



CITY OF GLOUCESTER
PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
Thursday July 29, 2010 at 6:30 PM
Kyrouz Auditorium, City Hall, 9 DALE AVE
Richard Noonan, Chair

Members Present:

Richard Noonan, Chair
Mary Black, Vice-Chair
Marvin Kushner
Henry McCarl
Karen Gallagher

Staff:

Gregg Cademartori, Planning Director
Pauline Doody, Recording Clerk

I. BUSINESS

- A. Call to Order with a Quorum of the Planning Board at 6:45pm
- B. Introduction of Planning Board Members and Staff

II. PUBLIC COMMENT-None

III. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Approval Not Required Plans

- ***Bernard and Phyllis Sova to divide one lot into four at 1 Stanwood Point (Assessors Map 230 Lot 51). (Continued from July 15th)***

Mr. Cademartori reviewed with the Board the ANR plan that had been submitted and discussed. There were several deficiencies, and with suggestions from the Board a revised plan was submitted with the date of July 22, 2010. The plan is now compliant and each of the four lots has the required upland area, but will be subject to additional permitting. It is satisfactory plan for an ANR endorsement.

Motion: That the subdivision control law does not apply to the revised plan dated July 22, 21010 for Bernard and Phyllis Sova to divide one lot into four at 1 Stanwood Point (Assessors Map 230 Lot 51).

1st:Karen Gallagher

2nd:Marvin Kushner

Vote: All approved 5-0

B. Site Plan Reviews

- ***JaJo Realty Trust to construct new commercial building at 146-148 Eastern Avenue (Assessors Map 160 Lots 39 & 48). (Continued from July 15th and Continued to August 19th)***

Mr. Cademartori stated that the applicant is in the process of developing a more detailed plan.

Motion: To accept the continuance request of JaJo Realty Trust to construct new commercial building at 146-148 Eastern Avenue (Assessors Map 160 Lots 39 & 48) to August 19th.

1st:Henry McCarl

2nd:Karen Gallagher

Vote: All approved 5-0

- ***Abbie Morgan, LLC to establish motor vehicle service and modify parking lot at 168 Eastern Avenue (Assessors Map 160 Lot 6) (Modified Site Plan).***

Mr. Cademartori reviewed with the Board the project at 168 Eastern Ave. He stated the site plan was approved and now the applicant has pursued a special permit from city council for motor vehicle service. Additional plans have been submitted. The changes added to the plan are in front of the building, which now proposes an area for displaying vehicles for sale. The applicant has followed the Board's recommendations regarding relocating the loading zone further away from the entrance from Eastern Ave and also gained the approval of the Engineering Department for drainage design. Barring any additional conditions, all other conditions included in the prior site plan approval have been satisfied to date.

John McNiff Jr. Abbey Morgan LLC

Mr. McNiff stated that the revised plan reflects changes suggested by the Board. The change of the entrance is now 25' radius from 15' radius the signage has been changed and the loading zone has been moved from one side of building to the other. It was noted by the buyer that he felt slightly restricted by the planning Board regarding the number of parking spaces and wants to increase it from 5 spaces to 9 spaces. A gas trap has to be installed because of zoning changes. We needed to do some test holes and it was found that out in front of the building was the only area to be able to install the trap. 10 1/2 feet was needed and to comply with code we had to remove the tree and that's where we it ended up. It is awkward to request this at this point and is hoping the Board will see the necessity of what we have to do here. We will maintain the green space. Please accept these modifications.

The Board reviewed the plans for any further discussion. Mr. Noonan asked if there was any opportunity to replace the tree on the property.

Mr. McNiff stated that because of the need to test we disturbed a large amount of the trees roots.

Mr. McNiff stated that the applicant will pave Old County Road and will commit to it in writing. We will also look at screening along Old County Rd to prevent unsightly views of the property.

Mr. Cademartori stated that this is a reasonable additional condition that the landscaping be enhanced.

