

APPROVED

MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, September 28, 2021 Woburn Planning Board Meeting | 7:00 p.m.

Meeting held virtually via Zoom Platform

Chair Kevin Donovan called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm and asked City Planner Karen Smith to call the roll.

Ms. Claudia Bolgen, Mr. Bob Doherty, Mr. Jim Callahan, Ms. Carolyn Turner, Mr. Michael Ventresca, and Chair Kevin Donovan were in attendance; Mr. Dave Edmonds was absent. Planning Director Tina Cassidy, City Planner/Grant Writer Dan Orr, and Planner Karen Smith were also in attendance.

Cassidy stated the meeting was being recorded by both video and audio.

PUBLIC HEARING (CONTINUED): SPECIAL PERMIT APPLICATION to authorize 37,728 sq. ft. of light manufacturing floor space at 32 Cabot Road (CONTINUUS Pharmaceuticals, Inc.)

Cassidy began to summarize the status of the Petition and summarized remaining issues of concern among department heads reviewing the project, including the storage of hazardous materials onsite, required permitting, security measures, hazard mitigation/emergency response and infrastructure-related impacts.

Cassidy further stated follow-up responses to comments, revised site plans, and hazardous material/security protocol documents were submitted on behalf of the Petitioner and subsequently forwarded to pertinent departments to request secondary review and the issuance of additional comments/concerns; however, a number of department comments remain outstanding. As a result, she recommended that the Board consider continuing the public hearing on this matter to the October 12th meeting to allow departments with additional time to respond to Planning staff's request.

Attorney Joseph R. Tarby, III, Rubin & Rudman, began to address the Board on behalf of the Petitioner. He stated that he has a meeting scheduled with City Engineer Corey and DPW Superintendent Duran to address some of the outstanding comments in preparation for the October 12th meeting.

Donovan invited questions from Planning Board members. There were none.

Donovan opened this matter for a public hearing and turned to Cassidy to explain the logistics of using the "raised hand" or telephone functions to identify audience members who wish to speak.

PUBLIC HEARING

Donovan asked Cassidy if any members of the audience wished to address the Board on this matter. No members of the audience indicated a desire to speak.

Callahan asked for clarification of the timing of required Planning Board action. Cassidy stated that initial Planning Board action to open a public hearing on October 7th, which the Board has satisfied. She added that the Board's next deadline for action is to file a Decision on this matter within 90-days of closure of the public hearing.

Motion to accept the Planning Director's recommendation to continue the public hearing on the matter of 32 Cabot Road, to Tuesday, October 12, 2021 at 7:00 p.m., made by Bolgen;
Seconded by Turner;

Roll call vote on the aforementioned motion:

Bolgen-Aye
Callahan-Aye
Doherty-Aye
Edmonds-Absent
Turner-Aye
Ventresca-Aye
Donovan-Aye

The motion carried, 6-0-0.

PUBLIC HEARING: PROPOSED ZONING AMENDMENT to amend Section 5, Notes to Section 5.1 Table of Use Regulations of the 1985 Woburn Zoning Ordinances by adding the following sentence to the end of Note 26.1.a.: "Notwithstanding the foregoing, a Restaurant, Full Service located in such an office building shall be allowed to operate outdoors and adjacent to such Restaurant, Full Service." (Attorney Joseph Tarby)

Cassidy provided a summary of the status of the proposed zoning amendment, which was initially before the Board at its prior meeting on September 14th and continued to determine whether a withdrawal of the Petition might occur to address a number of recent outdoor dining-related zoning amendments to the zoning code could be proposed in more coordinated fashion. She added that there is also a concurrent effort to draft and adopt a definition for the term "outdoor dining" to the zoning code, with the assistance of City Solicitor Callahan Doucette, for greater clarity.

Cassidy further stated that she would like to modify her recommendation to the Board this evening for a favorable recommendation to the City Council to adopt the proposed amendment after further reflection on the relatively narrow scope of its impact (on certain buildings within the S-1 zoning district only).

Attorney Joseph R. Tarby, III, began to address the Board on behalf of the Petitioner. He stated that he would request Planning Board consideration of further modification to the proposed amendment to accommodate prospective restaurant tenants whose seating is configured into multiple areas by adding corresponding language.

