

CITY COUNCIL STANDING COMMITTEE

Planning & Development

Wednesday, July 28, 2010 – 6:30 p.m.

1st Fl. Council Conference Room – City Hall

Present: Chair, Councilor Joseph Ciolino; Vice Chair, Councilor Robert Whynott;
Councilor Greg Verga

Absent: None

Also Present: Councilor Hardy; Councilor McGeary; Mark Cole; Steve Winslow; Anthony Giacalone, Aaron Burke; Nino Ciamartaro; Anthony Bertolino, J.D. McEachern; Judy Masciarelli; Mary Lou Maraganis; Dan Morris; John McElhenny

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. Councilor Ciolino stated there was a quorum of the City Council.

1. Unfinished Business

- A) Petition of Residents re: 85-89 Bass Avenue: Report by Building Inspector (Continued from 06/16/2010)

Anthony Giacalone, 8 Edgewood Road was before the Committee representing his father-in-law, Nino Ciamartaro, owner of 85-89 Bass Avenue explained that after their last meeting on the matter, there was a site visit with Anthony Bertolino, Councilor Hardy and Aaron Burk of Wolf Hill Nurseries. They had agreed they would try to do around nine trees on the property. They are proposing that five trees now which he felt made sense which has nothing to do financially. It is that given the size and growth pattern of the proposed trees if they do more than five, they will be intertwining and cover all their signage (for businesses on the property). They did a layout and will do a more detailed plan for City Council. They will go with an evergreen tree so that leaves don't drop during foliage season. This will create a year round screen of the property.

Aaron Burke, Wolf Hill Nurseries suggested an eastern white pine, a Japanese black pine, something along those lines. The five trees will go in with only a loss of five parking spaces. They will all be about six feet in circumference going in from the ground up. They will gain screenage by truck tree immediately. Foliage won't be lost. There is a curb that comes down Bass Avenue. Two feet off that curb they'll cut a 4' x 4' hole framed in concrete and drop the trees in there. That way there is no cutting of the parking lot. There was a concern with underground pipes.

Councilor Ciolino restated that it was Mr. Burke's recommendation that five trees would be appropriate. **Mr. Burke** stated yes, for growth and screening purposes. He believed nine trees would totally overgrow the property and would not grow well.

Councilor Ciolino asked if there was a guarantee on the plantings.

Mr. Burke stated there is a 12 month guarantee from Wolf Hill after planting. Further, if they need to work out a contract for immediate care, they will.

Councilor Verga thought it made sense, and asked for Mr. Bertolino's thoughts on the matter.

Councilor Ciolino asked how tall the trees will be at installation and maturity.

Mr. Burke stated at maturity level the Eastern White Pine will grow to 16 to 18 feet. Within five years, maturity level is 25-30 feet. He saw the issue being is the low lying homes across the street. The trees will be higher than their living room windows in six or seven years. They will be looking at green immediately; and going in the trees will be 8-10 feet.

Councilor Hardy stated that wasn't what they talked about at the site visit and asked about the berm they spoke of also going in.

Mr. Burke spoke of excavation underneath and around the root base; if they excavate underneath them, they will be fine; with less interruption to parking.

Councilor Hardy asked what would be the arrangement of the trees on the lot; where would they be.

Mr. Burke showed a hand-drawn map to the Councilors to show where the five trees would go in. Five spaces would be lost.

