A Special Meeting of the City Council was held in the City Council Chambers on Monday, September 12, 2022, at 6:00 P.M. for the purpose of taking action on the committee report listed below.

Notice of this meeting was posted on September 8, 2022 at 5:05 P.M.

All Councillors Present,

Council President Patricia Morsillo presided.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Councillor Riccardi offered the following report for the Committee on Ordinances, Licenses and Legal Affairs co-posted with the Committee of the Whole to whom was referred the matter of an ordinance to amend a zoning ordinance relative to the Halloween Parking Overlay District.

The Committee on Ordinances, Licenses and Legal Affairs co-posted with the Committee of the Whole has considered said matter and would recommend adoption for first passage by roll call vote.

It was voted to accept the report and adopt the recommendation by a roll call vote of 8 yeas, 3 nays and 0 absent. Councillors Cohen, Dominguez, McCarthy, McClain, Prosniewski, Riccardi, Varela and Morsillo were recorded in the affirmative. Councillors Hapworth, Merkl, and Watson-Felt were recorded in the negative.

Councillor McCarthy motion for immediate reconsideration in hopes it does not prevail was denied.

COUNCILLOR RICCARDI: Recap on how we got here, This Ordinance came to us on May of 2022, a Joint Public Hearing was on June 27, City Council closed the JPH and sent the recommendation to the Planning Board. On July 14th the Planning Board sent their recommendation back to the City Council, who in turn sent the matter to OLLA to continue to discuss. The Zoning Enforcement Officer (Tom St. Pierre, LT. David Tucker from the SPD, David Kucharsky Parking and Traffic Director are all in support of the Ordinance. The ZEF had an issue with being able to enforce these "parking lots" that pop up during Halloween, so he went to the City Solicitor, Parking and the PD to come up with a solution, and this is the solution that they came up with. Map was drawn up based on where the Parking Enforcement Officers work daily. Feel for the Neighbors who are next to these lots, but at least we are adding regulations and guidelines which is what Ordinance enforcement is. The ZEO doesn't go around peeking around corners to catch the infractions, it's really up to neighbors to help enforcement. The Salem Police Chief as well as the Salem Police Department are in support of the Ordinance (see letter from Chief of Police), the Traffic and Parking are in support and those are the ones who will be doing the majority of the enforcement.

COUNCILLOR DOMINGUEZ: Agrees with C Riccardi, this is about working as a community. We need to come to some sort of a decision with this Ordinance. It's Halloween time and our city uses Halloween as revenue. Having something in place is good, it's not perfect but to have an Ordinance to rely on and to build on. We need to help the suffering business owners who might be affected, as well as our students and nonprofit organizations. It hard for our neighbors that may be affected, but we need to find a way to move forward. Those cars are going to be here no matter what, and we can't prevent them from coming. This Ordinance could help with that. And its great that the Chief of Police supports this. And I am in favor of this.

COUNCILLOR MERKL: Respect colleagues' position and what side they choose, Parking in October in Salem is a tough issue with no one solution. Any changes to allow parking should be a very through comprehensive study to focus on expanding parking as much as possible outside of the downtown area. Use of shuttles that moves 18,000 people last year during the month of October. What I find problematic is the map of the downtown of which these covers. It's the opposite of what we are trying to achieve. I am out and about in this area, and it is always congested, and it concerns me with equity as well. Based on the map ¾ of the area in this overlay are in one area and they are not non-profit or small business. This is approx. 2,000 parking spots. For example, we have a church that makes the cut of within the red circle, but another church 5 streets down, that doesn't. I actually Have a letter from that church asking to pass this Ordinance, but they are not in the area, so it won't affect them. Approval from Planning Board back in July, with a footnote that the City Council should expand 1.5 miles to include outside the downtown. Including the entrance corridors. So, passing this and making changes later makes me uncomfortable.