Motion: To approve the modified plan dated July 10, 2010 for Abbie Morgan, LLC to establish motor vehicle service and modify parking lot at 168 Eastern Avenue (Assessors Map 160 Lot 6) with the following condition.

- **Cut back of vegetation &,side of building to improve line of sight**
- **Enhance landscaping to compensate for tree loss**

1st:Karen Gallagher

2nd:Marvin Kushner

Vote: All approved 5-0

IV. PUBLIC HEARING (Continued from July 15th) ~7:30 PM

In accordance with the provisions of MGL Chapter 40A, Section 5, and the Gloucester Zoning Ordinance, Section 1.11, the Gloucester Planning Board will hold a public hearing to consider the following petition to amend the Zoning Map and Zoning Ordinance as follows:

Amend the Gloucester Zoning Map by creating an overlay district zone consisting of 3 +/- acres in the Marine Industrial district located at 33 & 47 Commercial Street, Assessor's Map 1 Lots 33 & 22, respectively, and to amend the Zoning Ordinance by adopting a corresponding new Section 25 entitled Birdseye Mixed-Use Overlay District (BMOD) governing the permitting new uses by master plan and special permit in the overlay district.

Mr. Noonan brought the continued public hearing to order at 7:30pm. He stated that the goal tonight is to start working through the sections of the ordinance proposal. We will keep an eye on the time and temperature and then will take public comment.

Attorney Lisa Mead of Blatman, Bobrowski, & Mead, LLC 30 Green St, Newburyport, Ma.

Mr. Mead stated that tonight they will provide a presentation and give the Board the opportunity to discuss and ask any questions that come up during the presentation.

Ms. Mead stated that the purpose section is very obvious and the goal is to encourage redevelopment, as well as to preserve the natural environment and historic aspects of the area. We have taken comment from the public and city official and that's how we developed the purpose section. The development of the definitions some are in the regular zoning ordinance, which are general and we have added some that were not in the ordinance. We want to be very clear as to what each item means. Ms. Mead reviewed the definitions with the Board and noted that all information is on file and available for review at Community Development Office 3 Pond Road. Ms. Mead identified the new definitions:

- Limited agriculture: green possibilities of the site to be able to grow on site.
- Basement
- Building area
- Commercial recreation indoor. Possibility of some kind of recreation uses indoor. Athletic activities for children.
- Ground floor:-because of concerns in the past about the whole thing being a hotel
- Integrative Medical Center
- Live/Work residences
- Marine Related Educational Facility
- Plan Unit Development
- Definition of reconstruction is added
- Renovation:
- Re tenanting
- Structure parking and use of clusters

Mr. Noonan asked if the Board had any question regarding the additional definitions.

Ms. Black asked where the definition of the adult day care center came from because they have very specific definitions and state requirements. Ms. Black suggested adding to the definition "appropriately licensed" to the definition. This is the opportunity to add to the definitions.

Attorney Mead the current zoning ordinance has general use "day care facilities". They wish to be specific. She stated that she would be happy to add to the definition, but it is only for zoning purposes.

Ms. Black also had a question on Section 6 page 2 regarding commercial indoor recreation. Is it like a function hall?

Attorney Mead stated no that would be separate use. It would be an indoor children activity center or children museum, or water park. What you would go back to is the underlying zoning the definitions that apply to the district apply to both.

Ms. Black stated at the last meeting a function hall was mentioned.

Mr. Cademartori stated that there wasn't a specific line item for it.

Attorney Mead stated that it might fall under a restaurant depending on the facility. She agreed that it should be done separately.

Mr. Cademartori stated that he would follow-up with Bill Sanborn and that most the time a function hall is attached or a part of an operating restaurant.

Ms. Gallagher asked for clarification regarding the hotel/ motel --based on combined gross floor area of the structure as we know it today--how many rooms would that equate to?

