

**CITY OF WOBURN
OCTOBER 2, 2012 - 7:00 P.M.
REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL**

Roll Call

Anderson	Gately
DiTucci	Haggerty
Drapeau	Mercer-Bruen
Gaffney	Raymond
Denaro	

VOTED to dispense with the reading of the previous meeting's Journal and to APPROVE, all in favor, 9-0.

MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS: None.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

On the petition by Alderman Darlene Mercer-Bruen concerning the structure or structures located at 34 Orange Street a/k/a 29 Hawthorne Street, Woburn, Massachusetts, for the purposes of determining whether said structure or structures are a public nuisance, a nuisance to the neighborhood, a dilapidated or dangerous building or other structure, as said terms are used in Massachusetts General Laws Ch. 139, Sec. 1, and if so, enter an order adjudging it to be a nuisance to the neighborhood, or dangerous, and prescribing its disposition, alteration or regulation. PUBLIC HEARING OPENED. Alderman Mercer-Bruen stated that the front of the property has been cleaned but the back of the property has not been cleaned. PUBLIC COMMENTS: Jeff Russo, 10 West Chardon Road, Winchester stated that he is a co-owner of the property, that the tenant is moving on his own and therefore the eviction proceeding has not been started, that he has not had contact with the tenant, that he heard that the tenant will be moving on his own, that an eviction process takes longer and is more difficult, and that he has not talked to the tenant by telephone. Alderman Mercer-Bruen stated that she is disappointed as the other co-owner reported that the eviction process had begun and that the owners have not spoken directly with the tenant. Mr. Russo stated that the tenant is not current on his lease, and that the tenant is a tenant-at-will. Alderman DiTucci stated that the eviction proceeding should begin with the fourteen day notice to quit, and that it was the understanding at the last meeting that the owners were proceeding with the eviction. Mr. Russo stated that he is attempting to speak with the tenant about the tenant's intentions, and that he will start the eviction notice proceedings tomorrow if he cannot speak to the tenant. Alderman DiTucci stated that the owners should service an eviction notice on the tenant immediately. Mary Snider 4 Carter Road stated that her property abuts the locus at

the rear property lines, that the rear yard is in better condition, that that the rear yard is messy but there are not as many items on the property as before. Alderman Mercer-Bruen stated that the co-owner agreed to allow the Fire Department and Board of Health to view the property, that these inspections have not been made, and she asked whether those departments along with the Building Department can inspect the property. Mr. Russo stated that he agrees to allow an inspection by the Fire Department, the Board of Health and the Building Department, and that there will be sufficient time to proceed with the eviction and inspections by November 20, 2012. Alderman Mercer-Bruen stated that the property owner is responsible for arranging the inspections and beginning the eviction proceedings by the continued hearing date. Motion made and 2nd that the PUBLIC HEARING be CONTINUED TO THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL ON NOVEMBER 20, 2012, all in favor 9-0.

On the petition by Peterson Party Center Inc., 139 Swanton Street, Winchester, Massachusetts for a special permit pursuant to 1985 Woburn Zoning Ordinances, as amended, Section 5.1.57b to modify special permits issued August 11, 2011 and January 26, 2012 by deleting the reference to the plan entitled "Proposed Parking Layout" Sheet PK-1 dated November 15, 2011 in Condition 2 and replacing same with the plan filed with this petition entitled "Proposed Parking Layout" Sheet PK-1 dated June 4, 2012 as the plan of record, at 36 Cabot Road. PUBLIC HEARING OPENED. Appearing for the petitioner was Attorney Joseph R. Tarby, III, Murtha Cullina LLP, 600 Unicorn Park Drive, Woburn, Massachusetts 01801 and he requested that the public hearing be continued to the Regular Meeting on November 20, 2012, that the matter is scheduled to be heard by the Planning Board on October 30, 2012, that the Planning Board obtained comments from the Conservation Commission about having jurisdiction in the area, that the petitioner had to hire a botanist and re-flag the area, and that the petitioner will revise the plan with new limits for the outside storage. IN FAVOR: None. OPPOSED: None. Motion made and 2nd that the PUBLIC HEARING be CONTINUED TO THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL ON NOVEMBER 20, 2012, all in favor 9-0.

On the petition by Alderman Michael Raymond concerning the structure or structures located at 6-8 Robinlea Circle, Woburn, Massachusetts, for the purposes of determining whether said structure or structures are a public nuisance, a nuisance to the neighborhood, a dilapidated or dangerous building or other structure, as said terms are used in Massachusetts General Laws Ch. 139, Sec. 1, and if so, enter an order adjudging it to be a nuisance to the neighborhood, or dangerous, and prescribing its disposition, alteration or regulation. PUBLIC HEARING OPENED. A copy of a communication dated October 1, 2012 with attachments to Alderman Raymond was received from Building Commissioner Thomas Quinn, Jr. as follows:

Re: 6-8 Robinlea Circle

With regard to the above, I have enclosed photographs and correspondence from various dates pertaining to issues with the current owner Michael Jacobs. The Department of Inspectional Service has had concerns in the past with the amount of unregistered vehicles and the amount of trash that has accumulated on stairways that could hinder safe egress from the dwelling units.

As of this time the appearance of the property is in a disorderly manner with materials scattered throughout the yard and stairways and if not addressed will create a safety concern by blocking safe egress from the dwelling units, and also a Fire Hazard.

I would respectfully ask that the City Council take action as allowed to ensure the safety of area residents who have also expressed their concerns with the conditions of this property.

