

**Planning & Development Committee**  
Wednesday, June 3, 2015 – 5:30 p.m.  
**1<sup>st</sup> Fl. Council Committee Room – City Hall**  
- Minutes –

**Present:** Chair, Councilor Greg Verga; Councilor Steven LeBlanc; Councilor Joe Ciolino, Alternate  
**Absent:** Paul Lundberg

**Also Present:** Councilor ; City Clerk Linda Lowe; Mike Hale; Chip Payson, Attorney Mark Nestor, Attorney Thomas Callaghan, Ashley Gullett, Mark McDonough Peter Glynn, Robert Henriques, Attorney Michael Faherty, Tom Daniel, Attorney Edward Pare, David Maxson, Dan Goulet

**The meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m. Matters were taken out of order. There was a quorum of the City Council when Councilors Fonvielle, Cox and McGeary entered the meeting.**

**1. *Special Event Application: request to hold Main Street Block Parties, June 20, July 18, and August 15, 2015 And September 4, 2015***

Ashley Gullett said she is the coordinator that the Mayor hired this year to take over the Block Parties and informed the Committee that there will be four block parties, the dates being June 20, July 28, August 15 and September 4, a Friday night party that was a compromise date with the Special Events Committee. Mr. Gullett informed the committee that the same activities would be going on as in the past years from 6:00 p.m. to 11:00 p.m. The Chair asked the City Clerk, Linda Lowe, to give the committee report from the Special Events meeting. Ms. Lowe told the P&D Committee that Ms. Gullett came before the Special Events Committee and that the Sept. 4 date was not on the application but is included in the motion they have before them. It was changed from the originally proposed date of Saturday, September 5 at the request of Police Chief McCarthy. Ms. Lowe referenced a plan that was submitted with the application and outlined the areas on the plan and what the minor changes were compared to last year. Councilor Ciolino wanted to make sure the Topside Grille is part of the Block Party if they choose to participate and wanted his statement included in the record that downtown is more than just Main Street. Ms. Lowe responded that if you took the map and outlined the perimeters along Rogers Street then this would ensure that everyone would be included. Mr. Mark McDonough asked whether this would include Katrina's Restaurant on Rogers Street as he would like to see the Block Party expand and would this require another permit and reconfiguration or just a change in the permit application. Councilor Verga said that the title should be generic "Gloucester Block Parties" as there was some discussion of having one in Magnolia, and thinks the mapping should include Topside Grille this year and next year if other wanted to be included to just extend the map. Councilor Ciolino brought this up because the Licensing Board is confused in thinking that just because establishments are not on Main Street then they cannot participate and this is not what the intentions are. The message has to be sent to the Licensing Board that any establishment on Rogers Street can also participate. Councilor Verga said in regard to the confusion with the Licensing Board that there is no way the new ordinance before O&A would not be done in time for the first block party. General Counsel Chip Payson said that they are running parallel with the P&D and that the Licensing Board Chair is on board and understands this. He said that for expediency sake for this block party they are doing everything the same time. The City Clerk said that Councilor McGeary is talking to the Licensing Board for some type of method that can be used for them to discuss whichever restaurants are in front of them when they meet on June 9 that would allow those restaurants to go forward even though the ordinance is not in place yet. Ms. Lowe reminded Ms. Gullett that a revised final map must be submitted before June 20.

**MOTION: On a motion by Councilor LeBlanc , seconded by Councilor Ciolino , the Planning and Development Committee voted 3 in favor , 0 opposed to recommend that the City Council approve a Special Events Permit to hold the Downtown Block Party Series on Saturday, June 20, 2015; Saturday, July 18, 2015; Saturday, August 15, 2015; and Friday, September 4, 2015 in order to temporarily close Main Street from the open driveway of Bank Gloucester to Washington Street for each date for four separate occasions between the hours of 5:00 p.m. and 11 p.m. with the following conditions:**

1. No vendor/merchant set ups on the sidewalk blocking entrance ways to retail or residential units, hydrants, crosswalks, or handicap ramps.
2. All vendor set ups in the street are to allow for no less than a 10 foot unobstructed, drivable area along the entire route - slightly wider at the curve of Palazola's Sporting Goods- to maintain