Councilor Hardy disagreed feeling the plan as presented wasn't a loss of spaces

Mr. Bertolino stated he wasn't able to speak about the neighbors; things have changed. He didn't think what was presented was not the same thing they spoke about and about what Mr. Ciamartaro spoke to him about the next day because he had changed his mind. Councilor Hardy was present at the meeting. He stated he was overly biased. They had discussed in the beginning they had ivy. Then they recommended three and two for trees which they were unhappy with. They had talked about no less than nine trees across the front, very different from what was presented just now. They were going to go four or five feet from the curbstone that's on the Ciamartaro property side of the sidewalk. They were going to put in another curbstone. They were going to have a dirt strip for approximately 100 feet; and they had agreed to plant approximately nine trees. They labored intensely over what kind of trees they were supposed to be so they would be everlasting. They deliberated over what kind of trees they were supposed to be because they wanted something everlasting. As Councilor Hardy stated they were concerned about square patches and heaving of the hot top. There was to be a drawn plan; he was supposed to get a copy to be prepared for the meeting. He had not seen it before now. He felt it was entirely different from what they had discussed because of the second curbstone. The following day he received a call from Mr. Ciamartaro concerned about two signs being blocked by the number of trees which he understood. His son-in-law related that he would move the two signs. They further discussed that a reduction from nine to seven trees may very well adequately fill what they are trying to accomplish across that strip. He felt he was concerned about the signs and understood Mr. Ciamartaro's position. He discussed it with Mr. Giacalone and said he would move them to the ends of the property. If they move the signs to the end of the property, that would accomplish not having a problem with the signage. The earth strip between the two curbstones was a major change. He didn't know that would change. By moving the strip approximately six feet into Mr. Ciamartaro's property, they were going to extend the parking lines so that no parking spaces were lost. The distance between the proposed new end of each parking line to the next series of parking lines was so adequately lined that it was possible for cars to pull in and out without having a problem. The only change was the concern about the signs and the amount of trees predicated on the fact that the signs stayed where they were. Moving signage made that go away and left them with seven trees. The real issue was what those trees would be. It was to be a hiding of the wall and that the mature height would continue to screen the wall.

Mr. Giacalone didn't disagree with Mr. Bertolino. He was at the meeting. He was willing to move the signs. They did talk about a continuous curve. He just received the plan yesterday from Wolf Hill. He was first proposed sugar maples, but they drop their leaves. That's why they spoke about evergreens which would be a 'full-time' screen. He wanted to do this right.

Mr. Burke stated they never discussed the sign movement.

Mr. Giacalone stated that the next day after the site visit, he and his father-in-law went to Mr. Bertolino and had yet another site visit because he was concerned about the signs. That's where they reached the compromise that maybe the nine trees wouldn't work with the signs. They did some compromising; that the nine trees might not work; they could get by with five trees or seven trees. He wanted to get this done. The Committee will make the right decision; and they will do what they have to do because they want to move on and get it done.

Councilor Ciolino stated they have to make some decisions.

Mr. Bertolino replied the issue should be "blessed" but not decided here. They talked at length about evergreen trees. That was a great idea because it was coverage year round. They're back to another site visit at least their ability to present one or two or three alternatives to be chosen. He felt they were no where near there.

Councilor Ciolino discussed the number of trees. They've heard five, seven and nine. He asked Mr. Burke for his recommendation.

Mr. Burke stated if they're moving signs, they can put in seven trees. If signs stay, then the trees in the spaces five would work; and they use the larger eastern white pines. You don't want to crowd them.

Councilor Ciolino stated they'll stick with seven trees, that they'll be evergreens. There will be curbing.

Mr. Burke stated they had discussed at the site meeting he was at as putting in a Cape Cod berm. It's a rolled soft curb put in parking lots. It helps to keep run off from going into the beds and helps with plowing. They're made of asphalt.

Councilor Hardy stated they talked about a raised bed so when the salt and sand is on the road and gets kicked up it wouldn't go over. It would lift the trees up higher and not have to excavate so deep for the plantings. They shook hands on this at the site; and have now gone through two iterations since then. It was less expensive to rip up that whole side than dig a hole and drop a tree. At the time it was said that the roots would probably come up and get under it. She showed the Committee a picture she drew of what it should be, as they agreed to at their meeting.

Mr. Giacalone didn't dispute what the Councilor said and described. He could do what he was asked to do.

Councilor Ciolino stated they have now agreed on seven trees. There will be a raised berm and the signs go to the ends.

Mr. Bertolino agreed.

Mr. Giacalone also agreed.

Councilor Ciolino stated that it will be nice when completed which Councilor Hardy also concurred.

Mr. Giacalone cautioned they were moving towards the end of the planting season.

