



**CITY OF GLOUCESTER
PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES**

June 20, 2013 - 7:00 P.M.

**Kyrouz Auditorium, City Hall, 9 Dale Avenue, Gloucester
Richard Noonan, Chair**

Members Present: Rick Noonan, Chair, Linda Charpentier, Joe Orlando, Marvin Kushner, Henry McCarl, Karen Gallagher, Mary Black- **Absent**

Staff Present: Gregg Cademartori, Planning Director, Pauline Doody, Recording Clerk

Also Present: Tom Daniel, Community Development Director, Matt Coogan, Senior Planner

I. BUSINESS

- A. Call to Order with a Quorum of the Planning Board
- B. Introduction of Planning Board Members and Staff
- C. Approval of Planning Board Minutes of June 6, 2013

Motion: Approval of the June 6, 2013 minutes.

1st: Henry McCarl

2nd: Marvin Kushner

Vote: Approved 6-0

II. PUBLIC COMMENT - None

III. CONSENT AGENDA

Planning Board to consider the Approval Not Required Plan submitted by Alexander J. Destino, Jr. & Mara L. Destino at 24 Wonson Street at (Assessors Map 129, Lot 9).

Presenter: Dan Ottenheimer, Mill River Consulting

Mr. Ottenheimer explained that the property is on Rocky Neck and the owners would like to divide the parcel into 2 lots. Each lot has adequate area and frontage. The existing lot will maintain access through Front St. and the new lot will have access of Horton St.

Mr. Cademartori stated has both the frontage and meet the width requirements.

Motion: The subdivision control law does not apply to 24 Wonson Street at (Assessors Map 129, Lot 9).

1st: Joe Orlando

2nd: Linda Charpentier

Vote: Approved 6-0

Planning Board to consider Approval Not Required Plan submitted by Brandon O'Connor et.al. at 14 Brown Street (Assessors Map 128, Lot 28).

Presenter: Attorney Michael Faherty

Attorney Faherty explained to the board that the property was divided under section 3.5 of the zoning ordinance. The structure predates the date of the Subdivision Control Law and relief was granted by the Board of Appeals. It will be two lots.

Mr. Cademartori clarified that the lot was handled in the terms of the dimensional relief needed.

Attorney Faherty confirmed it was handled in the Board of Appeals decision which also included the shed that was in violation.

Mr. Cademartori requested a copy of the decision.

Motion: The Subdivision Control Law does not apply to 14 Brown Street (Assessors Map 128, Lot 28).

1st: Karen Gallagher

2nd: Henry McCarl

Vote: Approved 6-0

IV. Other Business

1. Discussion with the Plan Implementation Review Committee regarding Community Development Plan review.

William Fonvielle 27 Olde Salem Road, Chair PIRC

Mr. Fonvielle addressed the Planning Board regarding the PIRC's efforts in updating its 2001 plan. On October 19, 2009 the Planning Board voted unanimously for a set of actions from the PIRC. The plan is to be a living document which speaks about continuous improvement and to recommend changes to the plan to the Planning Board for review. The plan will be a virtual plan available on line on the city's website. Sections of the plan were to be updated and then reviewed by the Community Development office and then it would be passed on to the Planning Board for consideration. At that time, the Planning Board would then take the appropriate actions necessary. Mr. Fonvielle contended that the PIRC has received no support from the Planning Board or from the Community Development Department. He also contended that the Tom Daniels, Community Development Director has a deep philosophical difference with the PIRC and has prohibited the community development office from reviewing the plan. The PIRC has believes an impasse has been reached. The plan needs to be reviewed from the city planning office. The goal of the PIRC is to develop a high quality product for the City of Gloucester, but needs the knowledge and technical expertise of the Community Development Office and Planning Board to bring the plan to fruition. Mr. Fonvielle stated he would like the Planning Board to take several actions;

- reiterate the recommendation of the memo dated October 2009,
- A letter/memo from the Planning Board to the Community Development Director and cc'd to the Mayor that asks for some commitment of staff resources from Community Development
- Regular reports to be presented to the Planning Board

Tom Daniels, Community Development Director

Mr. Daniels responded to Mr. Fonvielle statement by stating there has been a misunderstanding of his views regarding the PIRC. The process in developing a plan is key. Planning processes are community led or have a strong community component. Regarding the plan as a living plan or whether plans can be amended; Mr. Daniels stated he agrees with a living plan. A living plan is used to guide policy and decision making. If it sits on a shelf, it doesn't serve the community. A plan is developed and adopted at one point in time. It serves as a guide of work going forward and as a point of reference to engage what has been done and what work needs to be done. If the base plan is changed you have impacted the integrity of the plan and the point of reference is lost. A plan can be amended, but the process used to amend the plan is as important as how it was developed; amendments to an existing plan, not an editing or rewriting of an existing adopted plan. The views on the work should be considered a commentary on the Plan not an update to it. As a commentary piece, the integrity of the original plan is not impacted. The plan can still serve to mark the point in time when it was developed and adopted and can continue to serve as a reference point for what has been accomplished and what remains to be done. As a commentary piece on the plan there is not a concern about the process that was used to develop that commentary or the level of community engagement that was involved in developing that commentary piece. The community development plan continues to serve as a

living plan. Long range planning work guided by, but the focus has shifted in terms of geography and topical areas. The department's efforts will continue in this vain and seize opportunities of grant funding. Mr. Daniels summarized stating that there has been a disconnect around the expectations of the tasks that PIRC has been performing. A plan is adopted and stands as it is at the time it is adopted. Changes to the plan require a robust public process. In contrast, a commentary about the plan can be done anytime without violating the integrity of the plan and without requiring public process. The difference is changing the plan vs commenting on the plan.

Ms. Gallagher asked if the city is planning to review the current plan and what are the means to do so. She also asked if the review would be done in its entirety or in small edits as needed. She stated the only way to see a new plan being developed is to have a meeting with the public or it could be taken in segments.

Mr. Daniels stated there was not a plan for a comprehensive update as it is very intensive in terms of staffing. The community development office is focusing on smaller plans with the resources available. A plan can be amended and updated but the process that is used is very important. Editing it by a subcommittee of the planning board does not meet the task of community engagement process that is needed for an amendment of a plan.

The board discussed at length the process to be used to review the PIRC plan of 2001. They agreed that reviewing the plan with the recommended amendments without having a red-lined version showing what the original plans were would be an impossible task. The board's decided to accept an original and red lined copy of the plan for review and to create a process to bring the work forward. The appropriate process to make any changes to the plan will be determined at the end of the review period.

Motion: To receive from PIRC a working document showing what is currently in place and what is suggested as changes for the Planning Boards consideration.

1st: Joe Orlando

2nd: Karen Gallagher

Vote: Approved 6-0

Michael Rubin 58 Warner St.

Mr. Rubin stated he appreciates the discussion being held. He stated that anything that can be done to keep the plan open and transparent will be beneficial to the citizens of Gloucester.

2. Harbor Planning Update

Mr. Noonan reported that the Tuesday night meeting was cancelled.

3. Planning Staff Update

Mr. Cademartori introduced Matt Coogan, Senior Planner, to the Planning Board.

V. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

VI. NEXT MEETING

Next regular meeting of the Planning Board July 18, 2013

Planning Board Members: If you are unable to attend the next meeting please contact the Planning Office at (978)281-9781.