Mr. J.P. Martignetti, property owner in connection with the Petitioner, stated the latest proposed zoning amendment with the latest proposed modification,

Cassidy stated that the latest proposed language is the result of working with Attorney Tarby to ensure that a non-contiguous area of a restaurant tenant's outdoor space could accommodate dining activity under the zoning code.

Bolgen asked for clarification as to whether either the documents in the Board's packet attachments may be referenced to understand the scope of the proposed zoning amendment being discussed this evening. Cassidy stated that both versions included in members' packet have been further modified and specified the nature of the aforementioned latest amendments to accommodate multiple areas of outdoor dining.

Donovan invited additional questions from Planning Board members. There were none.

Donovan opened this matter for a public hearing and turned to Cassidy to explain the logistics of using the “raised hand” or telephone functions to identify audience members who wish to speak.

PUBLIC HEARING

Mr. J.P. Martignetti, property owner in connection with the Petitioner, indicated for clarification that he heard the term “outdoor seating” stated and wanted to ensure that the proposed zoning amendment is in reference to the term “outdoor dining” only.

Bolgen stated for clarification that the proposed change “outdoor dining” in place of “outdoor seating” would lead the Board to the same position that they were in at the beginning of the meeting. She indicated her understanding is that the proposed zoning amendment, as amended, would proceed without a formal zoning definition.

Cassidy stated that the Planning Board has issued an affirmative recommendation in the past on proposed zoning amendments without formal definitions in place but with the condition that a new definition to be adopted so that the zoning code may fully accommodate what is being proposed.

Bolgen stated that she would not necessarily be comfortable with voting on the proposed amendment without an underlying definition having been made part of the zoning code or without certainty as to the ultimate wording of that definition.

Tarby provided an overview of the background of this proposal and connection to what his client is proposing to accommodate the restaurant design for a prospective tenant. He added that the current proposal before the Planning Board is separate from the other outdoor dining-related zoning modifications that are still pending before the City Council.

Turner stated that the Planning Board has been provided with a definition for outdoor dining and brought it to the attention for the Board. Cassidy proceeded to read the draft definition into the record, which is as follows:

Outdoor Dining: the use of an adjacent, outside area by a Restaurant, Full-Service establishment for the same eating and drinking activities that occur within that establishment, operating in the same manner thereof including hours of operation, and which is continuously supervised by management or employees of the establishment. The outdoor dining use is not permitted at a Restaurant, Fast Food.

Turner further stated that the Planning Board may consider incorporating the proposed definition of “outdoor dining” as part of its overall recommendation to the City Council. Cassidy responded that the Board may consider referring to this proposed definition of “Outdoor Dining,” if it is inclined to do so this evening but clarified that this definition will still have to be formally considered by the Planning Board, likely at its October 26th meeting and that it will also likely have to be modified to better correspond with recent zoning code amendment proposals. She added that the sponsors of the recent outdoor dining-related amendments may also choose to withdraw the proposed Section 2 definition of “Outdoor Dining” and re-submit a more comprehensive zoning amendment package.

Donovan invited additional questions from Planning Board members. There were none.

Donovan asked the Planning Director for clarification of her recommendation. Cassidy responded to recommend closure of the public hearing on this matter, followed by Board action to recommend City Council adoption of the proposed zoning amendment, as modified, to read as follows:

Notwithstanding the foregoing, a Restaurant, Full Service located in such an office building shall be allowed to operate an area or area(s) of outdoor dining provided the area(s) is/are physically located immediately adjacent to such Restaurant, Full Service.

Donovan asked if there was any Planning Board discussion on the recommendation. There was none.

Motion to close the public hearing on this matter, made by Doherty;
Seconded by Callahan;

Roll call vote on the aforementioned motion:

Bolgen-Nay
Callahan-Aye
Doherty-Aye
Edmonds-Absent
Turner-Aye
Ventresca-Nay
Donovan-Aye

The motion carried, 6-2-0.

Motion accept the Planning Director's recommendation to send an affirmative recommendation to the City Council on the proposed zoning amendment, as modified, made by Doherty;
Seconded by Callahan;

Roll call vote on the aforementioned motion:

Bolgen-Nay
Callahan-Aye
Doherty-Aye
Edmonds-Absent
Turner-Aye
Ventresca-Nay
Donovan-Aye

The motion carried, 4-2-0.