Motion made and 2nd that the communication be accepted and made part of the record, all in favor, 9-0. Alderman Raymond stated that there have been efforts to address the issues at this property for five years, that it looked like the property was abandoned, that the property owner lives in Wisconsin, that the property owner's son lives locally, that he spoke to the property owner and his son about the property being in disrepair, that the house is located on a dead-end street neighborhood, that the property owner is in his late 80s, that the property owner is willing to address the issues at the property, and that the property owner was going to send a letter about his intentions but the letter was not received. PUBLIC COMMENTS: Alfred Magro, 9 Rich Road stated that he purchase 2-4 Robinlea Road thirty years ago, that the subject property was being rented at the time, that the subject property is a duplex, that the property owner did provide some maintenance, that the property owner does not provide care for the property now, that the properties in the area are maintained except for this property, that the subject property has been an issue for fifteen years, that the porch is falling apart, that the property is a hazard, that it is proper to give people a chance but the property owner is taking no action, that it is time for the city to act, that there are no tenants residing in the house, and that the house has been vacant for three or four years. Michele Carter stated that she co-owns 3-5 Robinlea Circle with her father, that her family has owned the property since it was first built, that there was peeling paint, holes in the floor and holes in the wall when then last tenant resided at the property, that the property owner's son stays at the house once a week, that a number of children reside in the neighborhood, that no one gets into the dwelling, that the property has been vacant for 4½ years, and that no broken windows can be seen from the outside. Sam Martorano stated that he owns 10-12 Robinlea Circle, that he sees the property owner's son Glen Jacobs at the property from time to time, that the building is a junk storage facility, that the building is filled floor to ceiling with junk, that the basement is littered, that the yard is littered, that he put a note on the door for the neighbor about the issues and the note is still on the door, that he spoke to the property owner Mike Jacobs who said he would get to the issues with the property eventually, that the property owner's son says that the property is his parents issue, that the grass is mowed, and that some vehicles have been removed from the property. Building Commissioner Thomas Quinn, Jr. stated that the property has been a concern for his office for the last two years, that he department has enforced zoning violations at the

property, that the conditions will only get worse if action is not taken, that there is a blocked egress at the property, that no building permits have been pulled for the property for many years, and that as seen from the public way there appear to be issues at the property. Alderman Drapeau stated that the number of these disaster properties is increasing at City Council meetings, that the city must be more aggressive in dealing with these properties, and that the city can demolish the property. Building Commissioner Quinn stated that his department deals with zoning and building code issues, that some issues are outside the jurisdiction of his department, that there should be legislation introduced to have a better understanding of the scope of authority over these issues, that there are no current zoning issues at the property, that he cannot determine whether there are building code violations without getting into the building, that there are issues that can be seen from the street that do not appear to be building code violations, and that unless he can get into the property he does not know if there are interior building code violations. Alderman Drapeau stated that he will work on preparing legislation to deal with the problem properties. Building Commissioner Quinn stated that some of these issues are caused by the poor economy, and that the conditions will get worse before they will get better. Alderman Gately stated that there has to be legislation to make violators pay for these violations. Building Commissioner Quinn stated that the property does not appear to be vacant as there was testimony at this hearing that one night per week someone resides in the property. Alderman Gately stated that the water and sewer charges should be paid if someone resides in the property once per week, and that if there is no water provided to the property and someone lives in the property then this is a problem. Alderman Raymond stated that the city has to take a stand with absentee landlords to fix these properties, that other communities are making a similar efforts, that properties must be kept to reasonable standards, and that there is a hole in the wall filled with a rag. Alderman Anderson stated that the Building Commissioner cannot get into the property because of restrictions, that someone being in the house once a week is not the same as living there, that there are no tenants in the building that the city must be sensitive to, and that the city has the tools to act and must do so. Guy Cafarella, 4 Robinlea Circle stated that neighbors own their property and keep the property maintained, that the owner can rent a dumpster and clean the property and the house, and that the trash should be cleaned up. Alderman Drapeau stated that normally this type of hearing would be continued to give the landowner time to respond, and that the testimony is that the landlord has indicated no intent in dealing with these issues. Alderman Raymond stated that he wants to see considerable work completed by the City Council Regular Meeting on November 20, 2012, that if there is no action then the City Council can act, that he is not certain if the taxes owed on the property are current, and that the property was held up in a divorce proceeding. Alderman Mercer-Bruen stated that she does not see why the property owner will act now if he has not acted before. Alderman Raymond stated that when the property owner received notice of this public hearing he called City Hall and then him as Ward Alderman, and that he is giving the benefit of the doubt that the work will take place. Alderman DiTucci stated that the City Council should adjudicate the issue by stating that if certain remedies are made then the action will be stayed. Alderman Gately stated that this is a process that can be frustrating, and that he has had three properties in his Ward which were taken down under nuisance orders. A copy of a communication dated September 24, 2012 to Michael Jacobs and Karyl M. Jacobs, 5509 Brandon Street,

Greendale, Wisconsin 53129 was received from Board of Health Agent John Fralick as follows:

Dear Mr. Jacobs:

I am writing in reference to complaints received by this department concerning your property located at 6-8 Robinlea Circle. Upon investigation of the complaints several potential violations of the Sanitary code 105 CMR 410 Minimum Standard for Human Habitation were encountered as follows:

- 105 CMR 410.500 Maintenance of structural elements (gutters, facial boards, soffit, shingles)
- 105 CMR 410.503 Railings missing (front stairs)
- 105 CMR 410.602 Trash and debris in yard
- 105 CMR 410.500 Front porch in disrepair

These violations should be addressed promptly to prevent further action by this department. If you have any questions, please contact this office.

Sincerely, s/John R. Fralick, Health Agent

Motion made and 2nd that the communication be received and made part of the record, all in favor, 9-0. Alderman Anderson stated that the City Council should find the property to be a nuisance at the meeting with notice to the property owner with further action deferred to the Regular Meeting of the City Council on November 20, 2012. Motion made and 2nd that an Order enter finding that the property located at 6-8 Robinlea Circle in Woburn is a public nuisance, a nuisance to the neighborhood, a dilapidated or dangerous building or other structure, as said terms are used in Massachusetts General Laws Ch. 139, Sec. 1 based on testimony received at a public hearing including but not limited to the following: 1. The property is an eyesore; 2. Stray animals go in and out of the property; 3. Neighborhood children are seen playing on the property which is a danger; 4. A report of the Board of Health dated September 24, 2012 sets forth violations of the Sanitary Code 105 CMR 410 Minimum Standards for Habitation as follows: a. 105 CMR 410.500 Maintenance of structural elements (gutters, facial boards, soffit, shingles), b. 105 CMR 410.503 Railings missing (front stairs), c. 105 CMR 410.602 Trash and debris in yard, and d. 105 CMR 410.500 Front porch in disrepair; 5. The property is maintained in a disorderly manner; 6. There are safety concerns for the city and more specifically the neighbors because of conditions at the property; 7. There are concerns about blocked egress to the property; 8. There are a number of unregistered vehicles on the property; 9. The property has been vacant for 2½ years; and further that notice be forwarded to the property owner advising that the property has been declared a nuisance, that the property owner be notified that disposition of the property will be heard at the Regular Meeting of the City Council on November 20, 2012, that one option is to tear the property down, and that notice be mailed to the property as well, all in favor, 9-0. President Denaro stated that the property has been declared a nuisance but action has been stayed until the Regular Meeting of the City Council on November 20, 2012.

