progress on their remediation plan to remove the nonconformance's such as boats, trailers, abandoned vehicles etc.?

Who owns the rusted metal piles as well as the green and yellow former truck bodies? Where did this come from?

Is the home at 44 Concord two or three bedrooms? How many people currently live there?

What is the status of the various vehicles throughout 44 R? What is the definition of a junk vehicle?

What is the difference of adjacent abutters and primary abutters? Were all the abutters duly noticed of the public hearing? When will the public hearing occur? When will this matter go back to P and D?

What is to be done with the hoarding? What is the history and timeline of the hoarding? Was this property used for more than a tree farm for which it was permitted?

What happens to the property if the zoning request to EB from R20 is not approved? Can it continue to be used as a tree farm? Can it be classified as a tree farm even if trees are imported to the property versus grown on the property?

Will there be a traffic study?

Where can I find the application for this zoning change?

How far back does the property go?

What is the difference between the work of the Planning Board and the work of Planning and Development standing committee of the City Council?

Site visit questions recorded by Councilor Gilman

Attorney Nestor addressed each question (questions in **bold**):

Can you describe the dumping that has occurred over the years? How much of this was specifically from the landscaping business? Stated the dumping started shortly after the property was purchased in 2002. Explained that most of the dumping was leaves, brush, loom and firewood, and explained that the owners had been victims of illegal dumping which, he stated, the owners were trying to dispose of the illegal dumping material.

What are the future expectations for the property if allowed to be zoned as EB? Stated the primary interest was to use the property as a landscaping business which, he stated, was allowed under EB zoning. He stated the owners were also considering a contractor's yard which was allowed under EB with a special permit. He stated a boat yard was also being considered, which would also require a special permit in addition to be districted under EB. He stated they would also continue operating a tree farm under the provisions of Ch. 128, Sec. 1A of the Massachusetts General Laws.

Can you describe the current use of each of the two properties? 44 R and 44? Stated 44 Concord Street had a rental house and 44R Concord Street was primarily used as a farm. He stated both owners had owned and operated the landscaping business from the site since 2020.

What is the status of the septic system and water usage as well as the status of the conditional approvals recently granted? Stated the septic system was upgraded from a conditional pass to a pass by the Board of Health per the January 20, 2022 letter from Craig LoPiccolo, Sanitarian, Gloucester Board of Health. He stated the high water usage, which was raised by the **Public Health Director** at the prior meeting, was determined to be a broken pipe which was corrected in late summer; he added that the water usage for the last quarter had decreased to under the acceptable amount for two bedrooms.

Will our inspectors continue to monitor the owners progress on their remediation plan to remove the nonconformance such as boats, trailers, abandoned vehicles etc.? Stated he expected that since the applicants were continuing to work with the Building Inspector that they would continue to remove

any non-related items. He also stated that the Building Inspector would continue to monitor the property until the relevant issues have been remediated.

Who owns the rusted metal piles as well as the green and yellow former truck bodies? Where did this come from? Stated the rusted metal that was dug up onsite was scheduled for removal. He added that his clients represented that the rusted metal piles were from the previous owner.

Is the home at 44 Concord two or three bedrooms? How many people currently live there? Stated there were two bedrooms with two people living there.

What is the status of the various vehicles throughout 44 R? What is the definition of a junk vehicle? Stated all the equipment used for maintenance of the farm, plus the landscaping equipment, were the property of both owners. Stated the definition of a junk vehicle per MGL Ch. 90, Sec. 22D was a vehicle that was abandoned if unregistered. Stated the City, per the Building Inspector, defined a junk vehicle as one that does not have a current inspection or one that has an inspection sticker that expired more than 60 days ago.

What is the difference of adjacent abutters and primary abutters? Stated the GZO offered a good explanation and stated that abutters were defined as directly off of the property or within 300 feet of the property line.

Were all the abutters duly noticed of the public hearing? When will the public hearing occur? When will this matter go back to P and D? Stated GZO Sec. 1.11.4 appeared to require the City Council to give notice of the Public Hearing. Also stated that the applicant gave written notice of the site visit via First Class mail and hand-delivered mail to all abutters. He stated that the matter was at P&D now and presumed that the P&D Committee would set the date for the Public Hearing.

