

CITY COUNCIL STANDING COMMITTEE  
**Planning & Development**  
Wednesday, September 21, 2011 – 6:00 p.m.  
1<sup>st</sup> Fl. Council Committee Room  
-Minutes-

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

**Also Present:** Councilor McGeary; Fire Chief Dench; Gregg Cademartori

**The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. Items were taken out of order.**

**1. Continued Business (all continued from 09/07/11):**

- A) SCP2011-005: Dory Road #11, GZO §5.22 Commercial Land-Based Wind Energy Conversion Facilities

**Councilor Ciolino** asked Richard Kleiman, representing the applicant for a letter for a request for an extension for the City Council's public hearing in case the Committee is unable to move forward with a recommendation to the Council before the City Council meeting of September 27, 2011. **Gregg Cademartori**, Planning Director noted after the initial presentation from Equity Industrial Partners, LLC, a motion was made by the Committee to hire an independent consultant to review the noise, flicker and shadow and acoustical studies submissions by the applicant. He has received funds from the applicant and contracted with Harris, Miller Miller & Hanson, Inc. (HMMH) was hired for the review. There have been several technical memorandums submitted to the Committee from HMMH as well as responses from the applicant's team of consultants including Epsilon Associates and the Cadmus Group, Inc. (all reports on file). They have also had a site visit and the visualizations of the height of the turbines with the helicopter test. There was also a photographic record from various locations around the City made of that helicopter test (photo report on file). **Stephen Barrett**, LEED-AP, Director, Clean Energy, HMMH, Inc. noted his firm's expertise in this kind of analysis. He stated that the material submitted by the applicant was all up to professional standards. The companies involved are ones he is familiar with. The tools and information provided is of industry standards. They did have some back and forth on some particular questions; some analysis that didn't come out of part of their initial reports. Answers were provided. On the sound/noise report, the back and forth is included in his memorandum. The shadow/flicker back and forth was also provided.

- **Noise:** Sound assessment report was provided by Epsilon Associates who was responsible for demonstrating the project's impact related to noise to be compliant with City ordinances and State noise policy. That noise policy must be complied with under the City wind ordinance. There are two different measures for evaluating compliance. The City's ordinance is a maximum level that is put out from any activity whereas the State is measured off of ambient conditions, so it is an increase in noise over ambient conditions. Epsilon had to both go out and do sound measurements to identify existing conditions as well as run some computer models to project what the noise would be produced from the two wind turbines. He then referred to his September 16, 2011 memorandum (on file) on page 2. #3 the modeling results showed:
  - a. that industrial and commercial abutters will not be subject to a noise level in exceedence of the relevant limits contained in the City ordinance.
  - b. the increase in noise at residential receptors will be 7 dBA or less over background which complies with the State noise policy. Under State policy they can't exceed 10 dBA stating that was an important point.
  - c. there is a 16 dBA increase in noise at the property line location (at the Rt. 128 extension) and in the letter of the policy, it exceeds the State noise policy 10 dBA increase standard. That is an exceedence and is non-compliant which is addressed further on in his report. It is recognized in the report that there was this exceedence.
  - d. supplemental data (requested by Mr. Barrett) provided indicates that Project Only noise from the nearest building at the Fuller School is 53 dBA (maximum noise heard) which complies with the 60 dBA daytime limit for a residential district in the City ordinance on the Fuller School site. Fuller School is zoned residential, so the residential piece of the zoning is what is relevant. The wind turbines are in compliance with the daytime limit.
  - e. approximately half of the Fuller School property would exceed the 50 dBA nighttime limit for a residential district in the City ordinance; the 53 dBA is in exceedence of the limit. The most important points are that c. and e. is a potential exceedence of standards identified.**Councilor Whynott** thought that was still far less noise than the traffic going by on the roadway going by Fuller. **Mr. Barrett** stated the analysis looks at existing