- adequate access for emergency vehicles. Failure to provide a 10 foot unobstructed margin of drivable area may necessitate the removal or relocation of the vendor/merchant at the discretion of the Fire Department, the Police Department, or the Block Party Committee.
3. The organizers shall allow the Fire Department drive-through access with the fire engine at the convenience of the Fire Department.
  4. Any restaurant/merchant set up of tables and chairs, tents, or area enclosures should extend into the street no further than the lines painted on the street for vehicular parking.
  5. That all of the side streets – Short, Porter, Center, and Hancock Streets – shall not be blocked by vendors, food establishments, tables, chairs, enclosures, equipment, or vehicles, so emergency vehicles may enter and exit Main Street as needed.
  6. Vendor/merchants shall be responsible for their own trash removal.
  7. Signs indicating the location of comfort stations shall be the responsibility of the Block Party Committee.
  8. Plumbing Codes and regulations shall be adhered to regarding use of restaurant bathroom facilities.
  9. Special lighting and electrical requirements necessitate approval of the Inspector of Buildings and the Electrical Inspector.
  10. The closure of the street at the intersection of Main and Short, Porter, Center, and Hancock Streets must be by means of sawhorses or the like, as directed by the Gloucester Police Department.
  11. It is the responsibility of the Block Party Committee to procure any other necessary Federal, State, and local permits and approvals associated with this event.
  12. That the Committee makes reasonable notification to all residents and merchants along the route that will be affected by the closure.
  13. Restaurants or vendors wishing to serve food outside must notify the Board of Health 7 (seven) days in advance for approval and must obtain any necessary approval of the Block Party Committee.
  14. Conditions or permitting requirements imposed by the Gloucester Licensing Board shall also apply and shall become incorporated herein as to the outdoor/sidewalk service of food and alcohol.
  15. All other applicable laws, City ordinances, and/or regulations are in full force including Ordinances regarding blocking of sidewalks. The Police Department will enforce these requirements in the interest of public safety.
  16. The Block Party Committee shall also adhere to any requirements expressed by the Special Event Advisory Committee including that:
    - (a) Written permission is to be obtained from the Assistant Public Works Director to close the public parking lot behind the Rogers Street entrance to the Dog Bar Restaurant for any performances, and
    - (b) That a letter from the office of the Mayor be provided assuring that the event is covered by the City of Gloucester Insurance, and
    - (c) this approval is based on the Gloucester Block Party 2015 Street Plan submitted to the Council to be filed with the Certificate of Vote.
2. *SCP2015-003: 15 Western Avenue, Unit No. 2 (“Condominium), Assessors Map 2, Lot 69, Modification of a Special City Council Permit granted on June 6, 2000 under GZO Sec. 2.3.1(4)(a) (GZO 2008 Sec. 2.3.1.6)*

**Councilor Verga** stated for the record under MGL c268A, that there is a unit for sale that is listed with his office. They are all independent contractors, and he has absolutely no connection to the listing and will receive no monetary compensation when the unit sells.

**Attorney Mark Nestor**, 45 Middle Street, representing the petitioner, and they are before the committee seeking an amendment to the special city council permit that was issued in 2000 by the city council. They are seeking relief to allow the third bedroom of the unit #2 condominiums to maintain in its current condition. The original plans called for four units which were then amended to three units and unit #2 had two bedrooms and a deck. The deck was subsequently enclosed. There has been ongoing litigation which has recently been settled between the City and the Trust. The copy of the agreement for judgement was attached to the application and believe that the requirements of the special council permit conditions have been pretty much met. Essentially what they are doing is allowing the third bedroom to be remain enclosed and rather than the deck. He would submit that it would be more beneficial to the unit for the third bedroom that is enclosed rather than a deck that can be outside with parties. There would be no impact to traffic and utilities, this is a minor alteration to a pre-existing structure that it is still consistent with the neighborhood character, he said. The lot area has been built up and is slightly larger as is the parking area and spaces than are required. The only impact is that the third bedroom will provide additional taxes to the city in addition to the

agreement for judgement that if this is approved, Partners will be paying \$40,000 to the city of Gloucester for back taxes. Councilor Ciolino corrected what attorney Nestor said in that it is not back taxes but fines. **Attorney Nestor** responded that the classified it as something different in the judgement. Attorney Nestor conceded that it was \$40,000 but that it would be disallowed if they paid the \$40,000 in fines and demolished the third bedroom and it goes back to a deck. Councilor Ciolino said he was quite familiar with this situation and has been going on for a long time and that all the parties were in agreement to bring it to a settlement.