Mr. Bell stated from the really economic and efficient stopover unit to a grander living space of 600-1600. Take a 1000sq feet average and divide it, would resulting in approximately 100- 125 rooms.

Ms. Gallagher asked what a floating overnight accommodations?

Attorney Mead stated a Floatel. It would be when a boat is docked.

Mr. Cademartori stated getting back to that calculation; it has a ceiling of 125,000 square feet or percentage of the gross floor area, whatever is greater, however for some of the other uses you specify the exclusion of structured parking in the calculation, if silent it would be included here. What is the intention?

Attorney Mead stated it was only hotel use not parking. The intent is not to include the structured parking and we should clarify that.

Mr. Cademartori asked for clarification as written live/ work; by this definition -you have to work within the buildings or PUD district?

Attorney Mead confirmed yes or within the PUD district.

Ms. Gallagher asked if there would be a charge for parking or would it be free?

Attorney Mead stated they were not at that level of detail yet.

Mr. Kushner stated he sees several different uses and no common thread; also there is a lack of information as to the number of vehicles generated by the number of uses. Many of the residences park on the edge of the building. Can you make it more feasible? He stated he was very concerned by how much parking will be generated by all these uses and would like to see a projection of vehicles.

Attorney Mead stated that the parking required by the uses has to be provided on site. The application will drive the number of parking spaces. They must be on site. There is a provision stated in the proposal and each master plan presented will have its own parking requirement.

Ms. Black asked for clarification from Mr. Cademartori stating that each master plan presented would have its own parking requirement assigned to it.

Mr. Cademartori clarified that the master plan stage, would flesh out a project concept with the number and types of uses. Special permits would be even more specific of impacts. In the concept as presented at the last meeting maybe an 80 space structured parking within one building would satisfy the requirement of that scenario. However, that is one concept and there could be any number of permutation including one with multiple buildings with mix of structured and surface parking, and unless they can demonstrate to the permit granting authority that there is a reason for relaxing the parking standards they would have to comply. When the uses are clustered and moving from one to another, there has to be an assumption that there are similar set of potential impacts and requirements.

Attorney Mead stated from the city's regulatory point of view the requirement that you have to maintain or meet. The underlying parking requirements help to control the size of the project because there is only so much space.

Ms. Black stated that parking ends up being master plan specific.

Attorney Mead stated the next item is the map and the uses allowed by right. It shows the uses authorized by PUD special permit. I've provided an outline with the zoning that lists the allowed uses in the underlying district. There is a table on page 3 in the memorandum (Attorney Mead referenced the document). The uses you see are the new special permit uses. Also are the additional accessory uses that are allowed in the underlying district would be allowed here, in addition to the accessory uses are new uses structured parking and drive-through facility as defined in the PUD district.

Attorney Mead handed out a document regarding the Concept of Use Cluster, which is attached. She stated that it showed her experience with use clusters seven years ago in Somerville. She explained that her partner developed the concept and it helps provide some flexibility so the developer can get financing. She stated that it was never adopted in Somerville, but it was where the concept developed. The City of Somerville did eventually adopt something similar and it is in use.

Attorney Mead read from the document to further clarify clusters. Section 7.13 Table of Use Clusters.

The goal is for people to go in and get a master plan approved. In that first guide there is a sample of definitions adopted. One of the definitions is the artist live/work. A question that was presented to us at the last meeting was-- how do know that they are living and working there? Attorney Mead referenced the document (page 3) stating that in Somerville the city actually certified the people who live there. As cities and towns catch up and try to assist development, for that to happen it must be understood that financing is tough for commercial ventures and applicant must be able to get something permanent without being tied down to specific use and then have to come back in and re-permit later. Understanding you can do this in this use cluster so long as it's the same or less square footage and it doesn't change the exterior of the building. In reviewing the education and recreation use cluster, it was found they are very similar and have similar parking requirements. They go together. There are two different kind of residential use clusters, one is a residential commercial use and one is regular residential use.