Alderman Anderson stated that the matter should be scheduled for the Regular Meeting of the City Council on November 20, 2012 to allow for additional discussion. Motion made and 2nd that the matter be placed on the agenda for the Regular Meeting of the City Council on November 20, 2012 under Unfinished Business, all in favor, 9-0.

Presented to the Mayor October 9, 2012 and ten days having elapsed without same being approved, said Order became effective without his signature on October 22, 2012.

On the petition by WJP Realty Trust, P.O. Box 2555, Woburn, Massachusetts 01801 for a special permit pursuant to Section 5.1.71 of the 1985 Woburn Zoning Ordinances, as amended, to allow for a commercial parking lot at 210 New Boston Street. PUBLIC HEARING OPENED. Appearing for the petitioner was Attorney Joseph R. Tarby, III, Murtha Cullina LLP, 600 Unicorn Park Drive, Woburn, Massachusetts 01801 and he stated that the property was constructed in 1979, that the property has 2.09 acres of land, that the petitioner has owned the property since 2000, that Transcomm Inc. had received a special permit for the storage of vehicles on the property, that Transcomm Inc. parked sixty buses on the property and performed repairs, that Transcomm Inc. moved its operations to 280 Salem Street, that the petitioner will park 98 vehicles outside the building and 45 vehicles inside the building for a total of 133 vehicles, that the vehicles will be driven individually to the lot from the Lawless facility on Lexington Street, that the Planning Board continued the matter because the Fire Department had concerns with the vehicle storage, that he requests the matter be continued to the Regular Meeting of the City Council on November 20, 2012, that there will be no repairs on site, that some vehicles are presently on the site, that there will be no sale of vehicles at the site, that the vehicles will be stored at the site, that there are a number of parking lots around the city where vehicles are parked as in this case, that the Building Commissioner is requiring that these companies come forward and obtain a special permit to permit the parking, and that this special permit will not impact the Lawless storage of vehicles at 175 Main Street. Bill Covalucci stated that he is the owner of the property, that there is a small used car business and an inspection company that inspects large vehicles for the State on the lot, and that Lawless will be taking less than one-third of the space on the lot. Alderman Gately stated that Lawless has vehicles parked at 175 Main Street as well. Alderman Anderson stated that he did not understand how the petitioner was getting around the requirements of Section 8.3 of the Woburn Zoning Code as the property is not within 500 feet of the primary property. IN FAVOR: None. OPPOSED: None. Motion made and 2nd that the PUBLIC HEARING be CONTINUED TO THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL ON NOVEMBER 20, 2012 AND THAT THE MATTER BE REFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE ON SPECIAL PERMITS, all in favor 9-0.

On the petition by Metro PCS Massachusetts, LLC, 285 Billerica Road, Chelmsford, Massachusetts 01824 for a special permit pursuant to Section 5.1.80b of the 1985 Woburn Zoning Ordinances, as amended, to install one microwave dish and associated cabling at an existing wireless facility and seeks relief from Sections 5.6 and 11.5 of the 1985 Woburn Zoning Ordinances, as amended, at 44 Montvale Avenue. PUBLIC

HEARING OPENED. A report was received from the Committee on Special Permits as follows: “back for action.” A communication dated September 26, 2012 was received from Edmund P. Tarallo, Planning Director, Woburn Planning Board as follows:

Re: Metro PCS Massachusetts, LLC – 44 Montvale Avenue - To allow for the installation one (1) microwave dish and associated cabling at the existing Wireless communication link pursuant to Sections 5.6.2, 5.6.4, 5.6.5 and 11.5

Dear Mr. Campbell and members of the City Council:

At the Planning Board meeting held on September 25, 2012, the Planning Board voted to send a favorable recommendation to the City Council on the Special Permit application of Metro PCS Massachusetts LLC, regarding the property at 44 Montvale Ave in accordance to Sections 5.6 and 11.5 subject to the following conditions:

1. That the microwave dish shall be in accordance with plans entitled “BOS0016B Montvale Avenue Woburn” dated 08/09/12; and
2. That the petitioner shall post a bond for future removal.

If members of the City Council have any questions or concerns regarding the foregoing recommendation, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely, s/Edmund P. Tarallo, Planning Director

Appearing for the petitioner was Mike Walsh, 2520 JFK Boulevard, Jersey City, New Jersey and he stated that in October 2008 the petitioner received a special permit to install six antennas at the property, that the petitioner subsequently installed four antennas, that the petitioner now wants to install one microwave dish at the property, that the microwave dish will be installed in the previously approved area, that the microwave dish will have a centerline at the centerline of the previously approved antenna, that there will be a coaxial line from the microwave dish to the cabinet, that the petitioner agrees to filing a removal bond, and that there is removal language in the lease in the event of default but that a removal bond will be provided to the city if requested. Alderman Gately stated that he spoke to the Planning Board Director, that the city has gone out to bid for a city-wide wireless facility survey, that there was only one bidder who had previously worked for two of the carriers, that the money in the account is sufficient to perform the study, and that the matter will go out to bid again. Alderman Anderson stated that the issue of removal should be between the landowner and the petitioner, and that the issue of removal seems to be an issue with the landowner and not the city. Alderman Gately stated that there was a property in the city where the units had been left on the building, and that the removal bond allows the units to be removed if the facility is no longer active. IN FAVOR: None. OPPOSED: None. Motion made and 2nd that the public hearing be closed, all in favor, 9-0. PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED. Motion made and 2nd that the SPECIAL PERMIT be GRANTED, AS AMENDED with the conditions as follows: 1. That the two recommendations of the Planning Board be adopted as conditions of the special permit, all in favor 9-0.

