

**Committee Members Present**

Councilor Peter Lachapelle, Chair  
Councilor Elaine Lauterborn, Vice Chair  
Councilor Ray Varney  
Councilor Sandra Keans  
Councilor James Gray



**Others Present**

Jim Grant, Director of Building Safety  
Karen Pollard, Deputy City Manager  
Michael Allen, Police Chief  
Jack Gee, Representative for Business Watch International  
Jacqueline (Jackie) Raab, Resident

**MINUTES**

**CODES AND ORDINANCES COMMITTEE**

Of the Rochester City Council

**Thursday September 5, 2013**

City Council Chambers

31 Wakefield Street, Rochester, NH

7:00 PM

---

**1. Call to Order**

Councilor Lachapelle called the Codes and Ordinances Committee meeting to order at 7:00 PM. All Councilors were present.

**2. Public Input**

Councilor Lachapelle explained that the public could speak during the discussion of the item which they have concerns with. He closed public input at 7:02 PM.

**3. Approval of the Codes and Ordinances Committee Minutes**

- **August 1, 2013**

Councilor Lauterborn **MOVED** to **APPROVE** the Committee minutes of August 1, 2013. Councilor Varney seconded the motion. The **MOTION CARRIED** by a unanimous voice vote.

- **Approval to Revise February 7, 2013 Minutes**

Councilor Lachapelle explained that the Clerk's Office found an error in the minutes from the February 7, 2013 Codes and Ordinances Committee meeting.

Councilor Lauterborn asked why they need to be revised. Nancy Carignan, Assistant City Clerk, explained that when she had researched a topic she found the mistake. She explained to the committee members that the error was pertaining to the Water Connection Ordinance. This item should have read the ordinance for the cross connection and backflow preventers.

Councilor Varney **MOVED** to **APPROVE** the revised version of the minutes from February 7, 2013. Councilor Lauterborn seconded the motion. The **MOTION CARRIED** by a unanimous voice vote.

#### **4. Proposed Renaming of the Building Safety Department**

Councilor Lachapelle asked the committee members if he could revise the agenda to allow Karen Pollard, Deputy City Manager, to review the renaming of the Building Safety Department ahead of the RAPID software presentation. There were no objections.

Ms. Pollard handed out a chart of the chain of command to the committee members. She explained that she had had conversations with City Manager Dan Fitzpatrick about the reputation of the department and to make it friendlier. The renaming would encompass everything this department does and she would like it to be referred to as the Building, Zoning and Licensing Services. She explained that the name represents the activity of the department.

Ms. Pollard stated that they had been using the title of Building Safety informally; they never officially changed it to that title. Jim Grant, Director of Building Safety, and his staff came up with the new title because of what their office does on a daily basis. She felt it was a great name, friendly and descriptive.

Councilor Lauterborn questioned adding zoning to the title. It was her thought that this went through planning. Ms. Pollard explained that the zoning ordinance is part of the Planning Department, but the enforcement falls under Mr. Grant as Zoning Administrator for the City. He will deal with issues that come before the ZBA. She cited that when Kenn Ortmann left the City they looked at streamlining the functions.

Councilor Lauterborn asked about changing some of the functions from the Planning Department to the Codes Department. Ms. Pollard stated that they have. She stated that Jim Grant and Karen Grenier have taken on new rolls with the ZBA. She went on further to explain this through the chart that she handed out earlier.

Councilor Lauterborn felt that it was a long name and recommended the title Building Safety and Codes. Mr. Grant explained that they are doing licenses as well on things such as taxi services and restaurants and that does not coincide with building safety. He stated that now they are adding the zoning function as well. He went on to

explain that Code Enforcement is a catch-all phrase, but the “enforcement” makes some feel that his department has already made up their mind as to the enforcement. The Codes and Ordinances Committee discussed further to eliminate the word enforcement from the title. Ms. Pollard thought using the plain language for the public is the most descriptive.

Councilor Lachapelle did not have an issue with the title, just a little to long, but softer then Code Enforcement. The committee briefly discussed changing the names on the cars.

Councilor Varney asked if Sheldon Perkins would still be the Code Enforcement Officer. Ms. Pollard stated he would be.

Councilor Keans asked if the “Building” could be omitted and just be Zoning and Licensing Services. Ms. Pollard explained that “Building” is still a big part of this department. Mr. Grant, on a side note, stated that adding the word licensing could be confusing for dog owners.