The City of Gloucester ordinance doesn't define the size. The control we drafted states that it has to be in the same square footage.

Ms. Black stated that some of our discussion has been generated around maximizing the space. Do we want to consider motor vehicles sales or rental and is this is a priority?

Mr. Cademartori stated it is important to remember what are already permitted uses in the MI district. There can be some statement about the appropriateness of the additional uses that are suggested, but what the district allows right now would have to be addressed in a separate recommended to the Council.

Attorney Mead stated that the council looks at everything when looking at a master plan and how it all works together.

Mr. Cademartori stated that there were amendments made over last winter and motor vehicle use was eliminated. We should discuss drive-through regarding traffic congestion issues and parking issues. From your consideration of the uses you have proposed by special permit, the other PUDs you provided examples of- they are often from much larger scale districts. Has there been consideration to what is truly viable for this site? Do you see any use that in your opinion are inappropriate for this site?

Attorney Mead stated that drive-through may not be viable, but the rest of the rest of them depending on the uses to go in there would be fine. The idea is that this is a unique location. Depending of the opportunity that comes, the ordinance has be drafted to support an appropriate mix.

Ms. Black stated that it is the basket approach; you can start off with one concept and then move along to the next if the first doesn't work out.

Attorney Mead stated that is if it's a by-right use. You can change it without going through city council.

Mr. Noonan stated that at first the thought was that this is a blank slate and anything goes, however, actually there is ultimate control, but movement within the uses.

Ms. Black stated that it provides a boundary.

Mr. Cademartori stated also for clarity you could receive master permits for uses A, B, C , and ultimately put in D, E,F provided that there is a likeness between each one of them. The cluster concept works for a grouping of uses that will occupy a third of the building, and another use another third, and so on, but you could go through a hearing process, demonstrate concepts and everything that goes along with it for three different types of uses and ultimately without returning to the council develop three other uses. It is a matter of defining similarity, impacts and compatibility.

Attorney Mead stated that the cluster binds you. Attorney Mead also addressed the Covenant concern for people purchasing or renting (read from document provided) that the area around it is an industrial area.. Please reference the Dimensional table. The Minimum area for the master plan coming to city council is 80,000 sq feet, which is approximately two acres, which on the landward side is two thirds of it. The minimum width is 100 feet for a PUD, frontage of land is 100 feet, The Building height has 125' maximum. The footnote requires that no more than 15% of building of PUD shall exceed 125'. It will be tiered down (read from document) no more than 55% of the building area shall exceed 108'. Attorney Mead referenced the drawing and stated the idea is to not have the height on the sidewalk.

Ms. Black asked if the drawing incorporate the 125' depiction.

Richard Griffen, Architect, 37 Turner St Salem, Ma.

Mr. Griffen stated that is was not to scale. The tallest point (showed on plan) high point will be more toward the middle. It is still in review.

Ms. Black asked how the height of 125' was determined.

Mr. Griffen stated that it was driven by the sense of topography Gloucester and amount of height of surrounding structures, and also by the fact as we developed the areas that may become residential we realized that they would need views and window space and as we get above a certain level we got squeezed down. We got severely limited at to the amount of square feet we could build above the third floor level. That is when we started thinking how we could work aesthetically with Gloucester and give us the square footage we needed.

Ms. Black stated her concern over the 125' height, not quite seeing how it would mesh with the city skyline. She stated that as she comes into the city, it would be the main feature seen.

Mr. Griffen stated that an accurate survey of heights has not been done yet. In terms of building construction it would mean nine stories and a pitched roof.

Mr. Bell stated that when the height was assessed, many building in Gloucester were taken into consideration. Mr. Bell talked of the Gloucester Mill project and the frame of mind of the people of Gloucester in the 1800's. It was a magnificent building at the time and they were embracing the future. We are asking for the people of Gloucester to do the same thing now. The city hall tower is 145' from entrance level and 180' above sea level. If we are to embrace the future of what this structure can mean and the city can access the return over the next hundred years. We are extremely sensitive to the aesthetics.

