

CITY COUNCIL STANDING COMMITTEE  
**Planning & Development Committee**  
Wednesday, November 7, 2012 – 7:00 p.m.  
**1<sup>st</sup> Fl. Council Committee Room – City Hall**  
-Minutes-

**Present: Acting Chair, Councilor Greg Verga; Councilor Joseph Ciolino, Alternate; Councilor Paul McGeary, Alternate**

**Remote Participants: Councilor Bruce Tobey**

**Absent: Councilor Hardy**

**Also Present: Councilor Cox; Linda T. Lowe; Mark Cole; Judith Hoglander; Catherine Ryan**

**The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.**

**Councilor Bruce Tobey** entered the meeting by remote telephonic participation (via cell phone) at 7:00 p.m., and left the meeting at 7:18 p.m. For the first 18 minutes of the meeting there was a quorum of the City Council. Upon **Councilor Tobey's** departure, **Councilor Paul McGeary** then stepped forward as an alternate member of the P&D Committee for the remainder of the meeting.

1. *CC2012-012 (Tobey) Legal constraints governing redevelopment of 65 Rogers Street (I4-C2) and measures Council would need to initiate to seek lifting of those constraints via Home Rule Petition to take parcel out of Designated Port Area (DPA) (Cont'd from 10/3/12)*

**Councilor Tobey** stated the Committee has before it a simple two section proposed Home Rule petition on which Linda Lowe, City Clerk and Suzanne Egan, General Counsel collaborated which has the effect if enacted by the General Court and signed by the Governor, of removing "...a certain parcel of land at 65 Rogers Street from the Designated Port Area (DPA)..." He asked the Committee to send this forward to the City Council so that here can be discussion. It is simple yet complex. There has been a tortured history of multiple private and public owners to get a land locked parcel developed in a marine dependent way. The community indicated that some sort of bio-marine facility on that site; assuming it can be financed, perhaps, a pure research facility is not allowed in the DPA." He asked that the Committee send this to the full City Council so they can have a discussion on it and hope they vote to approve it so it can be forwarded to the legislature. He explained on one hand this is a simple matter, on another, complex. He said this has been a long, "tortured" history with multiple public and private owners. This is a chance to get what is essentially a landlocked piece of land for all practical purposes now developed in a marine-dependent way. The conversation in the community has indicated that some sort of bio-marine research facility is appropriate for that site if it could be financed and an organization found, it could be done but for one thing. A pure research facility is not allowed in the DPA even if it is bio-marine. That has been discussed and before the City Council on multiple occasions. Even if it weren't something of that sort, they still need to get out of the DPA first. This is the "spring-board" parcel for a fully dynamic restoration of the economic vitality of the downtown. The Council as fiduciaries has an obligation to look out for the shareholders, Gloucester's citizens. For them to sit by and allow this to float indefinitely for another period of years does not serve the people the Council represents. He asked that the motion as prepared be approved by the Committee to recommend consideration at a public hearing. He also expressed he knew there had been conversation in some quarters that they should let the process play out and let a study group go forward to do a comprehensive review of the whole of the DPA; consult with the State DEP, and other State agencies, "whose lifeblood is keeping the handcuffs on our harbor." He said he would ask them to change it for the City. He gave the example of Boston and Chelsea harbors; why take a City-owned parcel out. Their parcels were not land locked, but Gloucester's is. It will be difficult to put two parcels together. He suggested there may be those that would say why the City should take its parcel out of the DPA; it isn't fair to other property owners. To that he would say that their parcels are not landlocked; the City's is. There is a dedicated use on the parcel that will never peel away nor should it, he said, with the lobster marina and it shouldn't. It would make it "extraordinarily" difficult to tie the two parcels together. Many of those same property owners complain and want it both ways. It isn't fair that the City should take its parcel out of the DPA and leave them in. On one hand others say the City gets financial advantages if it goes ahead and is not fair to them because then it is not a level playing field. He urged the Committee to move the matter forward.