COUNCILLOR HAPWORTH: Appreciate my colleagues for the way they've engaged in this debate throughout this process, though, I'm sure this vote will not be unanimous. I know we've all debated in good faith. You don't get that in many elected bodies today that good faith is appreciated. But on all sides, that faith is based on anecdotal evidence and assumptions. If we're going to change zoning, we need to do with data. In fact, beyond the process, I have some real issues with legitimizing parking. As a commercial use downtown for our tax base, climate goals and housing needs, we need to encourage more creative uses downtown than asphalt parking lots. October parking can be lucrative, and we have concerns that legalizing this use will guide future development on the surface lots and discourage creativity. Most importantly, this ordinance does nothing to address the biggest October problem residents face and that's soul crushing traffic. As downtown residents ourselves, our family has always looked to embrace October insanity. But we still need to get our kids to soccer games. pick up the groceries, get to appointments, and live our lives in October. Traffic in this city with vehicles expecting to park downtown has reached a critical level and the message needs to be unequivocally. Unless you are a resident or have unique transportation needs, do not expect to park in downtown Sale in October because there

will be no parking for visitors. This ordinance sends a message to our tens of thousands of October visitors. But there may or may not be commercial lots sprinkled around our downtown neighborhoods and invites them to clog our roads while circling for available space. We're told that visitors will take cars out to Sale regardless and this will at least get them parked in off the street. But that claim is based on not very much. Studies show that people's transportation decisions are strongly impacted by available parking. A 2021 study by the University of California showed that parking availability as parking availability increases, people choose to use public transportation less. That means that increasing the availability of parking for Salem's, for non-Salem residents in October runs in October runs completely counter to our consistent messaging. Finally, I guess I would ask, why are we codifying this practice that isn't working? There will never be enough parking and Salem in October, and this won't change that. Even if this ordinance encourages every single eligible lot in the overlay to become a commercial law, it still won't be enough. What it will do is encourage sales, tens of thousands of visitors, to continue to bring their cars into the middle of Salem, circling our neighborhoods and searching for temporary lots. And I guess I'll just end with this one final point. There's not a single traffic and parking problem in this country that's been solved by adding more capacity. We need more creative solutions.

COUNCILLOR MCCLAIN: considered this over the last, well, all summer, really, I think I've made comments at our previous meetings making it clear that I'm really not a big fan of this. I appreciate the position of our zoning enforcement officer. It's not easy to maintain and enforce the zoning in a city that's complex with that level of resources. But I do have issues with the process that took place, that brought this before us. And I don't in any fashion put the onus on that for a single individual. As I've said many times in these chambers. I'm troubled by the fact that our city seems to lack a comprehensive transportation management plan. We have had a number of initiatives come before us from different quarters, whether that's traffic and parking or the zoning enforcement. And many times I have said, what is the master plan? What is the goal? Where does this fit into our overall vision? And that is exactly how I felt when this proposal arrived before us. I am not convinced that what we are really going to be debating and voting on is the merits of this proposal in a vacuum. I think what we are really debating and really going to be voting on is the reality of all of these items being removed if we do not pass this overlay. And those are two different things. This is activity that has been going on for guite some time and it has been going on without the blessing, so to speak, of this body, yet it has continued because it was necessary. And so to have this presented to us with that sort of shadow of if this does not move forward, then this other action will happen, which is really not written on the paper is really problematic for me. I really work hard not to make decisions based on fear or threat, but really make decisions based on the merit. But I have to take that into consideration in this case and that really is a negative sticking point for me in this debate. I will say, however, that some of the key questions that I raised in our previous deliberations have been answered to some

degree. One of the key questions I asked previously was if we have operators of properties who are essentially becoming attractive nuisances, who are drawing people into neighborhoods, who are then doing things like urinating or breaking glass or violating noise ordinances late at night or congregating in inappropriate places, why is it necessary to introduce a zoning overlay to address those? Why does our existing criminal nuisance ordinance not provide us the capacity to shut that activity down? I was able to get that somewhat addressed in conversations with our chief and as we can see, we have a letter of endorsement which has said to me, our public safety officials are not going to endorse a proposal that they think is going to create attractive nuisances in our neighborhoods. That's fair. That was one of my concerns and it was spoken to. I will say also that in going over my notes and deliberations for this, I actually went through every single public comment that we received via email or telephone or otherwise, which were many everybody in this room knows. So and two things stood out to me. The first that stood out to me is when I took an actual tally of the people who had reached out to me. Slightly more of them actually were in support. The other thing that stood out to me is this really did not evoke a lot of response from my particular constituency in my ward. But those who did really spoke strongly of the revenues that are raised from this activity. They spoke of their high school sports teams, they spoke of their nonprofit ventures, they spoke of educational initiatives. And that's pretty important to me. I think as angry as I am about some aspects of this, I've been cautioned not to, so to speak, throw the baby out with the bathwater. And there is some merit to those arguments. I remain really concerned about the process. I remain very concerned that this was delivered to us without deliberation with the word counselors who would be impacted. As a ward counselor myself, that's really troubling to me. That hasn't been the standard at which I have observed us to work so far since I have joined this body. It's not a standard that I would ever endorse. I think it's highly problematic. But I also note that there are some differences of opinion for those counselors. Every word counselor who's impacted by this has not come to the same conclusion. I think there are some really strong negatives about this proposal, but I think there are some merits too, and I think that I'm prepared to hold my nose and vote yes.

