



CITY COUNCIL MEETING
CONDUCTED AS AN ON-LINE ZOOM MEETING
Northampton, MA

A special meeting of the City Council was called to order by Council President Gina-Louise Sciarra.

Roll Call

At 7:02 p.m. on a roll call the following City Councilors were present:

- | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|
| At-Large Councilor Gina-Louise Sciarra | At-Large Councilor William H. Dwight |
| Ward 1 Councilor Michael J. Quinlan, Jr. | Ward 5 Councilor Alex Jarrett |
| Ward 2 Councilor Karen Foster | Ward 6 Councilor Marianne LaBarge |
| Ward 3 Councilor James B. Nash | Ward 7 Councilor Rachel Maiore |
| Ward 4 Councilor John Thorpe | |

Announcement of Audio/Video Recording

Councilor Sciarra explained that the meeting is a continuation of the June 3, 2021 regular City Council meeting. She announced that the meeting was being audio and video recorded.

Financial Orders (on 2nd reading)

Financial Orders (on 2nd reading)
21.290 An Order to Appropriate \$435,653 Free Cash for AOM Restroom Expansion and Renovation - 1st reading

Councilor Sciarra took this item out of order to accommodate Academy of Music representatives present for the discussion. She reminded councilors there had been a request Thursday night for a second reading at tonight's meeting.

Councilor Dwight moved to suspend rules to allow a second reading. Councilor Quinlan seconded. The motion passed unanimously 9:0 by roll call vote.

Councilor Dwight moved to approve the order in second reading. Councilor Foster seconded.

As councilors may recall from Thursday, this was a request to provide some additional funding to the Academy of Music (AOM) to allow them to complete a significant bathroom renovation and expansion, Mayor Narkewicz recounted. Bids for the project came in higher than expected so he was bringing an order before council to allow AOM directors to get the work completed in time for their September 8th reopening.

Councilor Dwight moved to recognize AOM Executive Director Debra J'Anthony and AOM Board of Trustees President Andrew J. Crystal. Councilor Jarrett seconded. The motion passed unanimously 9:0 by roll call vote.

AOM officials started entertaining renovating the restrooms a little over two years ago based on the need because the theatre's attendance had grown exponentially, Ms. J'Anthony explained. Over the last five or six years, the theatre has gone from serving 40,000 to over 62,000. This is demonstrated through the bathroom lines. The theatre only has four stalls in the stalls-only bathroom and the men's room only has two stalls and two urinals. During a full sellout show, the women usually take over both bathrooms and send the men upstairs to the handicapped-accessible bathroom. The arrangement is just not tenable and does not serve the public. During COVID, they also started to reassess the need for safety features such as touchless sinks and faucets and the need for a ventilation system. (The bathrooms have literally no ventilation system, she presented.) Administrators sought funding a little over two years ago and received partial funding from the Massachusetts Cultural Facilities Fund and Smith College and small grants from the state Executive Office of Housing and Economic Development and the Beveridge Foundation. They kicked off a capital campaign this past fall and raised an additional \$82,000 from individuals and the public, but when they put the bids out and numbers started coming back, every time they put out an estimate the numbers just kept getting higher. At this juncture, the bids have increased to where they cannot move forward without further support from the city.

Academy operators began planning this two years ago, and from the time they began planning until now, the cost of lumber virtually tripled, Mr. Crystal reported. They did an early estimate with Elder Lumber and saw that estimate go up each time. Also, they had to launch a fundraising campaign in the middle of a pandemic when people were far more concerned with social issues and food insecurity. They raised \$82,000 but that was only half of what they raised in their last capital campaign. Dozens of shows are already booked for the fall and they feel it is critical to address the health and safety concerns in the bathrooms. Plans call for new ventilation that is 100% fresh air and 100% exhausted with a heat exchanger between the two to recapture lost energy. Taking public health concerns into consideration, the faucets and toilets will be touchless and hand dryers have HEPA filters. The last thing that aligned for them is that now is the ideal time to move forward because they have nothing booked since everything is cancelled or delayed until September 8th.

It is really critical that they receive funding quickly, Crystal stressed. The city has gone out to bid twice and the successful bidder is DA Sullivan. Once they know the funds have been allocated, the city can award the bid and the contractor can begin ordering materials. The timing is good because they don't have any shows but the timing is bad because construction costs have doubled and in some cases tripled. They are hoping the city can once again step in and help the theatre, which is quite an economic driver for the city. They appreciate anything the council can do to help them meet their goals.