**Councilor Ciolino** stated he would not support the Council's moving to take 65 Rogers Street out of the DPA. Many landowners on the harbor are "handcuffed" as Councilor Tobey said. It sets the wrong precedent for the City to break

the “chains” on the land it owns without considering the situation throughout the harbor. While there has been development tried for a long time, there are other parcels on the harbor the owners can’t do anything with. They should wait for a comprehensive harbor plan and move forward with a recommendation when that plan comes forward. He would not support this initiative. **Councilor Verga** expressed he had an open mind on the matter and was willing to move it forward to public hearing. He could not recall when this parcel was last used in his lifetime. The **Clerk of Committees**, at the request of Councilor Tobey, read the Home Rule Petition motion as moved by **Councilor Tobey** and seconded by **Councilor Ciolino** (for the purposes of discussion only).

**Councilor Verga** explained that last year the Mayor authorized the City to participate in “remote participation” in meetings. Even though Councilor Tobey is the Chairman of P&D, the Chair has to actually be in the room, and so he is acting as Chair for this meeting. Any votes taken by the Committee while Councilor Tobey participates remotely must be taken by roll call vote.

**MOTION: On motion by Councilor Tobey, seconded by Councilor Ciolino, the Planning & Development Committee voted BY ROLL CALL 2 in favor, 1 (Ciolino) opposed to recommend to the City Council to submit a Home Rule Petition as follows to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts State Legislature for their approval:**

**“Home Rule Petition eliminating parcel located at 65 Rogers Street, Gloucester from the Designated Port Area:**

**That the Gloucester City Council requests that its State legislators file a Home Rule Petition; and based on said petition, the General Court approve and enact a Special Act as follows:**

**Section 1: Notwithstanding any general or special law, rule or regulation to the contrary, a certain parcel of land located at 65 Rogers Street, Gloucester is hereby eliminated as a Designated Port Area under C.M.R. 25 and 310 C.M.R. 9 and any other applicable provision of the Code of Massachusetts Regulations. Said parcel is located at 65 Rogers Street in the City of Gloucester, Assessor’s Map #9, Lot #1, and contains approximately 79,248 square feet of land; and is more fully described in the Order of Taking vesting title in the City of Gloucester recorded at Book 29423, Page 177 in the Essex South County Registry of Deeds.**

**Section 2: This Act shall take effect upon its passage;  
AND FURTHER TO ADVERTISE FOR PUBLIC HEARING.”**

**2. CC2012-042 (Tobey) Protection of Babson Watershed Land and Babson Bird Sanctuary pursuant to Article 97 of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts re: Consider Language for Home Rule Petition**

**Councilor Verga** expressed his understanding that this matter may not require a Home Rule Petition and asked the City Clerk to clarify the matter for the Committee. **Linda T. Lowe, City Clerk** stated that Councilor Tobey’s request she did draft language for a Home Rule Petition and sent it to the Legal Department for their review. They have not yet heard back from General Counsel. Prior to drafting the Petition, she did research on Article 97, an amendment to the State constitution passed in 1972 which declares that when votes are taken to declare land as Article 97 land that has various public purposes such as open space or watershed, that land becomes protected and stays that way in perpetuity. No changes can ever be made unless there is another Petition made to the State Legislature. Another law was recently passed that makes it even harder to undo land in Article 97 protection which is subject to passage by a two-thirds vote of the legislature to override it. She noted that it was an amendment to Constitution in 1972, and the Attorney General at that time gave an Opinion on the effect of the Article 97 on property around the State, which is still cited, that if you had public property prior to the 1972 passage, and that if that property when taken or deeded, as in the case of the land in question, some taken and some deeded, clearly had Article 97 purposes such as watershed and open space, then the land would be Article 97 land and is retroactive. She expressed it would be appropriate to see what General Counsel thinks concerning whether the Babson land does indeed already have Article 97 protection. Even without doing the Petition, the land appears to have Article 97 protection. The Home Rule petition would be “doubling up.” **Councilor Tobey** asked the question was to confirm something he already knew, and to learn something he didn’t know. He expressed gratitude to Ms. Lowe for her research into the matter because it appeared that the land already has the “handcuffs” in place to prevent people from tearing up the watershed and put in a road. He asked this go to full Council and get this reduced to a memo from General Counsel and resolution that says the Council can then file at the Registry of Deeds so it is on the record once again. He then moved and **Councilor Ciolino** seconded a motion to refer the matter to General Counsel in collaboration with the City Clerk for a confirming memo and Resolution for the vote of the City Council at their November 13, 2012 City Council meeting. **Councilor Ciolino**