On the petition by SHP III Country Club, LLC d/b/a Brightview Country Club Heights, 3 Rehabilitation Way, Woburn, Massachusetts 01801 for a special permit to modify a special permit dated May 23, 1977 by altering the existing non-conforming use and structure as follows: 1. To allow for the conversion of sixteen (16) existing assisted living units to twenty-one (21) memory care units with 24 beds; 2. An increase of total units from 101 approved units to 104 units (83 assisted living units and 21 memory units); 3. The alteration of the existing structure to allow for a second floor deck; and 4. To allow for 49 parking spaces, at 3 Rehabilitation Way. PUBLIC HEARING OPENED. A communication dated September 26, 2012 was received from Edmund P. Tarallo, Planning Director, Woburn Planning Board as follows:

Re: SHP III Country Club, LLC d/b/a Brightview Country Club Heights – 3 Rehabilitation Way – To modify the existing Special Permit to allow for alteration of the existing non-conforming use and structure as follows: (1) to allow for the conversion of sixteen existing assisted living units to twenty-one memory care units with twenty-four beds; (2) an increase of total units from 101 approved units to 104 units (83 assisted living units and 21 memory units); (3) the alteration of the existing structure to allow for a second floor deck; and (4) to allow for 49 parking spaces pursuant to Sections 5.1.3b, 7.3, 8.2.5 and 15.

Dear Mr. Campbell and members of the City Council:

At the Planning Board meeting held on September 25, 2012, the Planning Board voted to send a favorable recommendation to the City Council on the Special Permit application of SHP III Country Club, LLC d/b/a Brightview Country Club Heights, regarding property at 3 Rehabilitation Way subject to the following conditions:

1. That the “Plans of Record” shall be the plans entitled “Brightview Country Club Heights, Deck and Interior Renovations, 3 Rehabilitation Way, Woburn, Massachusetts” dated August 24, 2012, Revised: September 10, 2012 consisting of 3 sheets; and
2. That the 17 spaces shown on Sheet 3 of the “Plans of Record” on the property of New England Rehabilitation Hospital, Inc. shall be continued to be maintained as parking for Brightview Country Club Heights.

If members of the City Council have any questions or concerns regarding the foregoing recommendation, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely, s/Edmund P. Tarallo, Planning Director

Appearing for the petitioner was Attorney Joseph R. Tarby, III, Murtha Cullina LLP, 600 Unicorn Park Drive, Woburn, Massachusetts 01801 and he stated that the property currently has 101 units for elderly housing with commercial uses on the first floor, that a variance was allowed for one-half parking space required for each bedroom because of the proposed use, that there are eighteen parking spaces on the New England

Rehabilitation hospital property, that the building was constructed in 1980, that the petitioner is a pioneer in the area of congregate elderly housing, and that the building has been owned by the petitioner for fifteen years. Maureen McNamara, Executive Director for the petitioner stated that the petitioner serves older adults, that more of the population faces memory care issues, that there is no safe and secure facility for memory care residents at the facility at this time, that when this becomes an issue the resident has to move to another facility which can be difficult for the tenants, that the second floor will be converted to a memory care unit, that there is no current waiting list at the facility but there is a waiting list from time to time, that the petitioner has renovated the front area of the building, that the petitioner is renovating the dining area, that the petitioner is upgrading apartments, that because this is an older facility the apartments are larger than newer facilities, and that most memory care units have a waiting list. Alderman DiTucci stated that the proposed changes are low impact, that most of the changes are to the rear of the property towards the golf course, and that the renovations will provide immediate benefits to the residents and the community. Ms. McNamara stated that under federal guidelines the facility cannot have a preference for Woburn residents, and that most of the residents or their families tend to be from Woburn. Alderman Mercer-Bruen stated that there is a need for this use, and that she wanted to know how the residents would be protected when on the exterior deck on the second level. Ms. McNamara stated that the deck is enclosed with windows. Dominic Rinaldi, Project Manager, BSC Group, 15 Elkins Street, Boston stated that this is a long parcel, that there are fifty onsite parking spaces on three sides of the building, that there are seventeen parking spaces granted by easement on the New England Rehabilitation hospital property, that there are eighteen signs indicated on the easement which allowed up to eighteen parking spaces but two of the parking spaces have been merged to one parking space resulting in seventeen parking spaces, that the original easement was referenced in the subdivision, and that the parking easement was clarified with revisions over the years with the last revision in 1989. IN FAVOR: Robert Maguire, 102 Middle Street stated that his mother resides at the property, that he is interested in the interior renovations and how these will change the dynamics within the facility, that he is not opposed to the project as there is a need, that when elderly are disrupted they are affected poorly, that he wants to know how the elderly residents will be affected, that he wants to know if the common areas will change, that he wants to know if the memory unit will be integrated with the rest of the residents, that this is an older building that does need work, that there are two elevators for seven floors, and that the proposal is a good idea but the impact on the current residents is important. Ms. McNamara stated that the petitioner will convert one floor to a memory care unit, that the remainder of the building will not change, that common areas for the other floors will remain, that there will be a common area for the memory unit, that there will not be intermingling between the memory care unit residents and the other residents of the facility, that the proposal provides a safe and secure unit for memory care residents, that when residents are with other residents who begin to have memory issues this creates a problem, that there will be discussions with the current residents as to the impact of the project on them, that they have not chosen interior plans until the approval of the special permit is received, that the contractors will have experience with renovations of a building with current residents, that there will be no apartments on the first floor, that the second floor was selected for the memory care unit as there are no

residents on the first floor, that the contractors will use the back stairs rather than the elevators, that a basic floor plan was prepared which can be submitted to the City Council, that there will be no exterior work other than the deck, that the dumpster which will be under the proposed deck will be enclosed, that there will be no interior changes other than on the second floor, that the residents of the second floor memory care unit will not be able to use the elevator, and that a key will be necessary to use the elevator at the second floor. Alderman DiTucci stated that the facility has a professional operation, and that the City Council cannot control how the petitioner runs its business and will have to allow the petitioner to deal with the current residents. Ms. McNamara stated that having a memory care unit is common. Ms. McNamara offered a concept floor plan to the City Council for the record. Motion made and 2nd that the concept floor plan be received and made part of the record, all in favor, 9-0. Motion made and 2nd for a five minute recess, all in favor, 9-0. President Denaro called the meeting back to order. Attorney Tarby stated that he has experience at Winchester Hospital with renovations while the building was in use, that disruptions are kept to a minimum, and that contractors who perform this type of work know how to minimize the disruptions. Motion made and 2nd that the public hearing be closed, all in favor, 9-0. Motion made and 2nd that the SPECIAL PERMIT be GRANTED, AS AMENDED with the conditions as follows: 1. That the recommendations of the Planning Board be adopted as conditions of the special permit, all in favor, 9-0.