Councilor Jarrett asked if Community Preservation Act (CPA) funds were an option for this project.

Ms. J'Anthony said no; they were already awarded \$55,000 in CPA funding for renovation of the lobby areas.

The theater had two renovation projects, Crystal clarified. They ran out of funds several years ago when they renovated the upstairs and never finished renovating the front lobby, the inner lobby where the concession area is located or the handicapped restroom. They were granted CPA funds for the lobby work upstairs. They ended up combining the remaining work on the lobby with the restroom expansion and renovation for bidding purposes to achieve efficiencies in general charges and overhead, thereby achieving some significant savings. The contracts are still separate since the funding sources are different.

There being no further questions, the motion to approve the order in second reading passed unanimously 9:0 by roll call vote.

The following order passed two readings:

City of Northampton
MASSACHUSETTS

In City Council

June 3, 2021

 Upon recommendation of the Mayor

21.290 An Order to Appropriate \$435,653 Free Cash to AOM Restroom Expansion and Renovation

Ordered, that

the sum of \$435,653 be appropriated from the FY2021 General Fund Undesignated Fund Balance (Free Cash) to the Academy of Music for expansion and renovation of the restroom facilities.

Rules suspended, passed two readings and enrolled.

21.217 Ordinance to Move Zero Lot Line from Section 10.14 to Section 6.13 - 2nd reading

21.217 An Ordinance to Move Zero Lot Line from Section 10.14 to Section 6.13 - 2nd reading

Councilor Dwight moved to approve the ordinance in second reading. Councilor LaBarge seconded. The motion passed unanimously 9:0 by roll call vote.

The following ordinance passed two readings:

**City of Northampton
MASSACHUSETTS**

In the Year Two Thousand Twenty One

Upon the Recommendation of Mayor David J. Narkewicz and Planning & Sustainability

21.217 AN ORDINANCE TO MOVE ZERO LOT LINE FROM SECTION 10.14 TO SECTION 6.13

An Ordinance of the City of Northampton, Massachusetts, providing that the Code of Ordinances, City of Northampton, Massachusetts, be amended to refer Zero Lot Line projects to a new subsection 6.13

Be it ordained by the City Council of the City of Northampton, in City Council assembled, as follows:

Amend Chapter 350 Attachment 7 & 8

Zero lot line single-family; see § 350-~~10.14~~6.13

Anywhere else in Chapter 350, Replace Zero Lot Line 10.14 to §6.13.

Passed two readings, ordained and enrolled.

21.218 Ordinance to Amend Zero Lot Line Section of Code - 1st reading

21.218 An Ordinance to Amend Zero Lot Line Section of Code - 1st reading

Action on this ordinance was continued May 20, 2021, Councilor Sciarra reminded. The Office of Planning and Sustainability (OPS) has submitted clean language, she noted.

Councilor Dwight moved to approve the ordinance in first reading. Councilor LaBarge seconded.

Councilor Sciarra read the revised language incorporating amendments jointly crafted by Councilor Jarrett and OPS.

Councilor Jarrett explained his reasons for putting forward the proposed changes. The first is to provide more flexibility. Requiring a house to sit right on the lot line as originally proposed has disadvantages, he noted. Such a placement automatically requires obtaining an easement for access, while the reduced lot line (RLL) proposal requires an easement only if the setback is less than five feet. The ordinance as amended allows the zero lot line (ZLL) option but also allows the structure to be placed in the location best for the site, taking development features such as trees into consideration.

The second is to set the width between structures to be consistent with historic development patterns. In Urban Residential B (URB), the minimum distance between principal structures would be 20 feet, while in Urban Residential C (URC) it would be 10 feet; the same as in the original proposal but with more flexibility for location of the structures in relation to the lot line.

The term "reduced lot line" is more accurate than "zero lot line" since "zero lot line" is only one of the many options, he added.

Ms. Misch confirmed this accurately described the modifications. She noted a scrivener's error in the legend on the final page and said it should be amended as follows:

Modify Chpt 350-Attachment 7 (URB) & 9 (URC) by adding a reference to reduced lot line section 6.13

Setbacks
Front =10 feet min.

Side = 15 feet min. **(URB): 10 feet (URC)**

Side = 0 feet on ~~one a~~ side for ~~zero lot line~~ **reduced lot line**- See §6.13

Councilor Dwight so moved. Councilor Maiore seconded. The motion to amend passed unanimously 9:0 by roll call vote.