conditions so they went out and recorded measurement of existing noise levels which includes the traffic. The relevant factors about the noise traffic on the extension it will be higher during the day and much more limited in the night. The Councilor is correct. The wind turbines are next to the highway, and the highway noise is attributed in all the analysis. One of the most important factors is that the noise goes down quite a bit in the evening on the extension in the middle of the night. 3c. where there is 16 dBA increase, Epsilon states that the 16 dBA is OK because in layman's terms there is no one standing at the property line that is affected. He agreed with that interpretation and finds that the 16 dBA noise increase at the property line is not a problem. Under #5, on the issue of the Fuller School, the Epsilon Report states Fuller School as a residential zone that the project is in compliance in daytime but not at nighttime. The Epsilon report concludes that because no one is at the school at night that the nighttime standard of 50 dBA doesn't apply. He agreed with that under existing conditions – there's no one at the school site at night that would be affected. The issue is for future uses of that property. He had no idea of what the City's interest is in that property. The point is that if they were to take that interpretation and say that there is no one there now at night, it would limit the future use for residential uses on that property. **Councilor Verga** assumed these numbers are based on when the turbines are at full capacity. This would not be 24/7 at full capacity. **Mr. Barrett** agreed that it is only when the wind turbine(s) is operational. Epsilon looked at two different time periods of operation. Both of those scenarios are a very conservative in approach. They used the right analysis, and the numbers generated are accurate. **Richard Lampeter**, Epsilon Associates stated this was worst case modeling scenario where the wind turbine is producing at the maximum sound power. Under other conditions or wind speed, sound levels at that particular location would be less. **Councilor McGeary** asked what the wind speed would be to generate that maximum rotation for maximum wind noise. **Mr. Lampeter** noted the their report (on file), the sound levels are compared for the Mass DEP compliance evaluation, at wind speeds at a height of 10 meters; the speeds of 7 meters/second and greater or the "max" sound power scenario, the minimum measured L90 background sound level was 47.9 dBA and about 15 mph would be the wind speed. **Councilor Ciolino** stated the ordinance states 30 mph or less. **Mr. Cademartori** noted that condition, the 7 meters per second is about what is modeled. The average wind speed, what is the frequency of 7 meters per second if that is a number that is tangible. **Mr. Barrett** noted it's complicated because there are two different regulatory things they're looking at. For the maximum output at 7 meters per second is when the turbine reaches its loudest output. Beyond that it, typically, flattens or may even decrease a little bit. The 7 meter per second scenario they modeled is the appropriate one. Whether or not it is worst case that is a different question in the worst case scenario. What he was saying is that you have the issue on the Fuller School property. **Mr. Cademartori** noted this is a predicted condition. It is going to occur, and that's why it is modeled. It isn't like a scenario where you're building in a "ton" of safety to say they still satisfy it; it will be a working condition. **Mr. Barrett** added to build a wind turbine, you want it to operate, and it will be operating at 7 meters/second. **Mr. Kleiman** asked about the Fuller School and that it was currently not used for school students. **Councilor Verga** clarified there is a preschool there, but only in session during the day. **Mr. Barrett** noted #6 in understanding the other uses in the area, there is a permitted hotel in the Gloucester Crossing business zone. Looking at the modeling, that hotel would be a residential use with people there at night also does not meet the 50 dBA limit for a residential use for maximum noise. **Mr. Kleiman** understood that is a business district and understood the hotel would be a commercial use rather than a residential use. **Mr. Cademartori** clarified the City does treat hotels as residential uses. **Councilor Ciolino** asked how much of a problem this is. **Mr. Cademartori** stated the Fuller question associated with #5 of the HRRH report of 9/16/11, you have two different scenarios: one with residential zoning with a school use or administration, etc.; and future use has not been determined, whatever that may be. The Code of Ordinances deals very specifically with that and was unsure how it should be resolved as this is what the Code of Ordinances says versus the hotel use, which he expressed gave him some concern. They have a permitted use as a residential use, and how it plays out in the same framework; there is a standard for it. What do they do about it if the standard is not adhered to. Councilor Ciolino stated you can't open windows in most hotels and perhaps would that be a consideration and not be a problem. However, a hotel might not be built there; and do they deny the wind turbines on what might or might not be built. **Mr. Cademartori** stated all they could really do is work with what they have in terms of standards that have to be satisfied. The district is dictating what the use is and what the special permit is dictating the use is. Mr. Barrett is just pointing out what the study demonstrates and somehow they have to resolve it. **Mr. Barrett** expressed he raised those issues which are gray areas; he was unsure how the Committee wishes to handle them; and reiterated they are gray areas that require interpretation from the City's perspective. **Councilor McGeary** asked about the difference