**Councilor Verga**, acknowledged there were members of the audience who wanted to speak to the Special Council Permit Application reminded them that this was a not a public hearing but a public meeting. However, with the assent of the Committee, he said he would allow some comments from the public.

**Attorney J. Michael Faherty**, representing Brian Wall, 13 Western Avenue, which is immediately adjacent to this property said Mr. Nestor stated that this was just a minor alteration of a pre-existing building, and suggested this was not the case. He said that there is a very difficult and drawn out history to this matter that needed to be recognized before the committee vote. He then spoke about the original plans and permitting process that went back to the original developer, Constellation Group. He then spoke about the front and rear setbacks, maximum building height, open space per dwelling unit and presented the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) Decision dated 10/17/00 to the Committee (placed on file). He said this was omitted from the Special Council Permit modification application. He spoke about the neighbors, including his client, that spoke to the developer, Constellation Group, design. Mr. Faherty also produced a photograph to the Committee (placed on file) from Mr. Wall's house showing when the construction first started and was brought to the attention of the building inspector, as approved by the ZBA and by City Council, that the plans did not show the enclosing of the deck. Mr. Faherty said that this permit that applicant is trying to modify has lapsed, and stated that in his opinion that a decision cannot be modified that has been lapsed for fifteen years.

**Linda Dalton**, owner of 15 Western Avenue Unit #1, said that she had been a resident in the condominium for seven years. **Ms. Dalton** was also representing her neighbor, Mr. Ware, the owner of Unit #3, along with her husband who could not attend the meeting. She presented to the Committee a legal document (placed on file) an Amendment to Master Deed of the Condo Association of 15 Western Avenue to take down the addition. She said all the owners met and signed the document which needed a one hundred percent vote. She presented a blueprint to the Committee (on file) of what the building would look like after the addition was taken down and was recorded at the Registry of Deeds. The reason she believed for this agreement was for Mr. Gattineri to take down the addition and reinstate his occupancy permit.

**William Sanborn, Building Inspector**, said that the Committee heard the story and there is no much he could dispute. This matter has been brought to five different courts and the city has prevailed every time. It has been a long difficult process and would like to see this matter resolved. **Councilor Ciolino asked Mr. Sanborn** about the interim building inspector, at the time when the original renovation of the building began, and if gave permission to go ahead with the project. Mr. Sanborn replied in the affirmative and when he was the building inspector he revoked the permit. **Mr. Ciolino asked Mr. Sanborn** on whether Gloucester has a history of taking down a building in violation of zoning violations. Mr. Sanborn replied it has never been done in Gloucester but Courts can order it as they did in a case in Marblehead.

**Councilor LeBlanc** agreed with Mr. Sanborn that this matter needs to be resolved. After listening to both sides, he will could not support this modification.

**Mr. Nestor** rebuttal to **Ms. Dalton and Mr. Faherty's** statements is that one of the reasons they were here is that the city and his client have entered into extensive negotiations and into a recent agreement for the problem to be resolved. If they didn't have an agreement they wouldn't be in front of the committee. The amendment to the master deed for the demolition was a requirement as the agreement for judgement calls for the fact if the modification to the special permit isn't granted to his client would have to demolish that part of the building. This could not be done with the existing by-laws of the condo. If this modification is allowed that it will alleviate one of Ms. Dalton's problems that the unit would probably be sold so it would not have an endless circle of tenants. In his opinion, you would probably want to have someone with ownership in the condo versus a series of tenants. In response to Mr. Faherty's statements, contrary to his representation, the packet that the committee received contained the agreement for judgment and the special permit with the application. This was initially allowed to be a four unit nine bedroom two car garage conversion from a two family before the then owners Constellation went bankrupt, the bank foreclosed and instead of leaving it unfinished it was sold to his client. They are now looking for a three unit seven bedroom no enclosed two car garage. They are clearly downsizing what the special permit was authorized for and this committee needs to take that into consideration. This matter is still ongoing and the Superior Court has not dismissed this case and potentially this could be ongoing litigation still. He would submit that based on the ongoing litigation (1) the court not saying congratulations and you have to demolish it or (2) it is completely dead in the water. The permit is

