

**CITY OF WOBURN
SEPTEMBER 20, 2016 – 7:00 P.M.
REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL**

Roll Call

Anderson	Gately
Campbell	Higgins
Concannon	Mercer-Bruen
Gaffney	Tedesco
Haggerty	

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

Motion made and 2nd to take the following matter out of order, all in favor, 9-0.

Petition by Woburn Friends of Hospice Care/Woburn Irish American Club, 147 Main Street, Woburn, Massachusetts 01801 for a Special Event Permit to allow a road race/walk on October 2, 2016 in the area of Horn Pond. Motion made and 2nd that the SPECIAL EVENT PERMIT be GRANTED, all in favor, 9-0.

Presented to the Mayor: September 22, 2016 s/Scott D. Galvin Sept. 22, 2016

Motion made and 2nd to return to the regular order of business, all in favor, 9-0.

MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS:

ORDERED That the sum of \$134,000.00 be and is hereby appropriated as so stated from BLS Ambulance Receipts Acct #31359-590000 \$134,000.00 to Fire Ambulance Salary Acct #0122051-511500 \$125,000.00, Fire/Equipment Acct #0122058-585000 \$9,000.00, Total \$134,000.00

I hereby recommend the above. s/Scott D. Galvin, Mayor
I hereby approve the above: s/Timothy Ring, Chief Fire Department
I have reviewed the above: s/Charles E. Doherty, City Auditor

s/President Haggerty

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

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

On the petition by 304 Cambridge LLC to amend the 1985 Woburn Zoning Ordinances, as amended, as follows: 1. Amend section 5 Notes to 5.1 Table of Use Regulations by adding the following note: 26. 1. Restaurant Full Service/Fast Food located in an S-1 Zoning District shall be subject to the following conditions: a. The full service/fast food restaurant must be located in an office building containing a minimum of 50,000 square feet of gross floor area; b. Any fast food restaurant shall not be visible from the exterior of the office building; c. The office building shall have frontage on a State numbered road under the jurisdiction of Mass Highway for design, construction and maintenance as of January 1, 2012.; 2. Physical Fitness Training Facilities located in an S-1 Zoning District shall be subject to the following conditions: a. The Physical Fitness Training Facility must be located in an office building containing a minimum of 50,000 square feet of gross floor area; b. The office building shall have frontage on a State numbered road under the jurisdiction of Mass Highway for design, construction and maintenance as of January 1, 2012.; 2. Amend Section 5.1 Table of Use Regulation as follows: a. Line 17a by replacing the “-“ with an “x” in the S-1 Zoning District and inserting: Note 26 under the heading: “Notes, Other Sections.”; b. Line 28 by replacing the “-“ with an “x” in the S-1 Zoning District and inserting: Note 26 under the heading: “Notes, Other Sections.”; c. Line 29 by replacing the “-“ with an “x” in the S-1 Zoning District and inserting: Note 26 under the heading: “Notes, Other Sections.” PUBLIC HEARING OPENED. A report was received from the Committee on Ordinances as follows: “ought to pass with the following amendments: 1. That Section 26.1.b in Section 1 of the proposed ordinance be amended to read “Any fast food restaurant shall not be visible (including signage) from the exterior of the building. No fast food drive-up customer service facility shall be allowed.”; and 2. That Section 3.c in the proposed ordinance be amended to read “Line 29 by replacing the “-“ with a “P” in the S-1 Zoning District and inserting: Note 26 under the heading: “Notes, Other Sections.”

Re: Proposed amendments to Section 5 of the Zoning Ordinance relative to S-1 Zoning Districts/304 Cambridge LLC

Dear Honorable Council:

The Planning Board conducted a public hearing on the above-referenced matter at its meeting on Tuesday, September 13, 2016. The petition proposes zoning text amendments that would allow full-service restaurants, fast-food restaurants and “physical fitness training facilities” (the term used in the zoning ordinance is “physical fitness training *and recreational* facility” – emphasis added) on S-1 zoned lots that meet the criteria below. These uses are not permitted in the S-1 Zoning District presently; they would be allowed by right (e.g. would not require a special permit or site plan review) if the amendments were adopted as proposed:

- The office building in which the restaurant or recreational facility would be located would have to have at least 50,000 sq. ft. of gross floor area;

- The fast food restaurant could not be visible from the exterior of the office building (but full service restaurants and physical fitness training facilities could be); and
- The office building would have to have frontage on a State-numbered route under the jurisdiction of MassHighway for design, construction, and maintenance as of January 1, 2012.

While the Planning Board did not necessarily take issue with the notion of permitting certain restaurants and physical fitness training and recreational facilities at 304 Cambridge Road, it did have a number of concerns about the proposal.

First, including the bulleted points above as “qualifying” criteria may very well run counter to State law (M.G.L. Chapter 40A, Section 4) which requires that “*Any zoning ordinance or by-law which divides cities and towns into districts shall be uniform within the district for each class or kind of structures or uses permitted.*” Restricting restaurant and recreational uses to lots with certain sized buildings or to only State numbered and maintained routes has no rational tie to, or explanation in, a land use or zoning-based concern or objective. Instead, the amendment seems designed and intended solely to benefit the owner of 304 Cambridge Road as he is the only one whose property would meet those three criteria. That would seem at odds with the State law cited above, so the Board suggests a different approach that would accomplish virtually the same end.

Second, the Board does not believe it is appropriate to allow full service restaurants, fast food restaurants, and physical fitness training and recreation facilities by right. If allowed, they should be allowed only by special permit so that the details of a project and its impacts on traffic, utilities and parking supply can be identified and assessed. If allowed by right, full service restaurant(s) of any size, “invisible” fast food restaurants and a 14,999 sq. ft. physical fitness training and recreational facility could be sited on the property without any review of the aesthetics or the impacts the uses might have on the site and nearby roadways. There would be no mechanism by which to impose conditions that might be needed to mitigate any negative impacts.

Third, several of the terms used in the proposed zoning amendment do not mirror the terms used in the zoning ordinance and they should.