between 50 and 53 dBA. **Mr. Barrett** responded it is a logarithmic scale. **Councilor Whynott** added it decreases rapidly exponentially with distance. **Mr. Barrett** responded that the closer you are the louder it is; as you move away it dissipates quickly. It's all programmed in the modeling. Mr. Barrett and Mr. Cademartori agreed the proposed hotel site and the school are almost equidistant. **Councilor Ciolino** noted the prevailing winds move through from Market Basket towards the Blackburn Industrial Park. **Mr. Barrett** noted the modeling tries to incorporate those types of factors. And while he didn't bring it up in his overview, there are also a number of other conservative measures built into the analysis. Given the conservative analysis these are the two areas to focus on. **Mr. Lampeter** added the turbine manufacturer provides an expected sound/power level; and then there is a level of conservatism, or a guaranteed level which in this case they added 2 dBA to the expected value to add some conservatism to get to that guaranteed level. The sound levels presented here are 2 dBA higher than the expected level from that particular wind turbine type. **Councilor Whynott** noted the day they went to look at the Town of Ipswich's turbine he asked what that wind speed was that day but **Mr. Cademartori** didn't know, as the Councilor thought it seemed that the turbine was moving well and didn't make much noise at all. **Mr. Lampeter** referred to Figure 7-1 in the original application under the 5 meter per second case, noting the Fuller School is identified in this figure; and in Mr. Barrett's memo from 9/16/11 that identifies the hotel as well. At 5 meter per second wind speed the predicted sound level from the turbine is 50 dBA approaches the hotel area. The sound levels at the hotel would be just below 50 dBA due to the wind turbines and would be less at the school. Once you get to the 7 meter/second rate that is when the 50 dBA ISO line extends to and divides the school area and extends beyond the hotel. **Councilor Whynott** noted the City's noise ordinance deals with the decibels only. He recalled copying out from a scientific manual some of the comparisons of what a vacuum cleaner puts out for sound, or a washing machine, for instance. 50 dBA was like a vacuum cleaner or a washing machine, he believed. **Mr. Lampeter** noted in their report (on file), figure 2-1 presents those typical noise sources and environments. 50 dBA would be quiet urban daytime for an outdoor environment. 50 dBA inside would be like a dishwasher in the next room; a little higher than that would be 'quiet speech.' **Councilor Verga** clarified they're saying worst case scenario if the hotel gets built, someone would hear the equivalent of a dishwasher. **Mr. Lampeter** noted that would be outside. Inside the hotel if you went from 50 dBA down, inside it would be about 35 dBA which would be like a library sound level. **Councilor Verga** noted the sound in the room next door from the television would be louder than the sound of the wind turbine then which **Mr. Lampeter** agreed. **Councilor Ciolino** noted the noise from the Rt. 128 extension which will be heard such as trailer trucks going by in addition. He asked if it is not aligning with the ordinance how do they permit it. **Mr. Cademartori** agreed that was a problem. **Mr. Kleiman** offered a suggestion to the Committee by noting these are excellent model projections on sound. They could presumably if they go into operation they could monitor sound at the site; if there is a condition for a period of time at night where it becomes an issue, it exceeds the 50 dBA; they have the ability to program the turbines to shut down during those periods when it hits that level. It has something to do with wind direction and wind speed. They can correlate the sound exceedence of the 50 dBA standard with the wind speed and direction; and program the machine to shut down for those periods. **Councilor McGeary** clarified that at certain speeds with wind from certain directions they'd program the turbines to shut down. Mr. Kleiman imagined that would be a limited number of hours. It can be done. It is the same type of programming they're talking about for shadow/flicker, just a different purpose. **Mr. Cademartori** stated that to him this is something that is a very variable situation to capture. Is there the sophistication to set up a program? **Mr. Barrett** stated there are programs and are ways; that is one of the advantages of these machines is that they are very sophisticated and can be programmed. They can get some additional information from Falmouth, MA, as an example. The Town of Falmouth is doing some curtailment for noise purposes; and they could get curtailment information from them to help inform that concept. Technically it is certainly feasible. **Mr. Kleiman** added if they were looking to shape language for a condition that would resolve that issue under the ordinance; they could put language together about the monitoring program and a curtailment program that's tied to the monitoring program to make sure the nighttime standard is not exceeded. **Councilor Ciolino** asked about the Gamesa Shadow Control System software (description on file – sent to Committee via email on 9/20/11) and was it the same program used for noise curtailment. **Mr. Kleiman** stated they do have a program that co-exists for noise as part of the package. **Councilor Ciolino** noted they would add a condition that this control system would be in place. **Mr. Kleiman** stated the control system is on the turbine. The monitoring could be done on the hotel site, and they would correlate the data; and program the data to shut down the turbines at certain times. **Councilor McGeary** added this would be based on the sound findings they'd have on site at the

