

CITY COUNCIL STANDING COMMITTEE

Planning & Development

Wednesday, September 8, 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; Police Chief Michael Lane; Fire Chief Phil Dench; Attorney J. Michael Faherty; Michael Lee; Janice Costa; Howard Costa III; Mildred McCarthy; Chief Michael Lane; Joseph & Mary Amicone; David Tucker; Al Kipp; Peter Williamson; David Harvey; Douglas Goolsby

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m.

1. Continued Business

A) *2010-2015 Draft Open Space and Recreation Plan: Plan Summary & Action Plan (Cont'd from 08/11/10)*

MOTION: On motion by Councilor Ciolino, seconded by Councilor Whynott, the Planning & Development Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed to accept the Draft Open Space and Recreation Plan: Plan Summary and Action Plan as presented.

2. SCP2010-010: 15 Middle Street, GZO Sec. 2.3.1.7, Sec. 1.10.1, Sec. 3.1.6, Sec. 1.10.1 and Sec. 3.2.2.a

Councilor Ciolino noted that the SPC filed with the City Clerk, and reiterated that it was under GZO Sec. 2.3.1.7, Sec. 1.10.1, Sec. 3.1.6, and Sec. 3.2.2.a. The applicant is Michael E. Lee, 15 Middle Street. All appropriate documentation and sign offs have been made at City Departments and the abutters notified appropriately.

Attorney Robert Coakley, representing the applicant, Michael E. Lee of 15 Middle Street spoke to the Committee regarding the application for a Special Council Permit (SCP2010-010) for that address under Gloucester Zoning Ordinance sections 2.3.1.7, Sec. 1.10.1, Sec. 3.1.6, and Sec. 3.2.2.a. He explained that this was a conversion of a three unit dwelling to a four unit dwelling which was intended to be owner occupied under 2.3.1(7). Further, they are asking for a height exception, to 39 feet under Sec. 3.1.6(b), as well as a decrease in the minimum lot area per dwelling unit from 10,000 feet to 7,890 feet, decreasing the area by 2,110 feet. There was no proof positive how it became a three family dwelling. There was a certificate of usage but that does not legally establish how it became a three family dwelling. Mr. Lee wished to improve the property physically since he bought the property and wishes to make the fourth dwelling on the top floor, owner occupied, which is essentially a slight height increase. They went before the Zoning Board. They granted all the necessary underlying dimensional relief under their jurisdiction. They have the appropriate open space area, a 7,500 square foot area, over the 5,000 feet required. They had filed with the Zoning Board. The plans are the same as were put before the Zoning Board. There is ample parking on site, without counting the spaces in the garage. Mr. Lee wishes to save the garage and fix it up. With the usage and ownership on site, he can control that. It can be blocked by allocating spaces and to any one of the four parties on site. They're asking for two forms of relief, one is the SCP authorizing the usage as a multi-family of four units and for the ability to go up to 39 feet, counting a widows walk, which is common to the neighborhood, measured to the top of the rail. The existing height is 34 feet. This would be five feet above the existing height. They went with a set of plans rendered by Mr. Lee's architect to the Zoning Board which were approved. Mr. Sanborn suggested that Mr. Lee go

back to the Board and show the minor changes that are on the plans that the Council has and the Board approved the minor changes, windows from the driveway side changing to a Juliet balcony which allows the doors to open more for show and safety purposes; they are not wide enough for chairs. Another change was on the rear where the roof line was made into a flat roof with a small deck on it. Visually instead of another gabled roof, it is a more simplistic design. The Zoning Board felt it was a minimal change and voted to authorize it and those plans have been filed with the Building Inspector. The other form of relief they're asking for is that for a multi-family they need 2,500 sq. ft. per unit. They're under it by about 500 ft. per unit. They're asking for a 'lot area' which was not a variance, but a special, special permit, like the height variance that the City Council is empowered to grant. He felt one of the advantages of this change was that the required means of egress for this property are all internal. There will not be a "hodgepodge of stairways" crisscrossing on the outside of the building. The design for the top floor is a mansard design. There is one of similar design next door to 15 Middle Street, also with a widow's walk, and also across the street. He also noted an example of a multi-family behind Mr. Lee's property which is just such an example. Mr. Lee has upgraded the electrical systems on the property. The house was kept within an extended family for 40 years. The house was tired. He has done a lot of physical upgrades, the electrical being the most conspicuous and most safety oriented. There is a staircase coming down the back of the building which is a required egress which is in deteriorated condition; that would come off and be replaced by internal staircases. The design they have for the top floor is a mansard design. There is a home of mansard design with a widow's walk to one side of the property and one across the street. The section of the Middle Street is replete with many multi-family dwellings. He pointed out Angle Street and that portion of Washington Street nearby as being the same. Some are as tall as or taller than the proposal of Mr. Lee, as well as have more units. He felt the application to be straightforward; that will be a better looking building. They have more than the required parking plan. There is room for cars to turn around on site and drive out facing into Middle Street.

