

1. Amesbury Planning Board Meeting Minutes
2. In Person Meeting – May 12, 2025, at 7:04 PM
3. Chairman Pascal Rettig called the May 12, 2025, Planning Board meeting to order at 7:04 PM.
4. *To submit a public comment ahead of time email Becky Frey at freyr@amesburyma.gov. To speak live at the meeting fill out a public comment form and turn it into Becky Frey. There will be a public comment portion of each public hearing discussed tonight.*
5. *The Chairman notes that tonight's Planning Board meeting is being recorded by Amesbury Public Access Television; this legal step has been taken but does not act as the official record. The written meeting minutes by the Recording Secretary is the official record.*
6. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call –
7. Keith Ratner – YES
8. Joel Nice – YES
9. Michael Jewell – YES
10. Tracey Chalifour – YES
11. Tom Salemi - YES
12. David Frick – ABSENT
13. Pascal Rettig – YES
14. Also: Nipun Jain (Planning Director) and Becky Frey (Community Development Coordinator)
15. **Signs – 108 Macy St.**
16. Kevin Gay from NH Signs commented that they were working with Sunoco to upgrade the signage that was there now. They worked with the DRC to maintain the existing size of the signage or reduce the size in some cases.
17. Becky Frey commented that the applicant submitted a revised package based on DRC feedback and Nipun Jain reviewed and confirmed that the revisions were made.
18. Tom Salemi motioned to approve the sign package for Sunoco at 108 Macy St. as revised. Seconded by Keith Ratner.
19. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
20. Keith Ratner – YES
21. Joel Nice – YES
22. Michael Jewell – YES
23. Tracey Chalifour – YES
24. Tom Salemi - YES
25. David Frick – ABSENT
26. Pascal Rettig – YES
27. Motion passed 6-0

28. Signs –19 Main St.

29. Becky Frey commented that similar to the last package, this went to the DRC in January. The applicant submitted a revised package and went back to DRC this month. The DRC recommended approval.
30. Tracey Chalifour questioned if the city had any guidelines or regulations for signs with solar on top. Mike Sanchez commented that he was at the DRC meeting and the solar only feeds the lights that are mounted to the top of the signs.
31. Becky Frey commented that the city doesn't have any regulations on solar lighting on signs. This is another way to light the signs within the regulations allowed. Tracey Chalifour commented she was not against it, but was concerned about the precedent that it could be setting. If the signs are bigger and the solar gets bigger. Becky Frey commented there were other regulations in the ordinance that would regulate it.
32. Keith Ratner motioned to approve the sign for Phoenix Café at 19 Main St. as revised. Seconded by Tom Salemi.
33. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
34. Keith Ratner – YES
35. Joel Nice – YES
36. Michael Jewell – YES
37. Tracey Chalifour – YES
38. Tom Salemi - YES
39. David Frick – ABSENT
40. Pascal Rettig – YES
41. Motion passed 6-0

42. Preapplication – 38-40 Prospect St.

43. Geno Ranaldi was present to speak to the application. Nipun Jain commented that this was a Historic Preservation Special Permit. There are two existing two-family buildings on the site. A significant portion of the parcel is vacant, and the property owner is looking to renovate the existing structures. Originally, Mr. Ranaldi was interested in putting in an ADU on the vacant parcel. He discussed the possibility of putting in a single-family structure instead by using the Historic Preservation Special Permit. The proposed site plan will include renovations of the two existing structures, changes to the parking and a new single-family home. The parking will be extended on Chester St. to create 3 additional parking spaces. The single-family home will have a garage and two parking spaces on Prospect St.
44. Pascal Rettig questioned if the historical significance of the existing structures had been established. Nipun Jain responded that this application has gone to the Historical Commission with their intended goals and objectives. Geno Ranaldi added that they will put in historic windows. The stained-glass windows are in decent shape, and they will restore them. The porches will be restored to the original structures. They will be updating the rental properties and bring them back to life.
45. Nipun Jain commented showed the existing structures and noted that they were in bad shape. There is redeeming historical and architectural value in the existing structures. The proposed elevations show what they will look like restored.

