

Planning & Development Committee
Wednesday, June 17, 2015 – 5:30 p.m.
1st Fl. Council Committee Room – City Hall
- Minutes –

Present: Chair, Councilor Greg Verga; Vice Chair, Councilor Lundberg; Councilor Fonvielle (Alternate)

Absent: Councilor LeBlanc

Also Present: Jim Destino; Gregg Cademartori; Chip Payson

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m. The Committee recessed at 6:18 p.m. and reconvened at 6:19 p.m. Matters were taken out of order.

1. *Special Events Applications Requests:*

A) Fishtown Horribles Parade Committee to hold Fishtown Horribles Parade July 3, 2015

Linda T. Lowe, City Clerk, reported the Fishtown Horribles Parade came before the Special Events Advisory Committee and no changes are reported to the years before.

David Tucker, 101 Cherry Street, member of the Fishtown Horribles Parade Committee confirmed that there are no changes from last year's plans and route.

MOTION: On a motion by Councilor Lundberg, seconded by Councilor Fonvielle, the Planning & Development Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed, to permit the Fishtown Horribles Parade Committee to hold the Fishtown Horribles Parade on Friday, July 3, 2015, and to close affected City roadways from 6 p.m. to 9 p.m. with the following conditions:

1. Certificate of Insurance:

A Certificate of Insurance naming the City of Gloucester as an additional insured party is to be filed with the City Clerk's office on or before June 19, 2015.

2. Road Closure Plan:

Police Department and the Fire Department approvals of the plans for the Fishtown Horribles on July 3, 2015 have been received through the Special Events Advisory Committee. Roads to be closed are to be marked with signage directing the public as to the duration of the closure and alternate routes. Traffic and parking plan and police detail information by the Police Department to be filed with the Police Chief. Any substantial changes, as determined by either the Police or Fire Chief or their designees to the route or related to safety issues may require City Council approval.

3. Refuse and Comfort Stations:

All refuse and recycling due to this event must be removed by the organizer. Any portable toilets (with two handicapped accessible) are to be provided and maintained by the organizer, placed the evening before the event or early in the morning of the day of the event and be removed by 9:00 a.m., July 4, 2015.

4. Emergency Services:

All requirements of the Gloucester Fire Department EMS must be met.

5. Staffing:

Event staff is to have cell phones and be identified by the public with distinct shirts. A list of event staff and their cell phone numbers is to be submitted to the Police, Fire or DPW Departments.

6. Notification of Immediate Abutters and Businesses to Parade Route:

Notice shall be made by the event organizer by hand or by mail no later than 7 (seven) days in advance of the event to function halls, motels and hotels, and other businesses along the parade route.

7. Responsibility of the Fishtown Horribles Parade Committee:

The applicant is also required to obtain any necessary approvals from the Licensing Board, the Health Department and the Licensing Commission. It is the sole responsibility of the Fishtown Horribles Parade Committee to ensure that all required documentation is timely filed with the appropriate City departments as indicated. Failure to comply with any conditions precedent may result in permit revocation. Applicant is also required to comply with any requirements made by departments through the Special Events Advisory Committee.

B) Gloucester Fund to hold concerts on Stacy Boulevard July 3 and September 5, 2015

Brent “Ringo” Tarr, 18 Timberview Drive, chief organizer of the Boulevard Concerts scheduled for the evenings of July 3 and September 5, said that the concerts have grown to the point where they have to block off the water side of Stacy Boulevard on the island side of the Blynman Bridge, but otherwise there are no changes. **Ms. Lowe** confirmed that Mr. Tarr was before the SEAC, and noted there were several safety concerns addressed to their satisfaction.

MOTION: On a motion by Councilor Fonvielle, seconded by Councilor Lundberg, the Planning & Development Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed, to permit the Gloucester Fund to hold two free concerts on Stacy Boulevard in the vicinity of the Blynman Bridge on July 3, 2015, and September 5, 2015, on the condition that the Gloucester Fund obtains all necessary approvals from the Licensing Board, the Board of Health and the Licensing Commission and to ensure that all required documentation and insurance is timely filed with the appropriate City departments. Failure to comply with any conditions precedent may result in revocation of Council approval.