What is to be done with the hoarding? Stated the hoarded vehicles were mostly gone with the remaining ones due for removal.

What is the history and timeline of the hoarding? Stated the hoarded vehicles started arriving in 2006 and that the hoarded vehicles were mostly gone at this time.

Was this property used for more than a tree farm for which it was permitted? Stated the property has been used as a tree farm and that the owners mistakenly thought under that permit it could be used for a landscaping business which is why, he stated, the owners were seeking to change the zoning to EB.

What happens to the property if the zoning request to EB from R20 is not approved? Stated the owners would have to review their options. He stated the owners wished to enhance the use of the property as it was over six acres and the location was off of Route 128. Stated the owners did not think it was financially feasible to just operate the land as a tree farm.

Can it continue to be used as a tree farm? Stated yes it could continue as a tree farm.

Can it be classified as a tree farm even if trees are imported to the property versus grown on the property? Stated he believed under Ch. 142 the applicant could do so.

Will there be a traffic study? Stated it was his understanding that a traffic study was not required for rezoning. He added that a traffic study might be required if the owners sought a special permit to use the property as a contractor's yard.

Where can I find the application for this zoning change? Stated he presumed the application could be viewed online under the City Council webpage and Planning Board.

How far back does the property go? Stated the property went back approximately 1,200 feet.

What is the difference between the work of the Planning Board and the work of Planning and Development standing committee of the City Council? Stated he would defer to the City Council, but stated the Planning Board primarily dealt with land use and development and that Planning and Development addressed many issues.

The **Public Health Director, Max Schenk** stated, regarding the septic system, that just prior to the last P&D meeting regarding this matter the Board of Health had just received the Title V Inspection Report that was required in lieu of upgrade of the system in order for the property owners to prove that the septic system was adequate for serving the house. He stated the Title V inspector had gone through the system, had a few minor comments, but wanted the Health Department to make a determination. He stated he met with the property owner onsite on January 20, 2022, and stated there were no obvious hazards to be seen and nothing overt that would give him any indication that the Title V Inspection Report could not be passed. He added that the only outstanding matter was that an inspection and permitting needed to be completed for the two rental units. He stated in terms of enforcement he did not believe that there were any issues that would hold up the process.

The **Zoning Enforcement Officer, Greg Cefalo**, stated that the owners had been acting in good faith and had been making progress. He stated the owners were moving towards cleaning up the property.

Councilor Gilman asked **Attorney Nestor** to correct the typo on the initial application [zoning was noted as Essential Business instead of Extensive Business]. **Attorney Nestor** stated he would fix it and resend to the City Clerk's office.

Councilor Gilman stated the Planning Board did not support this matter. She asked **Attorney Nestor** to summarize the findings of the Planning Board. **Attorney Nestor** stated that the Planning Board had voted 0 in favor, 3 opposed, to not recommend to the City Council that this property be rezoned. He stated that the Planning Board stated they did not feel it was a valid rezoning to which, he stated, he and his clients disagreed. **Councilor Gilman** asked **Attorney Nestor** if the zoning was changed to EB then any type of business could come in and assume that zoning if the owners decided to sell the property. **Attorney Nestor** agreed. He stated it was not the owners' intent to sell the property and added that the Wingaersheek Inn and Motel was zoned as EB and that the property fronted Route 128. He stated the property had historically been a tree farm and the owners wanted to continue with that.

Councilor Gilman asked **Attorney Nestor** if this matter was not approved and the owners decided to continue as a tree farm, provided the cleanup continued in good faith, then the owners would be able to continue the business that they had entered into for the use of the property. **Attorney Nestor** stated that the tree farm business could continue, but the landscaping business would be precluded. He added that if the EB was not granted then the owners would essentially be out of business because they would not be able to operate the landscaping business.

Councilor O'Neil asked for clarification regarding the setup of the rental units in the home. **Attorney Nestor** stated there were two one-bedroom units in the home. **Councilor O'Neil** asked if a garage was proposed to be built on the property. **Attorney Nestor** stated it was his understanding that a garage was not being proposed. He added that it depended on if the owners went forward with seeking a contractor's yard, if the rezoning was approved. He added that the use of the garage would be limited to the fixing of their own landscaping vehicles again, he stated, if the rezoning was approved.