Councilor Ciolino asked for the parking plan to be viewed (not previously available in Council packets) which the attorney produced for the Councilors to review.

Councilor Hardy asked how many parking spaces were required.

Attorney Coakley stated one per unit, of which there were six on the property plus the garage. He noted that the cover letter enumerated what was included in his packet, and the parking plan was noted.

Councilor Whynott noted there were no real changes in the roof line, just the height.

Attorney Coakley commented the roofline is a gable; the mansard drops that down and bows it in an angular fashion. The only change is on the top level.

Councilor Verga asked if there was anything from the Building Inspector. He recalled when the property was for sale; he thought the basement was rather low. He thought it was a two family, to be moved to three but they hoped for four units.

Attorney Coakley noted the certification from the Building Inspector when Mr. Lee purchased the property showed the property was carried on the City's records as a three-family house in City records back when Mr. Sanborn (current City Inspector of Buildings) was an assistant when there was an inventory done on all City buildings in the "semi-official" records that they have. Back then, if the City had records showing the usage for 20 years, they issued a certificate to that effect. You couldn't go back and find a variance or special permit on record in the Assessor's Office as to how it became a multi-family. If it was in an apartment house district, which carried into 1965 they were an allowed that use. That part of Middle Street wasn't an apartment house district during that period. They could not find proof where a permit was issued for the multi-family units.

Councilor Verga wanted to be sure the units were "up to snuff".

Michael Lee, property owner, noted the back apartment is 90% above ground; and he has done a great deal of work with all new systems, new ceilings, floors, feeling it was the nicest of the units and the other units were in "nice shape" as well. The one in the rear was all brand new with all proper permits.

Councilor Verga asked if the overall height did not exceed the height of the widow's walk.

Attorney Coakley replied the widow's walk was the highest point which was measured. The measured height is based upon average grade. Where the house is shortest is on the Middle Street end because of

the property sloping down in the rear. That was taken into consideration by Gale Smith, a local land surveyor who certified the height to them. The proposed height for the architect's plan is 39 feet in total, five feet over the current height.

Councilor Ciolino noted the Committee gets a great deal on such properties that are generational and only find out about these issues when the bank is looking for these records.

Councilor Hardy asked how high the current house was, which the attorney responded was 34 feet and that they're proposing 39 feet and queried what the dimensions of the widow's walk were.

Mr. Lee noted the widow's walk was accessible from the third floor by a stairway and that the intent was to use it to enjoy the view.

Councilor Hardy noted it looked to be more than 4'x4'x4'.

Attorney Coakley replied the narrow width visible from Middle Street it was about 12' to 14' long.

Councilor Hardy stated for that reason because it is over 4'x4'x4', it needed to be included in the height of the building. Did they plan on putting a cover on it, like an awning in the future?

Mr. Lee stated he was not considering such a thing.

Councilor Hardy asked for that to be a condition of the permit because that would add to the general overlap of the height and would there would be neighbors that it would affect if it would go higher than that in the future.

Councilor Hardy asked about drainage of the parking lot and would they be changing the pitch of the parking lot or the driveway.

Mr. Lee stated currently it was not an issue; there are plans to pave but not to change anything. He was aware that when paving to be careful of the drainage. There was a dirt area behind the property where all the water goes to.

Councilor Hardy noted he would be the owner occupant and what benefit did he see from that.