Mr. Burke stated he'd like to look at mid- to late September for the installation or early October. **Mr. Giacalone** asked what the timeframe would be.

Councilor Hardy stated they'd be looking at the end of September; and they need the Council permission on the modification for the plantings.

Councilor Ciolino stated that they submit all this.

Mr. Giacalone asked if they could submit a landscaping plan and if that would be satisfactory.

Councilors Ciolino and Hardy stated that would be all right.

MOTION: On motion of Councilor Ciolino, seconded by Councilor Verga, the Planning & Development Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed to recommend to the City Council to require the owners/developers of 85-89 Bass Ave to immediately submit a request for modification of the City Council Special Permit issued January 5, 2005 for 85-89 Bass Avenue under the Gloucester Zoning Ordinances, section 5.2, Earth, Fill, and Removal, and to include with the request a written statement by the owners or their representatives of the agreement reached with the neighbors/abutters (the petitioners) and with this Committee concerning additional, new tree plantings and concerning the wall referenced in the 2005 Special Permit. The request for modification shall also include a revised, current plan updating all previous plans submitted to the Council for the 2005 Special Permit and the March 2006 rezoning, relating to the wall and landscaping.

MOTION: On motion by Councilor Ciolino, seconded by Councilor Verga, the Planning & Development Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed to advertise for a public hearing for Modification of Special Permit for 85-89 Bass Avenue concerning wall and landscaping, trees, and plantings.

2. *Creation of a Gloucester Dog Park Petition, pursuant to Sec. 9-1 "Free Petition" of City Charter*

Steve Winslow, Project Manager-Community Development; Mark Cole, Operations Manager-DPW; Daniel Morris, Chair and John McElhenny – Open Space Committee; Judy Masciarelli and Mary Lou Maraganis, Dog Park proponents were introduced by Councilor Ciolino.

Councilor Ciolino stated they are starting the process for starting an 'off-leash' dog park. He's been working with them and a petition will come before the City Council. They'll come before the City Council to present their intentions. What the Committee's intentions for this evening was to give this matter to the Open Space Committee that they work with the Dog Park committee to try and come up with some locations where the park could be placed. Mark Cole of the DPW was there because he was the keeper of all the public properties, and felt there was a need for his involvement. There is a need to change the Gloucester Zoning Ordinance because there is no mention of a Dog Park or a definition. You can't have any dogs running loose on any City property or in parks. That will need to be amended. There are a lot of little things that need to change to make this happen. P&D will be referring the matter out to the Open Space Committee for their suggestions. If they need more time, they should let the Committee know how much more time they need.