At the conclusion of discussion the Planning Board voted unanimously (7-0) to recommend the uses be allowed by special permit (and not by right) on lots in an S-1 zoning district without requirements for minimum building size and State Highway frontage. It also recommended minor revisions to two of the terms used in the proposed amendment so that the terms are used consistently throughout the Zoning Ordinance.

Specifically, the Planning Board recommended the following to the City Council:

- That the term “full service/fast food restaurant” that is used in the draft amendment be changed to “full service restaurant or fast food restaurant”;

- That the term “physical fitness training facility” that is used in the draft amendment be changed to “physical fitness training and recreation facility”;
- That Line 17a of Section 5.1 Table of Use Regulations be amended by replacing “-“ with “P” in the S-1 zoning district;
- That line 29 of Section 5.1 Table of Use Regulations be amended by replacing “-“ with “P” in the S-1 zoning district;
- That line 28 of Section 5.1 Table of Use Regulations be amended by replacing “-“ with “P” in the S-1 zoning district; and
- That Notes to Section 5.1 Table of Use Regulations be amended by adding the following note:

“26. Fast food restaurants located in an S-1 zoning district shall not be visible from the exterior of the office building, nor shall any signage associated with the restaurant be visible from the exterior of the office building.”

The Board understood that its recommendation might mean the City Council receives special permit applications for S-1 zoned properties other than 304 Cambridge Road. It felt the special permitting process and legislation would provide the City Council with all of the authority it would need to reject any inappropriate application.

If you have any questions relative to the Board’s recommendation, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Respectfully, s/Tina P. Cassidy, Planning Board/WRA 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 petitioner has not issue the with restrictions recommended in the Committee on Ordinances report, that the petitioner takes exceptions to the Planning Board recommendations, that the petitioner takes no objection to the Planning Board recommendation to use the terms “full service restaurant or fast food restaurant” and “physical fitness training and recreation facility”, that the petitioner has concerns about requiring a special permit for a physical fitness facility under 15,000 square feet or for a full service restaurant as a special permit is not required for these uses anywhere else in the city, that under M.G.L. Chapter 40A, Section 4 the question whether a particular action is spot zoning turns not on which parcel is singled out or the effect on the parcel but by whether the change furthers the purposes of the zoning act, that there have been upgrades of properties in the area including the tenants in the Horn Pond Plaza and façade improvements, the Alzheimer unit now at the Country Club Heights, the improvements made at the rehabilitation hospital by the new owners and the significant work at the former abandoned garage, that the new uses will benefit the neighbors and the tenants of the building and further the

purposes of the zoning act, that the question is can the change fairly be said to be in furtherance of the purposes of the zoning act, that this proposal lessens congestion in the streets and roadways and is in line with the work in other properties in the area, that compared to other areas in the city under the S-1 zoning designation which have large older colonial homes this area has an office building, a rehabilitation hospital, a garage and a large multifamily apartment building, that it may be that this area should not be in the S-1 zoning district, that this same type of change was allowed in the upgrade of the garage nearby, that this S-1 zoning district area is highly different than the others in the city, that if this proposal was brought forward for one of the other S-1 neighborhoods it may not be as strong of an argument, and that the petitioner agrees with the Committee on Ordinances recommendations. Alderman Concannon stated that he was concerned that this may be spot zoning and the Planning Board expressed similar concerns, and that requiring that this section be applicable to a building located on a State numbered road or to be a certain size seems to narrow the criteria too much. President Haggerty stated that if there are other areas in the city which could meet these requirements then that property owner could take advantage of this ordinance amendment as well, and that this area should be looked at for a possible zoning change for all the parcels. Alderman Anderson stated that he spoke to the Planning Director, that she is willing to work on a rezoning of the area, and that there are five parcels in the S-1 zoning district in that area. PUBLIC COMMENTS: 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 COMMITTEE REPORT be ADOPTED, all in favor, 9-0.

Presented to the Mayor: September 22, 2016

s/Scott D. Galvin Sept. 22, 2016

On the petition by Houg Vong and My Thi Vong, 6 Albany Street, Woburn, Massachusetts 01801 for a special permit pursuant to 1985 Woburn Zoning Ordinances, as amended, Section 5.1 Note 15 to amend a prior special permit issued September 24, 2015 to allow for an oversized garage to reference a revised set of plans showing the height of the garage to be 2.3 feet higher than previously approved at 6 Albany Street. PUBLIC HEARING OPENED. A communication dated September 20, 2016 was received from Building Commissioner Thomas C. Quinn, Jr. as follows:

Re: 6 Albany Street

With regard to the above address, a site plan and architectural plans were submitted to my office by Attorney Salvati on September 19, 2016. I have reviewed these plans today September 20, 2016 and have provided comments below to assist the council as they review this special permit.

1. Architectural plans that have been stamped by Jane E. Grover show two garage doors at a 9 ft. wide and 8ft high on pg. A-1, any relief of height would require approval from the City Council.
2. Architectural Plans pg. A-5 show no interior access on the lower level from the existing garage to the garage addition, access should be shown on the plan and installed as a requirement.

3. Architectural plans pg. A-5 shown an interior staircase to the upper level of the garage addition, I do have concern on these stairs and what the intended use of the upper portion of the garage will be used for, additionally there is no access from the existing garage's second level to this area.
4. Architectural Plans pg. A-6 show an as-built height of 23ft 2 ½ "Survey Plan, as built plan by Edward J Farrell dated August 23, 2016 indicate addition height of 22.5' +/-, clarification should be done by the owner, surveyor and Architect on the discrepancy, these elevations are also different that the approved plans of the Special Permit granted in September of 2015.
5. Architectural Plans reviewed do not show any location of water or sewer connections, this should be addressed by the applicant.
6. Architectural Plans reviewed do not show any location of an electrical service, it should be noted that an additional electric service would not be approved by the Building Commissioner to service the garage or addition, the principal use of the premises is as single family dwelling.

In closing if the applicant is granted a Special Permit by the City Council, the existing building permit application will need to be amended before any stop work order is removed from the premises, additionally site inspections will need to occur to assure compliance with any Special Permit and all other applicable codes.