Mr. Lee stated he would be the owner occupant and would manage the property from there on site, which means he is right there to manage the property with immediacy.

Councilor Hardy asked how many bedrooms in the proposed new unit.

Mr. Lee responded two.

Councilor Whynott related he went to the area of 15 Middle Street and spoke to a resident across the street who expressed to him that no views would be blocked, and it wouldn't bother them.

Mr. Lee stated there were no views impeded by his building now nor would be with the addition.

Councilor Hardy asked when they would anticipate beginning work.

Mr. Lee stated he's already started to speak to a contractor. He hopes to have it framed out before winter to do the interior work over the winter.

Councilor Hardy asked about room for the construction dumpster on the property.

Mr. Lee stated there was room and would want it off the property as soon as possible.

Councilor Ciolino stated that the applicant has met the six requirements of Sec. 1.8.3; that the social, economic or community needs are met with the upgrading of the existing building and the construction of an additional dwelling to the existing three family which is a use consistent with the surrounding neighborhood; traffic flow and safety by formalizing the existing parking on the site; there are adequate utilities to serve the site, that the additional fourth proposed unit doesn't place an additional strain on public services; the neighborhood character and social structure is maintained as the proposed four-family dwelling is consistent with the uses in the surrounding neighborhood; qualities of the natural environment will be maintained, as the applicant shows no impact with the conversion and finally, the potential fiscal impact by the addition of one unit, to be owner occupied will provide additional tax revenue to the City. The Councilor also noted the Committee made their own site visit and were impressed and pleased to see this matter move forward.

MOTION: On motion by Councilor Ciolino, seconded by Councilor Verga, the Planning & Development Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed on 15 Middle Street, Assessors Map #2, Lot #39 (R-5), to grant the Special Council Permit(s) (SCP2010-010) for conversion of an existing three (3) unit dwelling to a four(4) unit dwelling by adding one (1) unit under Zoning Ordinance Sec.

2.3.1(7); and for a height exception of nine (9) feet under Sec. 3.1.6(b) for a total height not to exceed thirty-nine (39) feet; and under Sec. 3.2.2.a for a decrease in the minimum lot area per dwelling unit (4 units) from a total of 10,000 feet to a total of 7,890 feet with a decrease of 2,110 feet; and further, the Committee finds that the proposed use in this application for these special permits meets the six (6) factors of Sec. 1.8.3 and under Sec. 1.10.2 the proposed conversion is in harmony with the purpose of the zoning ordinance and will not adversely affect the neighborhood with the following condition:

- 1. No canopy or permanent roof is to be built over the widow's walk.**

MOTION: On motion by Councilor Ciolino, seconded by Councilor Verga, the Planning & Development Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed to ADVERTISE FOR PUBLIC HEARING on the matter of SCP2010-010: 15 Middle Street, GZO Sec. 2.3.1.7, Sec. 1.10.1, Sec. 3.1.6, Sec. 1.10.1 and Sec. 3.2.2.a.