hotel. **Mr. Kleiman** agreed and stated if they found some exceedence of the ordinance, they'd figure that out when that is occurring based on the wind speed and direction and have the computer programmed to have the turbines shut down whenever they approach that level. **Councilor Ciolino** noted the Gamesa's Shadow Control System stating they could ask for this type of this as a condition for shadow and flicker as well as sound via a solar control panel mounted on the top of the turbine which shuts it down for those circumstances. The tool optimizes shut off times on the current turbine power output. They can ask for this type of software to be installed and for noise and mention the hotel. **Councilor Whynott** stated it would have to be framed as a "what if"; they have to be able to comply if the hotel is built. But the hotel isn't built. **Councilor Ciolino** stated they don't have to install it if the hotel isn't built. **Councilor McGeary** asked to facts on the ground, referring back to what Mr. Barrett said earlier, that there was no sensitive receptor at the property line. If there is no sensitive receptor now at Fuller School and at the hotel site, would this be in compliance if there is no sensitive receptor or is it an absolute number. **Mr. Cademartori** stated one is referring to the State noise policy and the other is the City's Code of Ordinances, and then there is language that refers to both of them in the zoning ordinance. As it is characterized they're trying to be in compliance with multiple sets of regulations. The Code of Ordinances speaks to residential use and residential districts; and he was not sure how they rectify that. Councilor McGeary added, if in fact it is a residential district or has the possibility for residential use in the district then it would not be in compliance even if there was nothing there right now. **Mr. Cademartori** expressed an allegory that if he owned a house lot and decided not to build on yet, he had a certain understanding of what can go on in that district and also how surroundings are regulated in other sets of ordinances; so that they didn't come into a situation where someone goes to build their house all of a sudden they have this problem that was otherwise addressed in other sets of regulations or ordinances.. Councilor McGeary noted this comes back to the Chairman's suggestion they add a condition for computer control so that they ensure, as best they can at this point, that it will be in compliance. There is no way they can say 'it is only 3 dBA' essentially. **Mr. Cademartori** noted it works fairly well with the hotel but he didn't know how they would rectify the residential district which also includes the Fuller School because that would cause them to regulate the project such that it didn't surpass that decibel range at nighttime which is the property line at this point of Fuller School. **Councilor Verga** noted the software program could control that. **Mr. Cademartori** felt if that was 30% of the operating time for the project that is a pretty large portion. **Mr. Barratt** commented the shadow flicker software and control technology they've referred to is very straightforward. The curtailment in Falmouth, they have a plan for curtailment for noise. There is some background on that. They'd have to do more research; maybe the applicant has some experience; but he is not familiar with a system or plan that has been put together where there is a monitor out in the field and it causes a turbine to turn off because of a violation. Councilor McGeary clarified he believed the applicant stated they'd do a study. **Mr. Kleiman** stated they'd design a monitoring program when the turbines are operational. You measure the sound during the nighttime for potential non-compliance. You determine if they are in exceedence under certain wind speed and conditions, and if they are, they would then correlate that with wind direction to see if that makes a difference (and in certain wind directions they're in compliance – meaning if the wind was coming from a certain direction and creating more noise and no one should hear it), prevailing winds are generally southwest. Councilor Verga pointed out these numbers are based on models only. It makes sense to put out sensors and this could be no where near 50 dBA. This is all about what-ifs based on computer models. When it is actually in place, if the applicant is willing to shut down that is, "so be it". **Mr. Lampeter** stated they could have a monitor so that as soon as it went above 50 dBA, it would be tripped. Based on the measured sound levels there are a lot of times it could rise above 50 dBA due to other conditions, like wind gusts for instance or other noises. **Councilor McGeary** stated they would do it over a year study to build up a database that says in these wind conditions at this wind speed with this wind direction and in this season, that's when they do or do not exceed those conditions; and when those conditions are met, they have computer software that would shut down or dampen the turbines,. **Mr. Kleiman** agreed they could program the turbines to shut down during those particular conditions identified, hopefully over a limited period of time. **Councilor Whynott** expressed his dismay with the ordinance that he felt was so limiting and couldn't believe it would be 50 dBA. He knew a vacuum cleaner to be 35 dBA, but if you walk two rooms away, you can still watch TV. He noted the workings of the Ipswich turbine and its noise output which he observed it to be lower than the traffic that passes his home on Poplar Street. **Councilor Ciolino** noted the hotel is on the books as residential and they have to work with. With adding these conditions that will be an assurance. They need to have that fall back plan in place and the same thing with the flickering. They have to craft these conditions before this is