COUNCILLOR WATSON-FELT: I would take us all back almost two years ago and the start of the Bridge Street overlay zoning conversation and the planning Department put together an incredible amount of data, and they did an incredible amount of research. They did comparative analysis with other neighborhoods in Salem and outside of Salem. They engaged the public through a public input website. They engaged conversation with stakeholders, both from the neighborhood directly affected, as well as the counselor, as well as some of the local organizations who were considered subject matter experts. And the process went on about two years, give or take little less than two years. And that was affecting one neighborhood, and it had implications for housing density and affordability, and it had implications for community and neighborhood culture, and it had implications that affected people who live there. And I think I took for

granted that process because here I sit, the downtown City Councilor with a number of differing opinions and requests from constituents whom I represent who are adversely affected potentially by this ordinance and have been for years, by the lack of legal enforcement for years. And this process and the ordinance in front of us is huge disappointment. It lacks comprehensive attention and engagement that our residents are deserving of. And this whole baby with the bathwater thing is really frustrating for me because the reality is there is actually no collected data that reflects back the number of spots used historically by these lots because that data was not gathered. This was simply a problem that someone wanted to stop having to deal with. In fact, we have no commitment from any of the commercial lots that I'm aware of that has been shared with us as a body by the business owners that have been identified inside the circle, that they would even go through the permitting process, that they would even commit all of those spots as identified. So when people say that there is potentially a loss of 30 parking spots, which could triple to 120 in a day. I find that to be really offensive rhetoric because we have absolutely no base of fact for that. We have no base of fact that it's ever been that, and we have no base of fact that that's what it could be. So I've been really frustrated by this process, as some of my fellow city councilors have acknowledged, those on both sides have acknowledged over the course of this entire conversation since May. But we have absolutely no, this is not a comprehensive solution to an incredibly difficult issue that needs solving, which will come as no surprise to anyone who's tuned in since May, will still not be supporting this tonight. And I would encourage folks who have a real problem with that to please contact the mayor's office and the department heads who put this short sighted and ill conceived suggestion of a solution in front of this body and essentially forced our hands on a timetable in order to get this done in time to make, admittedly, a very difficult job easier.

COUNCILLOR COHEN: We had a couple of meetings and this body unanimously passed both ordinances. And this brings me to a third one, which is brick sidewalks. And I remember being at the Commission on Disabilities when that was presented. And we talk about equity. And the lens that I use as a city councilor is equity and access. That's it. Equity and access. And we really need to figure out what those are that's being empathetic and sympathetic. And in my mind, I think a lot of us actually are downtown councilors. I think North Street and Margin Street and a whole bunch of Derby Street. And the point and for people don't know, ward Five includes a bit of Washington Street and Lafayette Street all the way to Derby Street and Lafayette Park and where the Hampton Inn is in the residential. And you can throw a rock from there to claw bally from some of the places. And when I think about the people impacted in my ward, I think about how we're already inundated with cars during a lot of the year in traffic. It takes me longer to get from Hancock Street to Harbor Street on Lafayette then it takes from Harbor Street to my wife spending breakfast in North Street, where I have to go through the whole rest of the downtown. And if you've ever tried to get an ice cream at Treadwells and come back on North Street, you just notice all the cars going almost all

the way to the cemetery. So I think process is important, but some people know, especially Council Ricardi. I've been working on a green building ordinance for four years now, and I had a meeting with the Planning Department and Sustainability and Resiliency Department. And I just looked around the room and before we started, I said, does everyone here agree there's a climate crisis? And some of them did. But in my mind, this process, as the way it was laid out by Councilors Ricardo and Marcilo, I think wasn't perfect. It could be better. We could definitely expand the map and accommodate more people who have been using it. But I really believe in the end, as I told the Cornell, that these regulations that came to us after two meetings, that the traffic and parking head between our Olymp meetings really do address some of the concerns. And it really is up to the city to enforce it. And I think we'll all help with that. In my mind, this is about each one of us, 9% each, looking at the city at large and our colleagues and saying, how will this impact on you? And I just say, let's try it and see what happens. We can go back and make it better and maybe there will be issues. But I do feel there's a general as Councilor Dominguez said, there's a general sense in Salem of our community and how we can work together to make things better.