C) Gloucester Downtown Association to hold Sidewalk Bazaar on August 6, 7 and 8, 2015

John Orlando, member of the Gloucester Downtown Association, said that this is the 57th year of the Sidewalk Bazaar, and there are no changes from the last several years. **Ms. Lowe** confirmed the applicant came before the SEAC, agreeing that the event doesn't change much year to year. Responding to an inquiry by **Councilor Verga** about vendor creep onto Main Street from their proscribed spots to remain within the marked parking spaces, **Mr. Orlando** said that a team of volunteers ensures that vendors keep within the parking spaces and prevent creep into the street throughout the entire three day event.

MOTION: On a motion by Councilor Lundberg, seconded by Councilor Fonvielle, the Planning & Development Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed, to permit the Gloucester Downtown Association (GDA) to close Main Street from Pleasant Street to Washington Street, including Hancock, Center, Porter, and Short Streets to all vehicular traffic from 6:00 AM to 6:00 PM, Thursday, August 6, Friday, August 7, and Saturday, August 8, 2015 for the purpose of conducting the Gloucester Sidewalk Bazaar with the following conditions:

1. A memorandum from the City of Gloucester that shows the DGA Sidewalk Bazaar is covered under the city's insurance has been received.
2. There are to be no vendor set ups on the sidewalk blocking hydrants, crosswalks, or handicap ramps; Vendor set ups are not to extend beyond the marked parking lines on the streets.
3. No vendor set ups in front of the police station other than the area designated by the Police Department.
4. All vendor set ups must allow for unobstructed drivable area along the entire Sidewalk Days route slightly wider at the curve of Palazola's Sporting Goods to maintain adequate access for emergency vehicles. Failure to do so may necessitate the removal or relocation of the vendor at the discretion of the Fire Department, the Police Department or the event agent of the GDA.
5. The organizers shall allow the Fire Department drive-through access with a fire engine once each day of the event, on or about 9:00 a.m., and one random drive through to be decided by the Fire Department.
6. No parking or unloading of goods on any of the above-mentioned streets after 8:50 AM until 5:00 PM on each of the days of the Gloucester Sidewalk Bazaar.
7. Event staff is to have cell phones and be identified by the public with distinct shirts. A list of event staff and their cell phone numbers is to be submitted to the Police, Fire or DPW Departments in advance of the first day of the Sidewalk Bazaar.
8. The GDC is also required to obtain any necessary approvals from the Licensing Board, the Health Department, and the Licensing Commission. It is the sole responsibility of the applicant to ensure that all required documentation is filed in a timely manner with the appropriate City departments as indicated. Failure to comply with any conditions precedent may result in permit revocation. Applicant is also required to comply with any requirements made by departments through the Special Events Advisory Committee including vending.

D) Magnolia Farmer's Markets, Lexington Avenue Mondays, June 15 to September 21, 2015

Robert Marshall, 29 Pulaski Street, Peabody, Marshall's Farm Stand and one of the organizers of the Magnolia Farmer's Market, said that there is big community and business support for the event. He said it was evident by the first Farmer's Market held June 15 that for safety reasons Lexington Avenue needs to be closed during the event each Monday. He said a Farmer's Market brings people together and there will be more vendors to meet the community needs being expressed. **Ms. Lowe** reported that Mr. Marshall came before the SEAC and said that since this was a new event he was unsure whether there was a need to close the street. Because of the experience of the first event, it is why he is before the Committee now. She noted an additional condition should be added that says there needs to be a minimum of two farmers who sell their own products which comes from the state Department of Agricultural Resources policies to define a Farmer's Market. Non-farm vendors will be required to obtain a regular vendor's permit, she added.

MOTION: On a motion by Councilor Fonvielle, seconded by Councilor Lundberg, the Planning & Development Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed, to permit the Magnolia Farmer's Market on Mondays from June 15, 2015 to September 21, 2015, from 4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. Lexington Avenue is to be closed from Norman Avenue to Flume Road with appropriate signage posted at either end of Lexington Avenue advising motorists of alternative routes. A Certificate of Insurance naming the City of Gloucester as Certificate Holder is to be on file with the City Clerk's office no later than June 30, 2015 or in lieu of a Certificate of Insurance a letter from the city's Chief Administrative Officer stating that the city is responsible for the insurance. The following conditions apply:

1. **Applicant is to notify all abutters of the closed area of Lexington Avenue in advance of the events;**
 2. **Applicant is responsible for providing adequate trash receptacles and for removal of same;**
 3. **Applicant has agreed to make Magnolia Library bathrooms available to the public;**
 4. **All vendors, except those excluded by state law, are to obtain city vending permits prior to June 23, 2015.**
 5. **That the Magnolia Farmer's Market must have two or more farmers primarily selling products grown, produced, or raised by farmers present in order to constitute a "Farmer's Market" in keeping with the Mass. Department of Agricultural Resources Policy for Mass. Farmers' Markets.**
2. *SCP2015-001: Concord Street #250, Map 248, Lot 13, GZO Sec. 5.13 Personal Wireless Service Facility (Cont'd from 06/03/15)*

Councilor Verga said that when the Committee last met, the city's engineering consultant as did the Applicant's engineering consultant spoke, and the Committee advised the Applicant to meet with the neighbor representatives to speak about remaining issues of height and design.