In response to a question from Councilor Nash, Ms. Misch confirmed that this provision can only be used on adjacent properties under common ownership. The provision could not be used by agreement with an adjacent property owner, she clarified. The lot still needs to meet minimum dimensional standards for lot size, frontage, open space, etc., she added.

Councilor Maiore expressed her understanding that after creating the reduced setback, the owner could sell the lot to someone else. Ms. Misch confirmed that once the Approval Not Required (ANR) plan is endorsed by the Planning Board and recorded at the registry, the newly-created lot could be sold with the reduced setback as noted.

DEVELOPMENT TOOL

Allowing a property owner to carve off a lot for a family member is one use of this provision and does promote affordability, Councilor Jarrett acknowledged. However, they are also seeing ZLL used as a development tool where a developer may buy a house and either tear it down or keep it and add other lots around it. That is also happening and is one reason they are trying to modify this ordinance.

Councilor LaBarge referred to the complaint heard from Bay State residents that new construction there is too large and out of scale with the neighborhood. She asked Ms. Misch how the size of the new houses in Bay State compares to houses on Riverside Drive.

The short answer is every lot is different, Ms. Misch responded. Historically, lots carved off in URB and URC were between 40 and 50 feet wide and some houses on those lots have less than 10- or 15-foot setbacks. These older homes are larger or the same size as what Bill Ryan referred to in his email to the council as an "extra-wide house." Mr. Ryan gave a 30-foot width as an example of a house that was too wide, but there are many houses that wide, she pointed out.

There is not one uniform house or uniform lot size, she noted. From a district perspective, the requirement of minimum frontage of 50 feet and minimum lot size of 5,000 square feet is intended to match existing patterns of development.

Councilor Nash expressed the opinion that the work Councilor Jarrett and Ms. Misch have done on this is very creative and thoughtful and the amendment is a really nice solution. He thanked them both, saying he can see it represents a lot of time and energy.

ADDITIONAL AMENDMENT

At Councilor Jarrett's request, the administrative assistant screen-shared an additional proposed amendment:

To be inserted after **§350-6.13 A:**

B. For any lot with a reduced lot line, the sum of its side yard setbacks must be equal to or more than two times the standard side yard setback minus 5 feet

The amendment is intended to address the issue of wider houses on smaller lots, Councilor Jarrett explained. In URB, it would allow a 20-foot wide structure on a 50 foot lot and, in URC, a 35-foot wide structure on the same lot. It is supposed to encourage the construction of smaller dwellings, which should presumably cost less and be more affordable.

He has heard from many of his constituents that they would like the city to regulate this, so he thought it was important for councilors to have a discussion and weigh the pros and cons.

Councilor Jarrett moved to approve the amendment. Councilor Dwight seconded for purposes of discussion.

Councilor Dwight wondered whether the amendment was significant enough to require re-

advertising and restarting the public hearing. He said he is never quite sure when that threshold is reached.

Councilor Sciarra said she spoke to the city solicitor and it was his opinion that this amendment does not trigger that process. His belief is that it still falls within the topic and scope of the ordinance, she shared.

Councilor Dwight noted they've all been on the receiving end of a lot of testimony from one particular neighborhood and one of his concerns is the ever-changing terms. Neighbors first talked about 'McMansions' and now they're talking about 'extra-wide' homes. He believes almost all of them live in what is being described as an extra-wide home, and that makes him uncomfortable. He is a little concerned about custom-fabricated zoning to target one particular developer and one type of development. "I want to feel a damn sight more comfortable than I do right now about this," he said.

When asked for her input, Ms. Misch advocated for the ordinance as presented prior to the amendment. She pointed out that many of the existing 50-foot wide lots built out decades ago don't have a standard 15-foot setback and accommodate capes, ranches and other architectural styles that happen to be wider on the side facing the street. The intention of ZLL is to create that flexibility for narrower lots.

The ordinance as presented tonight allows the flexibility to avoid features such as ledge or trees yet at the same time maintain enough separation between principal structures to preserve the development pattern typical for the neighborhood, she suggested. "The more you chip away at that by reducing that flexibility, the less opportunity there might be to create different housing styles that meet people's family needs or individual needs as well as trying to preserve certain site features," she observed.

She thinks the ordinance as presented tonight has the safeguard of assuring adequate space between structures without being burdensome. The intent of the ordinance wasn't to try to minimize development options but to create flexibility. Planners have never tried to dictate the width of structures through zoning, she noted.