- moved forward. **Councilor McGeary** noted that they as a Committee and as a Council will be on more solid ground if they craft a permit that lives within the existing ordinance, and this seems to offer the potential. He asked about the Gamesa software and wasn't it for shadow/flicker curtailment. Further, was there an existing product that can program wind speed and direction and shut down the turbine? **Mr. Kleiman** stated it is not a product that has a noise monitor on the turbine; as part of the same software package called "SCADA", there are all kinds of control functions. The turbines can be programmed to shut down or not start under various conditions. If they find with the noise monitoring and under certain wind speed and directions to be in exceedence at that site, they can tell the computer software under those conditions to shut down the turbine(s). On inquiry from **Councilor Ciolino**, **Mr. Kleiman** stated the monitoring would be done when the turbines are operational because that would be the only time they'd know the actual sound levels. **Councilor McGeary** reiterated that the SCADA program exists variables can be programmed in. **Mr. Kleiman** agreed. They'd have the controls on and do a lot of remote measuring on the turbines and how much power they're producing and maintenance issues. The turbine has to shut down if it is too low or too high a wind speed. **Mr. Lampeter** couldn't speak directly to the Gamesa turbine but he has seen other turbines they have with a noise reduced option where it doesn't necessarily shut down, but where it spins slower so that they have data where they can reduce the noise by decibels, say 2 dBA. He believed it works into the SCADA system to slow the turbines down so it doesn't generate as much noise so it brings it down to the 5 meter per second scenario. **Mr. Kleiman** noted that it feathers the blades catching less wind and slows the blades down; and GAMESA does have that option as well. They would still get the benefit. **Councilor McGeary** noted the only way to find out is to build it, monitor it and it sounds like they have a way to ameliorate any problems should they arise if those conditions occur. This would probably be under a very narrow set of circumstances, but this protects the City's interest and living within the ordinance which is of importance.
- **Shadow/Flicker:** **Mr. Barrett** noted unlike noise with very specific numerical standards, there aren't any good standards for shadow/flicker. It is the burden of proof is with the developer to say there won't be an impact. The Cadmus Report shows a standard of 30 hours based in German law, and is the only number they have. The initial and enhanced analysis that Cadmus produced showed well below 30 hours of impact. His conclusion is that impacts are well within any existing standards and that this software package should be put on the turbines in case concerns arise during operation. He recommended they require some kind of software.

**Councilor Whynott** noted the helicopter test and that he and Councilor Ciolino had difficulty seeing the helicopter from Harrison Avenue looking towards the Dory Road sites. **Mr. Kleiman** noting the vegetation at the edge of the industrial park stated the only time shadow/flicker would be possible was when the leaves were actually on the trees, not during the winter. It appears it looks like it would be zero. Even if that becomes problematic they'd have the capacity to shut down the turbine. **Councilor Ciolino** noted the turbines will be a big change for Gloucester. This will be a different skyline for the City. They need to think about all the fallbacks; the hotel, the residences in the area. He felt the software is a critical part of the Special Council Permit and that they have to work on to get specifications. **Councilor McGeary** assumed that the applicant and Mr. Cademartori can craft that and get done by next Tuesday. **Mr. Kleiman** could do that and then Mr. Cademartori will work with the consultant Legal Counsel to put this together to protect entities like the Gloucester Crossing and the residents so that once they are running they can make adjustments. **Councilor McGeary** expressed that the cost of the study (for the monitoring of noise after the installation of the turbines) would be borne by the applicant which **Mr. Kleiman** agreed with. **Mr. Cademartori** asked if there are any standards that apply for commercial or industrial zones. **Mr. Lampeter** noted ISO's are for 50 hours. Mr. Cademartori asked what it is like for receptors D and F (Figure 6 in the 9/19/11 Cadmus Report on file). What were they talking about in hours for the offices along Blackburn Drive? **Mr. Kleiman** noted there are no windows on that side of the buildings; there are loading docks and trees. It is virtually windowless. The impact would not affect them. They are industrial in nature. It is fairly limited. They don't have a specific numbers as they didn't identify them as sensitive receptors. **Charles McClelland**, an Associate with the Cadmus Group stated they chose a receptor location noted as D and those sites were not revisited as any obstructions at those locations would not have had an impact. They have 152 hours at that location. There aren't a lot of windows at those locations and shadow/flicker is a perception. **Councilor McGeary** noted the shadow/flicker depends on the turbine being orientated to a certain direction. Is that based on prevailing direction of wind? **Mr. McClelland** noted their model takes into account the wind direction. **Councilor McGeary** stated it is a half hour at dawn or dusk. **Mr. McClelland** noted on page 11 of the first memo they prepared (on file) those calendars depict the times, and it will largely result in early after noon hours of 2-4 p.m. in the fall. **Councilor Ciolino** asked in the worse case scenario