If I can be of any further assistance do not hesitate to contact me.

Appearing for the petitioner was Attorney Mark Salvati, 10 Cedar Street, Suite 26, Woburn, Massachusetts 01801 and he stated that the petitioner is seeking relief in the height of the building, that there is no interior access, no water and no sewer connections, that there is no extra electrical service for the unit, that the construction of the garage was in error and therefore the petitioner seeks approval of the City Council for the work, that the height of the garage was 26 feet, this garage is 23 feet and the height of the previous approval of the garage was 20 feet, that the intent was to park vehicles in the garage and this has not changed, that no fines were levied on the petitioner because of the stop work order which they observed, that the most immediate abutter is a residential property, that if the City Council does not approve the petition then the roof would have to be taken off, that this action by the petitioner was a mistake and was not intentional, that the upstairs of the garage will be used for storage, and that the petitioner does not run a business from the garage but a couple of his employees live in the house and park their cars in the garage. Alderman Gately stated that the size of the garage doors will have to be reduced, that the City Council did its due diligence in its previous approval of the garage, and that the lighting has to be addressed to eliminate spill-off onto neighboring properties. Alderman Mercer-Bruen stated that as soon as the City Council approves this petition others will come forward asking for forgiveness on their projects, and that she will not support this proposed change. Alderman Concannon stated that the impact of this proposed use would mostly be on business abutters. President Haggerty stated that rules additional conditions could be added to any approval of the petition. PUBLIC COMMENTS: 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

denied, ROLL CALL: Anderson – No, Campbell – No, Concannon – No, Gaffney – Yes, Gately – Yes, Higgins – Yes, Mercer-Bruen – Yes, Tedesco – No, Haggerty – No, Motion Fails. Motion made and 2nd that the SPECIAL PERMIT be GRANTED, AS AMENDED with the conditions as follows: 1. That the garage shall not be used for residential purposes; 2. That the height of the garage shall not exceed 22.5 feet+/-; 3. That there shall be no water and no sewer connection made to the garage; 4. That access shall be shown from the existing garage into the addition and be approved by the Building Commissioner; 5. That there shall be no additional electrical service brought to the structure; 6. All conditions of the special permit issued on September 24, 2015 shall remain in full force and effect; and 7. All exterior lighting shall be directed onto the property, 7 in favor, 2 opposed (Gately, Mercer-Bruen opposed).

On the petition by NAI Entertainment Holdings LLC, 846 University Avenue, P.O. Box 9108, Norwood, Massachusetts 02062-9108 for a special permit pursuant to 1985 Woburn Zoning Ordinances, as amended, Section 5.1.15b to amend a special permit dated May 6, 1994 to allow for: 1. A revised site plan for is existing cinema building entitled “Showcase Cinemas, 25 Middlesex Parkway Woburn, MA” dated June 10, 2016 and prepared by Allen & Major Associates Inc., 100 Commerce Way, Woburn, MA 01888-0118 (the “Site Plan”); 2. A modification to II Grant of Special Permit (b)(ii) by eliminating the reference to Condition No. 17; 3. A modification to III Cinema Conditions Condition 17 by deleting said Condition 17 in its entirety; and 4. A modification to IV General Condition by deleting “Site” on the third line and the sixth line and replacing with “Parcel II” as shown on the Site Plan, at 25 Middlesex Canal Park. 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 petitioner is continuing to work on proposed conditions for the proposal, that the petitioner is willing to agree that any use that would be constructed on the new parcel will require a special permit even if it is a by right use, that this gives the city control over the parcel, that this is to address the concerns of neighbors that if the cinema is placed on a separate lot the new parcel will no longer have special permit control. Tim Williams, Allen & Major Associates, Inc., 100 Commerce Way, Woburn, Massachusetts 01888-0118 stated that that map of the parcel has been approved by the Land Court, that there are a total of 24.37 acres, that there will be two lots after approval, that one lot will be 13.49 acres and be the open parking area, that the second lot will be 10.88 acres which will have the cinema building and associated parking, that the cinema parcel will meet all zoning requirements, and that the subdivision will be at the open parking lot leaving the cinema on its own parcel. Alderman Anderson stated that currently only the cinema can be on the entire lot. PUBLIC COMMENTS: None. Motion made and 2nd that the PUBLIC HEARING be CONTINUED TO THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL ON OCTOBER 18, 2016 AND THAT THE MATTER BE REFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE ON SPECIAL PERMITS, all in favor, 9-0.

On the petition by Destination Partners, Incorporated, 12 Henshaw Street, Woburn, Massachusetts 01801 for a special permit pursuant to 1985 Woburn Zoning Ordinances, as amended, Section 5.1.57b to park two (2) box trucks in connection with its event planning business at 12 Walnut Hill Park. PUBLIC HEARING OPENED. A communication dated September 19, 2016 was received from Building Commissioner Thomas C. Quinn, Jr. as follows:

Re: 12 Walnut Hill Park Destination Partners

With regard to the above referenced, I have reviewed all information that has been submitted including discussions today with the applicant and his attorney and I offer the following to assist the Council.

1. Applicant has provided details that identifies that there will be no more than ten employees on site with occasional customers, this would require twelve parking spaces.
2. Overnight parking of commercial vehicles Destination Partners would require two parking spaces.
3. Existing Tenant Eastern Ambulance uses two parking spaces.
4. Total parking for all users on site including overnight parking sixteen spaces.

The site plan of record provided shows eighteen spaces with an area along the sider of the garage for two additional spaces, however the rear space along the garage may be within the buffer zone of the residential district to the east of this property (Pine Street) and would advise that no overnight parking is allowed within fifty feet of the boundary line WZO 5.7.5(3), this parking space be relocated to another suitable area on the premises.

I will also advise that if the building was constructed using the parking calculations of section eight of the current zoning ordinance a total of thirty seven spaces would be required for occupants plus an additional two spaces for the overnight parking.

In closing if the council does proceed with this request in a positive manner I would ask that you consider placing a condition on the Special Permit that it is not transferable.