46. Keith Ratner questioned what the date of the buildings were. Geno Ranaldi responded they were not as old as most historical buildings, but they have value.
47. Tom Salemi questioned how many stories there were. Geno Ranaldi responded that they were three stories. Tom Salemi commented that they had a lot of character, and it would be good to restore them.
48. Joel Nice commented this was a good project and liked the scale of the new building. This is good creativity by staff and the finished product will be great.
49. Pascal Rettig agreed with Joel Nice. Google Street view shows cool old buildings. It will be nice to have those Somerville types of two-decker buildings. Putting a nice single family instead is a good improvement over an ADU. Keith Ratner questioned if the building was currently occupied. Geno Ranaldi responded that they will be empty of tenants by the end of the week.
50. Nipun Jain commented that it's important the Board to make sure they give any concerns they may have in regards to the Historic Preservation Special Permit. The proposal meets the criteria for the permit. They are replacing the windows with the appropriate types and styles, fixing the porches with traditional materials, and restoring the architectural details. The siding will be replaced with hardy plank. The application will go to the Design Review Committee when it is formally submitted. The new residential structure will also be designed with a historic architectural style. There are other improvements being made to the site including off-street parking spaces for 12 cars for 5 units. There will be ample parking spaces on site. There will be a dedicated driveway for the two two-family structures and the single-family house will have its own driveway. The site plan will meet the performance standards.
51. Pascal Rettig questioned how big the single-family home would be. Geno Ranaldi responded that it would be 2,500 sf or less. Nipun Jain noted that it would be 1,800 sf. Geno Ranaldi commented that it would be exactly what was built on Perkins St.
52. Geno Ranaldi commented that there would be cedar siding, and they are restoring the front windows. Pascal Rettig questioned if there would be one or two extra dormers. Geno Ranaldi commented that the right building has a small dormer, and the other building has two small dormers. They are proposing a total of 3 dormers.
53. Pascal Rettig questioned if they were keeping both chimneys. Geno Ranaldi responded they would be happy to build back the chimney that they took down. Right now, only one is intact.
54. Tracey Chalifour questioned if the outlined privacy fence was on the new lot for the new house. Geno Ranaldi commented that the patio is on the shared driveway side. Joel Nice commented that the fence goes around the property.
55. Tracey Chalifour questioned if this had gone to Historical Commission. Geno Ranaldi confirmed that they had been.
56. Nipun Jain added that this also went to the Technical Review Committee. It was received favorably, and they made minor comments about utility connections. The applicant will follow up with DPW. They will also plan to coordinate with the Fire Department on the fire code requirements for the existing structures, and the new one.
57. Pascal Rettig questioned if the houses were currently on separate lots. Geno Ranaldi responded they were currently on one large lot. Pascal Rettig questioned if the end goal

was to end up with 3 lots. Geno Ranaldi responded that the single-family home would be on its own lot. The existing multifamily structures will remain on the same lot. Nipun Jain clarified that it would be a 2-lot subdivision.

58. Geno Ranaldi commented that he appreciates the feedback and would keep moving forward.

59. Preapplication – 26 Friend St.

60. Ben Roberts and Aileen Graf spoke to the application. Ben Roberts commented that they were using the multifamily special permit and presented a rendering they prepared to orient the project. The team has worked closely with OCED and met with TRC and DRC already. The site plan shows 3 parking spaces. There are currently no compliant parking spaces. The project requires 8 parking spaces, so they will be requesting a waiver.
61. Aileen Graf commented that they will be removing the back addition on the brick building and then use that space to create the three parking spots. The first floor will be reserved for commercial space. The upper floors will be residential units. There will be an entry in the front and the rear for the residential units. Trash and recycling will be located on the side of the building. The residential units will be on the top 2.5 stories. The goal is to try to infill the area. Adding additional floors gives strength to the street façade and experience. There are currently glass windows, and this design is trying to bring back a more traditional storefront. They added another storefront window as the building turns the corner. The park is adjacent to the added window, and it will help activate the space. A mansard roof will cap the building. They will use hardy clapboard and 2 over 2 windows. The roof material will be a faux slate product on the steep pitch and shingle on the flatter less visible part. The building will have lighting for signage in the future. There will be a door leading out to the park, so the commercial tenant could use that outdoor area as a support space. There are proposed balconies off the rear of the building for the residential units. There are proposed plantings between the park and parking lot on the property for screening. The back of the building has 3 parking spaces.
62. Pascal Rettig commented that the notes on the plan say there will be a membrane roof. Aileen Graf responded that was an old notation.
63. Aileen Graf commented that the side that faces the Pizza Factory will have HVAC. They need to maintain this access to ensure the tenants can bring trash to the front. There will be a gate there. Downspouts from the roof will go to the retention area in the back of the property under the parking. There is fencing planned for the trash and recycling. They are working with the city on the landscape plan due to the proximity and relationship to the park. Chris Horan confirmed they were working with the city. The island in the middle of the top area will have some green space and screening trees. They will be improving the brick paths in the front and edging with granite curbing. This will make it a more activated park.
64. Nipun Jain commented that this property is located in the Central Business District. It is currently a single-story commercial space. The proposal is to change the building to a mixed use with one commercial store and three residential units on the floors above. The building will meet height requirements. The existing footprint is non-conforming and that will continue to be the case. They are not making it any more non-conforming. The commercial