the towers get built and for some reason there is a glitch in the software and they can't get it to work; what would be the repercussion; if they put in terms and conditions they would be in violation of their Special Council Permit and the Ordinances. ). This would be the issue for the applicant at that time. **Mr. Kleiman** noted they would be "on the hook" to make it work. **Councilor Whynott** stated if nothing goes at Gloucester Crossing then it is moot.

**Councilor Ciolino** noted the permit stays with the property so the conditions remain. **Councilor McGeary** stated regardless, they will program what the sound study tells them. **Councilor Ciolino** stated the owner of the LLC would be responsible for that. **Mr. Cademartori** stated they don't know what that constraint will be; and if it is problematic then it is a concern for the City. **Mr. Kleiman** noted shadow flicker hours are limited and will not be an economic consideration of the operation of the machines. They want to demonstrate through talking with the equipment manufacturer that this is the mechanism to condition the project to maintain compliance. **Mr. Barrett** stated there are very specific times and that the programming associated with that is straightforward. The noise is more complex; and they don't know how much time it would take. **Councilor Ciolino** wanted to get the applicant going but they want to do it right. The applicant is to work with Mr. Cademartori and the consultant to come up with these conditions and forward that to the City Solicitor, the Committee and the Clerk's office. It is up to the City to tweak the language. **Mr. Cademartori** thought if it is a reasonable way to curtail it, it has to be within the Code of Ordinances and the Special Council Permit. It has to be very clear as to how it will be carried out. **Mr. Kleiman** stated they can tie it to the ordinances and the control equipment etc. as to language that is in enforceable. **Mr. Barrett** noted it would be to everyone's benefit to find a model where this has been done already, particularly in the noise for implementation. He recommended looking at Falmouth. **Councilor Whynott** thought if Falmouth has done it, they probably modeled on someone else. **Councilor Ciolino** brought up the Memorandum Of Understanding (MOU), and that Legal Counsel stated that would be sufficient to move the Special Council Permit forward. **Mr. Kleiman** noted the price and business terms are attached to the MOU, and it is signed. That is supposed to hold and appropriate to incorporate that as a condition. **Councilor McGeary** felt that would be incorporated as one of the conditions and a copy will be with the Special Council Permit. He noted that is just good practice. **Councilor Ciolino** stated they'll meet at 6 p.m. on September 27, 2011 for a special meeting of the Committee and pass the motion should all the conditions be in place. This would be a one item agenda. The applicant will send a letter to the Council President to continue the public hearing to October 11<sup>th</sup> in case all the pieces do not come together for that Special Committee Meeting of the 27th.

**This matter is continued to September 27, 2011 Special Meeting of the Planning & Development Committee in the Council Committee Room.**

- B) Request to permit to hold 31<sup>st</sup> annual Downtown Gloucester Christmas Parade on November 27, 2011

**Councilor Ciolino** turned the meeting over to Vice Chair, Councilor Whynott and recused himself as he is in charge of this event. **Councilors Verga** and **Whynott** both endorsed the event and agreed the plans in place were appropriate and all documentation necessary at this time was on file.