Motion made and 2nd that the communication be received and made part of the record, all in favor, 9-0. Appearing for the petitioner was Attorney Mark Vaughan, 7 New England Executive Park, Burlington, Massachusetts 01803 and he stated that the petitioner has been located on Henshaw Street for many years, that the petitioner is looking to purchase this location for their corporate event planning business, that the petitioner uses two box trucks in its business and wants to park the box trucks on the parcel overnight, that the building is approximately 38,000 square feet in size, that the petitioner has ten employees on site, that almost all interaction with their customers is by telephone or offsite, that there is a 2,000 foot area used as an ambulance dispatch unit in the building, that sixteen total parking spaces are required for the uses, that the revised plan has been reviewed by the Building Commissioner who provided comments to the City Council, that the building is located on a commercial roadway and the use will be in conformity with the

commercial uses on the street, that the trucks will be parked in the spaces indicated on the plan, that the special permit would be specific to the petitioner and not transferable to another tenant, and that the petitioner understands that the vehicles will have to be registered in Woburn. Attorney Vaughan offered a revised parking plan to the City Council for review. Motion made and 2nd that the plan be received and made part of the record, all in favor, 9-0. Alderman Gately stated that there should be a snow plan on file with the Building Commissioner which can be indicated on the plan. PUBLIC COMMENTS: 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. Applicant has provided details that identifies that there will be no more than ten employees on site with occasional customers, this would require twelve parking spaces; 2. Overnight parking of commercial vehicles Destination Partners would require two parking spaces; 3. Existing Tenant Eastern Ambulance uses two parking spaces; 4. Total parking for all users on site including overnight parking sixteen spaces; 5. That the special permit shall be issued to Destination Partners, Incorporated and shall not be transferable; 6. That all vehicles parked overnight onsite shall be registered in the city of Woburn; 7. That a snow plan shall be filed with the Building Commissioner; and 8. That the parking spaces as designated on the plan submitted to the City Council shall be striped and maintained, all in favor, 9-0.

Alderman Mercer-Bruen recused herself from participation in the next matter and left the Council Chamber.

On the petition by Anchor Realty Trust, 3 Breed Avenue, Woburn, Massachusetts 01801 for a special permit pursuant to 1985 Woburn Zoning Ordinances, as amended, Section 8.3.2 to allow for six (6) offsite parking spaces at 3 Breed Avenue. PUBLIC HEARING OPENED. A communication dated September 15, 2016 was received from Tina P. Cassidy, Planning Board/WRA Director as follows:

Re: Special Permit application for 3 Breed Avenue/Peter Spinazola, Trustee, Anchor Realty Trust

Dear Honorable Council:

The Planning Department has completed its review of the above-referenced application which seeks a special permit under Section 8.4.3 of the Woburn Zoning Ordinance to allow the applicant to use an abutting lot to provide some of the parking supply required by zoning.

A revised plan dated September 13, 2016 was submitted to address several questions Planning staff raised regarding the original plan. The plan now shows correct setbacks for the parking spaces on the NStar lot. One parking space on the 3 Breed Avenue lot is within 5' of a lot line, but it was represented that the Zoning Board of Appeals granted

relief from this requirement. The plan indicates the entirety of the leased parking area will be paved, and that the parking spaces will have direct access to and from Breed Avenue so that access through the 3 Breed Avenue lot will not be necessary.

The application does not contain enough information to prove conformance with the following zoning requirements/issues:

- If either parking area will be used at night, provisions must be made for security lighting that is shielded and arranged so as to prevent glare onto adjacent streets and properties (Sections 8.5.1 and 8.5.2.). Parking facilities must be surfaced with asphalt, concrete, or some other durable material, and graded and drained to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. Will the leased area be properly surfaced, graded and drained (Sections 8.5.3, 8.5.4 and 8.5.6)?
- The paved surfaces must be marked with a permanent marking system to clearly indicate the parking stalls (Section 8.5.5). Will they be so marked?
- Where will snow be stored/plowed in the winter season? There appears to be little (accessible) room on the site for snow storage. If suitable space cannot be found, a condition requiring removal of snow from the site should be imposed.
- The applicant proposes to create landscaping along two sides of the building but provides no details as to what that will entail. The landscaping must be green space (e.g. not impervious) in order to satisfy the 10% minimum open space requirements. Further, some landscaping choices like trees or sod may not be viewed favorably by the Fire Department, if it needed access to those sides of the building.

In addition to the above points, the Planning Department recommends the City Council consider the following:

1. Condition approval on the off-site parking spaces having direct access to and from Breed Avenue;
2. Require the off-site parking spaces to be equipped with wheel stops to ensure no vehicles overhang onto the 3 Breed Avenue property (and therefore into the 10' wide area directly behind the proposed building);
3. Require the applicant to include on the plan that actual calculation details proving maximum percent building coverage and minimum required open space. That is, the square footage of both the paved area and landscaped area of 3 Breed Avenue should be added to the zoning table on the plan; and
4. Require some site lighting for safety and security reasons. The size of the site may lend itself to building-mounted (versus pole-mounted) lighting.

I am happy to answer any questions you may have about these comments.

