

Planning & Development Committee
Wednesday, April 19, 2017 – 5:30 p.m.
1st Fl. Council Committee Room – City Hall
-Minutes-

Present: Chair, Councilor Paul Lundberg; Vice Chair, Councilor Melissa Cox; Councilor Valerie Gilman;
Absent: None.

Also Present: Councilor O’Hara; Councilor Nolan; Councilor Jamie O’Hara; Jim Destino; Gregg Cademartori; Chip Payson

The meeting was called to order at 5:41 p.m. There was a quorum of the City Council.

1. *Special Events Applications:*

A. Request to hold Tulip Festival on Stacey Boulevard on May 6, 2017

Councilor Lundberg advised that Joanne Senos, City Clerk, reported via memorandum to the Committee (on file) that the applicant went before the Special Events Advisory Committee (SEAC), and that since no city street closures were required for the Tulip Festival event, this matter is moot.

This matter is closed.

B. Request to hold Harbor Loop Summer Concert Series on July 6, 13, 20, 27; August 3, 10, 17, 24, 31, 2017

Councilor Lundberg noted the Harbor Loop Summer Concert Series went before the Special Events Advisory Committee and received approval and all the necessary sign-offs (memo on file).

Carol Pallazolla, 10B Taylor Street, representing the Harbor Loop Summer Concert Series explained that the bands are booked. The Interim Police Chief McCarthy has spoken to Ms. Pallazolla and given her sawhorses to be placed at about 4:30 p.m. on Harbor Loop at the directed designated places to stop traffic. She said there will be music from 6:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.

Councilor Cox asked at what time are signs posted designating “No Parking” on Harbor Loop. **Ms. Pallazolla** said they put the signs up at around 2:30 p.m. **Councilor Cox** suggested the vehicles that are already parked when the signs go up should be made note of reminding Ms. Pallazolla that Harbor Loop is 10 hour parking, and asked she to exercise caution with those vehicles in terms of ticketing and towing. **Jim Destino**, CAO, said that Ms. Pallazolla’s team have worked with the Police Department the Administration is looking forward to a successfully run summer concert series. He added that there was a transition from an all-volunteer group to Ms. Pallazolla’s leadership team. He mentioned that the city will be making a contribution to help support the popular concert series. **Ms. Pallazolla** added that she already has monetary matches from concert sponsors.

MOTION: On a motion by Councilor Cox, seconded by Councilor Gilman, the Planning and Development Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed, to approve a Special Events Permit to hold the Harbor Loop Summer Concert Series on Thursdays, July 6, 13, 20, 27; August 3, 10, 17, 24, 31, 2017 in order to temporarily close Harbor Loop at the center of the Loop at the “Buoy” for each date between the hours of 5:00 p.m. and 9:00 p.m.

C. Request to hold the 59th Gloucester Sidewalk Bazaar on August 3, 4, 5, 2017

Councilor Joseph Ciolino, as a member of and representing the Gloucester Downtown Association (GDA) as its Director, explained that there are no changes to the set up and running for the 59th annual Gloucester Sidewalk Bazaar to be held on August 3, 4, and 5, 2017. The only thing that is different, he advised, is that the GDA is in the process of hiring a coordinator to be the “boots on the ground.” There are already 20 people who have reserved a spot for the Bazaar which is a good sign, he added, noting that the event went before the Special Events Advisory Committee and received the required sign offs.

Councilor Gilman asked if recycling will be a part of the event and containers available. **Councilor Ciolino** said that is a part of their event organization and will be working with the DPW.