Ms. Black referencing the height issue asked is part of the concept was to give the proposed residential feature views; is it the intention that the 125' be accessible for public viewing?

Mr. Bell stated absolutely! Our enthusiasm is from our experience from being on the Ferris wheel at Fiesta. Technically it should be 145' to be able to access WiFi and other technical aspects.

Ms. Black asked if anything less would achieve the same thing? Ms. Black addressed Mr. Cademartori asking if the height was approved with the master plan, can the City Council come back and say they only want it to be 100' high?

Attorney Mead stated that it is by special permit and must meet the criteria. If the design did not provide and enhance the area etc, if it was not the right mix (read from document) it is up to the City Councils discretion.

Ms. Black inquired if the provision is included to allow 125', is it then allowed? The City Council can't come in and say we only want to give you a 100'.

Mr. Cademartori stated that in the MI district there is a ceiling of 40' and there is no height exception available and if anyone proposes additional height they must appeal to the Zoning Board of Appeals. In this case the applicant would need to demonstrate through design and context that they satisfy the outlined criteria. This is saying that it is an assumption that there is a certain allowance that you can be within a 15% of building height. 50% of structure and 108' and the balance being compliant with the 40' or less.

Mr. Noonan stated the height issue would be a discussion. We do not want to make it such a looming building. A street level perspective from both sides will be helpful for people to understand the scale of the project. Once a height is established we can clarify it. It still has to make City Council permitting.

Mr. Cademartori stated he was trying to understand the relevance of 100' frontage. I don't think you can achieve the 80,000 square feet with a 100 feet of frontage and width if you went from Commercial St. to the water side, they seem to be meaningless dimensional standards.

Attorney Mead stated there was nothing hard and fast about 100' Attorney Mead also addressed the off street parking and loading requirements stating that any project or reconstruction or renovation has to comply with the city's parking ordinances. All parking must be on site. We may take advantage of shared parking, but that is up to the City Council. The parking is use driven. The retail people will use it during the day and the public at night. One of the ideas is having a zip car facility—on demand car use. Attorney Mead continued on regarding the design criteria (read from document). She stated it was standard design criteria.

Ms. Black asked how do we overcome the subjectivity of it what constitutes preserving what is historical?

Attorney Mead stated as to preserve the character. You can put so many criteria in that the architects cannot do any work. It becomes too broad. City Council has final say as to what is appropriate for the city and the project.

Ms. Black asked Attorney Mead if it was felt that the language as it is presented now is at a midpoint so the project can move forward.

Mr. Cademartori had some comments and question to make sure it was consistent with the rest of the zoning ordinance. It is important for the Board to note and recognize with the proposed new special permit uses, in places it is suggested that a PUD project is exempted from other special permitting processes and from the provisions of the current zoning ordinance, particularly in the ALR- would not follow section 514. The inclusionary under certain residential uses is designated at a different level for live /work. He stated that one of the things he is not seeing here is reference to section 5.7; whether or not you are going to follow that process. It would be referenced in the hotel/motel/motor inn as well as new or conversion of multifamily, or apartment and I am not sure if further reference would be required elsewhere.

Attorney Mead stated the definition of PUD permit exempts the major project review and site plan review 5.7 & 5.8. It applies to any. Given the detail and breath the city council will do all those reviews. It is an all-encompassing permit.

Mr. Cademartori stated concern regarding guidelines and types of impacts that are reviewed in the major project reviews are at least incorporated by reference. One of the things discussed is the parking requirement based on the zoning ordinance. A major special permit also requires a traffic impact analysis be performed. I think for this type of project that you are introducing shared parking it will be important to consider what the demand is. A concept in the traffic impact analysis is trip generation. It is another way to evaluate a project and its local and area impact on the street network. I want to make sure that the substantive requirements are included in the review process.