Mary Lou Maraganis and Judy Masciarelli made a short presentation to the Committee on behalf the Dog Park proponents (Documentation presented at meeting on file). She gave the group's reasons for the need for a fenced in, off-leash dog park: environmentally conscientious using green technology; envisioning this as a community project in partnership with the City of Gloucester designed to help satisfy the recreational needs of dog-guardians and non-dog guardians. It would also promote animal welfare and rescue; and help promote tourism with 15% of visitors to the City bringing their dogs. She reiterated the area would be fenced in. She noted there were 1,000 dog parks currently, in airports, parks. Beverly, Swampscott and Newburyport are in the process of establishing dog parks. Salem is the closest dog park. It is one big open space. There are no segments for different kinds of dogs. They wish to be proactive to learn from other dog parks. They learned to have separate areas for small dogs, large dogs. Salem Dog Park has a fee, \$25.00 because they were having issues with people not having licensed dogs. It is a yearly fee paid when you get your dog license. It is an option for Gloucester. There are pros and cons to that. If anyone is to use public space for recreation, under Mass laws, whoever owns that property is not liable for anything that happens on that property. Brookline utilizes all their open space and parks – if the facility is not being used at certain times they're allowing dogs and their guardians to use the areas. It has caused complaints to drop against dog owners and about dog waste. They're making good use of all of their parks. Somerville has a similar program as are others. They form a task force with dog owners, then a liaison for the City and create dog friendly areas in the City. When you go to membership, there is a liability issue and then they have to sign a liability waiver. She noted that the Provincetown Dog Park is rated one of the best dog parks in the country. They would like to see more of what they installed created by artists for dog amenities. They define it as an area to exercise and socialize well-behaved dogs in a safe, off-leash setting and supplement other leashed and off-leashed dog areas. They cited the importance of socialization and exercise dogs in a friendly environment. The dog parks bring a vast array of people together because of their dogs. They got over 1,000 signatures in three weeks for their petition. They also want to educate people on picking up after their dog and on dog behavior. They want it to be ADA accessible. Many elderly don't get pets which this will give them a venue to possibly give them an opportunity to exercise their pets. Many dog parks have benches outside for people who don't have dogs to observe them. They suggested sample layouts of a "well thought out" park, components of a dog park such as shrubs, curved lines and different play areas. Dogs with similar play styles play together. There has to be a section where they go in, lock the gate then release their dog into the park off-leash and that it is repeated at the exit. They discussed sanitation, funding; lights, security; buffer zones, parking. It was important to have crushed stone or decomposed granite. That needs no water to manage. Some need proper drainage. They have to look at and address. It is supposed to be devoid of all organic material to keep bacteria from taking hold. The soil would be underneath. They didn't know how far down the stone has to be but couldn't say yet. Maintenance is annually around \$2,000 to \$7,000 annually. It is self-policing. They hope for trash removal by the DPW. There would need to be detailed dog park rules. There would need to be a minimum of an acre. They did find out that you can't use CPA money on existing owned public property. With the passage of bill 90, hopefully by month end, it would eliminate that restriction. They hope if that does pass they would be able to apply during the next application process in November. And they proposed possible sites. They can't do it

alone. The City collected around \$42,000 for dog licenses and may be helpful to divert some of that money towards maintenance of a dog park. They have received donations for design of the park, and many others who have approached them to offer goods and services including the Boy Scouts. The Chamber of Commerce, Bob Hastings that once they get the approval he could tap his membership to help them establish the park. And they proposed possible sites. They pointed to two spots in Stage Fort Park, which they felt was the ideal location behind the tennis courts up the hill towards the playground. People on the Boulevard are trying to have people pick up after their dogs. It will be much more encouraged to get debris off the Boulevard. Dog owners would prefer to run their dogs than walk them. What's nice about the area behind the tennis courts is the terrain, the landscaping and parking. The second location is up by the basketball courts which have the same things going for it with more acreage. They are underutilized areas of the park. Many cities and towns, when their developing their community spaces, similar to Stage Fort Park, are now including dog parks. Fuller Field is also a fenced in area near Gloucester Crossing. Green Street Playfield as a possible location but was not as ideal. Swinson Park was a possibility to identify as a smaller neighborhood dog park as there are 10,000 dogs in Gloucester. **Mr. McEachern** pointed out that behind the tennis courts at Stage Fort Park is used by the cross country teams.

Mr. McElhenny asked what the main reason for the dog parks was.

Ms. Maraganis stated there is no fenced in area where dogs can run and play with other dogs. There's been talk for a long time but no driving force to get it in place. It is important for dogs to socialize and exercise. It was tried seven years ago to start one, but it got no where.

Ms. Masciarelli noted that in summer months then they can't go to the beaches. If they had another place to go it would solve many issues.

Ms. Maraganis stated many dogs can't be off leash because they run off. It is also for people. They love going there. They form a close bond over their dogs.

Ms. Masciarelli noted that just walking dogs is not enough exercise. By having the right behavior in a dog park carries outside of the dog parks; less issues of barking and aggression.

Councilor Ciolino stated they want to reclaim parts of Gloucester where there are problems with dogs and dog owners. There is a need for a place for dogs and their owners to go. He would rather bring his dog to a nice clean area. Wherever there is a community where there is a leash law there should be a dog park.

A few years ago there was an issue to get dogs off the beaches. So where do you run the dogs.

Mark Cole, DPW asked who'd be in charge of the dog park. If there is an issue who do they call; the dog officer, the DPW?

Councilor Ciolino stated there is one in Salem, and they'll have to find out how they operate. They're not reinventing the wheel and will find out how other communities do it.