Respectfully, s/Tina P. Cassidy, Planning Board/WRA Director

Motion made and 2nd that the communication be received and made part of the record, 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained (Mercer-Bruen abstained). Appearing for the petitioner was Attorney Mark Salvati, 10 Cedar Street, Suite 26, Woburn, Massachusetts 01801 and he stated that the property is located at the end of Breed Avenue, that the petitioner also owns a large building at the end of the street, that the intention is to tear down the current building and construct a new building on the parcel, that the petitioner received variances from the Board of Appeals on the setback and having parking spaces within the front setback, that the petitioner has been using NStar property for many years under a long-term lease for parking, that the easement area is reclaimed asphalt, that the parcel is a tight site, that the parcel is in the shape of a triangle with an odd shape requiring the offsite parking, that there is little activity in the area, that the new building will be better than the current building, that the parcel will remain as is with reclaimed asphalt, that the petitioner will stripe the parking spaces if required by the City Council to do so, that there will be two lights shining down on the building, that the square footage of the building requires eleven parking spaces, that the current building is not much smaller than the proposed building, that the lease for the parking is for another ten years, that the lease is renewed and can be terminated every five years, that if the lease was terminated the petitioner would lose the parking, that if their parking was no longer available the tenants in the building would have to be changed to uses that could be accommodated by the available parking, and that there will be three tenants in three bays. PUBLIC COMMENTS: None. Motion made and 2nd that the public hearing be closed, 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained (Mercer-Bruen abstained). PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED. Motion made and 2nd that the SPECIAL PERMIT be GRANTED, AS AMENDED with the conditions as follows: 1. That the off-site parking spaces shall have direct access to and from Breed Avenue; 2. That the off-site parking spaces shall be equipped with wheel stops to ensure no vehicles overhang onto the 3 Breed Avenue property (and therefore into the 10 foot wide area directly behind the proposed building); 3. That petitioner shall include on the plan the actual calculation details proving maximum percent building coverage and minimum required open space. That is, the square footage of both the paved area and landscaped area of 3 Breed Avenue shall be added to the zoning table on the plan; 4. That there shall be some site lighting for safety and security reasons. The size of the site may lend itself to building-mounted (versus pole-mounted) lighting; 5. That the special permit shall be issued to Anchor Realty Trust and shall not be transferable; 6. That a snow plan shall be filed with the Building Commissioner; 7. That all paved surfaces shall be marked with permanent marking to clearly indicate the parking stalls; and 8. That the landscaped area along the two sides of the building shall be vegetated, 8 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained (Mercer-Bruen abstained).

Alderman Mercer-Bruen returned to the Council Chamber.

On the petition by Aldo Gallinelli and Judith Gallinelli, 15 Sorelle Place, Burlington, Massachusetts 01803 for a special permit pursuant to 1985 Woburn Zoning Ordinances, as amended, Section 5.1.56, Note 15 of the 1985 to allow for construction of a detached 30 foot by 40 foot barn at 15 Sorelle Place. PUBLIC HEARING OPENED. A communication dated September 6, 2016 was received from Thomas C. Quinn, Jr., Building Commissioner as follows:

Re: 12 Sorelle Place

With regard to the above, I have reviewed the site plan and Architectural Plans for the proposed detached garage that is in excess of 900 square feet and offer the following:

1. Location of proposed garage meets the required setbacks per the WZO section 6.2(3) for front, side and rear setbacks.
2. Proposed height of the garage as shown on the Architectural Plans is greater than the Maximum allowed height of twenty feet per WZO section 6.2(3) as shown twenty feet nine inches.
3. Architectural plans are insufficient for a full review, items listed below will need to be provided by applicant: A. Detail plan of roof framing; B. Details of all engineering lumber to be used; C. Detail of Header sizes about all openings.

Additionally it should be verified on the exact height of the garage doors as the plan shows nine foot high doors. Once the additional information has been received a further review will occur.

As always if you have any questions do not hesitate to contact me.

A communication dated September 15, 2016 was received from Building Commission Thomas C. Quinn, Jr. as follows:

With regard to the above, I have reviewed the plans for a detached garage that were submitted to the City Clerk's Office on August 31, 2016 prepared by C.D. Calhoun and I offer the following:

- Proposed elevation is shown at 19' 3 ¼" which is under the allowable maximum height of 20'.
- Pg. A-2 Front Elevation does not show proposed height of garage doors, height should be identified and shown on any plan that may be part of a Special Permit.
- Plans do not show any areas inside the structure that water or sewer service would be located if the applicant intends on installing it should be shown on plans.
- I will advise that any electrical power that will be used in the building will need to be supplemented from the single family residential house, a separate electrical service and meter would not be approved by the Building Commissioner.

As always if you have any further questions with this plan do not hesitate to contact me.

Motion made and 2nd that the communications be received and made part of the record, all in favor, 9-0. A set of plans entitled "Gallinelli Barn, 15 Sorelle Road, Woburn, Mass" dated 8/30/16 prepared by C.D. Calhoun & Associates Incorporated was received. Motion made and 2nd that the plans be received and made part of the record, all in favor, 9-0. Appearing was the petitioner Aldo Gallinelli he stated that he submitted plans to the City Council as requested, that a copy of the Conservation Commission Order of Conditions was also filed with the City Council, that the plan of record is dated 8-30-16, that the barn doors will be 8 feet high by 9 feet wide, and that water service is from Burlington but inspected by Woburn. Alderman Gately stated that the barn doors can be no larger than 8 feet high by 9 feet wide. Alderman Higgins stated that all of the petitioner must abide by all of the Conservation Commission conditions, and that the barn cannot be built to specifications other than those on the approved plan. PUBLIC COMMENTS: None. Motion made and 2nd that the public hearing be closed, all in favor, 9-0. PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED. Motion made and 2nd that SPECIAL PERMIT be GRANTED, AS AMENDED with the conditions as follows: 1. That no business shall be run out of or from the barn; 2. That there shall be no rental of space in the barn; 3. That there shall be no conversion of the barn to residential use; 4. That there shall be no sewer connection to the barn; 5. That there shall be no storage of flammables in the barn; 6. That the barn doors shall be 8 feet high and 9 feet wide, 7. That the plan of record shall be the set of plans entitled "Gallinelli Barn, 15 Sorelle Road, Woburn, Mass" dated 8/30/16 prepared by C.D. Calhoun & Associates Incorporated; and 8. That any electrical power that will be used in the building shall be supplemented from the single family residential house, without a separate electrical service and meter, 8 in favor, 1 opposed (Higgins opposed).