MOTION: On a motion by Councilor Gilman, seconded by Councilor Cox, the Planning & Development Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed, to permit the Gloucester Downtown Association (GDA) to close Main Street from Pleasant Street to Washington Street, including Hancock, Center, Porter, and Short Streets to all vehicular traffic from 6:00 AM to 6:00 PM, Thursday, August 3, Friday, August 4, and Saturday, August 5, 2017 for the purpose of conducting the Gloucester Sidewalk Bazaar with the following conditions:

1. A memorandum from the City of Gloucester that shows the DGA Sidewalk Bazaar is covered under the city's insurance has been received.
 2. There are to be no vendor set ups on the sidewalk blocking hydrants, crosswalks, or handicap ramps; Vendor set ups are not to extend beyond the marked parking lines on the streets.
 3. No vendor set ups in front of the police station other than the area designated by the Police Department.
 4. All vendor set ups must allow for unobstructed drivable area along the entire Sidewalk Days route slightly wider at the curve of the Brass Monkey to maintain adequate access for emergency vehicles. Failure to do so may necessitate the removal or relocation of the vendor at the discretion of the Fire Department, the Police Department or the event agent of the GDA.
 5. The organizers shall allow the Fire Department drive-through access with a fire engine once each day of the event, on or about 9:00 a.m., and one random drive through to be decided by the Fire Department.
 6. No parking or unloading of goods on any of the above-mentioned streets after 8:50 AM until 5:00 PM on each of the days of the Gloucester Sidewalk Bazaar.
 7. Event staff is to have cell phones and be identified by the public with distinct shirts. A list of event staff and their cell phone numbers is to be submitted to the Police, Fire or DPW Departments in advance of the first day of the Sidewalk Bazaar.
 8. The GDC is also required to obtain any necessary approvals from appropriate city departments. It is the sole responsibility of the applicant to ensure that all required documentation is filed in a timely manner as indicated. Failure to comply with any conditions precedent may result in permit revocation. Applicant is also required to comply with any requirements made by departments through the Special Events Advisory Committee including vending.
2. *RZ2017-001: GZO Amendment Sec. 1.11(c) re: creation of a Mixed Use Overlay District including properties #2 & #4 Schoolhouse Road and #7 Gloucester Crossing Road (TBC 04/19/17)*

Note: Documentation referenced by petitioner in the matter of RZ2017-001: GZO Amendment Sec. 1.11(c) re: creation of a Mixed Use Overlay District including properties #2 & #4 Schoolhouse Road and #7 Gloucester Crossing Road was received by the Planning & Development Committee on April 18, 2017 and were placed on file with the City Clerk's office and distributed to the Committee and are referenced throughout this section of minutes:

- *Fuller Mixed Use Venture LLC Proposed Redevelopment of the Fuller School Site: Presentation of the "Proposed Mixed Use Overlay District" to the City of Gloucester Planning and Development Committee, April 19, 2017;*
- *"Red-Line" version of proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment for ADDING Section 5.29 Mixed Use Overlay District;*
- *"Clean" version of proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment for ADDING Section 5.29 Mixed Use Overlay District;*
- *Fuller Project Summary of Revisions to Mixed Use Overlay District, Planning and Development Committee-4/19/2017*

Councilor Lundberg reminded those present this was a public meeting, and not a public hearing which will take place at the Council level on April 25. Testimony will not be elicited from members of the public, he advised.

Attorney Deborah Eliason, Eliason Law Office, 63 Middle Street, was present to represent the Fuller Mixed Used Ventures, LLC, (FMUV) pursuant to Sec. 1.11 of the Zoning Ordinance that is proposing an amendment to the GZO to create a Mixed Use Overlay District (MUOD) which was initiated by ten registered voters pursuant to Section 1.11(c) of the GZO. Also present from the FMUV were: Andrew K. Dolben, CPM, Executive Vice President, of Dolben Company, Woburn, MA; Peter C. Goudreau, Director of Project Development, Windover

Construction; Jack Meany, CEO Emeritus, YMCA of the North Shore; and Michelle Harrison, representing the interests of Sam Park as his project manager.

Parcel Description for rezoning as a Mixed Use Overlay District:

4 Schoolhouse Road: Assessors Map 262, Lot 14

2 Schoolhouse Road: Assessors Map 43, Lot 4 & 5

7 Gloucester Crossing: Assessors Map 262, Lot 37

The shallowest depth of the parcels from Gloucester Crossing Road is approximately 549 feet, 2 inches.