Bringing out the point that if an ALR project is exempted from that section, what type of guidance would the permit granting authority be looking to in ensuring that one satisfied the standards that they normally would be applying. He asked the Board to refer to 5.7.5.

Attorney Mead stated the suggestion is that those analytical tools required in section 5.7.5 also be required as part of the review mechanisms.

Attorney Mead addressed landscaping stating open space requirements all go through special permit review. The view corridors are more specifically defined. We have to show the access. Section 5.25.8 speaks to the master plan requirements.

Ms. Black asked about beach access and if it has been determined whether Pavilion Beach is public or private.

Attorney Mead stated that she is preparing a document on the history and title of the beach. The master plan submittal process has a two- stage review and you can submit both at once. You can come in with the master plan and also with the special permits if you knew exactly what you were going to do. You could also do one or both. **Attorney Mead** reviewed the PUD master plan (read from document), she stated that you cannot have an approved master plan and then back in with a completely different special permit request.

Mr. Noonan asked for clarification regarding a 15 year permit for a master plan.

Attorney Mead stated that if you get a master plan we must bring in a special permit in within 15 years.

Ms. Black asked how 15 years came about.

Mr. Bell stated that he is aging and it just constantly amazes him how long things take. He also has looked at the economy and its current standing as well as the time frame for this project. **Attorney Mead** stated that this will be a point of discussion. It is a big project.

Public Comment:

Bill Johnson 26 1/2 Fort Square

Mr. Johnson addressed that he would like to address several points of discussion from this evening and they are not in any order of importance.

In regards to the height of the building; if you stand at the Fort playground and look at the freezer building it is 35' high. Now stack two more of those on top and that will help to get a visual on the height of the proposed building. **Mr. Johnson** stated that his greatest concern is the residential aspect of the project. He is concerned it will become the majority of the building and dominant the use of the structure. He stated he would like to see this project move forward, however his main concerns are the height and the use cluster with the residential. If you do decide to allow some maybe have some kind of a barrier, like trees, sidewalks etc. I am not completely in opposition to this project.

Sonny Robinson 20 Harvard Street

Ms. Robinson concurred with **Bill Johnson's** statements regarding the height of the building. She stated adding to it apples and oranges in relation to any other tall spire in the city and should only look at it for this site. 40' is not a height restriction. **Ms. Robinson** also would join **Bill Johnson** in his concern about residential. It is 100% inappropriate. It should stay an MI district. To go residential on this site is to risk too much to the working waterfront. The use clusters are not use clusters. There is nothing similar between a marine related business and an adult day care. An adult day care center is not appropriate for this district. The definitions are understated. If you look at what is going on with ALR there is an overabundance of adult living and an under abundance of affordable housing. Be very careful of what you approve here and the potential implication of other developers to come in. You have a precedent setting here. Mayor Menino and points to development of South Boston on the waterfront and condo building have come and gone. Citizens of Gloucester want a viable marine industrial center. Please reject this proposal and keep the MI district as is. Hone the project way down.

Jean Gallo 20 Harvard Street

Ms. Gallo asked if rezoning was necessary. **Ms. Gallo** stated that **Mr. Bell** had said that there had been any takers for the site under the present zoning; it would be the most cost effective plan. She stated to remind the Board that **Anne Malloy** did want it but was outbid. The whole thing is bound by right, bound by special permit, and it seems to supercede existing ordinances. Does anyone thing supercede another? In listening to you, and hearing your questions and also hearing that they haven't been fully answered, I urge you to get the questions answered and don't kick it to City Council.

Attorney Mead stated - if you have received a PUD master plan permit, the provisions of underlying zoning is no longer applicable. Once you get a PUD permit, you are bound to it. You can propose by right uses and still must have a master plan and special permit to do it.