and residential entrances are separate. The commercial entry on the front will be handicap accessible. The city is working with the developer on the park adjoining the site. It will result in the beginning of a good improvement to the pocket park. This proposal will also make the storefront more interactive with the park. They will be replacing the storefront windows on the elevations. It will be a new building once it is complete. An activated park will also provide a better visual and physical connection to the properties in the back. It will provide walkability on Friend St. and around the building. There are aspects the Board should keep in mind when reviewing the application. This proposal should be ready to be approved because there are no major issues for the site improvements other than what has been shown. The project has been to the TRC, and they made a favorable recommendation. This project has been to the DRC as well and the feedback has been incorporated into the plans.

65. Joel Nice commented that this was a good design and will fix the broken tooth downtown. Right now, the building is an awkward scale and it is appropriate to make it taller. This was a good project, and it will be good to have Chris Horan in charge of helping to improve public spaces given his past work in the city.
66. Tom Salemi commented that this project looked fantastic and questioned how the height of this building compared to the surrounding buildings. Aileen Graf responded that it would be basically the same as the surrounding buildings. It is 36.5 feet.
67. Nipun Jain commented that they did a good job designing a traditional storefront. It is in keeping with the other buildings in the downtown area.
68. Keith Ratner agreed the squashed building always stood out there. It will be nice to have something that fits in. Adding more housing is good.
69. Tracey Chalifour requested clarification on the number of stories being added. Aileen Graf responded that they were adding 2.5 stories. The finished building will be 3.5 stories tall. Tracey Chalifour commented that three parking spaces seemed a little light. They don't know what kind of retail space this will be, and employees will need parking. The parking is inadequate for what they are adding to the building.
70. Ben Roberts commented that the three parking spaces they are adding in the back are for the residences they were adding. There is no change in retail parking spaces from today or tomorrow. There is a city parking lot across the street. Tracey Chalifour responded that the parking is tight on a daily basis and inadequate.
71. Michael Jewell did not have any comments.
72. Pascal Rettig agreed with Joel Nice. It currently makes a big gap in the street front. Pascal Rettig noted that he has never seen that park used and it would be wonderful to activate it. The proposed parking should not be an issue. All of the commercial space downtown rely on the central stock of parking on the street and in the public parking lots. If there is not room in the Upper Millyard Lot, then cars can park at the Water St. lot. The downtown area is 50% surface lots. Adding 3 spots for the residences means there is a dedicated spot for each unit. There is a diversity of parking use with commercial parking in the day and restaurants and people at night. Pascal Rettig did not think the solution to downtown was to add more surface parking.
73. Tracey agreed, but the people who are spending money for those condos will want 2 spaces. Pascal Retting responded that the condo owners will know what they are walking

into. They will be advertised with one parking spot. Tracey Chalifour commented that they will use city lots. Pascal Rettig responded that it was allowed.

74. Nipun Jain commented that they spent a lot of time talking about parking. The Commonwealth is promoting no parking regulations period. They are trying to balance the need for regulatory parking and what works in an urban complex. The goal is to reactivate downtown. The ordinance does not require commercial parking if there is public parking available within 300 feet of the space. The residential units will have dedicated parking, which is a bonus. There are residences downtown now without parking and those are still desirable. The city is looking at long-term parking planning as well. They want to see more buildings in this area, so they are looking at the public investment that may be needed. It is all a balancing act. Small projects like these allow for looking at bigger projects and infrastructure improvements. It is hard to make the investment on public infrastructure if they are not activating the downtown.
75. Tracey Chalifour supported the public park improvement.
76. Michael Jewell commented that it looked like a good project, and he did not think the parking was an issue.
77. Pascal Rettig commented that this will come back for a public hearing on June 9, 2025.

78. Preapplication – 89 Powow St.

79. Mike Elcier from Airosmith Development spoke in support of the MA State Police. They submitted a preapplication for site plan approval for the generator installation on an existing tower. They need to slightly bump out the existing compound to accommodate the ground additions.
80. Nipun Jain commented that when the proponent asked for the best way to move forward staff suggested they make a presentation to the Board and the Board could determine if it was a minor change or not. If the Board determined it was a minor change, then they could approve the facility. This project was approved a while ago, so it has not been before the Board in more recent times.
81. Pascal Rettig clarified that if they determined it was minor modification, then they could vote on it tonight as an administrative item.
82. Nipun Jain confirmed that was correct. This is not a building, they are not adding height. The proposal is to add a propane tank and other elements at the base to service an existing tower. It is all ancillary infrastructure in support of the functioning of the tower.
83. Alex Murphy from the MA State Police commented that the current system covers the area in 2 locations and this would focus coverage in Amesbury. This is part of a project to upgrade systems across the state. This supports the walkie talkies that the agencies use. 220 agencies use this service. The propane tank and generator will be a back up to keep it online. It is designed to keep the communicate open and serve the community. The town will be better served with this upgrade.
84. Joel Nice clarified that the generator will only come on in an emergency. Alex Murphy confirmed that was correct. It turns on for maintenance on a schedule to make sure it still works. This is one of several towers at this location. This will be back up power.