Mr. Cole expressed his concern as to who deals with these issues.

Councilor Whynott felt it should be the dog officer.

Councilor McGeary stated this would have to be worked out in an ordinance with the consequences, etc.

Ms. Masciarelli stated they're hoping to have enough volunteers who would have keys to the supply cabinets and monitoring the park and dogs.

Mr. Cole stated if they have a dog park would they be banning dogs from the beaches.

Councilor Ciolino stated they'd be banned for the summer.

Mr. Cole responded they're still on the beaches, regardless. It's not going to solve the dogs on the beaches.

Ms. Masciarelli stated if there was a regular place they could go dog owners/guardians would use it. Perhaps neighborhood dog parks are a solution.

Councilor Whynott didn't feel the dog park would solve the problem of using the beaches.

Mr. Cole asked if this would stop dog owners not picking up after their pets.

Ms. Maraganis stated the Dog Park would be a place of education and help let the public know about it.

Councilor Verga stated there is peer pressure in an enclosed area for owners to pick up after their dogs. He felt Mr. McEachern, however, made an important point. They don't want to displace anybody.

Councilor Ciolino stated they should look at many venues.

Mr. Cole would be happy to help them look for appropriate spots in the City. He noted on the upper levels at Magnolia Woods where playing fields were already burdened with regards to parking for all the sports taking place there and was out of the way; and the possible usage of the Stage Fort Park.

Mr. Winslow noted the Open Space Committee was in the midst of an open space plan and they will see it in their next packet from the Mayor. They did an informal survey at a health fair; walking their dog is a big reason why people use recreational facilities. They did look at numbers from Virginia Beach, a community of 50,000 having one dog park. He worked in Somerville and his colleagues there were working on the creation of a dog park. Initially they fenced in 10,000 square ft. there. Somerville is very dense, and it got overused very quickly. They eventually put in stone dust and were very successful. Rice stone was the best surface. The DPW has to be involved. There are dog conflicts that the dog officer has to be involved in. Some of these locations are good as they are away from residential areas. Somerville's latest dog park is full fledged which cost an enormous amount. They are in this process of identifying priorities for Gloucester, and they'll see when they get this plan that there's a lot the City has: 70% is open space and not a lot of resources to cover that. The Committee needs to work this into the other priorities. They are looking for public comment. Parks and playgrounds need resources; and the City doesn't have many of them. They have to deal with competing uses. It is something they have to work on. He spoke of the financial collaboration in Somerville that helped get the dog park there off the ground.

Councilor Ciolino asked if Mr. Winslow if he could get them information from Somerville; how they do it there; their ordinances. Their next task will be to have a written ordinance.

Mr. Winslow stated he spoke to the Building Inspector about zoning and Gregg Cademartori, Planning Director. If it's on municipal land he didn't think there was a need for any zoning changes. This would be a recreational use. There's a leash law which would have to be modified; and there is no definition.

Councilor Whynott stated the police don't get involved unless a person is in danger; it's in their contract; they don't have to respond to dog issues. So you have only one person, and that's the Dog Officer.

Councilor Ciolino asked if they could put a fee, perhaps an extra \$1 on dog licenses.

Councilor Whynott stated the fee for a dog license is \$22.50 now which was higher than most other area municipalities. The City can raise could raise the price of dog licenses any time they want which could help pay for it. You'd have to create a revolving account. It could be done.

Mr. Winslow and **Mr. Cole** reminded everyone as to who will have to maintain and take away debris.

Councilor Whynott stated every time they raise the

Councilor Verga asked who would check to see if there were dogs with licenses.

Mr. Cole asked if it was self-policing would you tell him he couldn't bring his dog in.

Ms. Maraganis stated there would be signage to state that rule.

Mr. Cole stated what if they're not.

Ms. Maraganis stated generally people in the park say something and don't want to put themselves in those kinds of situation.

Mr. Cole wanted the DPW doesn't want to be the policing entity on the dog park.

Councilor Verga asked then who would be checking the license and wished to see what other communities do.