Councilor Grow asked the **Public Health Director** if it was different to have a shared septic system versus a two-bedroom system. The Public Health Director stated a shared system was usually when there were two separate structures involved. He explained that a multifamily that had a single septic system was not considered a shared system. If there were two separate properties that were zoned as two separate properties on two separate lots, then that would be a shared system, he explained. **Councilor Grow** asked the **Public Health Director** when the septic system would again be inspected. He stated the system would be inspected again if an issue was detected when the pumper went to empty the system, for instance. He stated it would also be inspected upon transfer of the property. **Councilor Grow** asked if it was a two-family house. The **Public Health Director** stated that it had been represented as a two family, but would confirm that upon inspection. **Attorney Nestor** stated it was his understanding that both units of the home were occupied. He added that it was the bedroom capacity that drove the septic system.

Councilor Grow asked **Attorney Nestor** why 44 Concord Street was included in the application which essentially created a nonconforming use, as a duplex or single family home was not allowed in the EB zone. **Attorney Nestor** stated the frontage was needed because the access to 44R went through 44. He added that normally under the zoning a residential unit was not allowed under EB, but stated the language in the zoning was “should not” which raised the question of whether a special permit needed to be sought from the ZBA. He added for the purposes of operating as an EB, the frontage from 44 was needed.

Councilor Grow stated that it was two separate properties and asked if the intention was to turn the properties into one property. **Attorney Nestor** stated there was two distinct properties, but for the purposes of zoning they would be considered merged as both properties were owned by the same owner.

Councilor Grow stated landscaping could be a very broad definition. He asked what sort of heavy equipment was anticipated to be on the property. **Attorney Nestor** stated it was a landscaping business with excavating equipment to work with landscape architects, for instance, with possible storage of dirt and loam. He stated it was not the type of landscaping business where lawnmowers, etc. would be stored on property.

Councilor Grow asked the **Zoning Inspection Officer** how long he had been working with the owners on fixing the issues and when was the date of the first complaint. The **Zoning Inspection Officer** stated approximately since 2017. The **Zoning Inspection Officer** asked **Attorney Nestor** if it was determined that 44 Concord was a two-family if he could get assurances that permits would be pulled and that a current layout of the spaces be provided. **Attorney Nestor** agreed and stated it would be done anyways for the Certificate of Rental Dwelling.

Councilor Gilman offered a motion, seconded by **Councilor O’Neil**, on this matter. **Councilor Gilman** stated that she was not comfortable moving forward with this matter. She stated the purpose of the City’s zoning was to preserve the value of land and buildings. She stated she did not believe that the type of activity for the property being sought by the owners under the rezoning was suitable for a residential environment. She stated she also took into account the recommendation from the Planning Board in determining her vote. She stated she would not be supporting this matter. **Councilor O’Neil** stated she agreed with the comments of **Councilor Gilman**. She added that the neighbors had been complaining since 2017 and stated that she was not comfortable moving this matter forward and would be voting no. **Councilor Grow** concurred. He also referenced the recommendation of the Planning Board as well as the neighborhood complaints. He stated the solution offered for the complaints was not to fix the problems on the site, but to rezone the property and stated it was clear to him that a lot of angst and aggravation in the neighborhood had been caused by this matter. He stated he was also concerned about creating a nonconforming house structure by virtue of the zoning and stated that he would be voting no on this matter.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: On a motion by Councilor Gilman, seconded by Councilor O’Neil, the Planning & Development Committee voted by ROLL CALL 0 in favor, 3 opposed, to recommend that the City Council, pursuant to Gloucester Zoning Ordinance Section 1.11 and MGL c. 40A, §5, grant a zoning change to the owner of Concord Street #44R and #44, Assessors Map 229, Lot 2 from R-20 (Low/Medium Density Residential) to EB (Extensive Business), and the Zoning Map is to be changed accordingly.

The Public Hearing on this matter will be held at the City Council meeting of February 8, 2022.