85. Tom Salemi questioned if they had information on how often the generator goes on. Alex Murphy responded that it comes on once a week for an hour. It is not the only generator on Powwow St. They can get more information if necessary.
86. Pascal Rettig questioned if there were other generators on the site. Alex Murphy responded the upper right corner has an existing generator. There may be more generators than that. There is another tower across the way.
87. Tracey Chalifour questioned if the fuel storage was increasing. Mike Elcier responded that it would be a 100-gallon propane tank and a generator.
88. Tom Salemi questioned if that was the only propane tank up there. Mike Elcier responded that it was a fuselage generator. It complies with the 10-foot spark separation requirement. This was presented to the Fire Department, and they replied that they did not have any concerns.
89. Nipun Jain commented that the existing wireless communication facility is 180 feet in height, and they are not extending that. This was in keeping with how existing facilities have been amended. It is a small impact visually. Nipun Jain requested they submit written approval from the tower owner. Alex Murphy confirmed that could be sent. They signed a long-term lease two weeks ago. They will need a building permit for those site improvements also. Mike Elcier commented that they would submit the construction drawings and structural analysis.
90. Nipun Jain commented that the applicant has sign off from the Fire Department. They are not proposing a building. There is not a lot of justification for making it a major modification. From a staff perspective this is a minor modification, and the Board can make that determination if they so choose.
91. Tracey Chalifour questioned what the date of the email from the Fire Department was. Mike Elcier responded it was May 7, 2025.
92. Pascal Rettig commented that he felt the Board was in position to make a determination.
93. Joel Nice questioned if the generator itself produced exhaust. Alex Murphy responded there was a level 2 enclosure encasing the generator. Joel Nice questioned if there was also a muffler. Alex Murphy confirmed there was. Pascal Rettig added that propane generators are significantly quieter than diesel.
94. Nipun Jain commented that if noise was concern, then they can require that the applicant meet the noise standards laid out in Section XI.C of the Ordinance. Mike Elcier commented that they included the certified specifications for the generator.
95. Tom Salemi motioned to determine the proposal for 89 Powwow St. was a minor modification. Seconded by Tracey Chalifour.
96. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
97. Keith Ratner – YES
98. Joel Nice – YES
99. Michael Jewell – YES
100. Tracey Chalifour – YES
101. Tom Salemi - YES
102. David Frick – ABSENT
103. Pascal Rettig – YES
104. Motion passed 6-0

105. Pascal Rettig commented now they have determined it is an administrative item, and they can handle this matter without a public hearing. The options are to ask them to provide any additional information needed and approve at a future meeting or make a condition of approval on certain things.
106. Nipun Jain noted that the Fire Department sign off will be needed for the building permit application.
107. Tracey Chalifour motioned to approve the minor modification at 89 Powwow St. with the conditions outlined below. Seconded by Keith Ratner.
108. The applicant shall provide written approval from the Fire Department.
109. The applicant shall verify with the Building Department that the noise levels comply with the ordinance regulations at the property line. If the noise levels exceed the standard, then they will need to come back to the Planning Board.
110. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
111. Keith Ratner – YES
112. Joel Nice – YES
113. Michael Jewell – YES
114. Tracey Chalifour – YES
115. Tom Salemi - YES
116. David Frick – ABSENT
117. Pascal Rettig – YES
118. Motion passed 6-0
119. **Continued Public Hearings – 201 Elm St.**
120. Nipun Jain provided a quick recap on the proposed special permit and site plan project at 201 Elm St. The applicants made an initial presentation and they are coming back to address comments. The project did go to TRC and has been reviewed. TRC made a positive recommendation on the project. The DRC had recommended approval of the building designs. This has been to the Historical Commission, and they have signed off on that as well.
121. Meera Cousens and Bill Nolan were present to speak to the application. Bill Nolan commented that they have made several design changes and have continued to revise the plans that were submitted. The first change was to change the proposal from 2 lots to three lots. The original layout included a shared driveway, and the revised plans provide separate driveways. There is a proposed detached garage that goes with the historic home. The driveway to Elm St. will accommodate the cars and a turnaround. The storm water catch basin has been expanded to catch more storm water. Snow storage is shown on the plan and post development peak flows will not exceed current calculations. The submittal outlined 6 waivers. In the last meeting there was a lot of discussion on the height of the retaining walls and the buildability. Those walls are more clearly shown on the plans. The wall near the historic home will be 6.4 feet. The wall near the duplex will be 6.7 feet. The proposed single-family home will have a 7.3-foot wall. The rest of the walls in the back are less than 4 feet.
122. Nipun Jain commented that they reduced the height of the walls and many of them in the back are now under 4 feet.