COUNCILLOR PROSNIEWSKI: . I've spent over 40 years in law enforcement and watched how decisions are made and how judgments are made, especially in courts where a lot of contentious issues have to make judgment based on evidence and based on facts. So when I ran for counsel, I promised my constituents that I would look at the facts before I was going to make any assumptions or make any decisions. So I put together a set of facts on this issue. Traffic will increase in October. Easy Factor Swallow 3000 plus vehicles will have to park elsewhere. If this does not pass that many nonprofits, churches, charities, school programs, they will not profit because they won't have the funding from the sales of these lots. Fact other communities have already had these problems. Other communities have come to conclusions with these issues by regulating, by zoning, like we're trying to do here. Facts. The business community supports this program, as the Chamber of Commerce has written a letter stating so the Salem schools support this program. As I read a great letter written by the Director of Activities, Lisa Mansfield, stated how it would negatively impact the school programs The planning department supports this, the parking department supports this, the police department supports this, and the churches supports this fact that the lots will still fill up even if the owners just leave them open or they don't, that's just less parking. But the fact is, the lots will still fill up. Fact every city agency already publicizes not to drive to Salem. That's been for years. Anybody that has, even every resident in this city who would ask what's the best way to get to Salem, or how to get to Salem, how do I get to visit Salem? Everybody says, don't drive, take public transportation, take the trains. This has been done for years. So when somebody says, oh, we should publicize more about not driving, that's already been done. That's long past water over the bridge. Here's a fact Shetland, which hosts about 20 vehicles, are going to be asked to shut their lot down. Shetland is next to Pickering off, which is adjacent to downtown. Fact Salem will

lose that income. Let me assume. It's not evidence but let me assume or actually ask a question. If we close Shetland down and then we ask them, gee, can we muster our Halloween parade on their property? Can we have the pride parade on their property? Can we have the muscular dystrophy motorcycle run park on their property? I'm not sure how they're going to respond to that because we just cost them a whole boatload of money. It gets down to what is the definition of this proposal and who does it benefit and who doesn't it benefits the community. What's the community? The businesses, the schools, the churches, the organizations and the residents. That's who this benefits. I want to know who this does not benefit. How are we going to police these lots if we do force them to shut down? We've heard a lot about October being so busy that everybody's too busy to make enforcement on the other end. Well, if we shut them down, we're going to be enforcing that part of it. And if they do decide to open up against our regulations, how are we going to enforce it? Are we going to have lawsuits? Are we going to have litigation that's going to cost us money that may not pan out in the end? We're not going to change already. What's happening in downtown Salem, people come, it's human nature. bYou drive to the mall, you look for the closest parking spot. You drive to Salem during Halloween, you look for the closest parking spot. You work your way outward, you can't find it. You park further away. It's not going to stop anymore traffic from coming in. It's not perfect. This ordinance isn't perfect. No ordinance is. And there's always room to adjust it. The map is problematic. I agree. Maybe it's too small. Maybe we should expand a little bit, something to be talked about a little later. The issues of this process is not the fault of those that are going to be directly impacted by this. We cannot fault the school kids, the children, the nonprofits, the churches. These are people who count on these funds to help those who sometimes can't fend for themselves. So I would like to hear the facts, not the assumptions or the suspicions or the biases on why this is bad for sale. I would like to hear the facts before I make a decision. But as it stands right now, if I'm going to base my decision on the evidence that I've heard, I will be voting for this.

COUNCILLOR MCCARTHY: As was stated previously, zoning, land use can only be regulated by zoning. So we can sit here and debate the process and everything, but when it comes down to it, the use of land is regulated by zoning. So the only way, when called into question whether or not they're parking is an allowable use. The only way we can address that issue is by adjusting the zoning. I'm not going to sit here and try to fault anybody with how this got in front of us. But the process is how do we address something that has been going on unchecked for decades, but has been brought into question with regards to this unlimited area? Which I'm not going to sit here and say it's perfect or it's not perfect, because it's not. But we as a body went through a process. The process was a proposal was presented to us. We had a public hearing. We debated the issue. People came in, spoke to the issue. We closed the public hearing, the planning board, and referred it back. And it started a clock ticking of now, which we're up towards the time period. That's the way the process works. And that's what we