Attorney Edward Pare, representing the applicant SBA Towers and AT&T, said that there was a meeting on Saturday morning for the purpose of discussing a potential compromise. He said it appears there is some common ground on the design, although there is still a dispute of the final height of the tower. The consensus of the four neighborhood representatives was that a unipole design was preferred, but **Mr. Pare** advised with a unipole design, it would require additional height. Rather than be at 150 feet, in the interest of compromise, SBA Towers and AT&T could live with 130 feet for a unipole design, he said. He added that if height was a bigger factor, the Applicant could go with a monopole design and that height would need to be 120 feet, which he said, is a 20 percent reduction in height but gives the Applicant the flexibility of having the antennas on the outside for adjustment purpose. The neighbors were of the opinion that the tower should be no higher than 110 feet which he said from AT&T's perspective is a problem and not a reasonable solution for the gap in that area. He noted that over the last several days there have been a series of emails (all of which have been made part of the record) regarding the needs of the city's Police and Fire Departments. He said he believed the issue was resolved. He noted the last he saw there was a discussion of a microwave antenna at 125 feet, which can't happen on a unipole because of the design. He said they could work with that on a monopole design between collocators, but in a report that he received by David Maxson (the city's engineering consultant on the Personal Wireless Service Facility) he has developed a solution.

Mr. Pare concluded his opening remarks by saying that if they can reach a consensus, although their application is still for a tower height of 150 feet which is preferred, but in the interest of compromise they could bring a unipole down to a height of 130 feet, and with a monopole they could bring it down to 120 feet.

David Maxson, the city's telecommunications engineering consultant with Isotrope LLC, said that the Applicant has made accommodations with the height consistent with his reports that if they can let them go as high as they want to go they'll maximize the coverage from facility and the collocation. On the other side there is the balancing of the concerns of the community with respect to the design and how dominant the tower is from certain perspectives. While there is analysis down to 110 feet, he highlighted in his most recent communication (dated June 16 and on file) he wouldn't recommend a height of 110 feet because it completely limits collocation and that means all of AT&T's antennas would be below 110 feet, and is uncertain how good the coverage would be from that point. He added that at 120 feet or 130 feet depending on design seems to be a good compromise.

Councilor Verga said that although this was a public meeting and not a public hearing, with the Committee's assent he would recognize one member of a neighborhood group to offer their opinion of their recent meeting with the Applicant. He advised that the public hearing on the matter of the permitting of a Personal Wireless Service Facility at 250 Concord Street would be opened by the Council on July 23.

After a brief discussion between **Councilor Verga** and **Mr. Pare, Mr. Maxson** addressed the issue of the city's emergency services departments' needs saying that he read about what those departments are interested in, that as reflected in emails and in his report that this 90 foot target was a translated 90 foot target from another tower in town and has no bearing on this tower before the Committee [for permitting] which he pointed out was for a microwave link to other locations not for the actual public safety antennas. **Councilor Lundberg** said he thought what Mr. Maxson's report dated today (and on file) said that they should not let that be the determining factor for height but to find the proper height and style of the pole and then the Police and Fire Departments can get in where they can. **Mr. Maxson** said that was his opinion that they are here to deal with a wireless facility, and to whatever extent that facility can then be tweaked or repurposed for public safety benefits would be then appropriate. He said it is reassuring that the two-way radio antennas don't need to be very high, not even at 90 feet which suggests there is a way to accommodate those antennas at a lower height below the tree line because they don't have the same issues with vegetation as the higher frequencies the wireless companies use. He said as to the other question of linking public safety facility back to dispatch, he said in his report, he noted it is nice if they can have a microwave hop to somewhere else if you have your own private dedicated public safety link -- but public safety sites all over the country use telephone land lines whether they be fiber optic or copper, digital or analog, to connect dispatch to these remote locations. Since a phone company or the like will bring in telecom connections (land lines) to service the wireless facilities at the site, there will be services to public safety to lease. He said that helps to keep the microwave question from clouding the main issues.