Councilor Foster said she has heard from constituents about the need to balance the goal of encouraging infill development with ensuring that new development fits the character of the neighborhood. She personally sees the need for that balance and wondered if this amendment is something they would want to refer to the Planning Board for further discussion.

As he interprets it, a natural outcome of the amendment would be to promote structures with front-facing pediments and to discourage ranches and colonials which tend to be broader on the street side, Councilor Nash commented. He agreed with Councilor Foster that more discussion would be advisable. "For us to legislate that tonight without a little more research might not be appropriate," he commented.

Councilor Dwight made the observation that the width limitation would force a tendency to have the gabled side of a house facing the street. If the street faces south, that orientation would not facilitate the most extensive use of solar. Houses with south-facing roofs are better able to accommodate solar panels, a feature the city has been attempting to promote through zoning.

As Ms. Misch has alluded to, limiting the width of a house is somewhat unprecedented, he added. He would like to be a lot more comfortable that this did not limit the potential for some unique structures. His thinking conforms more with the intent as Ms. Misch described it, which is to create more opportunities rather than limit them. As they have repeated over and over, the intent is to expand inventory, expand housing, expand opportunity and develop and expand affordable housing.

He thinks this is a significant change and he sees Councilor Foster's recommendation of referring it to the Planning Board as appropriate. Something this substantive needs further deliberation and discussion by people with more expertise in this field than they have, he asserted.

Fellow councilors raise a number of points and he sees the need to think about this issue with the Planning Board, Councilor Jarrett said. One of the things he's talked about with people in eastern Massachusetts is the idea of 'guiding the bulldozer of gentrification.' Huge forces they do not control such as higher prices on houses and tear downs are pushing them, and the question is how to guide those forces to create more affordable housing and what to allow when they give a zoning bonus. ZLL/RLI is a bonus, he stressed. He'd like to look at that more holistically without just looking at one dimension such as width. He would like to look at how they can address these huge issues of affordability and design.

Councilors discussed whether to refer the entire ordinance back to the Planning Board or to pass the ordinance as already amended and just refer the amendment on the floor as a stand-alone amendment.

As the sponsor of the pending amendment, he is in favor of passing the ordinance as presented tonight and introducing the most recent amendment separately, Councilor Jarrett advised. He withdrew his motion.

Councilor Dwight called the question, and the motion to approve the ordinance as amended in first reading passed unanimously 9:0 by roll call vote.

See minutes of June 17, 2021 for second reading.

<u>Recess</u>	<u>Recess</u> The City Council recessed briefly at 8:33 p.m. The council reconvened at 8:38 p.m.
---------------	---

<u>Consent Agenda</u>	<p><u>Consent Agenda</u> Councilor Sciarra reviewed the items on the consent agenda, offering to remove any item for separate discussion upon request. Councilor LaBarge moved to approve the consent agenda as presented. Councilor Dwight seconded. The motion passed unanimously 9:0 by roll call vote.</p> <p>The following items were approved as part of the consent agenda:</p> <p>A. <u>Minutes of April 15, 2021 and May 6, 2021</u></p> <p>B. <u>21.291 Appointments to Various Committees - for referral to City Services Committee</u></p> <p><u>Energy & Sustainability</u> Ashley Muspratt, 15 Franklin Street, Northampton Term: July 2021-June 2024 <i>Reappointment</i></p> <p><u>Board of Health</u> Cynthia Suopis, 19 Ford Crossing, Northampton Term: July 2021-June 2024 <i>Reappointment</i></p> <p>Laurent Levy, 4 School Street, Northampton Term: July 2021-June 2024 <i>Reappointment</i></p> <p><u>Transportation & Parking Commission</u> Diana Day, 44 Berkshire Terrace, Apt. 2, Northampton Term: July 2021-June 2024 <i>To fill a vacancy</i></p>
-----------------------	---

<u>Recess for Committee on Finance Meeting</u>	<u>Recess for Committee on Finance Meeting</u> At 8:40 p.m., the City Council recessed for the Committee on Finance. The Committee on Finance adjourned at 8:49 p.m. The City Council reconvened at 8:49 p.m.
--	--