The depth of the parcels from School House Road is approximately 1012 feet, 2 inches.

The proposed MUOD has frontage on School House Road of approximately 915 feet and frontage on Gloucester Crossing Road of about approximately 1034 feet.

The MUOD proposes a combination of retail, commercial businesses, residential, recreational and/or community service uses benefitting the residents of the city of Gloucester.

The following buildings are proposed to be constructed:

- 3 residential 4-story apartment buildings comprising of approximately 200 units;
- 1 retail/commercial building of approximately 20, 000 square feet;
- 1 retail/commercial building of approximately 3,500 square feet; and
- YMCA building of approximately 45,000 square feet.

Attorney Eliason explained that: the Planning Board gave a unanimous recommendation to the MUOD proposal as on file with the Committee. The MUOD will accommodate the proposed Fuller development and allows it to be developed in the manner that was proposed in the Fuller proposal. Conventional zoning would be inefficient and likely to have limited success due to the significant zoning relief required to accomplish their project. The intent of the MUOD is to promote uses consistent with the Request For Proposal (RFP) and prohibit those that are not. The MUOD will work with the Fuller project but will also work with unrelated development in the future. The purpose of the MUOD is to promote retail, commercial, business, residential, recreational and community uses that benefit residents of the city; create a development that has a “sense of place” to balance a variety of compatible uses with the surrounding areas; have a compact, efficient design where people can work, shop, live, recreate, encourage shared parking and stimulate the general economy.

DESCRIPTION OF MUOD PARAMETERS:

The map (on file) of the overlay district was referred to and referenced above in terms of what it encompassed.

Ms. Eliason pointed out the Fuller property also includes property of Gloucester Crossing, one parcel called the, “hockey stick and funnel,” which is to the north of the area, and to the south a larger parcel that crosses Schoolhouse Road. This, although there are two separate lot numbers given by the Assessors, is actually one parcel and is why it is included in the district which also provides drainage for the Fuller sites (Map 43, Lot 4 and Map 43, Lot 5). The Fuller site is zoned R-10 (Medium/High Density Residential) as is Map 43, Lot 4 and Lot 5, and Gloucester Commons is zoned EB (Extensive Business) -- the MUOD allows uses in the R-10 and the EB but prohibits some of the current allowed uses because it was felt they were inconsistent with the purpose of this project and the MUOD and the RFP that was issued by the city. There are also some additional uses that are allowed in the MUOD that are not allowed in EB or R-10 Districts for the same reason -- to make a use that works well with what the RFP set out.

REVISIONS TO MUOD: As proposed by Petitioner and as revised and approved by Planning Board reviewed by **Ms. Eliason** as follows:

Sec. 5.29.1 Purpose. The word “municipal” was deleted at the request of the Planning Board because municipal uses are not being contemplated in this area.

Sec. 5.29.2.4 Applicability. “Site Plan Review shall remain the purview of the Planning Board and not the City Council.” It was noted that the FMUV (Fuller Mixed Use Ventures) had originally proposed that the City Council be the special permit granting authority for Site Plan Review but the Board recommended it stay with them and the FMUV agreed to that. By mutual agreement of the parties, there is a deadline for the Planning Board’s recommendation site plan review of 90 days and that deadline may be extended by mutual agreement of the parties.

Councilor Cox asked if that was in the purview of the Planning Board to remove the Council as Site Plan Review. **Ms. Eliason** said under the Zoning Ordinance, the Planning Board has the Site Plan Review, and that the petitioners had changed that to the Council but the Board recommended their purview remain intact according to the Zoning Ordinance.

Sec. 5.29.2.6(2) Design Standards. It was noted that parking standards were tightened and a provision was added authorizing the City Council to request the applicant provide documentation evidencing shared parking or off-site parking arrangements if such an arrangement is requested. It is anticipated that there will be shared parking with

retail and the YMCA; and it is intended to have a reciprocal easement agreement memorializing that fact. This authorizes the City Council in those instances to require that documentation to ensure it is satisfactory.