On the petition by NGP Management LLC, 3 Pluff Avenue, North Reading, Massachusetts 01864 for a special permit pursuant to 1985 Woburn Zoning Ordinances, as amended, Sections 5.1.69 and 7.3 to amend a special permit dated September 25, 1997 as follows: 1. Landowner's Decision and Notice of Special Permit dated September 25, 1997 allowing for the fast food establishment and ATM by revising Condition 6 which currently allows for hours of operation from 6:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. to allow hours of operation from 4:00 a.m. to midnight, and 2. Landowner's Decision and Notice of Special Permit dated September 25, 1997 allowing for the alteration of the existing externally illuminated nonconforming sign to allow for a modified sign that is an internally illuminated sign, at 318 Montvale Avenue. PUBLIC HEARING OPENED. A communication dated September 14, 2016 was received from Tina P. Cassidy, Planning Board/WRA Director as follows:

Re: Special permit applications for 314-318 Montvale Avenue/NGP Management LLC, and 318 LLC & 314 Montvale Avenue LLC

Dear Honorable Council:

The Planning Department has completed its review of two petitions that have been filed with the City Council for this property.

The first application, filed by NGP Management LLC, seeks two (2) modifications to a Special Permit Decision granted on September 25, 1997. Specifically, the applicant is requesting a revision to the permitted hours of operation of the existing fast food restaurant and ATM to permit both to be open 20 hours per day (4:00 a.m. to midnight) versus the current restrictions which limit hours of operation to 14 hours per day (6 a.m. to 8 p.m.). NGP is also seeking permission to alter its externally illuminated nonconforming sign to allow for a modified sign that is internally illuminated.

The second application, filed by 318 LLC NS 314-318 Montvale Avenue LLC, requests several things: Permission to construct a 4,000 sq. ft. addition to the existing building for “retail” use, to continue use of the existing non-conforming parking spaces on site, and two (2) modifications to the 1997 Special Permit decision to accommodate the new retail space: To eliminate a condition that limits the number of establishments on the site to two, and to allow for the alteration of the existing wall and free-standing signage by modifying it, adding to it, and illuminating it internally.

This comment letter addresses both applications, and the City Council may want to consider both applications simultaneously as well to ensure consistency between the decisions.

1. One application requests permission to continue to use the “...non- conforming parking spaces on a portion of the lot.” The Planning Department suggests the applicant identify the location of all non-compliant parking spaces on the plan and provide at least a verbal explanation as to why/how the spaces do not conform.
2. Much of the signage on site (free-standing and wall signs) may already be internally illuminated, despite the fact that the 1997 City Council decision required all signage to be externally illuminated. The applicant should be required to provide site plans *and* building elevation plans that specify the location, size and dimension of each proposed sign on site so that compliance with zoning can be confirmed and the signs’ impact on abutting properties ascertained. This seems especially important given the request to allow the signs to be internally illuminated.
3. The 318 LLC/314-318 Montvale Avenue LLC application seeks to delete condition #9 which limits the site to two (2) establishments: an ATM and “...no more than one (1) other permitted use to be allowed at this location.” Staff does not recommend the condition be stricken; if it were, there is a risk the applicant could demise the interior space into more than three commercial establishments. Instead, the Planning Department recommends the condition be modified by replacing “one (1)” with “two (2)” and adding an “s” to “use”.

On a related note, we recommend the applicant be required to provide floor plans of the interior of the building. In addition to the general information such plans would provide, citing specific floor plans in the Decision will help ensure compliance with any condition relative to the maximum number of establishments allowed on site and

will permit an evaluation as to whether the proposed site plan meets the parking requirements.

4. The new 4,000 sq. ft. “retail” use is somewhat of a mystery. It is defined only as a “retail establishment” in the development impact statement included in the application. The Planning Department strongly recommends the Council ascertain the type of retail establishment that would locate here, if for no other reason than to evaluate traffic conditions and impacts. “Retail” is a very broad term, and the amount of traffic generated by say a convenience store would be much greater than the traffic generated by a specialty clothing store of the same size.
5. Plans of the exterior elevations should be required for review, so the Council can evaluate the building’s aesthetics, analyze the location of all signage and points of ingress/egress, confirm conformance with maximum building height requirements and to provide a specific development plan, for the benefit of abutters for whom aesthetics and building scale matter.
6. The application form incorrectly states that both properties involved in this application are zoned B-H. They are not – they are both “split-zoned” and lie in both the B-H and R-2 zoning districts.
7. The parking summary on sheet 3 of 6 should be revised to provide the floor area of each establishment, so that conformance with parking requirements can be verified.
8. All compact parking spaces must be clearly identified by signage and/or markings as required by Section 8.2.3. The current plans do not show any such signage.
9. Parking spaces for ATM’s must be located within 100’ of the ATM machine. The plan should denote which spaces within 100’ of the machine are in fact reserved for the ATM. Planning staff suggests the two ATM spaces be equipped with signage indicating their reservation for ATM users only.
10. The City’s Engineering Director should be consulted regarding matters related to traffic on site, to/from the site, and the proposed project’s interrelationship with the planned Montvale Avenue project.
11. Investigate possible reconfiguration of the westernmost driveway to further discourage/prevent left turns by exiting cars;
12. A retaining wall is proposed along the western property line. Will it violate zoning by exceeding six (6) feet in height?
13. Section 8.6.1. requires that parking lots containing more than five (5) stalls be screened from abutting properties used for residential purposes. There is a combination of existing and proposed vinyl/stockade fence that screens the parking lot from the residential properties at 89 and 95 Washington Street, but a significant

run of fencing is 6' chain link which will provide no sight-impervious buffer. Does the existing/proposed fencing scheme adequately protect the properties at 89 & 95 Washington Street ?

14. The locations of proposed lighting is shown on the plan but no details are provided to ensure it will provide adequate security lighting and be shielded and arranged so as to prevent glare onto adjacent streets and properties (Section 8.5.1 and 8.5.2).
15. Sections 8.7.1. and 8.7.5 require the building to have one loading bay for use by the tenants thereof. The plan doesn't appear to include one. The bay must be at least 10' wide, 35' in length and 12' in height in accordance with Section 8.7.2.1. and must be located *inside* the building in accordance with Section 8.7.2.6 because it is located within 100' of a residential district.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions regarding these comments.