Motion made and 2nd that the public hearings on the next two matters be held collectively, 8 in favor, 1 opposed (Haggerty opposed).

On the petition by Woburn Armory LLC to amend the Zoning Map of the City of Woburn by changing the zoning district for the entire parcel known as 286 Main Street a/k/a 320 Main Street, containing approximately 38,344 square feet of land as shown on a plan by Design Consultants, Inc., entitled "Plan of Land in Woburn, Massachusetts" dated June 23, 2005 from the R-2/B-D zoning districts to the B-D zoning district. PUBLIC HEARING OPENED. A communication dated September 26, 2012 was received from Edmund P. Tarallo, Planning Director, Woburn Planning Board as follows:

Re: Woburn Armory LLC – Zoning Map Change – To amend the Zoning Map of the City of Woburn by changing the zoning district for the entire parcel known as 286 Main Street a/k/a 320 Main Street, containing 38,344 square feet of land as shown on a plan by Design Consultants, Inc., entitled "Plan of Land in Woburn, Massachusetts" dated June 23, 2005 from the R-2/B-D zoning districts to the B-D zoning district.

Dear Mr. Campbell and members of the City Council:

At the Planning Board meeting held on September 25, 2012, the Planning Board voted to send a favorable recommendation regarding the above referenced zoning map change to the City Council.

If members of the City Council have any questions or concerns regarding the foregoing recommendation, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely, s/Edmund P. Tarallo, Planning Director

Appearing for the petitioner was Attorney Joseph R. Tarby, III, Murtha Cullina LLP, 600 Unicorn Park Drive, Woburn, Massachusetts 01801 and he stated that on April 3, 2012 the City Council adopted an Order to demolish the building, that the Order was appealed, that discussions began to preserve the main armory building, that the City Council allowed the City Solicitor to delay the demolition proceeding, that if the zoning amendments are allowed the landowner would file a special permit petition which would preserve the main Armory building, that the first two floors would contain offices with the third floor having three residential units, that the shed would be demolished with a new addition being constructed containing twelve to fourteen residential units, that the property will be in the B-D zoning district which allows a residential use over a commercial use, that a restrictive covenant will limit the uses to those consistent with the S-1 zoning district such as apartments, offices and bank buildings, that the restrictive covenant will provide that the zoning will revert to the original zoning if the proposed use is not allowed, that this remedy has been used for other properties in the city, that Massachusetts Historical Commission approval will be required to remove the shed, that there will be an extraordinary expense to rehabilitate the building, that no plans have been drawn, that the petitioner is in the process of drafting the restrictive covenants, that the architect would put the plans together as well as the site plan, that Massachusetts Historical Commission approval will be required before the matter can be presented to the City Council, that if the matter is not required to be approved by the Massachusetts Historical Commission first then the plans can be presented to the City Council, and that the petitioner may be able to obtain preliminary architectural plans when the matter is in committee. Alderman Drapeau stated that the proposal appears to be a potentially successful project, that the proposal is scaled back from the original proposal with extensive renovations, and that it may be reasonable to waive the requirements of Section 11.11 of the Woburn Zoning Ordinances. Alderman Gately stated that the building has been vacant for sixteen years, that when the demolition Order was made the landowner realized that the city was serious that action had to be taken to improve the property, that he does not want the building torn down but the City Council had to pursue these measures to force progress, that originally 25 units were requested which was reduced to 23 units then 19 units and now maybe 15 to 17 units will be developed, that some development will go on the locus, and that this proposal may save the building. Alderman Anderson stated that he is concerned about the potential B-D uses that would be allowed on the property, that the language relative to the Woburn Historical Commission should be eliminated from the proposal, and that the City Council can make the decision without the need of going to the Woburn Historical Commission. Alderman Haggerty stated that he has reservations about mitigation and housing issues. IN FAVOR: Mark Sanborn, 12 Caulfield Road stated that his property abuts the locus, that he understands something will be developed on the parcel, that this matter is five years into the process, that he is concerned that the petitioner is giving a covenant when the petitioner was not willing to abide by the original covenant, that the proposal seems like a good plan however no plan

has been presented to inspect, and that if the zoning amendments are allowed he wants to know how the city will be certain that the proposed work will be performed. OPPOSED: None. Motion made and 2nd that the PUBLIC HEARING be CONTINUED TO THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL ON NOVEMBER 20, 2012 AND THAT THE MATTER BE REFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE ON ORDINANCES AND TO THE COMMITTEE ON SPECIAL PERMITS, all in favor 9-0.

On the petition by Woburn Armory LLC to amend the 1985 Woburn Zoning Ordinances, as amended, as follows: 1. By revising Section 11.11 entitled "Affordable Housing Requirement" by adding a new Paragraph 8 to Section 11.11 as follows: "8. The City Council by majority vote, may waive the requirements of this Section 11.11 if the development includes dwelling units in a building deemed "Significant" by the Woburn Historical Commission.", and 2. By revising Section 18.8.2 "Waivers" by adding the following language to the end of Paragraph 18.8.2 as follows: The "period" after "site" shall be deleted and the following language added: "or the renovation, rehabilitation or redevelopment of a building deemed "Significant" by the Woburn Historical Commission." PUBLIC HEARING OPENED. A communication date September 26, 2012 was received from Edmund P. Tarallo, Planning Director, Woburn Planning Board as follows:

Re: Woburn Armory LLC – Zoning Change – To amend Section 11.11 entitled "Affordable Housing Requirement" by adding a new Paragraph 8 to section 11.11 as follows: "8. The City Council by majority vote, may waive the requirements of this Section 11.11 if the development includes dwelling units in a building deemed "Significant" by the Woburn Historical Commission."; and 2. By revising Section 18.8.2 as "Waivers" by adding the following language to end of Paragraph 18.8.2 as follows: The "period" after "site" shall be deleted and the following language added: "or the renovation, rehabilitation or redevelopment of a building deemed "Significant" by the Woburn Historical Commission."