Councilor Lachapelle asked if there was a motion to bring this to the full City Council for the October meeting. The Codes and Ordinances Committee discussed this briefly.

Councilor Gray **MOVED** to bring the renaming of the Code Enforcement Department to the October 1, 2013, meeting of the full City Council. Councilor Varney seconded the motion. The **MOTION CARRIED** by a unanimous voice vote.

## **5. Vendor Presentation and Discussion on RAPID Software (Pawn Shops)**

Michael Allen, Police Chief, introduced Jack Gee from Business Watch International. He explained that the software that Mr. Gee is presenting is in reference to the software that he had proposed at a past Codes and Ordinances meeting.

Jack Gee gave a Power Point presentation to the Codes and Ordinances Committee. He explained in detail how their software works with secondhand dealers and pawn shops. Chief Michael Allen handed out a proposed 34.8 ordinance which he had drafted with Attorney Wensley; *this can be found as an attachment.*

During the presentation, Mr. Gee explained that his software was also able to find seven unregistered sex offenders. Councilor Keans was concerned with this. She wanted to know what did sex offenders have to do with pawn shops. Mr. Gee explained how his software found these unregistered sex offenders and gave the reasons for this. The Codes and Ordinances Committee discussed further.

Councilor Keans wanted to know how the secondhand dealers and pawn shops get notified of thefts. Mr. Gee explained they are notified by a blast email. Councilor Keans asked who would be entering the information into the system. Chief Allen explained this

and they discussed it further. Councilor Varney stated that this eliminates the need to go to every shop. Councilor Gray was also concerned with the input of information. Chief Allen stated they would only need one person to do the input.

Councilor Varney said that the shop would enter their information as far as what they take in. Chief Allen explained that they do it now, but it is done manually. He explained how this will work with a holding period.

Councilor Lauterborn asked what type of service will the software be. Mr. Gee explained that it is web based with an annual fee.

Councilor Lauterborn expressed her concerns with property being pawned in other towns that do not have the software. Mr. Gee tried to explain that until more communities get on the system it will be difficult. He went on to explain that Salem is on the system and some of Rochester's property has been found in Salem.

Councilor Lauterborn asked if there were any grants to support this system. Mr. Gee was unaware of any grants; however communities usually pass the cost onto the businesses. Chief Allen stated that different jurisdictions within the state do it different ways. Salem charges a high fee to the businesses and currently Rochester only charges \$50.00 for the dealer's license. He also discussed Manchester's system in brief. Chief Allen stated that Business Watch International is giving Rochester the system for free for the first year. He also explained that his department was looking into funding, as well.

Councilor Keans asked how much is the system eventually going to cost. Chief Allen stated \$250.00 per shop. The committee discussed the thirty-two shops within the City at this time. Chief Allen stated the Police Department would not be charged for the software. It was discussed that the \$250.00 be part of the license fee.

Councilor Varney asked how will everyone get trained. Mr. Gee explained that his staff will be doing the training with the shops and that shops that have their own software can be integrated easily. Mr. Gee will train the officers.

Councilor Keans asked if they can monitor the stores' activities through this software. Mr. Gee explained this does not effect their personal information on their computer.

Councilor Varney stated that it was nice to have the one year free, but in reality they need to address the \$250.00 fee that will be incurred after that. Councilor Keans stated that there is no way to budget this and asked what happens if the annual fee goes up, which they would have to pass on to the shops. Councilor Varney said that the City pays for software licensing fees currently and this is no difference. The Codes and Ordinances Committee debated further.

Chief Allen does not want them to lose the goal of this system. It is designed to protect the victims of the City and there are costs to doing business.

Councilor Keans asked Chief Allen how much property gets stolen in the City. She asked for a dollar amount. Chief Allen explained that he can get her that figure. Councilor Keans just wants to be able to justify the cost that they are passing on to the businesses. Councilor Varney asked Chief Allen to come to the next City Council meeting to present the statistics on these thefts. Chief Allen agreed.

Councilor Lauterborn asked Mr. Gee how many communities in New Hampshire use the system. He explained that currently Salem is the only one. She would like to find out their statistics of recovery with this system. Chief Allen stated that they have only had this for a short period of time.

Councilor Gray would like the data from Salem on exclusively Salem residents so they can look at this without the out of state residents who are pawning in New Hampshire. Mr. Gee explained Salem had the capability to do this. Chief Allen will ask Salem for this information.