expressed agreement with Councilor Tobey; and didn't know of anyone who wished to see this property built upon. It was their obligation to protect it. **Ms. Lowe** noted that a document was given to the Committee tonight on the research that shows the Attorney General's opinion (on file).

**MOTION: On motion by Councilor Tobey, seconded by Councilor Ciolino, the Planning & Development Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed to refer this matter to General Counsel for collaboration with the City Clerk for a confirming memo and Resolution to be attached for the Council's consideration and adoption on the Protection of Babson Watershed Land and Babson Bird Sanctuary pursuant to Article 97 of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to be filed at the Essex County South Registry of Deeds; and that this be available for the City Council meeting of November 13, 2012.**

**Councilor Tobey left the meeting 7:18 p.m. Councilor McGeary entered the meeting as an alternate member of the Committee.**

**3. Consideration of a non-binding referendum question on the disposition of the Fuller School**

**This matter is continued to December 5, 2012.**

**4. Essex County Velo Gloucester Grand Prix Cyclo Cross Race held on September 29-30, 2012 at Stage Fort Park**

**Mark Cole**, Assistant DPW Director stated he walked the course the day after the event. He walked it after Wolf Hill Landscaping did the repairs and there were several areas that needed more attention after the rain event. He and Mr. McKechnie walked the course and agreed it need additional attention. Wolf Hill agreed to come back and do that. They were going to hold off until after the cross country race, two weeks after the Velo event. Wolf Hill went Friday the following day, and hit all the areas again. There is a lot of grass starting to grow. A worker reported the baseball field has a lot of grass starting to grow. He will reevaluate in the spring and have Wolf Hill walk that course again. **Councilor Verga** noted they will not resolve the matter at this meeting. He stated there were a number of emails received in favor of the event and a number of emails raising issues on the condition of the park after the Essex County Velo event.

**George Roark**, 50 Beauport Avenue, Gloucester expressed his disagreement with Mr. Cole's assessment of the condition of Stage Fort Park following the event and reviewed a series of 14 color photographs taken by him (submitted and placed on file) which he exhibited and narrated for the Committee as follows:

**#1** dated 10/21/12 shows the top of the embankment at the playground that was used as a run up. He commented there is no protection there. **#2** dated 10/21/12 shows the embankment that they come up and shows the erosion. **#3** is the bottom of the embankment on the Lucy Davis pathway and shows the dirt coming down onto the pathway. **#4** dated 10/11/12 shows the dirt almost as high as the wall which he stated was never taken care of and claimed it was currently in the same condition. **#5** dated 10/21/12 shows the Lucy Davis pathway. He expressed the opinion that the topsoil has been eroded over the 14 years this event has been run. There are all stones on top of it. It has never been fixed. The event had 1,622 bicycles go over the path, and those bicyclists did multiple laps per race. **#6** dated 10/21/12 taken at the Sam Parisi ball field shows the grass growing on top of the rocks there.

**Councilor Verga** stated he made a site visit with Councilor Whyntott on October 11<sup>th</sup> walking the park with Mr. Roark.