- 3. SCP2010-011: 82 Hesperus Avenue, GZO Sec. 3.1.6(b)**

Councilor Ciolino noted that the type of permit being sought by the applicants of Joseph and Mary Ellen Amicone; the particulars of the lot itself; all the paperwork was in order and that all the appropriate City **Attorney J. Michael Faherty**, representing the applicants; Joseph M. and Mary Ellen Amicone described the property at 82 Hesperus Avenue as a zoning classification of RC-40 on Map #192, Lot #14 and that the applicants are seeking a height variance under GZO Sec. 3.1.6(b) for a building of a height in excess of 35 feet. They are asking for an elevation of 37.6 feet, 1.6 feet higher than allowed currently. The site fronts on Hesperus Avenue and goes all the way down to the ocean on what is known as Norman's Woe Cove which is off shore a bit to the south and east of the site. He noted the site as an assumed elevation, a benchmark elevation of 100; when you do elevations everything is done plus or minus through that benchmark. He noted the street had a relative elevation is 101 and 100, 99, 99 along the street which is the relative elevation at the edge of the roadway. The setbacks in this district are 40 feet from the street and 30 feet from the edge and are all well within the range of the setbacks. He described the elevation lines shown on the map of pre-construction elevations as well of those of the proposed home. The north elevation would be seen from Hesperus Avenue. The total building height is 28.4 feet from the peak of the roof line and another roof line (not enumerated verbally); 28 feet is the height of the building from Hesperus Avenue. Because the land slopes so critically to the water, the elevation on the rear of the building on the water side is the height that requires the exception and gets the 37.6 feet based on the average elevation. He felt this was important because there are a number of factors affecting the site. There is an existing dwelling on the site close to the water. When the Amicone's first approached the Conservation Commission (ConCom) because it's close to coastal banks, they preferred if this building were to be taken down that any new construction be outside of the buffer zone of the coastal bank and that was done and the ConCom has signed off on that relocation. He noted a hump on the property with 102, 104. The house will be at the steepest point. Pointing to the map, Attorney Faherty noted, "100 here and 85 to 90 here, the total elevation above the street at the peak of the roof is approximately 14 feet, which is a little bit higher than the atrium; the roof height above street height because of the slope facing Hesperus Avenue." There is more on the other side facing the ocean. Any shadowing that will occur because of the building will fall on the Amicone property only. He pointed to a single storey ranch home owned by McCarthy across the street and their view will be impacted by the 28 feet. He compared that if they were to try and meet the requirements you would end up with a single storey building in this location on the lot because anything above single storey, a two storey triggers the height exception because of the slope. There is no utilities consideration because they will be underground. There is an approved septic system on the lot and water.

Councilor Ciolino asked how much higher the elevation from the requirement was.

Attorney Faherty stated it was 7.5 feet above the required 30 feet.

Councilor Ciolino asked what the height of the proposed cupola on the roof.

Attorney Faherty noted that would be uninhabited space and would not be included in the calculation. It is a decorative feature and non-accessible.

Councilor Hardy asked if there was a widow's walk feature which the attorney stated no there was not.

Kerin Fenster, 86 Hesperus Avenue noted she had a letter (submitted at the meeting and on file) from the Mr. & Mrs. Shelkrot, abutters at 92 Hesperus Avenue, which she read that noted Ms. Fenster was there in their stead due to the Jewish High Holy Days. They expressed their concern about the height of the proposed building. They noted in the letter the clear cutting of the property and felt the new dwelling would be highly visible. They felt the building will stand out even more due to its height. They felt this permit should be denied. For herself, Ms. Fenster noted she had an addition to their home to come in at the current height restriction, and that homes should not exceed that range as that there are expectations that it would be adhered to. She understood that trees will be planted and hoped so. She noted the Amicone's have spent a great deal of money on the property already, and appeared ready to go. She sympathized with how far down the line they've come but didn't wish get off on the wrong foot. But she felt they do want to make these concerns clear.

Howard Costa, III, 97 Hesperus Avenue who stated he lived across the street from the proposed structure. Back in 2001 they built a house there. When they laid the house they turned their house more to the east to have a better view; stayed within the confines of the ordinances; and went through all the appropriate channels to do so. He noted several homes around them having remained within the confines of the same ordinances. He felt this proposed home would greatly restrict his view of the water that he enjoys now. He can see without exception of the roof over the existing home he has a clear view of the harbor. He wouldn't see it if the home goes up that high. They have five of the abutters are here this evening, to say that the home is too high. They wish the view be taken into consideration. When the packets were received there was a document in the packet received by the Committee is a Google map which he felt was misleading and showed that to the Committee, and in addition submitted his own Google map which he believed to be a better version (map was submitted and placed on file). He noted what he felt were inaccuracies. Mildred McCarthy's home is a one-level ranch. His is a colonial home. He noted a house was still on the lot.

Attorney Faherty stated that is the house to be torn down on the property.

Mildred McCarthy who lives across the street from 82 Hesperus Avenue stated she does not drive but looks out the window at her view every day and wondered where her view would go. It would be gone.

Attorney Faherty noted before the application was filed, he looked at the heights of the various homes in the neighborhood. Mr. Costa's home is up quite a bit from the street. Mrs. McCarthy's house is a ranch house. Any structure that is built on this lot, unless built on the exact location of the old house, which the ConCom will not allow, will be an obstruction. It is important to do the visit. Whenever the Committee schedules it, they will assure there is adequate demarcation.