**MOTION: On motion by Councilor Verga, seconded by Councilor Whynott, the Planning & Development Committee voted 2 in favor, 0 opposed to recommend to the City Council to permit the Downtown Gloucester Christmas Parade on Sunday, November 27, 2011. Sign offs from the Fire and Police Departments are on file as well as written documentation of the parade route. The Certificate of Insurance naming the City of Gloucester as the Certificate Holder is to be on file with the City Clerk by the close of business on Friday, November 18, 2011.**

- C) Request from Gloucester Downtown Association for street closure on December 10, 2011 for 2<sup>nd</sup> Annual Winter Carnival/Gloucester Downtown Shopping Spree Drawing

**This matter is continued to October 19, 2011.**

**2. Request from North Shore Habitat for Humanity re: October 30, 2011 5K Road Race at Good Harbor Beach**

**Sharon Lourie Trustee and Don Preston**, representing North Shore Habitat for Humanity reviewed for the Committee their plans for holding a 5K Road Race on Sunday, October 30, 2011. Ms. Lourie advised that all required documentation was on file with the office of the City Clerk. They also met with the Licensing Commission and received their approval. They have filed and received permits from the Board of Health for serving food with

no propane used; and filed and received a permit for a transient vendor, as well as a permit for a raffle. The Committee expected the race organizers to notify all the affected inns, hotels and function halls along race route of the date and times runners are anticipated to be on the road in advance of the race date which would be incorporated into the motion. Fire **Chief Dench** added his support.

**MOTION: On motion by Councilor Whynott, seconded by Councilor Verga, the Planning & Development Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed to recommend to the City Council to permit the Sunday, October 30, 2011 5K Road Race sponsored by the North Shore Habitat for Humanity. Race route documentation along with sign offs from the Fire, Police and Public Works Department are on file with the City Clerk's office. A Certificate of Insurance naming the City of Gloucester as the Certificate Holder is also on file. All inns, hotels and function halls along the race route are to be notified at least seven days in advance of the race date and times runners are anticipated to be on City streets.**

***AGENDA ITEMS # 3 through #7 ARE ALL CONTINUED TO THE WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 5, 2011 MEETING OF P&D:***

3. *SCP2011-006: Washington Street #298, GZO §1.8.3 and §5.13.7.2 (PWSF Modifications) (TBC 10/05/11)*
4. *SCP2011-007: Blackburn Drive #30, GZO §1.8.3 and §5.13.7.2 (PWSF Modifications) (TBC 10/05/11)*

**Councilor Ciolino** stated that SCP2011-007 for the Modification of PWSF of AT&T under Zoning Ordinance §5.13.7.2 received by the Council on September 13, 2011 is being withdrawn by AT&T due to several errors in the application and supporting documents which incorrectly reference the location. The PWSF is **NOT** at 30 Blackburn Drive (#30 Blackburn Drive is Varian Associates). The City Clerk has spoken today (9/21/11) to Attorney Joseph Giammarco of Brown Rudnick who acknowledged the application must be revised and agreed that AT&T will withdraw the application and refile it once all location references have been corrected.

**This matter is considered complete.**

5. *SCP2011-008: Kondelin Drive #16, GZO §1.8.3 and §5.13.7.2 (PWSF Modifications) (TBC 10/05/11)*
6. *SCP2011-009: Main Street #186, GZO §1.8.3 and §5.13.7.2 (PWSF Modifications) (TBC 10/05/11)*
7. *SCP2011-010: Prospect Street #27, GZO §2.3.1.6, conversion to or new multi-family or apartment dwelling, three dwelling units; §1.10.1 and 3.16 increase in building height over 35', §1.10.1 and 3.2.2(a) decrease In the minimum lot area open space per dwelling unit (TBC 10/05/11)*

**Councilor Ciolino** asked his fellow Committee members to visit the site at Prospect Street #27 on their own to view it prior to their next regularly scheduled meeting when at that time they will hear this matter.

8. *Review and recommendation for the disposition of real property for the Magnolia School House (Blynman School) (referred from CCM 09/13/11)*

The P&D Committee would participate in a joint meeting of their Committee with the Budget & Finance Committee on Thursday, September 22, 2011 in order to receive further information on the matter.

**This matter is continued to October 5, 2011.**

**Councilor Whynott** expressed his concern followed by a brief discussion between the **Councilors** and **Mr. Cademartori** on the catastrophic loss of telephone service at Gloucester High School late in the summer and that the situation is in the process of being worked through.

**A motion was made, seconded and voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 7:15 p.m.**

**Respectfully submitted,**

**Dana C. Jorgenson**  
Clerk of Committees

**DOCUMENTS/ITEMS SUBMITTED AT MEETING:**

- *Event Summary and information on Habitat for Humanity submitted by Sharon Lourie*