did. We followed the process. Is it perfect? No. Could we do better? Yes. But it also is reflective of what we've been doing for decades with a lot of boots and suspenders on it. And also I would also note that being a member of this committee, this body, for a long time, I we, being the city, have implored various different alternatives on people to come into Salem, whether it was the shuttle bus from the North Shore Mall, whether it was the shuttles that we do currently, now from the high school, whether it's rideshare bike lanes. We have been at the forefront of trying to provide different modes of transportation for people to get around Salem, but not in one piece of literature that the city puts out that identifies any parking situation in the city. Do we identify these private lots, those lots exist because human nature or whatever it could be. But I also want to remind people that these businesses. They exist seven days a week. But for the most part. Except on the weekends when they either by sheer choice of the fact of the volume of people that come to Salem. They decide not to. Not to open on the weekends. Or they're a Monday through Friday type of business where you have a parking lot that is unutilized because their business only runs Monday through Friday. That on a Saturday. Sunday. And the one holiday during the month they are available for parking. If they choose to do that, then it's one of those. It's a situation that has been unchecked, really not looked at until most recently brought into light. And because it's been brought into light, we're here trying to deal with how do we deal with the fact that it's technically not allowed. Some people have mentioned Shetland. I will say Shetland is in my ward. I've got numerous complaints about Shetland, about boat loads, of other things, but I've never got a complaint about parking. I've got a complaint that they should open up more parking, make more parking available to the residents. But when it comes to Halloween parking, I have never got a complaint about their ability to park on their site. Like as I just stated, I've got numerous complaints about other things they do, but never once about Halloween parking. Do I want to draw more people into a neighborhood? No. But what they're doing is as they found it. As our reaction to that has been as more and more people come into Salem. We as a body have expanded our Halloween parking zones. Those the yellow signs or the green signs or whatever color they're going to be this year. We have identified more neighborhoods and areas to try to protect the residents from the onslaught of people coming in. Circling and finding a place to park. Is this the most ideal, perfect situation? Absolutely not. Is it what's in front of us? Yes. Did it go through a process? Yes. Did everyone have their ability to weigh in when they so choose? Yes. And we've gotten lots of emails and correspondence about it. And I appreciate all the comments and I've read them all. But with regards to this one, I've also had the conversations with our zoning officer, I've had the conversations with the police. And at this time, with what's in front of us, this is the best. It's not perfect. What we're going to adopt, we're going to take a vote on. But it's been molded from our discussions to be at the best, what's in front of us right now. And obviously it's on our diligence that if someone believes it needs to be modified or adjusted in the future, then it's on this body to do so. But for right now, I'll be voting in favor of this.

COUNCILLOR VARELA: Although this is not ideal, it is a starting point. And you know what, tourism isn't going anywhere. We're only getting busier here and those 3000 spots, even though it doesn't really make a dent in combating traffic and parking here, at least it's helpful to get cars off the road. You cannot change the behavior of people driving downtown. Furthermore, I really believe if we do not adopt this Halloween parking overlay, it will do more harm than good, especially to our nonprofits, our churches who use these funds to fund a lot of opportunity. I'd also like to also put this out here. As an at large counselor, I really believe it's your responsibility to represent the entire city and the best interest of the city, not just where you live downtown. And I understand the concerns of a lot of our two residents. But you know what, I'm going to be voting yes to this overlay with a promise that in the future after next year, that we will strengthen this ordinance and look back at it.