Mr. Mucauhley showed a plan of the working waterfront. The coloration of red is property that is better than 50% utilized. The rest is potential for development for marine waterfront. What is important is that we will be removing these 4 acres from this and it also shows how much we have regressed. Birdseye is a unique opportunity.

Mr. Bell stated the residential component is what provides us to offer the opportunity to subsidize the commercial space. The market rate to any rent is below what it cost to do construction. You must have an economic engine to pay and that engine is residential. We think the adult day care concept is going to change rapidly. We want it to have an option. We want to as open and honest and clear. The market in Gloucester is restrained. Please take into consideration the Maplewood Ave Mill building.

Mr. Noonan thanked all the participants.

Mr. Cademartori closed in suggesting that it may be helpful for those recommending and deliberating on the zoning proposal to provide some grounding to the concept which has been provided as potentially being enabled by the proposed ordinance. In his estimation the building depicted is likely far less than the allowed proposed 125' height maximum, perhaps on the order of 80 feet at its highest point. It would be helpful to know the height depicted and the square footage of the concept plan.

Motion: To continue the public hearing on Amending the Gloucester Zoning Map by creating an overlay district zone consisting of 3 +/- acres in the Marine Industrial district located at 33 & 47 Commercial Street, Assessor's Map 1 Lots 33 & 22, respectively, and to amend the Zoning Ordinance by adopting a corresponding new Section 25 entitled Birdseye Mixed-Use Overlay District (BMOD) governing the permitting new uses by master plan and special permit in the overlay district to August 19th.

1st: Henry McCarl

2nd: Marvin Kushner

Vote: All approved 5-0

V. OTHER BUSINESS

- A. Pre-Application Discussion - Potential Subdivision at 23-27 Silva Court. (*No discussion*)
- B. Planner's Report

Mr. Cademartori stated that the open space plan draft was completed and will be in front of city council by September. There is a submission to the Board by Steve Winslow, which is a summary packet. I will forward that to you and you can take a look at. The City website is going live on Monday. The full draft of plan will be posted on Monday morning and the Planning Board is one of the bodies that have been asked to review it. One of the things we have done is try to rectify the information that we have within the city, as to whether a parcel has any conservation interest. The state requires a full inventory of all open space resources of what the city has and we have made much progress on this front. Over the next months or so we will receive public comment and perhaps have a presentation at a Planning Board meeting.

The Community Development Department is moving forward with consultant assistance on a draft feasibility study for municipal wind project in Blackburn Park. We received a \$50000 + grant for the study which will set us up for more grant funding for design and construction if the site is financially viable.

Ms. Gallagher reported on the CPA committee stating there were 13 proposals for projects and they were looked at last night. The total was for several million dollars and maybe with a match we may be able to do 600,000. Between now and October we have several meetings and we will determine what is best to submit to City Council.

Henry McCarl reported on PIRC stating there is some misunderstanding as to how far along we are. We are in the preliminary stages. We are utilizing the consultant plans. The idea is to put all this together to discuss what changes would be used. The PIRC charter was to hold review on the city plan established in 2001 and will continue to hold to that nature. We have improved communication between the Boards and agencies and we are not trying preempting anyone's prerogative. But feel some activity needs to be done on overall planning.

Mr. Noonan stated that we want to make sure that good work is getting done and the right work is getting done.

Mr. Cademartori stated that there was an article in the paper regarding the potential harbor walk. We have mentioned that we have additional staff working on a conceptual harbor walk that does not interfere with surrounding properties or uses. We want to create a connecting link to the Commercial St area and to the Harbor Loop area. The Mayor asked for seaport funds and if successful we will continue to work on this in the fall. The CPC has received a funding request for open space planning in North Gloucester Woods. Background data is being worked on now. Each of these projects once further along will be presented to the Board.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion: To adjourn 10:00pm

1st: Ms. Black

2nd: Mr. Kushner

Vote: All approved 5-0

VI. NEXT MEETING

Next regular meeting of the Planning Board is Thursday August 19, 2010

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