<p><u>Financial Orders (on 1st reading pending Finance)</u> <u>21.286 Order Authorizing Acquisition of a Parcel on the Easterly Side of the Mill River - 1st reading</u></p>	<p><u>Financial Orders (on 1st reading pending Finance review)</u> <u>21.286 An Order Authorizing Acquisition of a Parcel on the Easterly Side of the Mill River - 1st reading</u> Councilor LaBarge moved to approve the order in first reading. Councilor Jarrett seconded. The motion passed unanimously 9:0 by roll call vote. <u>See minutes of June 17, 2021 for second reading.</u></p>
<p><u>Financial Orders (in 2nd reading)</u> <u>21.292 Order to Appropriate Additional \$608,500 from Various Sources for Roundhouse Parking Lot Reconstruction - 1st reading</u></p>	<p><u>Financial Orders (in 2nd reading)</u> <u>The following order passed two readings:</u> <u>21.292 An Order to Appropriate Additional \$608,500 from Various Sources for Roundhouse Parking Lot Reconstruction - 1st reading</u> Mayor Narkewicz reminded the Council President that he made a request last Thursday for a second reading on this order. Councilor Dwight moved to suspend rules to allow a second reading. Councilor Foster seconded. The motion passed unanimously 9:0 by roll call vote. Councilor Dwight moved to approve the order in second reading. Councilor Quinlan seconded. Central Services Director David Pomerantz gave a brief overview of the Roundhouse project, which the city has already bid and is ready to get to work on. The project started over three years ago with a capital appropriation to just redo the lot and evolved into a project involving some land-taking and increasing the number of parking spaces by 22. In addition, work includes rerouting the bike path toward the Northampton Housing Authority, addressing a number of safety concerns with upgraded lighting, putting in some storm water diversion at the request of the DPW and making some accommodations to better serve Northampton Fire Rescue in case firefighters have to bring apparatus into the lot to access the back of the apartment building on the west side. The project has grown. There was going to be a solar piece but because of all the infrastructure under the parking lot, that has been dropped. The project received site plan approval in April. The city has bid the project and he has prepared an initial letter of award which is ready to send out to the contractor. With the Masonic Street parking lot closed, they want to move this project as fast as they can and hopefully have the parking lot back in operation before Smith College returns in session. Councilor Jarrett thanked Director Pomerantz for working with him and Chris Mason for thinking about the lighting issues and how they could be improved within the existing contract. The motion passed unanimously 9:0 by roll call vote. <u>The following order passed two readings:</u></p>

City of Northampton
MASSACHUSETTS

In City Council June 3, 2021

Upon recommendation of the Mayor

21.292 An Order to Appropriate Additional \$608,500 from Various Sources for Roundhouse F Lot Reconstruction

Ordered, that

\$608,500 be appropriated from the following accounts to provide additional funding for the reconstruction of the Roundhouse Parking Lot:

\$200,000	Receipts Reserved for Appropriation – Parking (Fund 2312)
\$ 26,925	Remaining funds from prior Parking Maintenance Vehicle Purchase (193030 585613)
\$381,575	Capital Stabilization (5000 340616)

Rules suspended, passed two readings and enrolled.

Orders
21.278 an Order Transferring Care, Custody and Control of a Certain Area of Land from Smith Voke to DPW - 1st reading

Orders
21.278 An Order Transferring Care, Custody and Control of a Certain Area of Land from Smith Voke to DPW - 1st reading
Councilor Sciarra read the order.

Councilor Dwight moved to approve the order in first reading. Councilor LaBarge seconded.

Mayor Narkewicz described the parcel's location. Heading up Route 9 toward Leeds across from Scotty's is a dirt road with a gate that is part of the Smith Vocational and Agricultural High School (SVAHS) property. The location is on the left of the dirt road leading up to the Horticulture/Forestry Department.

The Department of Public Works (DPW) approached SVAHS about the possibility of using the site for a small facility to house a pressure-reducing valve for one of the city's main water lines. DPW staff did a site visit with the board of trustees and received permission to use the property. Since the underlying land belongs to the city, the City Council now needs to authorize assigning the use of the land to the DPW for this pressure-relieving valve and appurtenances.

The administrative assistant screen-shared an aerial photo of the site with the location of the proposed building and 36-inch water main outlined. It happens to be in proximity to the 36-inch water line, so it is an ideal location, Mayor Narkewicz noted.

In response to a question from Councilor LaBarge, the Mayor said the building is approximately 20 by 15 feet. She asked how much land Smith Vocational owns, and Mayor Narkewicz said it is many, many acres.

There being no further questions or comments, the motion passed unanimously 9:0 by roll call vote.

See minutes of June 17, 2021 for second reading.