Dear Mr. Campbell and members of the City Council:

At the Planning Board meeting held on September 25, 2012, the Planning Board voted to send the following recommendations regarding the above referenced zoning amendments to the City Council:

1. That the amendment to Section 11.11 entitled "Affordable Housing Requirement" by adding a new Paragraph 8 to section 11.11 as follows: "8. The City Council by majority vote, may waive the requirements of this Section 11.11 if the development includes dwelling units in a building deemed "Significant" by the Woburn Historical Commission." not be approved;
2. That the amendment to Section 18.8. 2 be approved as modified by adding the following language to the end of 18.8.2 as follows: The "period" after "site" shall be deleted and the following language added: "or the preservation and rehabilitation of a building included in the Massachusetts Historical Commission's inventory of historic

and archeological assets of the Commonwealth, in accordance with the requirements of the Woburn Historical Commission.”

If members of the City Council have any questions or concerns regarding the foregoing recommendation, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely, s/Edmund P. Tarallo, Planning Director

SEE MINUTES FROM THE PRECEDING MATTER. Motion made and 2nd that the PUBLIC HEARING be CONTINUED TO THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL ON NOVEMBER 20, 2012 AND THAT THE MATTER BE REFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE ON ORDINANCES AND TO THE COMMITTEE ON SPECIAL PERMITS, all in favor 9-0.

On the petition by to determine whether there is cause for revoking the inflammable licenses held by NStar Electric Company, Cove Street at the request of licenseholder, by Anika Therapeutics, Inc., 236 West Cummings Park at the request of licenseholder, and by Francis P. McHugh, 26 Jefferson Avenue for failure to register. NStar Electric Company withdrew its request for the license to withdrawn and filed the certificate of registration. PUBLIC HEARING OPENED. PUBLIC COMMENTS: Appearing on the petition was Charles Chute, 160 Bedford Road and he stated that he will file the necessary papers to register the inflammable license at 26 Jefferson Avenue. Motion made and 2nd to close the public hearing relative to the inflammable license of Francis McHugh at 26 Jefferson Avenue and that the matter be referred to the Committee on Public Safety and Licenses, all in favor, 9-0. Motion made and 2nd to close the public hearing and revoke the license of Anika Therapeutics, Inc. at 236 West Cummings Park, 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained (Gately abstained) Motion made and 2nd to close the public hearing and allow the withdrawal of the petition relative to the inflammable license of Nstar Electric Company, all in favor, 9-0.

CITIZEN’S PARTICIPATION: None.

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

On the petition to transfer the Inflammable License at 225 Presidential Way to Presidential Way Woburn, LLC, committee report was received “ought to pass.” Motion made and 2nd that the COMMITTEE REPORT be ADOPTED, all in favor, 9-0.
Presented to the Mayor October 5, 2012 and ten days having elapsed without same being approved, said license became effective without his signature on October 16, 2012.

On the petition to transfer the Inflammable License at 235 Presidential Way to Presidential Way Woburn, LLC, committee report was received "ought to pass." Motion made and 2nd that the COMMITTEE REPORT be ADOPTED, all in favor, 9-0.

Presented to the Mayor October 5, 2012 and ten days having elapsed without same being approved, said license became effective without his signature on October 16, 2012.

NEW PETITIONS:

Petition to transfer the Inflammable License at 23 Pleasant Street to from Global Companies, LLC to Nicolas Realty III LLC. Motion made and 2nd that the MATTER be REFERRED TO COMMITTEE ON POLICE AND LICENSES, all in favor, 9-0.

Petition by John W. Collier, 200 Monsignor O'Brien Highway, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02141 for a special permit pursuant to Sections 5.1.2a and 7.3 of the 1985 Woburn Zoning Ordinances, as amended to convert a pre-existing single family dwelling to a two family dwelling at 19 Center Street. Motion made and 2nd that the MATTER be REFERRED TO PUBLIC HEARING, all in favor, 9-0.

COMMUNICATIONS AND REPORTS:

A communication dated September 25, 2012 was received from Charles L. O'Connor, Parking Clerk, Police Headquarters, 25 Harrison Avenue as follows:

In accordance with Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 90, Section 20½, I am submitting a report to you on the parking violations in the City of Woburn for the period ending July 2012: number of parking violations issued 446, number of violations paid 214, number of violations outstanding 211, amount collected and submitted to the Office of the Collector \$18,704.40. There exists a backlog of 5,891 tickets for 1982 through 2011. Demand will be sent until all tickets have been paid. Parking violations referred to the Handicapped Commission to date \$2,650.00.

Respectfully submitted, s/Charles L. O'Connor, Parking Clerk City of Woburn

Motion made and 2nd that the MATTER be RECEIVED AND PLACED ON FILE, all in favor, 9-0.

A communication dated March 1, 2012 was received from the Ad Hoc Polling Place Review Committee. Motion made and 2nd that the MATTER be REFERRED TO COMMITTEE ON LIAISON, all in favor, 9-0.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS OF PRECEDING MEETING: None.



APPOINTMENTS AND ELECTIONS: None.



MOTIONS, ORDERS AND RESOLUTIONS:

From the Traffic Commission:

ORDERED GLENWOOD AVENUE – No parking on Glenwood Avenue a distance of 140 feet easterly from the intersection with Summit Street.

Motion made and 2nd that the MATTER be LAID ON THE TABLE, 7 in favor, 2 opposed (DiTucci, Raymond opposed).

ORDERED

That in accordance with Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 54, as amended, the City Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to notify and to warn such of the inhabitants of the City of Woburn as are qualified to vote in the State Election to assemble at the polling places in the City of Woburn as designated herein, on TUESDAY, the SIXTH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2012 from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m., then and there to cast their votes in the State Election for the candidates for the following offices at the following polling places:

ELECTORS OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT	FOR THIS COMMONWEALTH
SENATOR IN CONGRESS	FOR THIS COMMONWEALTH
REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS	FIFTH DISTRICT
COUNCILLOR	THIRD DISTRICT
SENATOR IN GENERAL COURT	4 TH MIDDLESEX DISTRICT
REPRESENTATIVE IN GENERAL COURT	15 th MIDDLESEX DISTRICT
	(Wards 1, 7)
REPRESENTATIVE IN GENERAL COURT	30 th MIDDLESEX DISTRICT
	(Wards 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
CLERK OF COURTS	MIDDLESEX COUNTY
REGISTER OF DEEDS	MIDDLESEX SOUTHERN DISTRICT
REGIONAL SCHOOL COMMITTEE	NORTHEAST METROPOLITAN
SHERIFF	MIDDLESEX COUNTY

QUESTION 1: LAW PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PETITION

Do you approve of a law summarized below, on which no vote was taken by the Senate or the House of Representatives on or before May 1, 2012?