still in effect which is why the agreement for judgement is on record with the Superior Court. This is the intention of his client and the city of Gloucester to resolve this matter. He would submit that if the only actual issue is the view, as he understood from Mr. Faherty that his client at 13 Western Avenue, the view is not going to be much different block from the third bedroom versus blocked if you have a deck. A blockage of a view by itself is not a basis to deny a permit. It is in the best interest of everyone involved that this modification of the special permit be allowed and move forward. Councilor Verga asked the City Clerk to give brief history of this matter leading up to and including the litigation. Ms. Lowe replied that the special council permit granted originally by the council was litigated for several years because the owners ignored the plans approved by the ZBA which were incorporated in the special council permit and enclosed the second floor creating an additional bedroom rather than the deck as approved.

**Councilor Verga** said that the way he looked at it is that the view is irrelevant, they did something that they were weren't supposed to do and before they were far enough along they were told to stop because they were in violation . He said to him it is an open and shut case and cannot support this modification.

**Councilor Ciolino** said that he is going to support the motion to move this matter forward to council.

Recessed at 6:20 p.m. before motion; resumed meeting at 6:22 p.m.

**MOTION: On a motion by Councilor LeBlanc, seconded by Councilor Ciolino, the Planning and Development Committee voted 1 in favor , 2 opposed to recommend to the City Council to grant the application to modify the special council permit for 15 Western Avenue , Unit 2, Map 2, Lot 49 granted June 6, 2000, GZO Sec. 2.3.1(4)(a)**

**MOTION FAILS.**

**This matter will be advertised for public hearing July 14, 2015.**

**3. *PP2015-002: Petition of National Grid for installation of underground facilities from Leonard Street to 1 Chester Square – This matter is taken up by the Committee as a Public Hearing***

**This public hearing is opened at 6:24 p.m.**

**Those speaking in favor:**

**Peter Glynn**, representing National Grid and are seeking permission to install a conduit from Leonard Street to 1 Chester Square and will go down the road about 90 feet to the property. He believed at one point there was an old service which needed to be upgraded as the wires are deteriorated. He presented photos to the committee as he outlined the work that would be done.

**Those speaking in opposition: None**

**Communications: None.**

**Councilor Questions:** **Councilor Cox** asked **Mr. Glynn** how many days would it take to complete this project and would they be consecutive days. **Mr. Glynn** replied that he assumed it would probably take under 2 days. Councilor Cox had a question regarding the excavating condition #4. **Councilor Verga** deferred the question to the **DPW Director, Mike Hale** and replied to **Councilor Cox's** inquiry.

**Hugh Collier, 71 Leonard**, expressed his concern as the excavation was going to be in front of his residence. He wanted assurance that the excavation be completely appropriate as there was recently a Comcast excavation that was inappropriately done and unpermitted. **DPW Director, Mike Hale**, replied that the permit Comcast had was misleading and was done last November. He spoke with Comcast and they assured him that they would restore the trench but there was a permitting piece missing at that time.

**This public hearing is closed at 6:30 p.m.**

**MOTION: On a motion by Councilor LeBlanc, seconded by Councilor Ciolino , the Planning & Development Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed, to GRANT the petition of National Grid and Verizon New England, Inc. to construct a line of underground electric 1-3 inch conduit 90 feet +/-, including the necessary sustaining**

and protecting fixtures under and across the public way or ways from Pole 3726 Leonard Street for a service to the property at Chester Square #1 as shown on plan with an address of 1 Chester Square, WR19331702 and on Assessors Map 122, Lot 29 with the following conditions:

1. Notification to the Department of Public Works 72 hours in advance of the proposed work. A construction schedule will be prepared by the applicant for review and acceptance by the Department of Public Works.
  2. Proposed excavation may only occur during accepted road opening and construction season, 15 March-15 November. No winter construction shall be permitted.
  3. In the absence of a detailed construction plan, the Department of Public Works requests: all proposed conduits and appurtenances shall be placed so as to cause minimum conflict with existing underground utilities and utility services<sup>4</sup>. All excavated trenches shall be patched flush with the surrounding asphalt using hot mix asphalt binder at the end of each work day, to minimize pedestrian hazards. Asphalt shall be applied in two lifts of 2-inches, totaling 4-inches.
  5. All final paving shall be done in consultation with the Department of Public Works and an agreed upon final paving plan executed by the applicant.
4. *Memorandum from General Counsel re: Grant of Easement for 91 Commercial Street*

**Councilor Verga** asked the **DPW Director, Mike Hale**, to explain the reason for this easement. Mr. Hale said this easement is for replacing the old existing telephone poles with new ones in a slightly different location but within the same general area. The new sewer pump station at 91 Commercial Street will also service businesses in that area.