**#7** dated 10/11/12 shows a field going down to the garden park. **Mr. Roark** claimed there has been nothing done with this land. The ruts are there and not resolved. It has been only seeded. **#8** dated 10/21/12 shows the condition of the ballpark behind the bench in the in-field. **#9** dated 10/21/12 is by Cressy's Beach. Nothing was done to the path. **Councilor Verga** stated based on his trip he also saw that there had been no remediation of the conditions there. He saw the grass cut. **#10** dated 10/24/12 shows a boulder behind the Visitor's Center on that road. This boulder was moved by a machine or a person. There are a lot of scrape marks on it. Another boulder was moved to make a path for the cycling race. **#11** dated 10/11/12 shows the cut made through the bushes; which **Mr. Roark** suggested someone from the event staff or the DPW did this to make another pathway for the cyclists. **#12** dated 10/21/12 shows sand dragged up off of Half Moon Beach. This event used the beach for part of their course and built a ramp. **#13** dated 10/21/12 is near Cressy's Beach showing erosion and no remediation. **#14** dated 10/11/12 shows the land between the Gloucester Civic Garden Club which has a statute and the Gloucester Garden Club plot; at the widest point it is 15 feet wide. The race used it to go down the Lucy Davis path. He stated the work hasn't been done. **Mr. Roark** further stated that the Lucy Davis pathway has to be protected. It is not good for walking. **Councilor Ciolino** asked what he thought the solution is. **Mr. Roark** responded in his opinion it would be to put

the park into the condition it was prior to the race. He went yesterday and saw the work that had been done. To protect areas that have been repaired he suggested stakes should be placed so as to prevent pedestrian access to protect the remediated areas. The park, he said, is for the citizens of Gloucester; and the park is being destroyed and not being repaired.

**Paul Boudreau**, Race Director, Essex County Velo stated this was the first time he is hearing a lot of this information. While he knew there was damage [to the park], the repairs they've done in conjunction with Wolf Hill have been satisfactory. This is the first time to his knowledge it hasn't been the case. **Councilors Verga and Ciolino** stated they have heard complaints of the condition of the park after the two-day event for four years. **Councilor Verga** added they hear it every year. They get assurances the park will be repaired but it isn't. **Mr. Boudreau** responded he reviewed the supporting documentation in the agenda packet, and noted in particular people think he is coming in from out of town and making a "boatload of money." They don't go home with paychecks. This is not the way he makes money. They are not here to ruin a park and leave. They proactively work with Mr. Cole to see the park returned to its proper state. He will work on specific actionable items. The series moves to Providence, RI to Roger Williams Park. Last week the series was in Northampton, MA. The promoters deal with the local parks to do landscaping and haven't heard of any ill will. Essex County Velo isn't the only promoter who does this. Councilor Ciolino pointed out there is no parking revenue and asked what income the City received from the event itself. **Mr. Cole** stated there is the rental fee (\$250/day) for the park itself. They charge for the event days only, and not for the days the event sets up. There is no parking revenue because there is none charged for parking at Stage Fort Park at that time of year. Essex County Velo has already paid the bill for the DPW expenses of just over \$2,000. As to the boulders being moved, the DPW moves them every year for this race and then move them back. **Mr. Boudreau** added they move the boulders for the race and then return them back to prevent vehicles from accessing the park. He stated their organization has never cut bushes or trees in Stage Fort Park. **Councilor Verga** noted there was an eye witness. **Mr. Roark** stated his wife and he saw years ago there was someone cutting up on the embankment. They didn't know who did it. Shortly after that it was used for the race. **Mr. Boudreau** reiterated they have never cut bushes or trees but only weed whacked to assure safety for the cyclists. **Councilor Ciolino** asked if \$2,000 has made the park whole. Mr. Cole stated that money has nothing to do with the repair of the park. It was to cover the expenses incurred by the DPW. **Mr. Boudreau** stated Essex County Velo pays Wolf Hill directly. Within a few days of getting there Wolf Hill was delayed due to rain. They did their initial work, and Mr. Cole was not 100 percent satisfied. They did a re-assessment with Wolf Hill and two Fridays ago Wolf Hill went back, October 26<sup>th</sup>. **Mr. Roark** reported the conditions are essentially unchanged. They did change by the sandbox, behind the ball field, with soil and seeds. They put it down by the two parks and that was about it. It was covered with some loam and seed. **Councilor Ciolino** stated they hear every year from the Little League people. They put down loam and seed and the ruts are still there. The grass grows into the ruts. To complicate the process more, it looks flat but then the kids run for a ball they fall into the ruts. Remediation is not being done correctly. He said there is major reconstruction needs to happen; that the damage is cumulative. They need someone to properly compact the soil to make sure it is flat. The park is a major City resource. He knows the City does well, but this is a great deal to the event organizers for \$500. **Mr. Boudreau** pointed out it costs \$75,000 to run a two day event such as this to pull the event. **Councilor McGeary** asked if grading should be part of the plan. Mr. Cole stated in a lot of the years Wolf Hill goes through with a power rake and adds loam and seed. He pointed out that the Little League has not called his office to complain about park conditions after any race. The cyclists do go through the outfield but not on the in-field. **Councilor Ciolino** asked Mr. Cole to speak with "Bucky" Rogers, head of the Gloucester Little League organization about it. **Councilor Verga** stated when he viewed the park it just looked like seed was tossed down. The event has grown from a one day event with 150 riders to a two-day event with 1,600 encompassing a great portion of the park. The Councilor expressed his disappointment in himself and his fellow Councilors for approving this event without having a clear remediation plan in place. **David Dow**, 12 Essex Street stated he was the originator of the letter in the Times which initiated this post-event evaluation. He expressed the opinion that the only way to fix the situation is to stop the race. He said a careful walk through will show that Mr. Roark's pictures are accurate. He questioned why the City should allow the damage to be done every year and asked they stop permitting the race. **Mr. Roark** added he would be willing to walk the park with anyone from the City and with Mr. Boudreau. He noted he did complain in 2005 and presented the complaints to a Councilor at that time. **Councilor Verga** stated there is time before Essex County Velo comes forward for another permit. He would like to see new pictures that look satisfactory and suggested they need a plan to pull the event in so as not to include the entire breadth of the park. The Committee will have to see an action plan to return the park to its former state, and to see if it is worth the City's while. If the end result this public asset is off limits for two days and it looks like a war zone after, then he would expect something to come back to P&D on the progress and action plan especially for the serious damage to be remediated. Next year when they come back they will reconsider this seriously.