Councilor Fonvielle said that the Magnolia Fire Station currently doesn't have a cable connection. **Mr. Maxson** said with fire dispatch at Central Station on School Street, these links from any new tower, whether by microwave or telephone line, go back to dispatch and have no association with Magnolia or any other remote station.

Councilor Verga reiterated to the audience that this meeting was not a public meeting, but as Chair of the P&D Committee he was going to recognize a representative of the neighborhood group to hear their take on the recent meeting with the Applicant.

Peter Radochia, 259 Concord Street, confirmed attendance by neighborhood representatives at a meeting with the Applicant and spoke of the neighbors' preference for a 110 foot unipole. He said the neighbors also felt that rather than collocate on one pole they prefer a series multiple poles would be better at lower heights. He noted that a unipole design contains the antennas internally.

Indicating that he had done considerable research on the police and fire emergency issues, he said that the tower needs to be linked with fiber optics, microwave or copper land line. He said the copper land lines in West Gloucester are "horrible," and also said that he's been told the copper land lines are not reliable and is why the microwave antenna was opted for by the Police Department, he said, at 125 feet which is a line of sight from that tower to the Plum Cove water tank. He asked if the Applicant intended to bring in fiber optics to the site. **Mr. Pare** said that if fiber optics aren't near the site, it is unlikely it will be brought in by the Applicant immediately although eventually that may happen. If copper [land lines] are nearby, they'll use that. He said it is a matter of a cost/benefit calculation by the applicant. **Mr. Radochia** also said there was a conversation with the Applicant about the color of the tower. He added that it would be nice to choose a color that blends with the environment.

Mr. Maxson acknowledged Mr. Radochia's research on what public safety was really talking about but wished to clarify the matter of the kinds of lines are available and reliability which was addressed in his most recent report. If speaking of fiber optics, they talk about who is providing the link and whether it is a dedicated line. He said the most reliable link is the link you own. He explained that some communities have municipal fiber optic networks they rely on, placed on utility poles that are not crossing into anyone else's. The next step is a land line company, cable or phone, provides communications. The copper is often, especially if far away from a central office, is many

times consolidated to a fiber translation point somewhere. When a wireless company comes into a site and orders lines from the phone company, the phone company will determine what needs to be pulled in in terms of copper and fiber lines. As with AT&T, the closer the fiber is brought to the wireless site the greater the bandwidth that will be available to that wireless site. The fact that they'll running lines from the street back to the property and cell site and connecting to the telephone network means there will be capacity for public safety. While they'll provide broadband data service to smartphones, all that the two-way communications need is one very low band voice channel, digital or analog, to link to the radio at the site. He said it is low risk, low demand thing, he said. As to reliability, microwave has a fade margin depending on certain factors which impact reliability. Running a copper line is a different infrastructure that is also open to certain failure opportunities. Each one of the systems is designed to some target reliability. While there is a perception one may be more reliable over the other, it may not be the case. Whatever the phone company engineers to bring in will be more reliable at the outset. While microwave is nice, he said, he noted he didn't see it as absolutely necessary.

Councilor Verga said the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Applicant and the city throughout these meetings on the Special Council Permit has been mentioned frequently. He highlighted that the MOU was never executed by the previous Mayor, and questioned how it factor in now if at all. **Mr. Pare** said it is the Applicant's intention to execute an MOU concerning public safety. He explained that the reason there was a draft is because there was a lot of uncertainty related to the issues as cited but it was assumed it could be executed when it is determined where the whip antennas will be placed. He said the applicant is still committed to giving public safety the space they agreed to but may not be at the height they originally agreed to in the draft MOU. He said it appears they are still within the draft MOU parameters and the Applicant is willing to sign it and tweak it as necessary. **Chip Payson**, General Counsel confirmed the Administration is willing to enter into the discussion on an MOU but at this point would not commit one way or the other. He confirmed the MOU wasn't signed, and until then it is for information purposes only.

Jim Destino, CAO reconfirmed that the MOU was unsigned. For purposes for the Council it is informational whether or not they want to include it as a condition of the permit. He said it can work but linkage is the key to insure that the signal gets back to the station and how the cost will be borne. It is one two-way radio if it's linked to the station, he said, which is ultimately what the city needs. Whether this is a further city project of linking it themselves, that is a discussion outside of this application. He said in terms of the Council's permitting anything the city can get for space on the tower would be beneficial.