Councilor Hardy asked with the proposed house, were there any houses in front of the proposed house that you need to go so high "to see the ocean yourself" so there's nothing obstructing the view.

Attorney Faherty noted there is nothing obstructing the view. The only issue is the lower elevation is three stories high. Because of the slope of the land there is a 15 ft. change in the elevation between two points. He described the home to the Councilor and noted the house was 150 long with the garage extension. On the waterfront side it is 155 to 160 ft. The home is about 10,000 square feet with a footprint on four levels.

Councilor Ciolino stated the Committee would conduct a site visit on Sunday morning, September 12, 2010 at 8:00 a.m. to the property with a balloon or a piece of equipment noting the actual height and stakes marking off the house footprint and take the matter up again at their Wednesday, September 22, 2010 meeting.

This matter was continued to September 22, 2010.

5. Fishtown Horribles Parade Discussion of Possible Changes of July 3, 2011 Parade Route

Police Chief Michael Lane stated after the last meeting where they discussed the matter he met with Mr. Kipp and Mr. Tucker and listened to them, in addition he looked at the historical aspect of the parade, he didn't see any issues and public safety was satisfied, that Rogers Street is their widest street. There have been no problems in many years and he and Lt. Aiello agree that it is served well for public safety and recommended the route stay is it is.

Fire Chief Phil Dench felt if they were thinking of going up Main Street he didn't see any benefit with that. The only benefit he could see was if they went up Middle Street to Washington Street to Prospect Street to Railroad Avenue. That would open up all of East Gloucester and all of Main Street to fire apparatus. It would give them access to everything over in the East. Currently it is difficult to get to that area. They have to break the parade some way no matter. If it was changed, they wouldn't have to break the parade except for Washington Street in the Centennial Avenue area. He saw a benefit if they're thinking of changing the route, but didn't see a benefit going up Main Street.

Chief Lane stated he had proposed an alternative route but proposed it as an alternative not as his first choice. He believed it was a good alternative. However, the current parade route did not trouble him.

Councilor Ciolino noted the Triathlon and the Marathon; they're closing Main Street and Rogers Street. They have to revisit those events also. Why are they closing the two main arteries of the City, for an event, which causes havoc with the many businesses in that area. It's supposed to help not hinder business. They all walked it and by going up Main Street; it was not much of a change mileage in the parade route. If they put up signs and you have to be off the street by a certain time, it works. It could work for the Horribles Parade. "Just because we keep on doing something, and there's been no emergency so far, doesn't mean you go against common sense to block two main arteries." He felt that it needs to be opened up for not only the parade but the marathon and the Triathlon.

Chief Lane noted the Parade Committee will show that the businesses are not inconvenienced. Mr. Linquata had the most objections and it was to get to his home after the closing of his restaurant. When you have a parade people are inconvenienced. He, as a resident is willing to put up with it for a good parade.

Councilor Whynott noted Mr. Linquata gave his reasons and then they listened to the Chiefs, one saying there is a problem, and one not. He hadn't heard many people chime in on the matter. Unless he hears more than that – change other things coming along but not this. He didn't hear a big outcry.

David Tucker, 101 Cherry Street stated for them to put on a good quality parade takes a certain amount of space to put the people in. Going up side streets will not fit the amount of people, car parking. There's no cars diverted, they'll just walk up the hill. Their concern is that a lot of people will not go to the parade. Main Street has many curbs that come out and small parking spaces and brick walk ways. There are trip hazards. On the wider streets with the routes now, a band can push aside if need be. As far as the quality of the parade they have now, they spend \$17,000 to \$20,000 on bands. They need the people on Rogers Street or it means they lose four bands. He sends out the parade from the High School. This is not a vendor issue to put them on Rogers Street. They get \$100 per vendor. They stay in one spot. If they have 17 vendors it won't pay even for one band. It is not the issue of vendors. It's the numbers. The Boulevard and Rogers Street are their two biggest areas. That's where the money comes from and that's why the parade slows down there. He noted the expense of the bands themselves. It's all in the \$2,000 range. That is their main goal to pack the people in. Mr. Tucker felt if the route was smaller they wouldn't be able to pay for the parade. If this parade goes a different route he can't continue in his role with the Fishtown Horribles Parade Committee. It has been like this for all these years with no problems. The emergency vehicles were able to get to where they needed to go.