**Councilor Ciolino** pointed out the Rotary Club has invested over \$250,000 into Stage Fort Park. The children's park there was declared one of the best in Massachusetts, and they are proud of it. **Councilor McGeary** asked how many times the cyclists go around the course. **Mr. Boudreau** stated the lap times were long. He did compete, and did four laps in his flight with other flights of cyclists taking less or more laps, depending on the flight. Councilor McGeary asked they get it fixed; keep careful records and look to make the course less damaging. **Councilor Verga** stated these are suggestions; but if the race organization waits until July, and it looks the same, the Committee will have to make a careful consideration of their application. He would like to see "Part B," pictures of the park in satisfactory condition.

**This is continued to the second meeting of the Committee in January 2013.**

**The committee recessed at 7:51 p.m. and reconvened at 7:58 p.m.**

**5. *PP2012-003: Application by National Grid for the installation of underground electric conduits located substantially at Atlantic Road #149 – Public Hearing***

**This public hearing is open.**

**Councilor Verga** stated this public hearing will be continued. **Ms. Lowe** explained that the DPW Director has expressed concern about certain specifics of this particular pole petition and is working with the Legal Department on it. He expects to have a recommendation for the Committee at their December 5<sup>th</sup> meeting. National Grid was contacted and advised that because of this they did not need to send a representative to the meeting tonight which was acknowledged by them in writing via email (on file). **Councilor Verga** noted no other interested parties were in the conference room for the public hearing.