**MOTION: On a motion by Councilor LeBlanc, seconded by Councilor Ciolino , the Planning & Development Committee voted in 3 favor, 0 opposed, to recommend that the City Council pursuant to GCO Sec. 2-3(2)(d) grant to National Grid (d/b/a Massachusetts Electric Company) and Verizon New England an easement to install and maintain electric poles referred to as the "Overhead System" on city property at 91 Commercial Street and as submitted by National Grid as shown on the plan entitled, "Easement Sketch, Plan Number 14569222" and as described in the easement deed submitted with National Grid and Verizon New England's request for disposition of said easement for a nominal fee of \$1.00. Verizon New England shall record the Easement at the Southern Essex County Registry of Deeds and shall pay all costs to do so including providing copies to the City of Gloucester.**

5. *SCP2015-001: Concord Street #250, Map 248, Lot 13, GZO Sec. 5.13 Personal Wireless Service Facility (Cont'd from 05/20/15)*

**Councilor Verga** said since their last meeting they had a presentation from David Maxson, the City's consultant, and received information on alternatives on location, design and height. **Attorney Edward Pare**, representing the applicant, said the Committee had the renderings on the fire tower that Mr. Maxson of Isotrope provided to them. **Mr. Pare** said the renditions are for the fire tower for the height of 150 feet, which is their proposed height, and the second rendering of 130 feet was requested by various councilors. The design would basically be a fiberglass shelter on the top of four support legs. AT & T's installation would be on the inside of the fiberglass and the signal would penetrate the fiberglass quite nicely. He believes the way the design is worked out that other carriers co-locating would be able to attach their antennas to the four legs. As far as their response, they do take exception to some of the finding in Istrope's report and didn't think they were significant per se but as he said from the beginning it all comes down to Isotrope height and design. Their position is that they need the 150 feet and gave the Committee the statistics and their rebuttal gave them some specifics with respect to the coverage they will give up based on population and road coverage. He reiterated from the last meeting that the height of 110 feet will and does not work for AT & T. He said he thought that the reduction in population count was somewhere in the range of 50 percent. He continued to say that with respect to alternative locations, they positioned it on this site in the appropriate place. There is an existing residence and what is not clear is that there is a large residentially zoned parcel which may be developed at some point. They shifted towards that parcel but maintained at least 110 feet from that property line for a fall zone. In regard to other locations in the area, he explained that their radio frequency engineer, **Dan Goulet**, added that none of the alternative sites would provide the coverage that AT & T was looking to achieve. They have not looked with specifics to see if any of those sites were feasible or constructible

with the requirements, and they would need to negotiate with the property owner and believed this was the best site. Mr. Pare concluded that this was the extent of their rebuttal to Isotrope's report. They have included in their letter (on file) specific tables showing specific reduction of coverage and population counts. **David Maxson of Isotrope**, the city's consultant on this matter, weighed in by saying that the Committee heard a typical rebuttal by a telecommunications applicant on whether to use the 700 MHz or the 1900 MHz to model coverage and felt that he needed to respond to the way the rebuttal characterized his use of 700 MHz as he doesn't treat it as something that stands alone without considering the 1900 MHz. **Mr. Maxson** outlined the difference in service between the 700 MHz and the 1900 MHz and the difference with the applicant's determination and his report with the Committee. **Mr. Maxson** did agree with Attorney Pare that there is a large area here that is underserved regardless of which spectrum you use to evaluate coverage. He also said he was surprised that the applicant was essentially insisting that any public safety antennas would be below the antennas of the cell company on the cell tower. Public safety antennas are omni directional and are often put on the very top of the tower. In regard to the population and mileage estimates, he explained his comparison between the 150 feet, 130 feet and the 110 feet. His numbers did not compute with Mr. Goulet.