COUNCILLOR WATSON-FELT: I think through this, the regulations are still insufficient. When we create a zoning change, we can sit here and say we're going to make it better. The reality is it takes a lot of work. We all know this, we're all experiencing this right now. We have absolutely what is in front of us insufficient. Let me be clear, I support nonprofits. I am a local nonprofit leader. I am a public school mom. I don't hate churches. In fact, I attend one. This is still not a sufficient solution and fixing it will be really hard. Could potentially be. I don't want to do the rhetoric thing. Could potentially be very difficult to add to tease apart and restart when what we need is a comprehensive master transportation plan that increases the use of lots outside our downtown. Increases the use of shuttles. Increases our marketing about those shuttles only locations. Perhaps even goes deeper. Giving closed off streets the ability to be shuttle only and resident only transportation streets so that shuttles can move around the traffic. Everyone has been saying here tonight, not everyone, apologies. A number of the councils tonight have been referencing that this has been going on for years and years. So that's right, we have been looking the other way while an illegal use of land has been going on and getting worse for over 20 years. We have allowed by looking the other way to let this monkey barrel of issues get created. And now we're being asked to put something that's maybe just going to kind of fix it a little bit for now, through in a three month block of time. And I have a real problem with that because what it will do is tell people that there are potentially more because that's how it's going to found spots in the downtown. Has it ever occurred to anyone here present who sits here and says they are going to come anyway? Has it ever occurred to you that maybe they wouldn't if we made alternative accommodations? Has it ever occurred to you that the increased use of these illegal lots over the years and the increased use of online groups and blogs and travel posts and visit Salems and all of this and Facebook and Reddit and Twitter and everything in between. Go to Salem. There's this little tiny dirt lot where you can pay \$40 and park for the whole day and no one takes you away? Has anyone ever thought that that has made it worse, that that is why they come, that this is a selffulfilling prophecy and that if we were to pass this and codify this, it is really going to be very

difficult to take it away? That's what we would be doing. All I am proposing to say no to this year is to come up with an imploring subject matter experts, to come up with a better decision, a better offer, because that is what the Salem residents are worth. And another comment. Not every business is in support of this. I've seen online and received commentary from downtown business owners who are whose business is based on the tourism industry imploring us to vote against this. So we need to be really careful about whose comments we're listening to and whose we're not. And I admit that I am sitting here and not acknowledging the very real concerns of the loss of funding for nonprofits and churches and all the like. And again, I would ask that they seek additional support elsewhere just this year and complain to the people who brought this to us. I cannot consciously be painted into a corner on a matter that I think will fundamentally make matters worse.

Councillor President Morsillo steps down from the podium and Councillor McCarthy takes the roll of President.

COUNCILLOR MORSILLO: This is mostly about process and next steps. I haven't been counting the votes up there, but if this does pass, this is just phase one, as we've done with so many other ordinances, zoning and not. We've gone back, we've made changes. In fact, we passed the accessory dwelling unit ordinance last year and it's back before us to review, to make changes, to make whatever changes are required. We can do the same thing here. Of course, if it passes, all eyes are going to be on these lots. All eyes are going to be on the regulation of these lots, if it works, what the complaints are. But to me, being afraid to vote for something because you're afraid to fix it, isn't that's not okay? That's what all ordinances are. There attempts. Everything is getting towards the perfect ordinance. I've never seen a perfect ordinance. I've never had one presented here. I've never voted on one. They all need work. They all get amended. They all get we come back to it later and amend it. We had the marijuana buffer ordinance that came back to us this year to amend this stuff happens. I agree that we are under a time constraint. I would like to see the area expanded also because I think that there are more places to park. But I also know that we do a lot in this city to get the word out, to use public transportation. I have seen the mayor on television stations during October. I've heard her on the radio two years ago during the pandemic. The mayor was on the radio and on TV saying, please don't come. There's nothing happening here. Don't come. People came. So you can tell people not to drive, but they're going to drive. We can add more signs in Salem, and I've been advocating for that, to get people to the park and shuttle lots. We can do a lot more in that area. Garage sales are better publicized than those park and shuttle lots in this city. Of course, we can work with the departments to bring in these ideas, or we can bring in an order to study it in any of the committees. And I hope that whichever way this goes tonight, all of you with ideas on how to fix parking will do that. This was never meant to solve traffic in the downtown. It was never stated that this was supposed to fix traffic in the downtown. That is a huge thing to do. This is just to legalize what's happening. And I

get that that's not okay. I get that it should have been enforced. I get that there's a lot that's happening in Salem during October and a lot is a higher priority than the parking in private lots. You can like that or not. That's just a reality. It's just a reality. The police have a lot more things going on than who's parking in what commercial lot. So I will be voting in favor of this. I am for the regulations that it brings and I thoroughly expect to be amending those regulations during the month. Right. If you see something isn't working, call Dave Kucharsky. Let's get the regulations amended so that this stuff works more smoothly.

The matter of an ordinance to amend a zoning ordinance relative to the Halloween Parking Overlay District has considered said matter and would recommend adoption for first passage by roll call vote of 8 yeas, 3 nays, and 0 absent.

Councillor McCarthy motion for immediate reconsideration in the hopes that it does not prevail was denied.

Councillor McCarthy adjourns the meeting at 7:12PM