Councilor Varney wanted to discuss the training further. Chief Allen explained that this can be rolled out a bit easier because it is a free trial for the first year.

Councilor Keans asked who does the \$250.00 go to. It is explained the fee goes to Business Watch International. She then asked if this fee will be increased year after year because they will have to pass this on to the businesses. Mr. Gee explained that at this point he has only seen a decrease in the price.

Councilor Lauterborn asked if the free trial year has a catch to it and how will it work. Mr. Gee explained the way it would work and they do not have to commit.

Councilor Gray asked if there was a difference in the fee if they are using their own software versus RAPID. Mr. Gee stated there is no difference; they have to integrate the businesses' software. He provided further information.

Councilor Varney asked where this system started. Mr. Gee explained it was in Canada originally. The RAPID system is based out of Coral Springs, Florida.

Councilor Keans said to be very careful in how this is instituted because she does not want to see the City as the test case in the New Hampshire Supreme Court. She asked if the new ordinance is going to require the businesses to have this software system. It was explained that it will.

Councilor Lachapelle likes the idea of the free trial for a year. It will provide a year's worth of data to absorb and justify to the business owners what the software system has done and crimes that have been solved. He also stated it could also provide them with the time to look for grants.

Councilor Keans asked why would the shops want to be on this system. Mr. Gee explained if they are manually writing up tickets now then this system would be much easier for them; plus, there is more accuracy. Councilor Lachapelle explained that right now they have to keep paper tickets for an amount of years and this system would make it easier to store data. Councilor Keans wished that a few of the shop owners were present for their input.

Councilor Lachapelle would like this to stay in committee, but would like to discuss with the full City Council during a workshop. Councilor Varney agreed and would like to have the Power Point presentation for the workshop as well. Mr. Gee will email this to Chief Allen. Councilor Keans would like some of the shop owners present. The Codes and Ordinances Committee agreed that it should be added to the agenda for September 17, 2013, workshop meeting. They thanked Mr. Gee for his time.

Chief Allen asked if they wanted to postpone the discussion on the drafted ordinance. Councilor Lauterborn asked if the ordinance is relative to the presentation they have just heard or based on past discussions. Chief Allen stated that it is based on past discussions, but includes the electronic reporting system. He goes on to explain this will be a brand new ordinance.

Councilor Keans asked if they needed the sex offender component. Chief Allen tried to explain that these individuals are committing a crime by not registering. Councilor Keans said there are other offenders in the community, not just sex offenders. She and Chief Allen debated further.

Councilor Lauterborn cited that she wants to see a beefed-up ordinance to help the police and the victims so that they will have a better chance of getting their property back. Chief Allen stated the proposed ordinance would do that.

Councilor Keans explained that some residents are told by the police when they report a theft to check the shops themselves. Will this ordinance and system stop that? Chief Allen said that they should not be told that, but the ordinance will stop it. Councilor Lauterborn cited a recent newspaper article where the resident found their property in one of the shops.

Councilor Gray stated that the shops need routine compliance audits. Chief Allen said they periodically do compliance audits. He went on to explain with this system it will eliminate the need to do that. He gave further examples.

The committee discussed that the system will work both ways. A stolen item gets logged at the Police Department, but has not been pawned yet, and an email blast will go out. Two days later if the item is pawned the system would get a hit. Chief Allen concurred. The Codes and Ordinances Committee discussed this further. Councilor Keans wanted the sex offender component omitted. Councilor Lauterborn discussed moving the new ordinance that is being proposed. Councilor Varney stated that the new ordinance has the electronic component which, until they discuss the software issue and

have it in place, they can not move on it. Chief Allen explained if they decide not to use the RAPID system he would still like to see an electronic reporting system in place and he mentioned a few options.

Councilor Varney said if they move the ordinance forward he would like to see a line added to paragraph D stating that the shops need to implement within twelve months of the passage of the ordinance. This will give them time to implement the new system and get accustomed to it. He did not feel they could force the shops to do it right away on passage of the ordinance. Chief Allen explained that Salem made it contingent upon their renewal, which occurs in April. Mr. Grant stated our licenses renew in April, as well. Chief Allen thought this would be the right way to implement it. Councilor Keans cited that adding a sentence to Roman numeral III at time of renewal based on Councilor Varney's suggestion. Councilor Varney felt that this would not give them enough time to get all the shops on board by April. He stated that the ordinance might not be passed until November. The committee discussed this issue further.