Chief Lane noted the trees and wires that would be in the way on Main Street. Middle Street would be the same thing.

Councilor Ciolino countered that trailer trucks go down Main Street all the time without hindrance. Mr. Tucker noted the narrowness of the roadway in spots, but the Councilor also countered with the narrowness of Centennial Avenue and its bridge, as well as the trip points for pedestrians.

Chief Dench noted they brought up the other events with the Block Parties, for instance, which he had issues and now they have made it safer. The Triathlon last year had issues regarding public safety. This year they changed it to the Boulevard. They change to try and make it better and safer. They know that the parade is getting bigger, the streets are getting clogged. He would like to see some changes and try and make it different. He loved the parade and watches it every year and doesn't want to see it go away. It was about making the downtown and the City safer and more accessible to the emergency vehicles.

Mr. Tucker felt this was a lot of ifs and no reason why there should be any changes.

Councilor Ciolino stated the reason they were here was because the new City Council was taking a look at all these events, even those races that have run for 25 years. This wasn't just because of one individual but how to make the city safer. He believed common sense tells you you shouldn't block two main arteries in the City. The parade is difficult. The Marathon and Triathlon are newer; and they can work with them. This is about safety going forward. It is a new council and a new attitude.

Mr. Tucker asked why they would add on more the same evening for the parade. After the parade is a concert. Why have that then on the Boulevard if this is such a big issue.

Councilor Whynott noted this was not just a "one-time deal". Each year the parade will have to come before the Committee like all other main events using City streets.

Councilor Ciolino stated that was correct, just as he would have to come before this Committee for permission for the Santa Parade as well.

Councilor Whynott reiterated the Parade Committee would have to come before P&D.

Mr. Tucker didn't think they would get the crowds on the side streets.

Councilor Hardy didn't feel the crowds were as great this 3rd of July as they had been in the past.

Councilor Whynott thought that he wouldn't vote to make any changes to the route. The Fire Chief has concerns but the Police Chief didn't. He would like to see what happens in the following year.

Councilor Hardy noted that Mr. Tucker had never seen the parade before, as he is the point person at the high school parking lot who sends the parade out. She asked he see the parade with her the next year, so that someone from the Committee can see the issues from the Council's eyes.

Chief Lane stated he thought the Councilor was saying they wanted a parade-knowledgeable person standing with them to talk about logistics.

Councilor Hardy noted the main reason the parade was so long was there are all these gaps which make it stay on the arteries that much longer. She noted when she was on Centennial Avenue this past July she witnessed trucks throwing candy to the children; there were some trucks that were huge, and the candy was thrown at the wheels of one of the trucks by the driver. He was far above the road, and children were right in front of those wheels. She expressed deep concern for their safety.

Mr. Tucker noted they have the drivers sign a paper saying that they won't toss candy. They have told people to stop throwing candy from trucks, and that they will stop them if they know about it.

Councilor Hardy also noted the motor cycles that stop behind the trucks pulling wheelies. She reiterated that the parade needs to be tightened up; and wondered how trucks get into the parade.

Peter Williamson, Parade Committee member noted that they have a first come first served with the placement of the trucks. They have no control over the trucks coming to the parade.

Councilor Hardy asked how they thought they could better regulate the parade.

Chief Dench noted that the parade has gotten so big by the time the last marchers and floats leave the high school, the beginning of the parade was just coming into the high school lot. They have said there aren't enough volunteers to control the parade. Then, he believed, they need more volunteers. Then, for him, that was an issue. He reiterated they need to control their parade.

Mr. Tucker stated they have a radio club who helps them to stay in contact. They do work to take care of the parade. If their Committee receives one negative comment about any unit, they do try to take care of it.

Councilor Verga noted a split decision from the safety folks. He supported no change this year; but he would like to see guidelines handed out to people.