**This matter is continued to December 5, 2012.**

**6. *Establishment of a proposed partnership between the City and the Downtown Gloucester Cultural District Committee (Cont'd from 10/17/12)***

**Judith Hoglander**, Co-Chair of the Downtown Gloucester Cultural District Committee and member of the Committee for the Arts stated they were unaware of concerns that were brought forward at the last P&D meeting, and to whom they were being directed. There were mixed issues expressed at that time. Councilor Tobey had asked they talk with the people who had the concerns. Again, it was unclear which group should be meeting with them. Because of personal issues she was not able to do a large meeting. Some of the concerns dealt with a lot of the changes in the downtown and harbor area. Mentioned were I4-C2, the Mt. Auburn study, the Harbor Walk, and other issues which are a lot of changes and new things. She understood that one of the concerns was that all of them needed to have a meeting with Sarah Garcia, Harbor Planning Director, and many people at the table to address these concerns and how they were coming to interconnecting plans. She had suggested a meeting after the first of the year. She hoped that would address some of these concerns at that time. She asked Catherine Ryan, a member of the Committee for the Arts to have conversations with Joanne Constanza, who had appeared at the last P&D meeting, to listen to her concerns and expressed her hope that they were all in a good place. **Joanne Castano**, 6 Old Bray Street stated there have been folks in the community who have been confused about things moving along so fast. People were concerned that they had the Harbor Walk, then the Cultural District which she had been heavily involved in cultural economic development, and SEArts. All of these issues, and initiatives and bring that economy focused into Gloucester and Cape Ann. It appears to many people that all of these matters are overlapping. Pieces within that have planning are called for. Communication between these groups and organizations is not happening, in her opinion. She expressed her opinion it appears that the Harbor Walk is influencing the cultural district and then the commission for the \$50,000 for public art. People are concerned about the public art to be associated with the Harbor Walk; that the commission came quickly to the Committee for the Arts, and that they are rushing to implementation quickly; and that the Harbor Walk is becoming that cultural district. **Ms. Hoglander** explained the process is that after the public hearing they would make their application to the Massachusetts Cultural Council (MCC). Jim Duggan, CAO will be the contact person for the City. The MCC would look at the application, then schedule a site visit and look at the proposed map (on file). In mid-January they will have partners that have signed on representing a cross-section of the downtown who will meet. The primary partner is the City. Any artists can become partners. There will be opportunities for discussion. Anything in that partnership to be implemented would be done after careful considered. **Ms. Castano** added that

much of their issue is tourism to the City. Through the Harbor Plan, the arts are under tourism. The State went through the reorganization of the State departments. Culture and art are being pushed in the direction of tourism that is affecting their industry significantly and suggested that artists are leaving the City because of it. **Councilor Ciolino** asked for clarification on who Ms. Castano was associated with and who were the artists leaving the City. **Ms. Castano** stated it is just a group of artists she is with. She did not enumerate further about artists leaving the City. She said that they are concerned about the direction of tourism. **Councilor Ciolino** asked what this has to do with the formation of the Downtown Cultural District. **Ms. Castano** stated this group of artists are for the Cultural District, but that they need a conversation about tourism and cultural tourism; and all of these agencies talking together to let the artists explain what they need. She reiterated they are for the cultural district as part of the creative community. However, she stated it appears that the Harbor Walk is pushing the arts agenda.

**Councilor Verga** asked if they have a timeframe to get a resolution voted, suggesting there was still time for everyone to have their discussions. **Ms. Hoglander** stated there are many issues involved. This is not just the cultural district and not just the Committee for the Arts. It requires a lot of participants. She proposed that an answer would be to have a larger meeting after the holidays with City departments and all the people together to sort this out. The nature of the cultural district and partnership agreement since the City is the lead partner would allow citizens to channel their input through it. She offered another option by recommending to these artists that they have positions open on the Committee for the Arts and encouraged them to come forward to sit on the Committee by making their interest known to the Mayor's office. Rather than a lot of separate organizations, she urged they come to the organization that already exists.