SUMMARY

This proposed law would prohibit any motor vehicle manufacturer, starting with model year 2015, from selling or leasing, either directly or through a dealer, a new motor vehicle without allowing the owner to have access to the same diagnostic and repair information made available to the manufacturer’s dealers and in-state authorized repair facilities.

The manufacturer would have to allow the owner, or the owner's designated in-state independent repair facility (one not affiliated with a manufacturer or its authorized dealers), to obtain diagnostic and repair information electronically, on an hourly, daily, monthly, or yearly subscription basis, for no more than fair market value and on terms that do not unfairly favor dealers and authorized repair facilities.

The manufacturer would have to provide access to the information through a non-proprietary vehicle interface, using a standard applied in federal emissions-control regulations. Such information would have to include the same content, and be in the same form and accessible in the same manner, as is provided to the manufacturer's dealers and authorized repair facilities.

For vehicles manufactured from 2002 through model year 2014, the proposed law would require a manufacturer of motor vehicles sold in Massachusetts to make available for purchase, by vehicle owners and in-state independent repair facilities, the same diagnostic and repair information that the manufacturer makes available through an electronic system to its dealers and in-state authorized repair facilities. Manufacturers would have to make such information available in the same form and manner, and to the same extent, as they do for dealers and authorized repair facilities. The information would be available for purchase on an hourly, daily, monthly, or yearly subscription basis, for no more than fair market value and on terms that do not unfairly favor dealers and authorized repair facilities.

For vehicles manufactured from 2002 through model year 2014, the proposed law would also require manufacturers to make available for purchase, by vehicle owners and in-state independent repair facilities, all diagnostic repair tools, incorporating the same diagnostic, repair and wireless capabilities as those available to dealers and authorized repair facilities. Such tools would have to be made available for no more than fair market value and on terms that do not unfairly favor dealers and authorized repair facilities.

For all years covered by the proposed law, the required diagnostic and repair information would not include the information necessary to reset a vehicle immobilizer, an anti-theft device that prevents a vehicle from being started unless the correct key code is present. Such information would have to be made available to dealers, repair facilities, and owners through a separate, secure data release system.

The proposed law would not require a manufacturer to reveal a trade secret and would not interfere with any agreement made by a manufacturer, dealer, or authorized repair facility that is in force on the effective date of the proposed law. Starting January 1, 2013, the proposed law would prohibit any agreement that waives or limits a manufacturer's compliance with the proposed law.

Any violation of the proposed law would be treated as a violation of existing state consumer protection and unfair trade-practices laws.

A YES VOTE would enact the proposed law requiring motor vehicle manufacturers to allow vehicle owners and independent repair facilities in Massachusetts to have access to the same vehicle diagnostic and repair information made available to the manufacturers' Massachusetts dealers and authorized repair facilities.

A NO VOTE would make no change in existing laws.

QUESTION 2: LAW PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PETITION

Do you approve of a law summarized below, on which no vote was taken by the Senate or the House of Representatives on or before May 1, 2012?

SUMMARY

This proposed law would allow a physician licensed in Massachusetts to prescribe medication, at a terminally ill patient's request, to end that patient's life. To qualify, a patient would have to be an adult resident who (1) is medically determined to be mentally capable of making and communicating health care decisions; (2) has been diagnosed by attending and consulting physicians as having an incurable, irreversible disease that will, within reasonable medical judgment, cause death within six months; and (3) voluntarily expresses a wish to die and has made an informed decision. The proposed law states that the patient would ingest the medicine in order to cause death in a humane and dignified manner.

The proposed law would require the patient, directly or through a person familiar with the patient's manner of communicating, to orally communicate to a physician on two occasions, 15 days apart, the patient's request for the medication. At the time of the second request, the physician would have to offer the patient an opportunity to rescind the request. The patient would also have to sign a standard form, in the presence of two witnesses, one of whom is not a relative, a beneficiary of the patient's estate, or an owner, operator, or employee of a health care facility where the patient receives treatment or lives.

The proposed law would require the attending physician to: (1) determine if the patient is qualified; (2) inform the patient of his or her medical diagnosis and prognosis, the potential risks and probable result of ingesting the medication, and the feasible alternatives, including comfort care, hospice care and pain control; (3) refer the patient to a consulting physician for a diagnosis and prognosis regarding the patient's disease, and confirmation in writing that the patient is capable, acting voluntarily, and making an informed decision; (4) refer the patient for psychiatric or psychological consultation if the physician believes the patient may have a disorder causing impaired judgment; (5) recommend that the patient notify next of kin of the patient's intention; (6) recommend that the patient have another person present when the patient ingests the medicine and to not take it in a public place; (7) inform the patient that he or she may rescind the request at any time; (8) write the prescription when the requirements of the law are met, including verifying that the patient is making an informed decision; and (9) arrange for the medicine to be dispensed directly to the patient, or the patient's agent, but not by mail or courier.

The proposed law would make it punishable by imprisonment and/or fines, for anyone to (1) coerce a patient to request medication, (2) forge a request, or (3) conceal a rescission of a request. The proposed law would not authorize ending a patient's life by lethal injection, active euthanasia, or mercy killing. The death certificate would list the underlying terminal disease as the cause of death.

Participation under the proposed law would be voluntary. An unwilling health care provider could prohibit or sanction another health care provider for participating while on the premises of, or while acting as an employee of or contractor for, the unwilling provider.

The proposed law states that no person would be civilly or criminally liable or subject to professional discipline for actions that comply with the law, including actions taken in good faith that substantially comply. It also states that it should not be interpreted to lower the applicable standard of care for any health care provider.

A person's decision to make or rescind a request could not be restricted by will or contract made on

or after January 1, 2013, and could not be considered in issuing, or setting the rates for, insurance policies or annuities. Also, the proposed law would require the attending physician to report each case in which life-ending medication is dispensed to the state Department of Public Health. The Department would provide public access to statistical data compiled from the reports.

The proposed law states that if any of its parts was held invalid, the other parts would stay in effect.

A *YES VOTE* would enact the proposed law allowing a physician licensed in Massachusetts to prescribe medication, at the request of a terminally-ill patient meeting certain conditions, to end that person's life.

A *NO VOTE* would make no change in existing laws.

QUESTION 3: LAW PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PETITION

Do you approve of a law summarized below, on which no vote was taken by the Senate or the House of Representatives on or before May 1, 2012?