Councilor Verga noted what isn't in dispute is the preferred type or design, which is a unipole that would need to be at 130 feet. **Mr. Pare** confirmed that the neighbors have suggested the unipole with has all the equipment on the interior, which they can accommodate at 130 feet and reiterated that should the Council choose to opt for a monopole that would be at a height of 120 feet.

Councilor Verga said the matter comes down to the height of the tower and the design as well as a need to move this matter to the Council. He explained that in the Public Hearing process the applicant will have a chance of about 15 minutes to give a presentation and the organized "opposition" would have equal time, rebuttals, and rebuttals of rebuttals and then the Council would ask their questions and then make their decision.

Councilor Lundberg clarified with Mr. Maxson that a unipole is a type of monopole that doesn't show any of the components on the exterior and that a unipole would need to be at a height of 130 feet. Councilor Lundberg then suggested that the Committee use the preferred unipole design in the motion and a height of 130 feet which he said was all subject to the opinion and vote of the full City Council in determining the compromise between the visual impact and the effectiveness of the technology. **Councilor Verga** expressed his agreement with the Councilor's summary.

Councilor Lundberg then motioned and Councilor Fonvielle seconded a recommendation to grant SCP2015-001 to the Council with eight conditions.

Councilor Fonvielle pointed out that while he seconded the motion that an affirmative vote by him in Committee that at Council his vote may be different. He said there is an implied tradeoff with the compromise between the 130 foot unipole and the somewhat less slightly 120 foot monopole and mentioned that neighbors want a 110 foot height but is not necessarily possible in practice.

Councilor Lundberg said that the Committee finding that there is a significant gap in coverage is an important finding for the Applicant which sets the stage for everything else.

Councilor Verga touched on the Fire Department high access training found under GZO Sec. 5.13.12 with **Ms. Lowe**, and then put forward an amendment to the main motion to include this requirement as Condition #9, which

was seconded by Councilor Lundberg. By a vote 3 in favor, 0 opposed, Condition #9 was added to reflect Sec. 5.13.12 of the Zoning Ordinance.

MOTION: On a motion by Councilor Lundberg, seconded by Councilor Fonvielle, the Planning & Development Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed to recommend that the City Council grant the Special Council Permit (SCP2015-001) under Gloucester Zoning Ordinance, Sec. 5.13 for a Personal Wireless Service Facility (PWSF) to SBA Towers V, Inc. ("SBA") and New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC by and through its Manager, AT&T Mobility Corporation (the "Applicants") at 250 Concord Street, Map 248, Lot 13, zoned R-40 with the following FINDINGS AND CONDITIONS:

1. Based on the evidence submitted by the Applicants, as reviewed by the independent consultant (the "Consultant") retained by the City to review the Special Permit application, the Committee finds that AT&T currently has significant gaps in its wireless coverage in West Gloucester including the area of 250 Concord Street.
2. Based on the evidence submitted by the Applicants, as reviewed by the Consultant, the Committee finds a tower at the proposed site is the only feasible and least intrusive means to satisfy those coverage gaps.
3. Based on the evidence submitted by the Applicants, as reviewed by the Consultant, the Committee finds that those coverage gaps may be resolved with a tower constructed at a height of 130 feet.
4. The Committee recommends that the tower be a unipole design as depicted on the renderings submitted by the Applicants.
5. The Committee finds that the public safety agencies in the City also have gaps in communications in West Gloucester which is an ongoing public safety issue. A Memorandum of Agreement (MOU) with SBA which provides the City's public safety agencies with space on the tower and on the ground for communications was presented by the previous Mayor to the Zoning Board of Appeals. That MOU is not executed. The Committee recommends that the public safety equipment be located as agreed to in a final executed MOU between the Applicant and the City of Gloucester.
6. Under Section 5.13.11 of the Zoning Ordinance, or as amended, term of the Special Council Permit shall be 25 years.
7. The applicants shall be subject to the monitoring and maintenance requirements of Section 5.13.8 of the Zoning Ordinance, or as amended.
8. The applicants shall be subject to the provisions of Sec. 5.13.9 of the Zoning Ordinance, or as amended, concerning abandonment or discontinuance of use.
9. The applicant shall be subject to the provisions of Sec. 5.13.12 of the Zoning Ordinance "Provision for Fire Safety and Rescue." The Applicant shall contribute to the Fire Department Revolving Fund #293012 High Angle Training for this permitted Personal Wireless Service Facility on a pro-rated basis.

This matter is advertised for public hearing for June 23, 2015.