3. *SCP2022-001: Beacon Street #32, Map 16, Lot 53, GZO Secs. 2.3.1(7) “Conversion to or new multi-family or apartment dwelling, four to six dwelling units” and 3.1.6(b) “Building heights in excess of 35 feet” in the R-5 High Density Residential District*

Summary of Discussion: Attorney Meredith Fine stated that this application was for a Victorian home located at 32 Beacon Street. She stated the home was currently divided into three units, but there had been a fourth illegal unit located in the basement for at least ten years. She stated that her client, Mr. Edward Gallegos, recently purchased the property and desired to add the fourth unit back to the property legally. She stated that there was ample parking in the back of the property and that there would be no changes to the exterior besides any necessary repairs, and added that the building was 48 feet high.

Councilor Gilman asked if Attorney Fine would go through Sec. 1.8.3 “Standards to be Applied” to understand the substance of what the P&D Committee was considering. Councilor Grow gave a brief overview of the Standards to be Applied.

Attorney Fine stated that under social, economic and community needs served by the proposal there would be an additional, much-needed housing unit while preserving the beautiful Victorian building. For traffic flow and safety, she stated that the additional fourth unit would be a one-bedroom apartment which would not affect traffic. She stated there would be a very minimal effect on utilities. She stated that she was under the impression that the neighbors were pleased to have the building renovated. She reiterated that there would be no changes to the exterior of the building with no ill-effect on the natural environment. She stated the potential fiscal impact would be a small tax benefit from the additional unit and improvements to the building.

There was a brief discussion regarding the category [Sec. 2.3.1(7)] of the Special Permit and the number of units being allowed under this permit.

Councilor Gilman offered a motion, seconded by Councilor O’Neil, regarding this matter. Councilor Gilman added that the ZBA approved this matter on September 30, 2021, with the ZBA requiring one offsite parking space, with Councilor Gilman noting that there were seven offsite spaces total. She stated that there were no exterior changes and that it would not be substantially more detrimental to the neighborhood and the existing non-conforming structure. She also stated that this building was four units for many years with one illegal unit, and the applicant was requesting to bring back that fourth unit legally. She stated a Certificate of No Appeal had been issued as more than twenty days elapsed with the ZBA decision. She added that she would be supporting this matter. Councilor Grow expressed his appreciation for the owner following the correct procedure in adding the fourth unit and voiced his support for this matter.

The Public Hearing for this matter will take place at the City Council on February 22, 2022.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: On a motion by Councilor Gilman, seconded by Councilor O’Neil, the Planning & Development Committee voted by ROLL CALL 3 in favor, 0

opposed, to recommend that the City Council grant to Meredith A. Fine, Esq. on behalf of owner Edward Gallegos, a Special Permit (SCP2022-001) for the property located at Beacon Street #32, Assessors Map 16, Lot 53 in the R-5 district, pursuant to Gloucester Zoning Ordinance Sec. 2.3.1(7) "Conversion to or new multi-family or apartment dwelling, four to six dwelling units," for a fourth dwelling unit, and Sec. 3.1.6(b) "Building heights in excess of 35 feet" for the building to remain at 48 feet. This permit is made on the basis of plans and elevations submitted to the City Clerk on January 14, 2022 entitled, "Plan of Land, 32 Beacon Street;" Plan dated May 10, 2021 and submitted to the City Clerk on January 14, 2022 entitled "Floor Plans for 32 Beacon Street;" and Plan dated August 5, 2021 and submitted January 14, 2022 entitled, "32 Beacon Street Ext. Elevations." Subject to new information and/or debate that results from the public hearing, this Special Permit is deemed to be in harmony with the intent and purpose of the zoning ordinance.

Other Business

Councilor Grow wished to remind everyone about the upcoming Ward meetings on February 7 (Ward 3), February 9 (Ward 4) and February 10 (Ward 1). He added that Shawn Henry from the Planning Board would be attending these meetings as well.

MOTION: On a motion by Councilor Gilman, seconded by Councilor O'Neil, the Planning & Development Committee voted by ROLL CALL 3 in favor, 0 opposed, to adjourn the meeting at 6:32 p.m.

Submitted by: Sherry Karvelas, Clerk of Committees

Documents submitted at the meeting: None.

Meeting Recording: <http://gloucester-ma.gov/1097/Past-Remote-Public-Meetings>