Sec. 5.29.6(6) Design Standards. It was noted that the standard for overhead utilities was tightened. The utilities will be underground for most part unless not economically feasible or the utility company won't allow it. Three poles will be above ground parallel to Yankee Division Highway, Route 128, immediately off of Blackburn Circle. The utility feeds are determined and one feed will likely serve the YMCA portion of the property. It was noted to be more efficient and cost effective if there are three poles fed from that location and then from there the utilities move underground. At that location there is a line of trees to buffer the poles from view and is not deemed an aesthetic issue.

Sec. 5.29.3.3 Additional Uses. Minor changes were made to make the MUOD consistent with the current Zoning Ordinance. They refer to specific uses that the YMCA may be grouped under and changed Personal Wireless Service Facility to Wireless Communication Facility in compliance with the new Zoning Ordinance amendment.

Sec. 5.29.3.4 Prohibited Uses. It had been suggested that use variances be granted by the City Council instead of the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) considered customary. At the Planning Board's recommendation variances are granted by the ZBA.

Sec. 5.29.4.1 Dimensional Table. Changes requested by the Planning Board were (by comparison to the CCD, CB, VB, EB and other relevant districts): Lot area was increased from 40,000 square feet ("sf") to 60,000 sf; minimum lot width from 50 feet ("ft.") to 100 ft.; lot frontage increased from 80 ft. to 100 ft. and minimum side and rear setbacks were increased 7.5 ft. to 10 ft.

Comparison of relative building heights approved and proposed Gloucester Crossing & Fuller Mixed Use Venture was noted as comparing favorably. Originally throughout the zoning district height was 45 ft. and is reduced to 30 ft. The exceptions are the YMCA at 45 ft. and the residential component will be to a height of 55 ft. Also increased was the minimum open space requirements -- originally it was zero and now it is 200 ft. for multi-family; 100 ft. for a shopping center and philanthropic (YMCA). Open space is being planned, but without knowing what the parking requirements are going to be and such that cut into open space the FMUV doesn't yet have a specific number for the total development.

Sec. 5.29.4 Dimensional Requirements. The drive-thru dimensions are consistent with those in the CB, MI and GI Districts and will follow all the requirements in the Zoning Ordinance for drive thru-facilities.

Section 5.29.4 fnt (1). Non-habitable towers and other architectural features are limited to not greater than 400 sf. (in footprint) and not to exceed the ridge height by more than 12 ft. It was noted originally proposed was an unlimited footprint and up to 20 ft. above the ridge height.

Sec. 5.29.6.1(b) Off-Street Parking Requirements. Residential are 1.5 spaces per unit which is noted as higher than the Zoning Ordinance. The parking requirements were increased for other uses from a minimum of one space per each 325 sf. If floor area exclusive of the basement, to one space for each 260 sf. or 2.85 per 1,000 sf. Noted were graphs showing Average Weekday Hourly Parking Demand, Average Weekday Hourly Parking Demand and Average Saturday Hourly Parking Demand and were touched upon briefly. Being proposed as minimum requirements under the Zoning Ordinance is met.

Sec. 5.29.6.2 Off-Street Loading Requirements. At the request of the Planning Board, all loading bays will be either on the side or back of buildings and not in front of a building and excepting of the primary front elevation but doesn't preclude a loading area at the front entrance, but such a designation will not satisfy the requirements of this particular section.

Sec. 5.29.9 Submissions. Even if several parcels and uses the applicant may file a single application for the project.

Sec. 5.29.10 Relief by Special Permit. This section only applies for uses allowed by right or by special permit or for accessory uses within the MUOD and standards are included for the Council to follow when relief is requested.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING COMPONENT:

Ms. Eliason conveyed the following information to the Committee: Even though the MUOD isn't proposing a change to the Zoning Ordinance pursuant to Affordable Housing, time was spent discussing that matter with the Planning Board. The FMUV is requesting the Council to approve "payment in lieu" of on-site units.