123. Bill Nolan commented that there are two types of retaining walls. The ones lower than 4 feet will be boulder walls. The walls over 4 feet will be casting placed concrete with footings and reinforced with a natural stone veneer. They did design a worst-case scenario 8-foot wall and have shown a cross section of that. They will have a structural engineer reviewing some aspects of the project. The 8-foot wall would be with full off-balance soils on the back and a pad underneath it. The toe would be 3 feet 8 inches. They will be able to build this on their own property. Pascal Rettig clarified that they would dig out the additional 3-foot 8-inch area and rest the soil temporarily. Bill Nolan confirmed that was correct. They would excavate the area temporarily and once they have the footing from the wall, they would start back filling it. They will back fill with crushed stone, so there will be a drain behind the wall. Pascal Rettig questioned what the distance was to the property line. Meera Cousens responded it was 5.9 feet.
124. Nipun Jain commented that was the one location that is the tightest for the property line, but they have enough tolerance to build on the walls on their property. There are several ways to do these walls, and this is the most common way. There is adequate information on how they can be built on the site.
125. Bill Nolan commented that they have added screening and vegetation. There will be screening in front of the garage on Elm St. and lower screening in the front, so it doesn't create a blind spot for cars. There will be large shade trees. There will be screening between the barn building and the cape style home. The backyards will be private. The houses are staggered houses, so the exterior spaces are separate.
126. Bill Nolan commented that the Historical Commission approved the approach they are taking and felt the other two buildings were complimentary. They have had two meetings with the Design Review Committee.
127. Pascal Rettig commented that he saw the drainage report, but no one has looked at it yet. Nipun Jain commented that Stantec was reviewing that and had not completed it for the meeting. The most effective way will be to have Mike Leach from Stantec work directly with Meera Cousens to discuss the drainage flow. They are trying to expedite the review because of the small nature of the project.
128. Pascal Rettig questioned what was used of the before calculations because the area used to be forested. A lot of trees were chopped down. Meera Cousens commented that they used calculations from before the trees came down. Pascal Rettig questioned where the grass would be. Meera Cousens commented that it was in the watershed report. They located the tree stumps and used the edge of the forested area. Nipun Jain commented that some areas of the site had driveway areas and patios in the back. They were not visible before the tree canopy came down.
129. Tom Salemi commented that the driveway to Elm St. dumps out at the intersection and questioned if the DPW and Police had looked at that. Meera Cousens responded that it was an existing driveway. Nipun Jain added that they were supportive of the driveway as long as there was a right turn only sign for cars leaving the driveway. Bill Nolan commented that there were conversations at the DRC and Historical Commission about providing access for them to turn around onsite. That makes it a safer situation. The City Engineer suggested the right turn only lane. Tom Salemi commented that the right turn only sign did not seem easy to enforce. Nipun Jain commented that the sign had been requested by public safety

to address concerns. The applicant has also added the turnaround area on the driveway, so they have addressed the issue. This driveway will be reducing the number of cars coming out of the two-family structure driveway. It's a balancing act.