Mr. Tucker stated they can't limit the amount of trucks. It's basically anyone who shows up gets in the parade.

Councilor Ciolino noted if Chief Lane doesn't have a problem with it, and then neither does he. Chief Dench, however, does have a problem on how the parade was operated. He wanted the Committee to come back in January with the route. He wanted to see it in black and white; that no candy is thrown from the trucks, and to tighten up the parade as best they can to prevent the gaps. The tighter the parade the less time the main arteries will be blocked. He also wished to see safety measures about the trucks also. Then the P&D Committee can permit them. There need to be some compromises.

Mr. Tucker stated they will take the units out of the parade if they throw candy. They have to walk and throw it.

Councilor Ciolino asked they give the P&D Committee a copy of their contract for the parade units, and plans for units like the trucks; and getting a copy of the Certificate of Insurance.

Councilor Whynott asked the Chiefs to talk about the matter between them to formulate a plan.

Chief Dench appreciated the dialog and would hope the parade committee would also continue to work towards some changes.

Councilor Hardy noted they are trying to work with the Parade Committee and asked if someone from the Committee will stay with one City Councilor for their 2011 parade in order to observe the parade to make it even better for the following year.

David Harvey asked that in the January meeting, with all the concerns, could they also have a plan so that they have a better understanding of preparation for emergencies.

Chief Dench stated if there are sirens, the parade needs to get out of the way.

Mr. Harvey noted they want to know a game plan of how they should stage the parade to maximize safety. He noted his concern that if they are utilizing a main thoroughfare through the City, and something drastic happens, is there a game plan in place.

Chief Lane noted each event has an incident action plan at Police Headquarters. There are certain procedures that take place in the case of an adverse event. As far as the parade goes, Chief Lane offered to sit down with the Parade Committee and go over things with them. He and Chief Dench could help them set parameters.

Mr. Tucker asked as far as police go, he asked about extra details.

Chief Dench noted they can't go moving the core group of firefighters all over the City. If they could they would. They don't have the outlying stations opened often, and so they all come out of Central.

Councilor Ciolino stated those are issues to be discussed as well as the cost to the City in overtime etc. They need to analyze that and cut down the expense.

Chief Dench noted how hard the Parade Committee works and knew how hard it was to put together a successful parade each year; but it was important for them to recruit more volunteers to help control the parade and be more aggressive in their recruitment.

Chief Lane noted the ROTC has a group who could give them some support. They could also look at choke points and see how they might make it better.

Chief Dench noted the issues at Mason Street which he would like to have people there to help control the parking.

Councilor Hardy noted P&D can help to regulate the street usages for the evening of the parade and that was what they can work on.

Chief Dench noted that they have to make some improvements; now was the time to work on it and solve some of these problems to make it safer every year.

Councilor Ciolino felt it would be a good idea for the Parade Committee to meet with the Chiefs before the P&D meeting in January meeting when they next take this matter up.

The matter was continued to the third week in January 2011.

5. Letter from FEMA re: Digital Flood Insurance Rate Map & Flood Insurance Study Report for Essex County.

This matter was received and filed.

6. *Global Initiatives Group proposal for the “Puritan Project”/proposed resolution*

This matter was filed and will await further communication from the Global Initiatives Group.

7. *Letter from Mayor re: Court Relocation Committee and Gloucester District Court*

Councilor Ciolino stated before any action can be taken by the Committee, the proposed lease mentioned in the letter by the Mayor would have to come to the Committee for its consideration; and, therefore, continued the matter to the Committee’s November 3, 2010 meeting.

This matter was continued to November 3, 2010.

A motion was made, seconded and voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 8:30 p.m,

Respectfully submitted,

**Dana C. Jorgenson
Clerk of Committees**

DOCUMENTS/ITEMS SUBMITTED AT MEETING:

- **Affidavit Notice to the Abutters: 15 Middle Street
82 Hesperus Avenue**
- **Parking Plan: 15 Middle Street**
- **Letter from Mr. & Mrs. Shelkrot: 92 Hesperus Avenue**
- **Google Map of the area at 82 Hesperus Avenue by Howard Costa, III**