A graph entitled, "Evaluation of Economic Hardship" was highlighted showing acquisition costs. Column 1 shows RFP Estimate at Nov. 2015: Acquisition price was estimated at \$5.1 million; Abatement of Hazardous Materials was estimated at \$500,000; demolition at \$1 million for a total cost of \$6.6 million. Better estimates on abatement are now available, and in Column 2 it is noted the Acquisition Price is \$5.6 million after negotiations with the city; Abatement of Hazardous Materials is estimated now at \$1.6 million; Demolition to be \$1.3 million; it is yet unknown what Mitigation Cost for Unsuitable Soils will come in at or the Mitigation Cost of High Water Table. It

was suggested that the Unsuitable Soils will be costly to remediate. The Total Acquisition Cost is now estimated at \$8.5 million or a 29% change over the RFP estimate.

Also noted was a calculation of the cost of adding on-site Affordable Housing units, shown to be \$2.5 million which increases the Total Acquisition Cost to \$11 million or is 67% higher than the RFP. Another consideration is that on-site units be deemed affordable to families making 80% of area median income -- the area median income includes Boston in the calculation and is approximately \$90,000. It was pointed out that according to the Housing Production Plan about 50% of Gloucester residents wouldn't be able to afford that. **Ms. Eliason** said that even if the affordable on-site units bring the city to closer to its 10%, this wouldn't serve residents that need affordable housing. She noted that by using the payment in lieu it would allow the city to utilize it for other suitable and more useful affordable housing units.

Gregg Cademartori, Planning Director, conveyed he submitted a report to the Committee dated April 14 (on file). He explained the following: that the Planning Board held three public hearing sessions on this proposal. Many changes are focused on making the MUOD more predictable. A Zoning Ordinance is the blueprint for what might be seen in terms of a project. The MUOD is response to RFP where it is reasonably certain there will be a housing element, a YMCA and retail associated with it. While this enables that type of project, it also makes more specific in number of variations to be expected. There was a particular focus on parking and parking ratios. **Mr. Cademartori** clarified for the record that **the parking ratio is 3.85 rather than 2.85**. A lot of these things started flexibly in favor of the applicant, and that through the recommendation of Planning Board there is a give and take for allowing flexibility over current Zoning Ordinance as to allowed density, allowed height for instance. Once this is in some form approved by Council and adopted as the zoning to enable a project to come forward, city staff will be exploring in depth the details and a proposal is developed and a response of city to vet the proposal requiring more investigation.

He reported that there was lot discussion about the Affordable Housing aspect but that the question of how that is addressed – there is currently an ordinance with three options, one of which is “in lieu payment.” He said that the Board didn't extend their recommendation to that particular aspect but that it must comply with GZO Sec. 5.11, the Affordable Housing Requirement. That, he said, is something for the City Council to address. The changes were finalized into the draft that he said he worked with Ms. Eliason that covers the concerns raised by the Planning Board, which voted on it unanimously which is now before the Committee.

COUNCILOR COMMENTS & QUESTIONS:

Councilor Cox said while this is about an overlay district and not the affordable housing component, there remain many questions on that particular aspect – that if the Council accepts an in lieu payment rather than inclusion of on-site affordable housing units, what are the city's plans for use of those funds which is the role of the Administration to give the Council a fuller picture of what is possible which she said would help the city and the Council in making this decision.

Ms. Eliason clarified one change made after she submitted her red line MUOD Zoning Ordinance. The Zoning Ordinance for Sec. 5.29 as submitted by the Planning Director is the most accurate version, she said. **Mr. Cademartori** confirmed that it was language in design standards for overhead utilities and has the same intent as the Planning Board's recommendation.