**Mr. Goulet** clarified what the difference of service would be between the 700 MHz and the 1900 MHz. He also outlined his determination of the population counts, coverage and the height analysis (Exhibit 5B on file).

There was a discussion between **Councilor Ciolino** and **Attorney Pare** regarding the public safety antennas and **Mr. Pare** said AT &T would work with the City. **Mr. Pare** reiterated that he knew that there was going to be a lot of discussion regarding the height. The public safety antennas would not be functional at the 110 feet height, it will not work for AT &T at 110 feet so they are not going to build a 110 foot tower and put the public safety antennas on top when AT&T doesn't function nor would there be co-location opportunities and that there are balances here. For every foot the height goes down on the tower, the public safety equipment would also go down in a like number. **Mr. Pare** said that the Fire Chief informed the President of the City Council that they would need 90 feet and AT&T would need the height above that. Their preference is a 150 feet. There was a discussion with **Councilor McGeary** and **Mr. Goulet** that if the public safety antenna was placed on top of the 130 tower, for example, and the city allowed that, the city get their coverage, would there still be rental space at the bottom of the tower. There was a discussion and explanation of the required center line on the tower.

There was a discussion between **Mr. Maxson** and **Mr. Goulet** regarding their calculations of the population counts, mileage and coverage.

**Councilor McGeary** questioned **Mr. Goulet** that at 700 MHz, by whatever metric you choose, how much data has to be simultaneously transmitted back from the antenna before you see the latency? **Mr. Goulet** responded that he didn't have the answer and would have to get the information from AT &T. **Councilor McGeary** said that the answer would be useful information. **Mr. Maxson** offered his explanation of LTE.

**Councilor Verga** said that when the P&D started the process one of the concerns was what their view in the end would be compared to the TCA, so they hired an expert. There is indeed, according to their expert, some room to move to talk about heights and design. That is where they are now and are still awaiting for the attorney the city hired to work on the motion for the P&D as they cannot formulate one without assistance. **Councilor Verga** made a formal request to **Mr. Goulet** to obtain the information from AT &T to **Councilor McGeary's** question. **Councilor Verga** said that they were not ready to make a decision tonight, but speaking for himself, he would be looking at the height between 100 feet and 150 feet. **Councilor Verga** suggested that before the next P&D meeting, **Mr. Pare** should speak with some of the concerned citizens in attendance tonight and then they can discuss some alternatives. **Mr. Pare** responded that he believes he has been forth coming in that continuum. His main concern is now with timing. The **City Clerk, Ms. Lowe**, said the applicant agreed to an extension to June 23 council meeting and the next meeting would be July 14. **Mr. Pare** said that he will continue to work with the city's legal department. There was a discussion between **Mr. Pare** and **Councilor McGeary** on whether it would be economically beneficial to AT&T if the tower was 130 feet. **Councilor Verga** requested the **City Clerk** inquire of the Fire and/or Police Department and their opinion of the design and what their minimum height needs to be. The committee would need to add to that minimum height to determine the final height of the tower.

**This matter is continued to June 17, 2015.**

**Councilors Cox, Fonvielle and McGeary left the meeting and there was no longer a quorum.**

**Recessed at 7:35 p.m.; meeting resume at 7:40 p.m.**

**6. *Memorandum from Community Development Director re: the Executive Summary to the Gulf of Maine Research Institute (GMRI) Marine Innovation Center Concept Study***

The Committee discussed with **Tom Daniel**, Community Development Director the Executive Summary to the Gulf of Maine Research Institute (GMRI) Marine Innovation Center Concept Study in order to gain an overview of the documentation and next steps the city may take with regard to the city-owned property at 65 Rogers Street, known as I4-C2.

No further action was required on this matter by the Committee at this time.

**A motion was made, seconded and voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 8:00 p.m.**

**Respectfully submitted,**

**Joanne M. Senos  
Substitute Recorder**

**DOCUMENTS/ITEMS SUBMITTED AT MEETING:**

- Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) Decision dated 10/17/00 and photograph of exterior of dwelling at 15 Western Avenue, Unit 2 by J. Michael Faherty (SCP2015-003), Amendment to Master Deed by Linda Dalton
- Photographs of 1 Chester Square by Peter Glynn, National Grid