130. Nipun Jain commented that the applicant made improvements to lot 3. The original comment was that cars would have trouble pulling in and out of the driveway because of the shape of the lot. The location of the single family home did not change but they expanded the driveway and turn around to allow for better navigation.
131. Pascal Rettig commented that the driveway on lot 1 was not ideal but it does look like there is pretty good visibility on the corner. The applicant should be aware of what landscaping they put in to prevent interference with sightlines.
132. Nipun Jain commented that that they can clarify that the landscaping should not interfere with 8-10 feet sightlines.
133. Tom Salemi commented that they could consider adding a blind drive sign.
134. Joel Nice commented that the overall site improvements were good. It was good that they expanded the storm water retention.
135. Tracey Chalifour commented that she preferred the other design with the shared driveway. It looks like the 3 structures are jammed into that spot.
136. Keith Ratner motioned to extend the Planning Board Meeting to 10 pm. Seconded by Tom Salemi.
137. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
138. Keith Ratner – YES
139. Joel Nice – YES
140. Michael Jewell – YES
141. Tracey Chalifour – YES
142. Tom Salemi - YES
143. David Frick – Absent
144. Pascal Rettig – YES
145. Motion passed 6-0
146. Tracey Chalifour commented that there were some conversations about the Brown Hill Overlay District and the context of that relating to this proposal. Tracey Chalifour questioned if they were missing some component with that.
147. Nipun Jain commented that like any other overlay district it was created to prevent historical homes from being torn down. It is an overlay district. If there are other proposals under other provisions, then they can use those provisions in the zoning code. This application is using the Historic Preservation Special Permit, so there is no conflict. Pascal Rettig commented that the Board was allowed to waive requirements of the overlay.
148. Michael Jewell did not have any comments.
149. Pascal Rettig opened public comment.
150. Matthew Gillard of 3 Dewey St. in Amesbury commented that this project is concerning for several different reasons. It is concerning that they are asking for 6 waivers. They are trying to jam houses into lots that are not supposed to be there. This is in the Brown Hill Overlay District and Mr. Gillard lives directly behind and above this house. There is a 100-foot grade change from his backyard to this development. The deforestation has already been done. Mr. Gillard was present to express the wishes of the neighborhood. He has

lived in that house for 45 years. Most of the other families have been up there for 45 years. All of the elderly neighbors were involved in putting this overlay district in. The neighborhood's want the house restored but they do not want the development there. This is not a restoration project. They are installing a gas fireplace there. Mr. Gillard has done special preservation projects downtown. This project is not a sensible development. That driveway at that intersection is concerning. Turning left is dangerous. The performance standards the contractor is asking for are a lot. The Brown Hill District is meant to discourage deforestation and development of the steep hillsides. It is interesting to hear that there will not be any increase in runoff. The water running off that site right now is offensive. The storm drains have mud on top of the grate and 4 inches of mud around it. It's coming from the test holes on the site. The hillside is already washing into the storm drains. The carelessness of ignoring the Brown Hill District is not good. The Board cannot make an educated decision on this without knowing more about the Brown Hill. Mr. Gillard did not like either design. The Board is the only one with the power to say no. The developer is doing their best to maximize the property. If they were talking about a full-blown restoration, then they would not have a 4-car garage next to it. The roofline is 7 feet taller. There is a natural spring in the center of their driveway at 8 Monroe St. They have to pave it every 3 or 4 years. They are jamming too many residences too close to that intersection. The State redesigned Elm St. but did not take into consideration that traffic flow. The Board has requested traffic studies for other projects. It would be justifiable to ask that. Taking a left off of Bay St. is dangerous.

151. Meera Cousens commented that they comply with the storm water regulations. Pascal Rettig questioned if the site was stabilized at all currently. Meera Cousens responded that she was not sure, but they could install erosions controls if needed.

152. Ethan Petersohn commented that the drain grate has been like that since before they bought the property. Pascal Rettig commented that the mud and dirt may have increased.

153. Pascal Rettig commented that one thing to note is if this project did not move forward, then there still would be some type of development. The home would not be preserved. The historic special permit exists as a vehicle to allow an increase in density of what's allowed by right. The historic preservation special permit only cares about the exterior of the buildings. There are no requirements for the interior.

154. Bill Nolan commented that they met with the Historical Commission, and they liked the outside design. There were comments around the interior. They agreed to take down the existing ceilings and expose the infrastructure. The original 4 rooms are being restored as close as possible. The back of the house is beyond disrepair. The existing foundation cannot be restored. The building in the back will be built in kind and look exactly like it does today from Elm St. They will be taking down the ad-on areas at the back of the house. They will be providing contemporary pieces to the house. The fireplace will be there in the great room. It will be done in a style that matches the older parts of the building. The Historical Commission is interested in detail like exposing the timber and salvaging the existing storm door. There will be a fence between the proposed garage and home. It will be a lower fence to make it fit better on the site. There was a discussion about tree removals. A decent amount of the trees was taken down because the developers were

worried about them falling on the house. The landscape plan shows they intend to plant new trees back there. Most of the trees that were removed were invasive.