PUBLIC HEARING: RESCISSION OF APPROVAL OF DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION PLAN FOR 12 BUCKMAN COURT and conditional vote to release bond currently being held to guarantee its completion (Attorney Joseph Tarby)

Cassidy provided an overview of the proposed rescission of Planning Board approval of the 12 Buckman Court definitive subdivision due to the sale of the subject property and the lack of desire by the property owner to pursue build-out of the subdivision.

Attorney Joseph Tarby, Rubin & Rudman, began to address the Board on behalf of the applicant and stated that he has nothing additional to present but would appreciate a favorable vote by the Board to approve a subdivision rescission.

Bolgen asked for clarification for the Planning Board's authority to rescind a subdivision or any findings that the Board has to issue its decision. Tarby responded that his understanding is that the Board has the authority to act upon a Petitioner's request to eliminate subdivision approval. He added that this stance comports with the City Solicitor's understanding in corresponding with her.

Callahan asked about any site work that has commenced on the property relative to subdivision construction. Cassidy responded that she is not aware of any substantial improvements that commenced onsite following subdivision approval, other than brush-clearing and potential water line-capping.

Donovan invited additional questions from Planning Board members. There were none.

Donovan opened this matter for a public hearing and turned to Cassidy to explain the logistics of using the "raised hand" or telephone functions to identify audience members who wish to speak.

PUBLIC HEARING

Donovan asked Cassidy if any members of the audience wished to address the Board on this matter. No members of the audience indicated a desire to speak.

Donovan invited questions from Planning Board members. There were none.

Cassidy recommended that the Board move to rescind the approval of the 12 Buckman Court subdivision, and release the amount of bond monies held to guarantee subdivision completion, in the amount of \$139,884.47, in the form of a Letter of Credit, subject to the expiration of the twenty (20) appeal period without any appeals having been filed, or in the event of appeal(s), successful resolution of it/them in the developer's favor; and (b) submission of proof that the Planning Board's rescission letter has been recorded with the Middlesex South Registry of Deeds.

Motion to close the public hearing on the matter of the 12 Buckman Court subdivision, made by Bolgen;
Seconded by Doherty;

Roll call vote on the aforementioned motion:

Callahan-Aye
Doherty-Aye
Edmonds-Absent
Turner-Aye
Ventresca-Aye
Bolgen-Aye
Donovan-Aye

The motion carried, 6-0-0.

Motion to adopt the Planning Board Director's aforementioned recommendation on the matter of the 12 Buckman Court subdivision, made by Bolgen;
Seconded by Doherty;

Roll call vote on the aforementioned motion:

Callahan-Aye
Doherty-Aye

Edmonds-Absent
Turner-Aye
Ventresca-Aye
Bolgen-Aye
Donovan-Aye

The motion carried, 6-0-0.

BORSELLI DRIVE II DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION: Request to accept As-Built and Acceptance Plans and release of remaining surety to guarantee completion of subdivision (George Gately, Jr.)

Cassidy provided an overview of the proposal before the Board and indicated that the developer has successfully submitted required As-built and Street Acceptance plans, along with a statement of construction conformance to the approved subdivision plan by the Project Engineer. She added that Engineering staff has issued comments affirming acceptance of these submitted plans. 2

Cassidy stated that given affirmative comments received by Engineering staff relative to the acceptability of As-built and Acceptance plans, she would recommend acceptance of both plans. However, relative to the requested release of remaining bond monies, she would not recommend a full release without having reached resolution/obtained signature on a newly-required and City Solicitor-reviewed Sewer Access Easement document or verified that all outstanding conditions of approval have been met.

Gately stated that the Sewer Access Easement was not shown on the original subdivision plan but was discovered to be required following review of the As-built/Street Acceptance plans, which would be conveyed to the City for maintenance purposes. He added that he would appreciate expediting the bond release process to ensure that he does not have to wait until City Council/Mayor authorization of the easement document.

Donovan invited questions from Planning Board members. There were none.

Donovan asked the Planning Director for any additional comments. Cassidy stated that her recommendation is accept the As-built and Street Acceptance plans, as submitted, and to release all bond monies held to guarantee completion, in the amount of \$112,300 and in the form of a Treasurer's Check, subject to (a) the developer's execution of a required Sewer Easement Agreement document ("Sewer Access Easement"), and (b) confirmation by Planning staff to the developer that all conditions of definitive subdivision approval have been sufficiently addressed upon final review.