SUMMARY

This proposed law would eliminate state criminal and civil penalties for the medical use of marijuana by qualifying patients. To qualify, a patient must have been diagnosed with a debilitating medical condition, such as cancer, glaucoma, HIV-positive status or AIDS, hepatitis C, Crohn's disease, Parkinson's disease, ALS, or multiple sclerosis. The patient would also have to obtain a written certification, from a physician with whom the patient has a bona fide physician-patient relationship, that the patient has a specific debilitating medical condition and would likely obtain a net benefit from medical use of marijuana.

The proposed law would allow patients to possess up to a 60-day supply of marijuana for their personal medical use. The state Department of Public Health (DPH) would decide what amount would be a 60-day supply. A patient could designate a personal caregiver, at least 21 years old, who could assist with the patient's medical use of marijuana but would be prohibited from consuming that marijuana. Patients and caregivers would have to register with DPH by submitting the physician's certification.

The proposed law would allow for non-profit medical marijuana treatment centers to grow, process and provide marijuana to patients or their caregivers. A treatment center would have to apply for a DPH registration by (1) paying a fee to offset DPH's administrative costs; (2) identifying its location and one additional location, if any, where marijuana would be grown; and (3) submitting operating procedures, consistent with rules to be issued by DPH, including cultivation and storage of marijuana only in enclosed, locked facilities.

A treatment center's personnel would have to register with DPH before working or volunteering at the center, be at least 21 years old, and have no felony drug convictions. In 2013, there could be no more than 35 treatment centers, with at least one but not more than five centers in each county. In later years, DPH could modify the number of centers.

The proposed law would require DPH to issue a cultivation registration to a qualifying patient whose access to a treatment center is limited by financial hardship, physical inability to access reasonable transportation, or distance. This would allow the patient or caregiver to grow only enough plants, in a closed, locked facility, for a 60-day supply of marijuana for the patient's own use.

DPH could revoke any registration for a willful violation of the proposed law. Fraudulent use of a DPH registration could be punished by up to six months in a house of correction or a fine of up to \$500, and fraudulent use of a registration for the sale, distribution, or trafficking of marijuana for non-medical use for profit could be punished by up to five years in state prison or by two and one-half years in a house of correction.

The proposed law would (1) not give immunity under federal law or obstruct federal enforcement of federal law; (2) not supersede Massachusetts laws prohibiting possession, cultivation, or sale of marijuana for nonmedical purposes; (3) not allow the operation of a motor vehicle, boat, or aircraft while under the influence of marijuana; (4) not require any health insurer or government entity to reimburse for the costs of the medical use of marijuana; (5) not require any health care professional to authorize the medical use of marijuana; (6) not require any accommodation of the medical use of marijuana in any workplace, school bus or grounds, youth center, or correctional facility; and (7) not require any accommodation of smoking marijuana in any public place.

The proposed law would take effect January 1, 2013, and states that if any of its part were declared invalid, the other parts would stay in effect.

A YES VOTE would enact the proposed law eliminating state criminal and civil penalties related to the medical use of marijuana, allowing patients meeting certain conditions to obtain marijuana produced and distributed by new state-regulated centers or, in specific hardship cases, to grow marijuana for their own use.

A NO VOTE would make no change in existing laws.

QUESTION 4

Shall the license commission be authorized to grant licenses for the sale of wines and malt beverages to be drunk on the premises in restaurants having seating capacities of not less than 50 seats; provided, however, that not more than 8 such licenses or such amount as allowed under section 17 of chapter 138 of the General Laws shall be in effect?

QUESTION 5 (Wards 1 and 7 only)
THIS QUESTION IS NOT BINDING

Shall the state representative from this district be instructed to vote in favor of a resolution calling upon Congress to propose an amendment to the U.S. constitution affirming that (1) corporations are not entitled to the constitutional rights of human beings, and (2) both Congress and the states may place limits on political contributions and political spending?

QUESTION 6 (Wards 1 and 7 only)
THIS QUESTION IS NOT BINDING

Shall the state representative from this district be instructed to vote in favor of a resolution calling upon Congress and the President to: (1) prevent cuts to Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and Veterans benefits, or to housing, food and unemployment assistance; (2) create and protect jobs by investing in manufacturing, schools, housing, renewable energy, transportation and other public services; (3) provide new revenues for these purposes and to reduce the long-term federal deficit by closing corporate tax loopholes, ending offshore tax havens, and raising taxes on incomes over \$250,000; and (4) redirect military spending to these domestic needs by reducing the military budget, ending the war in Afghanistan and bringing U.S. troops home safely now?

<u>Ward-Precinct</u>	<u>Polling Place Location</u>
1-1	Joyce Middle School Library, 55 Locust Street
1-2	Clapp Elementary School Cafeteria, Hudson Street and Arlington Road
2-1	Shamrock Elementary School Gymnasium, 60 Green Street
2-2	Shamrock Elementary School Gymnasium, 60 Green Street
3-1	Hurld Elementary School Gymnasium, 75 Bedford Road
3-2	Hurld Elementary School Gymnasium, 75 Bedford Road
4-1	Wyman Elementary School Auditorium, Main Street and Eaton Avenue
4-2	White Elementary School, 36 Bow Street
5-1	Goodyear Elementary School Gymnasium, 41 Central Street
5-2	Goodyear Elementary School Gymnasium, 41 Central Street
6-1	Altavesta Elementary School Gymnasium, 990 Main street
6-2	Altavesta Elementary School Gymnasium, 990 Main Street
7-1	Reeves Elementary School Gymnasium, 240 Lexington Street
7-2	Reeves Elementary School Gymnasium, 240 Lexington Street

s/President Denaro

Motion made and 2nd that the ORDER be ADOPTED, all in favor, 9-0.

Presented to the Mayor: October 5, 2012 **s/Scott D. Galvin October 5, 2012**

ORDERED That the Committee on Public Safety and Licenses meet with the Chief of Police for a status report on public safety issues

s/President Denaro

Motion made and 2nd that the MATTER be REFERRED TO COMMITTEE ON LIAISON, all in favor, 9-0.

Motion made and 2nd to ADJOURN, all in favor, 9-0. Meeting adjourned at 9:12 p.m.

A TRUE RECORD ATTEST:

William C. Campbell
City Clerk and Clerk of the City Council