Respectfully, s/Tina P. Cassidy, Planning Board/WRA 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 a special permit was issued to Einstein Bagels with an existing ATM in 1997, that conditions were imposed because the abutting parcel was residential and used as such at the time, that the house was sold and has been vacant for some time, that the hours of operation of the businesses nearby are as follows: Wendy's 10:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. with the drive-thru 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 midnight and the property abuts residential property, Bickford's Sunday through Thursday 6:30 a.m. to 12:00 midnight and Friday 6:30 a.m. to 2:00 a.m., McDonald's 5:00 a.m. to 12:00 midnight for the restaurant and 24 hours per day for the drive-thru, Hess 5:00 a.m. to 1:00 a.m., and Waxy's and Polcari's are open until 1:00 a.m., that there is no drive-thru for the ATM or the restaurant, and that the petitioner wants to changes the hours of operation to 4:00 a.m. to 12:00 midnight and to have the pylon sign be internally lit. Alderman Mercer-Bruen stated that there is a difference in the clientele between 4:00 a.m. and 5:00 a.m., that a 5:00 a.m. customer is generally starting an early workday, and that the 4:00 a.m. customer often are people coming in from the night before. Alderman Anderson stated that a 5:00 a.m. opening would be consistent with the other uses in the area. Alderman Campbell stated that she would support a 5:00 a.m. opening. PUBLIC COMMENTS: Kathy Bailey, 4 Utica Street stated that the hours of 4:00 a.m. to 12:00 midnight are an issue for the neighbors who reside on Washington Street, that she would prefer the hours to be between 4:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m., and that she has no objection to the sign modification proposal. 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 amendment as follows: 1. That the hours of operation shall be between 5:00 a.m. and 12:00 midnight, all in favor, 9-0.

CITIZEN'S PARTICIPATION: None.

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

FINANCE:

On the Five-Year Capital Plan FY2017-FY2021, committee report was received “ought to pass.” Alderman Concannon stated that he will support the matter, that it is good to plan for capital projects, that he is concerned about the timing of the new fire station which he thought would be sooner and that there was no action taken on building a downtown parking garage, and that this is a roadmap and not a mandate. Alderman Tedesco stated that moving capital items out of the operating budget is an important step to take. Alderman Gately stated that he would have liked to see a downtown parking garage and a few playgrounds included in the plan as well as faster action on the new fire station, and that this plan is only guidance. Alderman Anderson stated that no project is being funded and there is no appropriation, and that this is a good faith effort but the plan can change at any time. President Haggerty stated that following the plan allows department heads to plan for their departments, and that the plan should be updated annually as needed. Motion made and 2nd that COMMITTEE REPORT be ADOPTED, all in favor, 9-0.

Presented to the Mayor: September 22, 2016 **s/Scott D. Galvin Sept. 22, 2016**

PUBLIC SAFETY AND LICENSES:

On the Order to authorize the conveyance of a parcel of land on Old Lexington Street, 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: September 22, 2016 **s/Scott D. Galvin Sept. 22, 2016**

NEW PETITIONS:

Petition by ACT Leasing, Inc., 215 Salem Street, Woburn, Massachusetts 01801 for renewal of Second Class Motor Vehicle Sales License. Motion made and 2nd that the MATTER be REFERRED TO COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND LICENSES, all in favor, 9-0.

Petition by MetroNorth Business Center LLC, 74 Commerce Way, Woburn, Massachusetts to amend the 1985 Woburn Zoning Ordinances, as amended, as follows:

ORDERED Be it ordained by the City Council of the City of Woburn that the 1985 Woburn Zoning Ordinances, as amended, be further amended as follows:
1. Amend Section 5 Use Regulations and Notes to 5.1 Table of Use Regulations as follows: 1. Amend Note 1 by adding after “(8.2.5)” the

following: “a maximum driveway width for commercial developments greater than 15,000 square feet (8.4.1.3)”;

2. Amend Section 8.4 Design and Layout of Required Parking Facilities as follows: 1. Amend Section 8.4.1.3 by adding to the end of the fifth paragraph after the word “Planning Board” the following: “or by a Special Permit granted by the City Council pursuant to this Section 8.4.3.”

By MetroNorth Business Center LLC, an individual owning land to be affected by the change or adoption

Motion made and 2nd that the MATTER be REFERRED TO PUBLIC HEARING, all in favor, 9-0.

A communication dated September 13, 2016 was received from Attorney Joseph R, Tarby, III, Murtha Cullina LLP, 600 Unicorn Park Drive, Woburn, Massachusetts 01801 as follows:

Re: R.C. Olsen Cadillac, Inc., 201 Cambridge Road, Woburn, Massachusetts

Dear Mr. Campbell:

On October 9, 2014 your office issued a Landowner’s Decision and Notice of Special Permit which was recorded with the Middlesex County Registry of Deeds at book 64400, Page 445 (the “Decision”). The Special Permit was extended to October 9, 2016. On behalf of my client I respectfully request that the Special Permit be extended for one additional year to October 9, 2017. If you need any further information please do not hesitate to contact me.

Very truly yours, s/Joseph R. Tarby, III

Alderman Gately stated that the petitioner has not come in for review of the special permit regarding the trailer issue, that this request should be denied and the petitioner given ninety days to remove the trailers, that he would be willing to extend this period to six months, that the storage trailers take up a lot of space, that the lot is crammed, and that the petitioner needs the parking spaces taken up by the storage trailers. Alderman Mercer-Bruen stated that she does not support a further extension of the special permit, and that the special permit for the storage trailers was to the petitioner only and not transferable. Alderman Anderson stated that it is up to the City Council to grant or deny the request to extend the special permit and any further action relative to enforcement is under the jurisdiction of the Building Commissioner. Motion made and 2nd that the REQUEST BY R.C. OLSEN CADILLAC, INC. TO FURTHER EXTEND THE SPECIAL PERMIT GRANTED ON OCTOBER 9, 2014 AND EXTENDED ON

SEPTEMBER 17, 2015 be DENIED and that the petitioner remove the storage trailers from the locus within ninety (90) days, all in favor, 9-0.