155. Pascal Rettig commented that the current landscape plan shows one tree on lot 1. Bill Nolan commented that the intention was to populate the hill with a mix of trees. Pascal Rettig clarified that the darker area on the landscape plan would be reforested. Bill Nolan confirmed that was correct.
156. Pascal Rettig summarized the outstanding items on this project. The first is the stormwater review. The Design Review Committee gave positive feedback. Nipun Jain commented that there was work being done for a long time before they came to the Board. The team looked at the provisions of the historic preservation special permit. They worked with staff and the Design Review Committee before filing. Several iterations were discussed even with the Historical Commission. What gets lost is the existing conditions and what could happen without collaboration. The existing two family without the historic special permit could be demolished. There is no reason to keep it because it is not habitable and doesn't meet code. The opportunity to try to save historic properties is an important objective to keep in mind. The improvements to the existing structure and replacement to house falling apart is a benefit. They are trying to keep the fabric of the home and make it work. The density is not increasing randomly. This is a recalibration of the site. They could keep the two-family use and propose something different. They could split the parcel to create another lot and have no design review input. This site could end up with 4 units without any oversight. This is not the only way, but it is a great way to do it especially because the historic structure is preserved. They are doing this development in a sensitive manner and working with the Boards. The only thing left of any significance is the storm water review. That is currently underway, and they can wrap it up shortly. The Board can move forward with at least looking at the waivers.
157. Tracey Chalifour noted that the public comment mentioned a traffic study and questioned if that was something they would consider or if the project was too small. Pascal Rettig responded that a traffic study would primarily give the Board information on the changes in traffic. There will not be any changes in the service level of traffic by adding 3 residential units. Nipun Jain added that a traffic study is for the volume of cars coming in and out of a site. The concern about the existing conditions is the existing driveway. There is an existing curb cut on Monroe St. This would not require a traffic study. The Board could add a condition on approval that public safety would need to approve any signage needed for that site.
158. Keith Ratner motioned to extend the Planning Board meeting to 10:15 pm. Seconded by Joel Nice.
159. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
160. Keith Ratner – YES
161. Joel Nice – YES
162. Michael Jewell – YES
163. Tracey Chalifour – YES
164. Tom Salemi - YES
165. David Frick – Absent
166. Pascal Rettig – YES

167. Motion passed 6-0
168. Pascal Rettig commented that the waivers were asking for relief from setbacks. At the preapplication the applicant made it clear that relief was one of the core conditions of the project. They discussed the need for the dimensional waivers at the preapplication.
169. Nipun Jain commented that this was a preexisting structure on a preexisting non-conforming lot. It is an obvious candidate for waivers. The placement of new buildings were done in consultation with the Design Review Committee, and they considered the massing and driveway circulation. Those are the reasons behind the waivers being requested. Lot 3 has an odd shape, and the house was placed closer to the street to try to keep the traditional nature of historic homes. Staff supports the requested dimensional requirement waivers.
170. Keith Ratner motioned to accept the 6 requested waivers as presented. Seconded by Joel Nice.
171. Tracey Chalifour questioned if they should vote on them separately. Pascal Rettig responded that they were all documented together and the same kind of waiver, so they can take them together.
172. Tom Salemi commented that he may abstain because they were moving too fast and he was not informed enough.
173. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
174. Keith Ratner – YES
175. Joel Nice – YES
176. Michael Jewell – YES
177. Tracey Chalifour – ABSTAIN
178. Tom Salemi - ABSTAIN
179. David Frick – Absent
180. Motion passes 4-0-2
181. Pascal Rettig commented that this was a small project, but they haven't seen the notes on the storm water. They anticipate the peer review memo will be available soon. Nipun Jain questioned if the Board felt anything else was missing that they wanted to make a condition of approval. Pascal Rettig commented that they would need a subdivision plan. They have a note from the Historical Commission and a memo from TRC. The biggest sticking point is the safety and visibility on the driveway on Elm St. Their safety assessment was to add a right turn only sign on the driveway. Pascal Rettig questioned if they needed a turning template on the driveway. Nipun Jain responded that would be submitted with the building permit. Pascal Rettig noted that they have everything from a documentation standpoint provided the storm water comes back without significant changes.
182. Keith Ratner motioned to ask for a draft decision for 201 Elm St. for the next meeting that incorporates any outstanding storm water conditions. Seconded by Michael Jewell. Pascal Rettig commented that they will discuss the storm water memo at the next meeting. Nipun Jain confirmed he would incorporate any recommended conditions from the memo.
183. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
184. Keith Ratner – YES
185. Joel Nice – YES
186. Michael Jewell – YES