Councilor Gilman noting Sec. 5.29.1 Purpose, said that although the RFP didn't include municipal uses, seeing that this overlay is a general overlay for any possible development at this site and not just earmarked for one group, she asked why it was important to eliminate it. **Mr. Cademartori** said it could be applicable to other areas once you designate an overlay and expand the bounds and identify that this would be the zoning that would be in effect. Municipal uses, he advised, are for the most part exempt, and can be located anywhere but the specific intent of this overlay is responsive to the RFP. If the MUOD doesn't go forward or during Public Hearing process this isn't adopted, he said that the zoning will default to the zoning currently in place: R-10 and EB Districts -- this has a specific intent and at this juncture municipal use is not part of that mix. **Councilor Gilman** asked if there are limits as to how long the MUOD would be in effect. **Mr. Cademartori** said there is none. If this is Zoning Amendment is adopted this is the available zoning with the underlying zoning. He advised there is a structured Purchase & Sale Agreement that what comes out the other end of the processes is what will be constructed but doesn't mean it can't be varied over time but would have to comply with the MUOD. **Councilor Gilman** touched upon the possibility of issuing parking stickers who will live in the residential units to be built expressing concern that residential users may have issues with parking. **Ms. Eliason** said she didn't know what controls will be put in place at this juncture. She said that the residential parking will be segregated making it easier to be controlled, but that they don't know if there will be a designated spot(s) per unit yet. **Peter Goudreau**, Director of Project Development, Windover Construction, said they try to avoid designated spots because it is inefficient.

Councilor Gilman said it was brought up in a Ward 4-2 meeting that there are wetlands on the Fuller property in the middle of it. **Councilor Cox** said she understood there is wetland on the outer boundary at the top of the curve of the Blackburn Rotary on the northernmost portion of the MUOD map, which is very small and is miniscule in the overlay area, but also in the middle. **Mr. Goudreau** said there is one other small wetland just over the MUOD district line where the poles are to be located, that is very small and nothing in the middle of the proposed MUOD. **Mr. Cademartori** said there is an area designated as a 500 year floodplain which he called, "very unusual," in that the city doesn't have areas designated like that in the city. There are no specific building standards associated with it. There is a modification of the definition of lot in the proposal and exempts that from inclusion which is where the field right now but has an old designation as a 500 year flood area. That has been significantly modified with Gloucester Crossing Road and was a "relic" from when it was in its natural state, he pointed out, but likely since the 1960s there has been filling activity and has no presence of a wetland on the surface. The site has a high water table. **Mr. Goudreau** said they found USGS maps from the 1940s and the playing field was significantly lower back then which was confirmed by their borings. Neither wetland area as proposed is being built upon, **Councilor Cox** said.

Councilor Gilman asked about traffic levels being raised at or around the Blackburn Circle and asked if traffic studies have been done and what is anticipated with the extra 1.5 vehicular spots, and the YMCA. **Mr. Goudreau** said they did due diligence level traffic studies and all of the study showed the capacity of the existing roadways and intersections, existing rotary elements can handle the increase in traffic without difficulty. **Mr. Cademartori** advised that a more in depth study will be conducted as part of a Special Permit Major Project application under Sec. 5.7.5 of the GZO which relates to traffic standards and when that study is available it will be vetted. He said there will be an increase in traffic. **Councilor Gilman** expressed her appreciation for the graphic on the actual hardship to the petitioners due to increase at costs for demolition and hazardous waste removal as relates to the cost/loss to the petitioners for affordable housing units and the preference for in lieu payment. **Mr. Cademartori** said if something is presented to the Council it should be in much more detail as the Council makes their determination in terms of the hardship as to the way the ordinance is written. There is an inclusionary ordinance that at the time of a project that's when there is some certainty. The city has an Affordable Housing Trust that has had limited amounts of funds and one other small funding source and putting together a project proposal to use those funds to create affordable housing is complicated and will be a task to take advantage to those funds and leverage those funds for future affordable housing units. **Councilor Lundberg** said that once the Council passes the amendment to the Zoning Ordinance, then the applicant comes forward with a Major Project application and will have to address those issues, and the Council will be able to consider the appropriate balance.