A communication with attachment was received from Attorney Joseph R. Tarby, III, Murtha Cullina LLP, 600 Unicorn Park Drive, Woburn, Massachusetts 01801 as follows:

Re: Concept Plan Review Application of Cabot, Cabot & Forbes LLC, 120 Commerce Way, Woburn, Massachusetts

Dear Mr. Campbell:

Please be advised that this office represents Cabot, Cabot & Forbes LLC in connection with the above-referenced Concept Plan Review Application. Pursuant to Section 23.3.3.6 Concept Plan Submission Criteria of the 1985 City of Woburn Zoning Ordinance as amended, I hereby submit an Application for a CWCOD Concept Plan Review.

Pursuant to Section 3.3.2, this matter will be reviewed by the Concept Plan Review Committee consisting of 3 members of the City Council and two members of the Planning Board. I am enclosing twenty copies of the Concept Review Application (City Council – 10 copies; Planning Board – 8 copies; City Engineer – 2 copies).

In addition I have enclosed a copy of the Treasurer's Certificate that has been filed with the City Treasurer's office. Please contact me at your earliest convenience to discuss the scheduling of a meeting of the Concept Plan Review Committee. If you need any further information please do not hesitate to contact me. Thank you.

Very truly yours, s/ Joseph R. Tarby, III

President Haggerty stated that this is the first proposal under the CWCOD ordinance, that the CWCOD Committee consists of Alderman Gaffney, Alderman Tedesco and Alderman Mercer-Bruen and two Planning Board Members to be named, and that the Committee will then begin review. Alderman Gaffney stated that the Planning Board will be meeting September 28, 2016 and will select their two representatives at that meeting. Motion made and 2nd that the MATTER be REFERRED TO THE COMMERCE WAY CORRIDOR OVERLAY DISTRICT CONCEPT PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE, all in favor, 9-0.

COMMUNICATIONS AND REPORTS:

A communication dated September 15, 2016 with attachments was received from City Solicitor Ellen Callahan Doucette as follows:

Re: Orders to authorize Conveyance of Ryan Park/Acceptance of Easements

Submitted herewith are 2 Orders for the Council's consideration. The first Order is to authorize the Mayor to execute a deed of the 12-acre, more or less, Ryan Park land to the Recreation Commission. This conveyance is required by the EOEIA Article 97 Land Disposition Policy relative to the special legislation authorizing the temporary use of the Clapp School. Conveyed to the City in 1979, the Ryan Park land has never been formally dedicated as Recreation land subject to Article 97 protection.

The second Order authorizes the Mayor to accept drainage and sewer easements created by the definitive subdivision plan for Moreno Drive.

Thank you for your attention to this matter, and please don't hesitate to contact me regarding any additional questions or concerns.

Sincerely, s/Ellen Callahan Doucette, City Solicitor

Attached thereto was the following:

ORDERED Be it ordained by the City Council of the City of Woburn that the Mayor be and is hereby authorized to execute a deed conveying approximately 12.6 acres of land, more or less, located off Russell Street and known as "Ryan Park" to the Woburn Recreation Commission for administration, control and maintenance under the provisions of M.G.L. c.45, §3 as it may hereafter be amended, and of amended Article 49 of the Massachusetts Constitution.

s/Alderman Higgins

ORDERED Be it ordained by the City Council of the City of Woburn that the Mayor be and is hereby authorized to accept the grant of drainage and sewer easements located in and upon residential lots located on Moreno Drive, Woburn.

s/Alderman Higgins

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

Presented to the Mayor: September 22, 2016 s/Scott D. Galvin Sept. 22, 2016

A communication dated September 7, 2016 was received from Joanne Collins, Director, Woburn Council on Aging along with a copy of the Director's Report and the minutes of the Council on Aging meeting for the month of August 2016. Motion made and 2nd that the MATTER be RECEIVED AND PLACED ON FILE, all in favor, 9-0.

A communication dated September 1, 2016 was from Gegi Leeger, Director, Privacy and Regulatory Affairs, XO Communications Services, LLC, 13865 Sunrise Valley Drive, Herndon, Virginia 20171 advising that XO Communications Services, LLC has become a subsidiary of Verizon Communications, Inc. Motion made and 2nd that the MATTER be RECEIVED AND PLACED ON FILE, all in favor, 9-0.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS OF PRECEDING MEETING:

On the Order to amend Section 18-1(A) of the 1989 Woburn Municipal Code, as amended relative public notice of Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) contact telephone numbers. Motion made and 2nd to take the matter from the table, all in favor, 9-0. Motion made and 2nd that the ORDER be ADOPTED, all in favor, 9-0.

Presented to the Mayor: September 22, 2016 **s/Scott D. Galvin Sept. 22, 2016**

APPOINTMENTS AND ELECTIONS: None.

MOTIONS, ORDERS AND RESOLUTIONS:

ORDERED That the Committee on Special Permits meet with representatives of the Extra Space Storage relative to a special permit issued on February 8, 1989 for the property located at 15 Olympia Avenue.

s/Alderman Mercer-Bruen

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

ORDERED WHEREAS, there presently exists a structure or structures located in the City of Woburn, Massachusetts known and numbered as 9 James Terrace; and

WHEREAS, at the said building or buildings the exterior grounds have excessive parking on the locus and adjoining streets;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDERED by the City Council of the City of Woburn that the City Clerk and Clerk of the City Council schedule a public hearing pursuant to Mass. General Laws Ch. 139, Sec. 1, et. seq., and give notice thereof to the owner of said building or buildings, said hearing to be conducted for the purposes of determining whether said building or buildings are a nuisance, a nuisance to the neighborhood, dilapidated or dangerous building or buildings or other structure or structures, as said terms are used in Mass. 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.

s/Alderman Gately

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

Presented to the Mayor: September 22, 2016 **s/Scott D. Galvin Sept. 22, 2016**

Motion made and 2nd to ADJOURN, all in favor, 9-0. Meeting adjourned at 8:38 p.m.

A TRUE RECORD ATTEST:

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