187. Tracey Chalifour – Abstain
188. Tom Salemi - YES
189. David Frick – Absent
190. Pascal Rettig – YES
191. Motion passed 5-0-1
192. Keith Ratner motioned to continue the public hearing for 201 Elm St. to the June 9, 2025, Planning Board Meeting. Seconded by Tom Salemi.
193. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
194. Keith Ratner – YES
195. Joel Nice – YES
196. Michael Jewell – YES
197. Tracey Chalifour – YES
198. Tom Salemi - YES
199. David Frick – Absent
200. Pascal Rettig – YES
201. Motion passed 6-0
202. Tracey Chalifour motioned to extend the meeting to 10:30 pm. Seconded by Tom Salemi.
203. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
204. Keith Ratner – YES
205. Joel Nice – YES
206. Michael Jewell – YES
207. Tracey Chalifour – YES
208. Tom Salemi - YES
209. David Frick – Absent
210. Pascal Rettig – YES
211. Motion passed 6-0
212. **Administrative – 13 Merrimac St.**
213. Nipun Jain commented that the request for modification was sent to the DRC for recommendations. Based on their recommendations the applicant put together a revised elevation and cross section. Staff recommends determining this is a minor modification. There are no changes to 2 Merrimac St. and no changes to 13 Merrimac St. other than the building footprint. Because the applicant has also made the changes recommended by DRC, staff recommends the Board approve the minor modification. The Board can clarify that they approve the minor modification with the conditions proposed by the DRC to be clear about what they are approving.
214. Joel Nice motioned to determine this request was a minor modification. Seconded by Tom Salemi.
215. Mike Sanchez commented that they agreed to what the DRC recommended with the window sizes, dormer adjustment, aligning the windows, and adding the half circular columns to the trim casing around the front door.
216. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
217. Keith Ratner – YES

218. Joel Nice – YES
219. Michael Jewell – YES
220. Tracey Chalifour – YES
221. Tom Salemi - YES
222. David Frick – ABSENT
223. Pascal Rettig – YES
224. Motion passed 6-0
225. Keith Ratner motioned to approve the minor modification with the conditions proposed by the Design Review Committee and referenced in the memo. Seconded by Michael Jewell.
226. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
227. Keith Ratner – YES
228. Joel Nice – YES
229. Michael Jewell – YES
230. Tracey Chalifour – YES
231. Tom Salemi - YES
232. David Frick – ABSENT
233. Pascal Rettig – YES
234. Motion passed 6-0
- 235.
236. **Administrative – 21 Water St. Modification Request**
237. Pascal Rettig commented that they were doing the administrative items out order. They received a modification request today to amend the Decision on 21 Water St. to allow the conversion of an existing office space to a retail juice bar and commissary kitchen.
238. Tom Salemi commented that he rented from 21 Water St., so he would abstain from voting.
239. Pascal Rettig clarified that the request was to allow a change of use.
240. Nipun Jain commented that they do not need to make a determination. There are multiple units in that building and making a determination about a minor change every time would not be a smart on the Board's part and it would not be a benefit to a multi facility building with some many different uses. In 2015 they went through the exercise of codifying all the uses in the property with the two addresses for the categories of industrial or office. There was no retail/restaurant space at that time. A condition was built into the decision that if nothing significant was happening then, the Board can accept changes of use as an administrative change if there is no impact on performance standards. This is a simple change of use. This one unit is in a single-story section of the building and has direct pedestrian access.
241. Mike Sanchez commented that the proposed use is a juice bar. There will not be any actual cooking on site. The Bakehouse may put a future commissary in there and they would have to permit that. Right now, the proposed use is a juice bar.
242. Michael Jewell motioned to accept the change of use request. Seconded by Joel Nice.
243. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
244. Keith Ratner – YES
245. Joel Nice – YES

- 246. Michael Jewell – YES
- 247. Tracey Chalifour – YES
- 248. Tom Salemi - ABSTAINED
- 249. David Frick – ABSENT
- 250. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 251. Motion passed 5-0-1

252. **Administrative – Bailey’s Pond**

- 253. Nipun Jain commented that it was staff’s recommendation to reduce the bond to \$61,250 based on the recommendation from Stantec.
- 254. Keith Ratner motioned to reduce the Bailey’s Pond bond to \$61,250. Seconded by Tom Salemi.
- 255. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
- 256. Keith Ratner – YES
- 257. Joel Nice – YES
- 258. Michael Jewell – YES
- 259. Tracey Chalifour – YES
- 260. Tom Salemi - YES
- 261. David Frick – ABSENT
- 262. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 263. Motion passed 6-0
- 264. Tracey Chalifour motioned to extend the Planning Board Meeting to 10:45 pm. There was no second to the motion and the motion failed.

265. **Adjournment**

- 266. Michael Jewell motioned to adjourn at 10:31 pm. Seconded by Joel Nice.
- 267. Keith Ratner initiated roll call vote –
- 268. Keith Ratner – YES
- 269. Joel Nice – YES
- 270. Michael Jewell – YES
- 271. Tracey Chalifour – NO
- 272. Tom Salemi - YES
- 273. David Frick – ABSENT
- 274. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 275. Motion passed 5-1