Councilor Cox made clear that even if the Harbor Walk didn't exist, the cultural district application would still go through. One is not dependent on the other. Rather, they compliment each other and are separate. The public hearing will move the cultural districts application forward to the MCC. They still have to make their decision. There is still time to pull out even after the public hearing. This is to get it to the State to see if they would allow for the formation of the cultural district. This is just saying the City is willing to partner for the cultural district. Many of their volunteers wear multiple hats. There is a lot of cross pollination. **Robert Whitmarsh**, Co-Chair of the Downtown Gloucester Cultural District Committee added the cultural district is very separate from the Harbor Walk. The cultural district, once identified, is done. It is always open to change that is more sensitive to those who it will affect. It is to enhance art activity not to exploit it for other reasons. **Ms. Castano** stated they need the input from the art community. Sometimes there is misunderstanding of where the community would like to see it go. She asked for better communication for communicating when meetings are taking place. Mr. Whitmarsh also pointed out that the Harbor Walk is not the boundary of the proposed cultural district; the waterfront is. **Lise Breen**, 14 Emerald Street stated she hasn't conversed with Ms. Castano and asked what group she represented and how many artists there were. **Ms. Castano** stated it is a group of about 14 artists who are looking at their assets and the threats to it; they will do a visioning about the creative development of Gloucester. **Ms. Breen** stated they have made genuine efforts to get the word out to email blast to SEArts; on Good Morning Gloucester blog, and by other means. The Harbor Walk was designed not just as a tourism push but to enhance livability in the City for all of its residents. The Harbor Walk does not equal tourism. **Katherine Ryan**, 17 High Rock Road and a member of the Committee for the Arts stated that the partners for the cultural district will speak to all these things. As to the make up of the cultural district, they have a partnership from Art Haven, many artists who want to have art along the Harbor Walk, etc. They have a group of 14 saying slow down, but there is a huge range. The North Shore Art Association, the Gloucester Public Schools, Art Haven are all partners. There has been tremendous outreach. Those partners wouldn't have signed on if this was inappropriate. This is the balance and compromise. She expressed that the sweeping comments are not true for all. **Councilor Ciolino** stated he would like to see the cultural district move forward. **Councilor McGeary** expressed agreement. While he said he respected Ms. Castano's remarks, he noted this is designed to foster the arts in the City, and time is of the essence. **Councilor Verga** encouraged conversation and that the public hearing will be on November 13<sup>th</sup> before the City Council.

**MOTION: On motion by Councilor Ciolino, seconded by Councilor McGeary, the Planning & Development Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed to adopt a RESOLUTION by the City of Gloucester, Massachusetts to create a state-authorized cultural district as shown on the map presented and incorporated by reference, for at least (5) years, to be named:**

**Downtown Gloucester Cultural District**

**WHEREAS, the City wishes to pursue a state-authorized cultural district through the enabling legislation Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 10, Section 58A.**

**WHEREAS, the City has a mixed-use geographical area that has a concentration of cultural facilities and assets.**

**WHEREAS, the City has held a public hearing and adopted a resolution proclaiming its interest in establishing a state-designated cultural district.**

**WHEREAS, the City has created a broad and diverse partnership of stakeholders committed to cultural, community and economic development to provide oversight of the district.**

**WHEREAS, the Massachusetts Cultural Council will be petitioned in accordance with its guidelines and criteria to designate said cultural district.**

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Gloucester that the City of Gloucester:**

**Article 1. Endorses the submission of this application and agrees to foster the development of a cultural district.**

**Article 2. Endorses the state-sponsored cultural district goals: attracting artists and cultural enterprises, encouraging business and job development, establishing tourist destinations, preserving and reusing historic buildings, enhancing property values and fostering local cultural development.**

**Article 3. Will appoint a city official to represent the city within the district partnership of said cultural district.**

**Article 4. Encourages all who own property or businesses within said cultural district to involve themselves and participate in the full development of the cultural district.**

**Article 5. Directs city agencies to identify programs and services that could support and enhance the development of the cultural district and ensure that those programs and services are accessible to the cultural district.**

**A motion was made, seconded and voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 9:08 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted,

Dana C. Jorgenson  
Clerk of Committees

**DOCUMENTS/ITEMS SUBMITTED AT MEETING:**

- 14 color photographs of the conditions at Stage Fort Park on or after October 11, 2012 by George Roark