21.288 An Order Further Amending Order 20.062 Entered on June 4, 2020, as Amended by Order 20.149 and Order 21.211 - 1st reading

21.288 An Order Further Amending Order 20.062 Entered on June 4, 2020, as Amended by Order 20.149 and Order 21.211 - 1st reading

Councilor Sciarra read the order.

Councilor Dwight moved to approve the order in first reading. Councilor Foster seconded.

This is the order they've kept amending [to suspend certain ordinances to allow outdoor dining], Mayor Narkewicz presented. A similar thing is happening at the state level. On June 15th, the governor lifted his state of emergency. Many state regulations are tied to the lifting of that order, such as the extension of premises that allowed restaurants to move alcohol service outside. Similar to the council's order, that bill also is scheduled to expire 60 days following the expiration of the state of emergency.

Administrators are hoping to remove the 60-day expiration clause locally so outdoor dining can continue until the end of the year. A bill filed by the governor is simultaneously racing through the house and senate that would remove the 60-day provision in the prior emergency legislation. The state legislature is also assessing whether some of the changes to outdoor dining and premises could be made permanent. Here in Northampton, the whole 'Summer on Strong' project and other outdoor dining areas set up in the public way would all essentially become illegal on August 15th if they didn't amend the previous order allowing it to happen. This would merely extend the order until November 1st which would get them through the outdoor dining season at which time hopefully there will be further guidance from the state.

Councilor Dwight said he expressed earlier and is going to continue to express that 1) it is a public right of way and public land; in other words, property held in common by the public. Problematically, in the past, when the city has given land over to private businesses, sometimes there's been a sense of ownership that comes to be assumed and a primacy that businesses are not entitled to, and that concerns him, particularly if this becomes permanent. That is to say, what has been done is a good thing insofar as it is being enjoyed by many people, and he would imagine businesses that have benefitted from it are very grateful. Other business owners have complained about other issues downtown that unfortunately assumes this sense of ownership or primacy that is not theirs. In the absence of state law that determines where the public's right ends and private ownership begins, this is an experiment. He is going to vote to support this because it is not a hill he chooses to die on, but it is a social equity issue and he can't let this pass without acknowledging it.

Councilor Nash said he appreciates Councilor Dwight's carefulness around this and said he absolutely agrees, they need to be careful. What's happened on Lower Main Street has really highlighted the vitality that people have been talking about. That vitality is linked to restaurants and businesses rather than public space but does demonstrate that Main Street can be narrower and traffic can still flow and that there can be a lot of lively happenings and it will attract people downtown. Most of this is in Ward 3, and he's done a lot of outreach with many of these businesses to get them on board with this. As they move forward with their downtown design, there is going to be a tension that they need to attend to; that people and businesses aren't allowed to just mark out space that belongs to everyone.

Councilor Maire said she wanted to express how glad she is that Councilor Dwight brought that up so it is something they can have in their consciousness.

Councilor Jarrett thanked Councilor Dwight and said he's been very pleased with the additional outdoor seating and public pedestrian space. They have taken most of that space from places dominated by motor vehicles. He asked if a person who is not a paying customer has a right to sit at one of those spaces.

In terms of the places that have liquor licenses, the owners have to control those premises and can't allow people to just flow in and out, Mayor Narkewicz advised. Places without a liquor license do not have same issue. It is a mixture depending on whether a liquor license is involved.

	<p>There being no further questions, the motion passed unanimously 9:0 by roll call vote.</p> <p><u>See minutes of June 17, 2021 for second reading.</u></p>
<p><u>Ordinances (Not Yet Referred)</u> <u>21.277 Ordinance Relative to Off-Street Handicapped Parking Spaces</u></p>	<p><u>Ordinances (Not Yet Referred)</u> <u>21.277 An Ordinance Relative to Off-Street Handicapped Parking Spaces</u> Councilor Foster said she would need to abstain because, as the director of All Out Adventures, her organization runs programs at this location.</p> <p>Councilor Sciarra read the ordinance.</p> <p>Councilor Dwight moved to refer the ordinance to Legislative Matters. Councilor Nash seconded. The motion passed 8:0 by roll call vote with Councilor Foster abstaining.</p>
<p><u>New Business</u></p>	<p><u>New Business</u> None.</p>
<p><u>Motion to Adjourn</u></p>	<p>Upon motion made by Councilor Dwight and seconded by Councilor Jarrett, the meeting was adjourned at 9:21 a.m. The motion passed 9:0 by roll call vote.</p> <p>Attest: _____ Administrative Assistant to the City Council</p>