Ventresca stated that he does not take any issue with release of bond monies, subject to providing the required easement and verification that all Planning Board conditions of approval have been satisfied.

Motion to accept Planning Board Director's recommendation, as stated, made by Turner;
Seconded by Callahan;

Roll call vote on the aforementioned motion:

Callahan-Aye
Doherty-Aye
Edmonds-Absent
Turner-Aye

Ventresca-Aye
Bolgen-Aye
Donovan-Aye

The motion carried, 6-0-0.

SUBDIVISIONS (DISCUSSION OF CONSTRUCTION STATUS & COMPLETION DATES)

FERULLO DRIVE DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION (Developer Robert Murray)

Cassidy provided an overview of the subdivision construction status and reiterated the timeline of Planning Board review of construction.

Attorney Joseph R. Tarby, Rubin & Rudman, began to address the Board on behalf of the Petitioner to provide an overview of recent subdivision construction work (i.e., roadway construction up to the binder coat) and indicated the timeline by which each remaining construction milestone (e.g., home/sidewalk construction and installation/relocation of streetscape and utility elements in accordance with the approved plan) is to be completed by the newly-proposed construction completion date of December 31, 2024.

Callahan asked for clarification the timeline for constructing each individual home in the context of planned roadway paving and curbing installation work. Tarby and developer Robert Murray indicated that the planned installation of sidewalk/curbing could take place on Lexington Street up to the approach of the new subdivision road (Ferullo Drive) but that curbing/sidewalk installation on the subdivision roadway itself would follow after home construction.

Bolgen asked for clarification on the timing of constructing the first home. Tarby responded that the first home will begin construction upon approval of a building permit currently under review. Murray added that construction of the home can begin without the pole relocation being completed, but construction on the home cannot be completed prior to relocation of the pole.

Cassidy stated that while the timeline for completion of the subdivision has not been ideal for abutting residents, she appreciates the explanation of the newly-proposed timeline this evening and hope the subdivision can proceed as planned.

Ventresca asked for clarification of the developer's request before the Board this evening. Cassidy confirmed that the request before the Board is to consider granting an additional 15-month extension to the existing completion date.

Bolgen made a motion to extend the construction completion date to December 31, 2024 for the Ferullo Drive subdivision and indicated that she is in support of this request given the good faith effort of construction to date and that the developer's request is provided prior to the currently scheduled completion date having expired;
Seconded by Ventresca;

Roll call vote on the aforementioned motion:

Callahan-Aye
Doherty-Aye
Edmonds-Absent
Turner-Aye
Ventresca-Aye

Bolgen-Aye
Donovan-Aye

The motion carried, 6-0-0.

CARLSON WAY DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION (Developer Bryan Melanson)

Cassidy provided an overview of the status of the subdivision and summarized outstanding items that are required prior to completion, including sidewalk segments, fencing, and content of the roadway that is currently in dispute with the subject property owner.

Cassidy referenced the submission of the As-built plan, which Mr. Melanson plans to address edits to re-submit a finalized version.

Cassidy provided an update on this matter that they worked with DPW to determine the next steps as they would be deemed acceptable relative to the easement. Solicitor has advised that developer will need to obtain the permission of the subject property owner prior to engaging any corrective work to satisfy the requirement of the easement surface.

Cassidy turned to Tarby to clarify conversation with the DPW. Tarby confirmed that he has spoken with the subject property owner at 17 Carlson Way (Mr. Peter Haggerty) and DPW. He added that his understanding is that original gravel base was maintained under the grass surface, although he did not ascertain any agreement from DPW Superintendent Duran as to what the final surface material should be.

Cassidy stated that her recommendation is to extend the completion date to December 31, 2021 to allow sufficient time to address corrective actions and re-submission of the As-built plan.

Salvati began to address the Board on behalf of the developer and is present to relay any information to Mr. Melanson.

Ventresca stated that if there is existing gravel and only grass was laid, it would seem usable from the perspective of DPW. Salvati agreed and stated that perhaps the DPW superintendent could confirm and that he would follow up on an answer.

Callahan asked about the status of the other conditions and indicated that the DPW may not find the presence of loam desirable. Salvati stated that he is confident that the developer can meet the timeline for submission of As-built plan by the suggested new completion date.