Councilor Lauterborn asked about the fourteen day holding period. Chief Allen explained that he had that added. She wanted to see this moved forward and acted on.

Councilor Gray asked how this would affect a new dealer coming into town and would they need to comply right away. Councilor Lachapelle said they would need to comply immediately if this ordinance is in place.

Councilor Lachapelle asked Chief Allen to have Attorney Wensley add verbiage as to the time frame they need to be in compliance.

Councilor Lachapelle wants this item discussed at the City Council workshop meeting on September 17, 2013, and asked that Chief Allen attend for that discussion. Chief Allen agreed and he will try to see if Mr. Gee can come back. Chief Allen recommended the passing of the ordinance regardless of the software issue. Councilor Lauterborn agreed. Councilor Keans asked Chief Allen if his department would be ready to go with the new ordinance even if they did not have RAPID. He stated yes, they will, and explained how the department would handle it.

Councilor Gray liked the effective date that Councilor Varney presented. He felt the fourteen day holding period should be added to the current ordinance and to pass that and then pass the electronic portion. Councilor Varney stated that they can not do that because the holding period is based on the electronic component. He stated it needs to be discussed at the workshop.

Councilor Lachapelle explained it is staying in committee and will be put on the agenda for the September 17, 2013, workshop. Chief Allen will be at the workshop with statistics on the thefts in the City.

## **6. Ordinance Provision to Enforce Maintenance on Neglected Properties**

- **Grass Height**

Councilor Lachapelle invited a resident to address her issues to the committee in regards to this topic.

Jacqueline (Jackie) Raab, resident of 23 Grove Street, asked if fireworks were being discussed at this meeting because she would like to discuss an issue that just happened. It was agreed that she will talk with Chief Allen after the meeting.

Ms. Raab stated that she is having issues with one of her next door neighbors who have never occupied the property after purchasing it some fifteen years ago. She explained that in the beginning the property was being maintained; however, for the past few years it is not being maintained, especially the grass and grounds maintenance. She has met with various City Managers in regards to this and City Manager Fitzpatrick told her it would be on the agenda for tonight's meeting

Ms. Raab has spoken to a few Councilors regarding this issue and stated that Councilor Varney had taken pictures of the property. She went on to explain that City employees went to turn on the water to the property recently and she questioned them about the property having never been occupied. She stated that the owner pays the lights and heat, but has never occupied it, so she would like to know if there is an ordinance on the books for a house being vacant.

Jim Grant, Director of Building Safety, explained to the committee and Ms. Raab the ordinance he handed out where 301.3 has a general clause statement that leads up to 302, stating "maintained, clean, and secure." He stated this house fall under this Chapter and explained it has some grey area.

Ms. Raab had Officer Tracy Hayes come to see the situation and Officer Hayes stated to Ms. Raab the property was terrible to the neighborhood. She has spoken to Officer Hayes again, along with Sheldon Perkins, Code Enforcement Officer, and she is under the impression that they are handling the situation for her. She explained that Councilor Varney used to live in East Rochester and he knows what the property used to look like and what the property looks like now. Ms. Raab felt the Codes Department needs to put something in place for a property owner to maintain the property so that it can be enforced.

Ms. Raab has lived there for sixty-three years and this house was a beautiful house and the owner is not keeping up with the maintenance. She thinks if he is not going to move in then he should sell it while it has value.

Ms. Raab went on to explain that on one occasion when she had spoken with Officer Hayes about this issue, one of the other neighbors stated to her that the property owner's wife was sick and that was why the yard was not being maintained. She explained that this neighbor mowed the yard for a year before they moved away. This year it had not been mowed once.



Ms. Raab stated that individuals whom she did not know had recently mowed the grass and pruned the trees. She went on to explain this took the individuals approximately four days to get the yard back into shape due to the overgrowth.

Ms. Raab wants this committee to get some language on the books to make their job easier to enforce when it comes to people maintaining their property and that is all she is asking.

Councilor Lauterborn asked if the owner knew there were complaints against him. Ms. Raab felt that Code Enforcement approached him because Officer Hayes said that is what they were going to do. Councilor Lachapelle asked where this owner lived. She informed him that the owner lived on the corner of Heaton and Portland Streets and he does not maintain that property either, and that used to be a beautiful house. She expressed her sadness with these properties not being kept up.