Ms. Maraganis stated it was from self-policing and peer pressure and also the membership to the park helps as well.

Mr. Cole was skeptical that someone would approach him to tell him he couldn't take his dog into the Dog Park because they didn't see a tag. How would they stop him? He could ignore that person and just go in anyway.

Ms. Maraganis stated there would be signage stating that only licensed dogs would be allowed at the entrances and exits.

Councilor Ciolino understood the DPW position and didn't want it to become a burden to their department. This was a start. This will take some time just to get the legalities done.

Councilor Ciolino again stated this was a beginning, their first formal meeting on the matter. There were a lot of pieces that needed to come together. It may take a year before they get through it all. He asked Mr. Cole to be part of the process. He asked if the Open Space Committee if they could do that.

Councilor Whynott stated in deference to Mr. Cole, some of the matters he brought up about the park need to be addressed now. They didn't want these things to happen the night they're voting at City Council.

Mr. Winslow stated that there was a Dog Owner Task Force in Somerville that ultimately dealt with their dog park. They may be able come up with some aspects and possibly have a site recommendation. A task force would need to be in place once a site was located and to have legal definition of what a dog park is. He didn't know if they'd be able to report back in 30 days. He suggested 45 days due to their meeting schedule.

Councilor Ciolino believed that once a site was located, that a Task Force would be in place.

Mr. McElhenny asked if they would just like a site recommendation not whether the Committee feels one way or another about the idea itself.

Councilor Ciolino asked that P&D would like both a site recommendation and the Open Space Committee's opinion on the matter.

MOTION: On motion by Councilor Ciolino, seconded by Councilor Verga, the Planning & Development Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed to forward the matter of a proposed "off-leash" dog park concept to the Open Space Committee in order that they and the proponents of the Dog Park may come back in 45 days with a report and suggested sites for it.

MOTION: On motion by Councilor Ciolino, seconded by Councilor Verga the Planning and Development Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed to receive language from General Counsel to amend the Gloucester Zoning Ordinances for its definition, creation, location, upkeep of any other necessary rules and regulations to govern the park itself.

The matter was continued to the September 22, 2010.

3. Request from National Grid re: Electric Easement Goose Cove Lane

Councilor Ciolino announced National Grid needs to demonstrate for their request for an easement on Goose Cove Lane, a private way; verification of who owns the land in question and the agreement of the abutters before it can grant the City Council permit per Gloucester Code of Ordinances Sec. 23-105. The Committee also asked for a representation of the kind of pole to be erected, a photo. National Grid will be appraised as soon as possible so that the matter can come back to the Committee upon presentation of the documentation to move forward.

4. Request from Magnolia Road Race Committee re: September 2, 2010 Magnolia Road Race

Mr. McEachern, a member of the Magnolia Road Race Committee informed the Committee about the 34th running of the Magnolia Road Race which raises funds for the Magnolia Library. He stated they have successfully run this race without incident for many years, and asked the Committee for their permission under the new formalized process. There are some road closures from the Dunkin Donuts on Lexington Avenue to the Blyman School. These are rolling closures. Everyone in Magnolia knows what's going on; they walk the route with handouts for the affected neighbors. It is a strictly a community event. It is well known. If there is any inconvenience to their Magnolia neighbors, it is short lived.

Councilor Verga asked how many runners they anticipated.

Mr. McEachern stated about 300 runners. They'd like more to make more money for the library.

Councilor Whynott noted that any well run event like this is a good thing for Gloucester.

MOTION: On motion by Councilor Verga, seconded by Councilor Whynott, the Planning & Development Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed to recommend to the City Council to grant permission to the Magnolia Road Race Committee and the Magnolia Library Center in order to run the 34th running of the Magnolia 5K Road Race, Thursday, September 2, 2010 with a start of 6:30 p.m. to start from the Magnolia Library, Magnolia Square, turning left onto Shore Road, turning right onto Hesperus Avenue (through Stone Pillars unpaved street), left onto Norman Avenue (pass library) through Magnolia Square, right onto Magnolia Avenue, U-turn at Blyman School, straight onto Shore Road, left onto Hesperus Avenue, right onto Lexington Avenue and finish at the Magnolia Library with the following conditions:

- 1) A memorandum from Lt. Joseph Aiello be on file with this approval in the City Clerk's office 14 business days prior to the race delineating the role of the Gloucester Police Department before, during and after the race;
- 2) A memorandum from Fire Chief Phil Dench be on file with this approval in the City Clerk's office 14 business days prior to the race delineating the role of the Gloucester Fire Department, during and after the race;
- 3) Signs indicating "Runners in the Road" shall be placed at key locations along the race course for safety purposes. They are to be posted the morning of September 2, 2010 and removed by 9:00 p.m. the same day;
- 4) A Certificate of Insurance naming the City of Gloucester as the Certificate Holder;
- 5) The road closures are to be only as follows:
 - Lexington Avenue from Hesperus Avenue to Norman Avenue on September 2, 2010 from 4:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.
 - Magnolia Avenue from Magnolia Square to Western Avenue from approximately 6:50 p.m. to 7:20 p.m.;
- 6) All memorandums of approval shall be obtained by the Magnolia Road Race Committee and the Magnolia Library and delivered to the office of the City Clerk.

MOTION: On motion by Councilor Verga, seconded by Councilor Whynott, the Planning & Development Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed to recommend to the City Council to grant permission to the Magnolia Road Race Committee and the Magnolia Library Center in order to run the Magnolia Junior 1 Mile Fun Run, Thursday, September 2, 2010 with a start of 6:00 p.m. to start from the Magnolia Library, Magnolia Square, turning left onto Shore Road, turning left onto Cliff Road, right onto Lexington Avenue and finish at the Magnolia Library with the following conditions:

- 1) A memorandum from Lt. Joseph Aiello be on file with this approval in the City Clerk's office 14 business days prior to the race delineating the role of the Gloucester Police Department before, during and after the race;
- 2) A memorandum from Fire Chief Phil Dench be on file with this approval in the City Clerk's office 14 business days prior to the race delineating the role of the Gloucester Fire Department, during and after the race;
- 3) Signs indicating "Runners in the Road" shall be placed at key locations along the race course for safety purposes. They are to be posted the morning of September 2, 2010 and removed by 9:00 p.m. the same day;
- 4) A Certificate of Insurance naming the City of Gloucester as the Certificate Holder;
- 5) The road closures are to be only as follows:
 - Lexington Avenue from Hesperus Avenue to Norman Avenue on September 2, 2010 from 4:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.

- **Magnolia Avenue from Magnolia Square to Western Avenue from approximately 6:50 p.m. to 7:20 p.m.;**
- 6) **All memorandums of approval shall be obtained by the Magnolia Road Race Committee and the Magnolia Library and delivered to the office of the City Clerk.**

Councilor Verga was invited to be the official starter.

Councilor Ciolino noted that he received a letter from the Horribles Parade Committee stating they had discussed the potential modifications in the parade route which he read in the record. They wanted to meet with the Committee in August to determine the route changes in the 2011 parade given the amount of planning involved instead of returning in February.

Councilor Verga stated he didn't mind them coming to P&D now; but he didn't want them to come in and tell them why it won't work. This needs to be a discussion.

Councilor Whynott stated times change, things change; and that they're looking for positive ways for things to work.

Councilor Verga asked if the Chiefs had thought about an alternate route they offered up at the meeting off the cuff. It would be good to get the players ahead of time to submit something.

Councilor Whynott asked they present suggestions to find another way to make it work.

Councilor Ciolino asked that a letter be sent to the Fishtown Horribles Parade asking they come to their September 9th meeting.

A motion was made, seconded and voted to adjourn the meeting at 8:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dana C. Jorgenson
Clerk of Committees

DOCUMENTATION/ITEMS SUBMITTED DURING MEETING:

- Presentation by Judy Masciarelli, 23 Way Road on proposed Gloucester Dog Park, Off-Leash recreational area;
- Letter from Al Kipp, Chair, Fishtown Horribles Parade Committee dated July 21, 2010.