Cassidy stated that the sidewalk detail should also be discussed with DPW to ensure adequate access (on Carlson Way). She added that the hot top on Wyman should be converted to concrete. Salvati responded that he is willing to seek additional answers from his client.

Donovan invited additional questions from Planning Board members. There were none.

Cassidy stated her recommendation is to grant the proposed subdivision completion date extension to December 31, 2021.

Motion to accept Planning Board Director's recommendation, made by Ventresca;
Seconded by Turner;

Roll call vote on the aforementioned motion:

Callahan-Aye
Doherty-Aye
Edmonds-Absent
Turner-Aye
Ventresca-Aye
Bolgen-Aye
Donovan-Aye

The motion carried, 6-0-0.

ROBERTSON WAY DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION (Developer Bryan Melanson)

Cassidy stated that the developer is still handling final modifications to an As-built plan and that certification that the subdivision has been constructed in substantial conformance with the approved subdivision is still outstanding from the project engineer.

Cassidy stated that she is recommending an extension to December 31st to handle finalizing of the As-built Plan. Salvati responded that he finds that timeframe to be for his client to complete remaining obligations.

Motion to accept the Planning Board Director's recommendation, made by Doherty;
Seconded by Turner;

Roll call vote on the aforementioned motion:

Callahan-Aye
Doherty-Aye
Edmonds-Absent
Turner-Aye
Ventresca-Aye
Bolgen-Aye
Donovan-Aye

The motion carried, 6-0-0.

ALAN R. GERRISH DRIVE (88-92 PEARL STREET) DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION (Developer Doug Ahern, Cattle Crossing LLC)

Cassidy stated that the Board last discussed this subdivision in August and that a progress report was submitted in July projecting that all aspects of construction would be completed by September 15th, but with the lack of the developer's confirmation and As-built/Acceptance Plans having been submitted, this deadline was not met.

Cassidy stated that her recommendation is to continue discussion on this matter to the Board's October 12th meeting allowing for a more productive discussion and developer representation.

Bolgen asked for clarification of the timeline and stated that she does not recall Board discussion of this matter in August. Cassidy responded that the August meeting was in regards to brief consideration of a request to accept outstanding drainage access easement-related documents.

Bolgen further stated that she would like the developer to be aware that the Board strongly urges the developer to attend the October 12th meeting, as they will not be as understanding due to a potential lack of attendance for the second consecutive meeting.

Donovan invited additional questions from Planning Board members. There were none.

Motion to continue discussion on the matter of the Alan R. Gerrish Drive definitive subdivision to the October 12th Planning Board meeting, made by Doherty.

Seconded by Bolgen;

Roll call vote on the aforementioned motion:

Callahan-Aye

Doherty-Aye

Edmonds-Absent

Turner-Aye

Ventresca-Aye

Bolgen-Aye

Donovan-Aye

The motion carried, 6-0-0.

RUSSO ESTATES DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION (Developer William Scire)

Cassidy began by providing an overview of the subdivision and recent appearance and construction updates.

Cassidy stated that the latest August update indicated that loaming/seeding and street trees were complete, but curbing, stone bounds and final topcoat and as-built remain outstanding, with October 31st being proposed as the latest completion date (deemed attainable but cautioned by engineering comments).

Salvati began to address the Board on behalf of the developer. He clarified that the most recent update of field work includes installation of curbing and construction on the final house lot, whereas outstanding work includes laying the roadway topcoat, installation of stone bounds and submission of an As-built Plan. He added that his understanding is that the developer has a current subdivision completion date of October 31, 2021 and that Mr. Scire is still on track to complete all outstanding work/obligations for the subdivision by such date.

No action was taken by the Planning Board on this matter.

LEGACY LANE DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION (Developer Frank Michienzi)

Cassidy provided a summary of the outstanding matters pertaining to completion of required legal documents (confirmatory HOA and property deed documents) and acceptance of As-built and Street Acceptance plans. She added that restoration of Middle Street to the discretion of DPW also remains as an outstanding condition of Planning Board approval.

Cassidy further stated that the developer continues to contemplate proposing a modification of the subdivision road to a private roadway. However, a formal application to modify the approved subdivision plan has not yet been filed to consider such request.