Councilor Ciolino said that pursuant to an Overlay District the Planning Board makes a recommendation, but that the Council picks and chooses what is to be in the Overlay District. This is an opportunity, he said, in speaking of affordable housing, under GZO Sec. 5.11.8 Alternative Methods of Affordability), which includes under subsection (2) Cash Contribution. With the approval of the Council or Planning Board, the Council can say it would move forward with the Overlay District, but not include the inclusionary. The Council can give the petitioners the option of an Off-site Location, an On-site Location but the inclusionary would not be an option -- then the Major Project is proposed, the application goes to the Planning Board and then is forwarded to the Council. They as a Council decide what is included in the MUOD, he assured, and the Council can delete and it can add to it. **Councilor Lundberg** expressed his agreement that Councilors can make amendments to any motion and said his preference is that as a Committee they give the deliberation on this matter to the full Council and not just to the Planning & Development Committee.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: On motion by Councilor Cox, seconded by Councilor Gilman, the Planning & Development Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed to recommend that the City Council under Gloucester Zoning Ordinance Sec. 1.11(c) to AMEND the Gloucester Zoning Ordinance by enacting Section 5.29 entitled "Mixed Use Overlay District" as submitted to the City Clerk's office on January 3, 2017, and as amended and recommended by the Planning Board on April 6, 2017, which is attached hereto and incorporated by reference for the parcels located at:

**4 Schoolhouse Road, Assessors Map 262, Lot 14;
2 Schoolhouse Road, Assessors Map 43, Lots 4 and 5;
and 7 Gloucester Crossing, Assessors Map 262, Lot 37.**

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: On motion by Councilor Cox, seconded by Councilor Gilman, the Planning & Development Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed to recommend that the City Council AMEND the Gloucester Zoning Map to create a Mixed Use Overlay District to include 4 Schoolhouse Road, Assessors

Map 262, Lot 14; 2 Schoolhouse Road, Assessors Map 43, Lots 4 and 5; and 7 Gloucester Crossing, Assessors Map 262, Lot 37 as shown on the plan entitled, "Exhibit to Accompany an Amendment to the Gloucester Zoning Ordinance, Mixed Use Overly District," to accompany an amendment to the Gloucester Zoning Ordinance, plan dated December 28, 2016, which is attached hereto and is herein incorporated by reference.

3. *SCP2017-005: Amendment to SCP granted on March 20, 2017 re: Great Republic Drive #38, Map 263, Lot 54, GZO Sec.1.5.3 (c), 5.7 "Major Project" and Sec. 5.27 "Medical Marijuana Cultivation Facilities" (TBC 05/17/17)*

Councilor Lundberg advised that the Committee was in receipt of a letter from Attorney Joel Favazza dated April 19, 2017 (on file) representing Happy Valley Ventures MA, Inc. with regard to an amendment of a previously permitted Special Council Permit is asking to withdraw the application under SCP2017-005.

MOTION: On a motion by Councilor Cox, seconded by Councilor Gilman, the Planning & Development Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed, to permit the withdrawal of SCP2017-005 amendment to SCP granted on March 20, 2017 re: Great Republic Drive #38, Map 263, Lot 54, GZO Sec. 1.5.3 (c), 5.7 "Major Project" and Sec. 5.27 "Medical Marijuana Cultivation Facilities" without prejudice.

This matter is closed.

4. *CC2017-009 (Orlando) Request that the Zoning Ordinance be amended by ADDING new Sections 1.5.4.1 "Zoning Administrator" and 5.29 "Certain Pre-Existing Multi-Family Use;" and AMENDING Sections 1.5.1, 1.8.1, 1.8.2, 2.2.1, 2.3.1 re: "Administration and Procedures" and "Use Regulations"*

This matter is continued to May 3, 2017 pending a Planning Board recommendation.

A motion was made, seconded and voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 6:41 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dana C. Jorgensson
Clerk of Committees

DOCUMENTS/ITEMS SUBMITTED AT MEETING: None.