Councilor Lachapelle asked Mr. Grant if there was any type of enforcement. Mr. Grant explained they cannot enforce with the way it is written now. Councilor Keans asked if the taxes were paid. Ms. Raab checked and as of last year they were paid.

Mr. Grant went on to explain that he has discussed issues such as this before with Mr. Lane and he complies when he is asked. He knows Mr. Lane and on one occasion he approached him on selling the property and he had no interest.

Ms. Raab discussed the location of the property with Councilor Keans. She stated it was the old Nixon house. She said when she looks out her window she can see missing paper around his bay window and the roof is missing shingles which will allow water to get in. Mr. Grant cited those issues are enforceable and he explained why. He felt that this owner is willing to work with them and this is the first time he heard of this case.

Councilor Varney said that there are other properties within the City in similar condition. He referred to the Blaisdell property and properties on Summer Street and Eastern Avenue. They need this ordinance to be more effective, especially for this reason and to cover the whole City not just this one property. Ms. Raab agreed. She stated to the City Manager she did not want this to turn into a Blaisdell property. She said there was also a property on Highland Street with the same issue.

Mr. Grant explained that when it comes to cutting the grass it is a hard issue to enforce. Councilor Keans and Councilor Lauterborn stated maybe they need to look at defining this by the zones. He explained how they define an ordinance could effect agricultural properties and he feels that there should be an ordinance for the residential areas.

Councilor Varney wanted to address the issue of foreclosures. When a home is foreclosed on, the bank needs to be responsible and maintain the property consistent with the neighborhood and he gave examples.

Chief Allen asked if other communities have sample ordinances for them to look at. Councilor Lachapelle wanted to know about this, as well. Mr. Grant is going to research other communities.

Ms. Raab explained that when she talked with the City Manager he mentioned that he had lived in several communities and this is the only place where there is nothing on the books. He personally told her this.

Councilor Lachapelle stated that this is staying in committee and will be on the agenda for the next Codes and Ordinances meeting on October 3, 2013. He asked Mr. Grant to have something drafted to bring back to them. Councilor Lachapelle explained the process of this to Ms. Raab, which she understood. Councilor Lauterborn suggested that she and other neighbors keep pursuing this owner because it will take a while to get something like this on the books. Jim Grant stated that Ms. Raab can contact him directly regarding this issue.

Councilor Lauterborn asked Mr. Grant with the way the ordinance is written now, what type of a fine would they be looking at. Mr. Grant explained a first offense is \$275.00 per day and second offense is \$550.00

Ms. Raab asked if fireworks could be on the agenda for the next meeting, as well. Councilor Varney asked if she had a complaint or did she want to change the ordinance. She stated both. He advised her to talk to Chief Allen. Councilor Lachapelle stated it sounds like an enforcement issue.

Councilor Lachapelle thanked Ms. Raab for her input.

## **7. Discussion Smoking on the Common**

Councilor Keans suggested that they prohibit smoking in two locations of the Common. She thought there should be no smoking within thirty-five feet of the playground and no smoking in the area of the concert seating. After Tuesday's City Council meeting, citizens have been approaching her regarding this issue and they need to do something about it.

Councilor Lachapelle explained that he dislikes smelling cigarette smoke, but he does not feel it should be banned completely. He agrees on designated areas. The Codes and Ordinances Committee discussed that signs should be put up and what these signs should have for verbiage.

Councilor Lauterborn suggested that when the Recreation Department sets up the chairs for a function they can put a sign up at that time stating no smoking in the seating area.

Councilor Keans asked if they could add signage to the existing dog signs. Councilor Varney stated the playground should have a permanent sign. The Codes and Ordinances Committee members are in agreement with this. Councilor Gray suggested that they may need to add “within thirty-five feet of the playground.” The committee debated further.

It is the recommendation of The Codes and Ordinances Committee to suggest to the full City Council that a permanent no smoking sign be placed at the playground on the Common, and during events a removable no smoking sign be placed in the seating area.

Councilor Varney **MOVED** to place the topic of no smoking signs on the Common to the Agenda for October 1, 2013, meeting of the full City Council. Councilor Lauterborn seconded the motion. The **MOTION CARRIED** by a unanimous voice vote.