Mr. Maxson, responding to a question from a member of the public who expressed concern that there may be degradation of signal using a unipole design versus a monopole design, said no. He said between the two heights and two designs, the applicant is trying to come to a coverage equivalence. The covers they put on the unipole have no impact on the signal.

3. Memorandum from General Counsel re: Grant of Utility Easement for 44 Whittemore Street

Chip Payson, General Counsel explained that the city is in the process of improving portions of Whittemore Street, and that in order to do this, the city must secure utility easements from one of the property owners, Jay McNiff (developing a subdivision on that street). It was noted that all appropriate documentation related to the easement is on file.

Gregg Cademartori, Planning Director noted the easement package on file and said that some of the utilities that connect Riverside Avenue and Whittemore Street were actually installed on the Cape Ann Forge property owned by Jay McNiff in trust. He said there are two steps in the process of the easements which is to memorialize where the utilities are right now, and there is the intention that there will be utility relocation in the near future, but now there is public utility on private property and an easement has been offered to allow them to exist. There was a subdivision file for the land to the waterside of the existing forge, and through that permitting process with the Planning Board, that identified the utilities on site. As part of the approval of the subdivision there are improvements

proposed to that connection between Riverside Avenue and Whittemore Street. There will be some utility relocation and realignment of the roadway.

Mr. Cademartori reiterated that the first easement is to memorialize the utilities locations and an easement if and when the utilities are relocated that all public utilities and roadway will be within the existing Whittemore Street layout or this offered easement. This is cleaning up issues from the late 1980's and ensures adequate access and utilities for the existing neighborhoods connected by this roadway and the subdivision, he said.

Councilor Verga inquired about an issue of an abutter's garage and/or fence. **Mr. Cademartori** said that issue has been completely resolved by granting the parallel easement; the final design for the roadway connection is 20 feet from the garage entrance. The compromise was the easement to allow for some buffer and protection from the existing residential uses on the northeast side of the roadway. He reported at the final approval at a Planning Board meeting that all the abutters present were pleased with the final design and with the easement.

MOTION: On a motion by Councilor Fonvielle, seconded by Councilor Lundberg, the Planning & Development Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed, to recommend that the City Council accept a Utility Easement for the property at 44 Whittemore Street and as shown on the plan entitled, "Easement Plan, 44 Whittemore Street in Gloucester, Massachusetts (Essex County)" dated April 15, 2015 by BSC Group, Inc., from John D. McNiff, Jr., Trustee, Cape Ann Forge Trust and containing an area of 4,862 square feet.

MOTION: On a motion by Councilor Fonvielle, seconded by Councilor Lundberg, the Planning & Development Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed, to recommend that the City Council accept a Utility and Access Easements for the property at 44 and 52 Whittemore Street and as shown on the plan entitled, "Easement Plan, 44 & 52 Whittemore Street in Gloucester, Massachusetts (Essex County)" dated April 15, 2015 by BSC Group, Inc., from John D. McNiff, Jr., Trustee, Cape Ann Forge Trust containing an area if 1,450 square feet +/- and of 1,606 square feet +/-.

4. City Council vote of August 27, 2013 regarding renewal of Rogers Street Parking Lot at 65 Rogers Street (I4-C2)

Councilor Verga expressed that he had not wanted to spend \$1 million for the purpose of a waterfront parking lot but that at this time is the best they can do. He asked about the Administration's plans for moving forward to remedy the situation of the continuing lack of development for 65 Rogers Street. **Mr. Destino** said the Administration intends to forward a Request For Proposal for the Council's approval related to 65 Rogers Street Council by mid-summer.

MOTION: On a motion by Councilor Fonvielle, seconded by Councilor Lundberg, the Planning & Development Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed, to recommend that the City Council renew an amendment to GCO Sec. 22-288 "Off Street Parking Areas" by ADDING Rogers Street Parking Lot at #65 Rogers Street and a description of the lot as 74 parking spaces and 4 handicapped parking spaces for a total of 78 parking spaces as shown on a plan submitted by the Department of Public Works for the 65 Rogers Street Parking Lot dated 7/29/13 to expire one year from June 23, 2015 and to be followed by two separate one-year renewals subject to the City Council review.

Mr. Destino briefly discussed the permitting of the Harbor Loop Concerts with the Committee and Ms. Lowe which would come forward for the Committee's consideration in July.

A motion was made, seconded and voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 6:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dana C. Jorgenson
Clerk of Committees

DOCUMENTS/ITEMS SUBMITTED AT MEETING: None.