Attorney Tarby began to address the Board on behalf of the developer. He stated he would be supportive of a continuance of discussion to the October 26th meeting to resolve the remaining issues for the subdivision and submit the outstanding legal documents given Mr. Michenzi's being unavailable due to personal matters this evening.

Cassidy stated that she would recommend a continuance of discussion to October 26th meeting.

Attorney Tarby stated that all of the legal documents are prepared for execution and is confident they will be submitted in time for consideration at the October 26th meeting. He added that the project engineer is working with the DPW superintendent to satisfy the condition of roadway restoration.

Motion to continue discussion on the matter of the Legacy Lane subdivision to Tuesday, October 26th, 2021, made by Bolgen;
Seconded by Turner;

Roll call vote on the aforementioned motion:

Callahan-Aye
Doherty-Aye
Edmonds-Absent
Turner-Aye
Ventresca-Aye
Bolgen-Aye
Donovan-Aye

The motion carried, 6-0-0.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: September 14, 2021 (virtual) meeting

Donovan asked if there were any comments on the draft set of minutes. There were none.

Motion to approve the September 14, 2021 meeting minutes, as submitted, made by Callahan;
Seconded by Doherty;

Roll call vote on the aforementioned motion:

Bolgen-Aye
Callahan-Aye
Doherty-Aye
Edmonds-Absent
Turner-Aye
Ventresca-Aye
Donovan-Aye

The motion carried, 6-0-0.

PLANNING BOARD DIRECTOR UPDATE

Cassidy stated that staff is ensuring that all continuances are covered from this evening and indicated that the October 12th meeting would be virtual due to the scheduling of public hearings.

Cassidy further stated that at least one public hearing will likely be advertised in preparation for the October 26th meeting, and that staff will confirm the format (in-person or virtual) for both October meetings.

ADJOURNMENT

Donovan asked if there was any other business to conduct this evening. There was none.

Seeing no further business, Bolgen made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:30 pm.
Seconded by Doherty;

Roll call vote on the aforementioned motion:

- Callahan-Aye
- Doherty-Aye
- Edmonds-Absent
- Turner-Aye
- Ventresca-Aye
- Bolgen-Aye
- Donovan-Aye

The motion carried, 6-0-0.

The meeting adjourned at 8:30 pm.

Table of Documents Used and/or Referenced at Meeting

32 Cabot Road (CONTINUUS Pharmaceuticals, Inc.) Special Permit: 1) Letter dated September 22, 2021 from the Woburn Fire Chief; 2) Vehicle Turning Plan from Pare Corp; 3.) Comments from Building Commissioner Thomas Quinn dated September 9, 2021, Police Chief Robert Rufo dated September 23, 2021 and DPW Superintendent Jay Duran dated September 24, 2021
Zoning Amendment: Restaurant: 1.) Draft Orders defining Outdoor Dining and Restaurant, Full-Service; 2.) City Solicitor memo to City Council dated September 13, 2021 regarding Review of Ordinance Amendments – Rooftop and Outdoor Dining; 3.) Red-line Version of Section 11.6.12 Notes to 5.1 table of Use Note 27; 4.) Email dated September 27, 2021 to City Council President, City Clerk, City Solicitor, and Attorney Tarby from Tina Cassidy, Planning Director.
12 Buckman Court Public Hearing: 1.) Letters from Owner’s attorney dated August 9, 2021 and September 24, 2021;
Borselli Drive II: As-Built and Acceptance Plans; City Engineer Greg Rheume’s review of plans dated September 21, 2021; Request letter dated September 10, 2021 from George W. Gately, Jr.; Commonwealth Engineering’s letter of conformance dated September 14, 2021
Discussions of Subdivision Construction Status & Completion Dates: 1) Recent Planning Board requests for correspondence provided to the developers of the Ferullo Drive, Carlson Way, Robertson Way, Gerrish Drive, Russo Estates, and Legacy Lane definitive subdivisions; 2) Construction Status worksheets and other correspondence submitted by the developers and 3) Engineering comment letters issued for the definitive subdivisions;
Copies of letters drafted by the Planning Department to the City Council regarding Special Permits
Draft Meeting Minutes: Tuesday, September 14, 2021 (virtual) meeting

Respectfully submitted,

Dan Orr

Dan Orr
City Planner/Grant Writer

Approved