## **8. Water Connection Ordinance**

Councilor Lachapelle said that this topic was being brought up again because of the definition of “failed” by the UAB. He suggested that they refine the word “failed” as per the suggestion of Councilor Varney. Councilor Varney cited that they could use the term of “any well requiring additional earth disturbance such as digging and drilling”. This would eliminate broken pumps, for an example.

The Codes and Ordinances Committee agreed to send this recommendation back to the UAB. Councilor Lachapelle explained if they like the new definition, then it can be brought to the full City Council.

## **9. Other**

There was no other business to discuss at this time.

## **10. Adjournment**

Councilor Lauterborn **MOVED** to **ADJOURN** the Committee meeting at 8:42 PM. Councilor Varney seconded the motion. The **MOTION CARRIED** by a unanimous voice vote.

Respectfully submitted,

Nancy Carignan  
Assistant City Clerk

*Attachment can be found on the next page*

**ORDINANCE AMENDMENT TO ORDINANCES  
RELATIVE SECOND-HAND DEALERS', JUNK DEALERS'  
AND PAWNBROKERS' HOLDING PERIOD**

**THE CITY OF ROCHESTER ORDAINS:**

I. That Chapter 34 of the General Ordinances of the City of Rochester, entitled "Junk and Second-Hand Dealers", as currently amended, be further amended inserting after Section 34.8 thereof, the following section, to be known as Section 34.8-a of the General Ordinances of the City of Rochester, and entitled "Second-Hand Dealers', Junk Dealers', and Pawnbrokers' Holding Period, Exceptions and Related Rules and Regulations", such Section 34.8a to provide as follows:

**"34.8-a Second-Hand Dealers', Junk Dealers', and Pawnbrokers' Holding Period, Exceptions and Related Rules and Regulations.** All junk dealers, second-hand dealer and/or pawnbroker, upon the acquisition of any article defined in Section 34.1 and/or 34.2 of the General Ordinances of the City of Rochester shall:

- (a) Not sell, encumber, by sales contract, or otherwise dispose of or alter an article in its appearance, within fourteen (14) full business days from the purchase thereof, unless granted permission in writing from the Police Chief or his designee, but in any case not within one full business day after the date of purchase.
- (b) Retain on the premises all items purchased or pawned during the waiting period and not place such item(s) on the sales floor until the waiting period has expired unless the item is clearly marked as to the sales release date based on the time frames outlined above in subparagraph (a) of this Section 34.8-a."
- (c) Exceptions to Section 34.8-a (a) and (b) are as follows: Any person accepting a secondhand good as a *trade in* for a similar item of the same or greater value is exempt from the reporting and holding requirements of this ordinance. Secondhand goods *do not* include used office furniture, used books, pianos, used clothing, or motor vehicles.
- (d) Every second-hand dealer/pawnbroker, upon the acquisition of any aforementioned article, shall electronically report all transaction records through an electronic reporting system determined and approved by the City, stating the full name, ID number and address of the seller, date of the transaction, and a full, accurate and detailed description (to include make, model and serial number) of each article. Dealer shall include photos of the identification of seller and articles being sold. This information should be uploaded to the designated electronic reporting system within forty-eight (48) hours of the end of said dealer's business day.

(e) Positive identification in the form of a government photo ID shall be required of the seller and the type of identification used shall be noted on the dealer's records. This requirement shall not apply to a transaction between second-hand dealers/pawnbrokers as herein defined in the General Ordinances of the City of Rochester.

(f) All electronic transaction records, together with any article listed therein, may be inspected at any time by any duly authorized police officer during regular business hours while making all reasonable efforts not to disrupt the normal course of business.

**II.** That Chapter 26, Section 26.3 of the General Ordinances of the City of Rochester, entitled "Pawnbroker's License", as currently amended, be further amended: (a) by changing the title of such Section 26.3 to "Pawnbroker's License and Holding Period"; (b) by labeling the existing paragraph of such ordinance as subparagraph "(a)" of Section 26.3 of the General Ordinances of the City of Rochester; and (c) by inserting after said subparagraph (a), the following new subparagraph, to be known as subparagraph "(b)" of Section 26.3 of the General Ordinances of the City of Rochester, such new subparagraph "(b)" of Section 26.3 to provide as follows:

"(b) All pawnbrokers shall be subject to the holding period restrictions and requirements set forth in Section 34.8-a of the General Ordinances of the City of Rochester."

**III.** That this ordinance amendment shall take effect upon its passage.