RECEIVED
By City Clerk at 11:00 am, Oct 16, 2026

1. Amesbury Planning Board Meeting Minutes

2. In Person Meeting – May 11, 2026, at 7:04 PM

3. Chairman Pascal Rettig called the May 11, 2026, 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. Tracey Chalifour – YES
10. Tom Salemi - YES
11. David Frick – YES
12. Pascal Rettig – YES

13. Also: Nipun Jain (Planning Director) and Becky Frey (Community Development Coordinator)

14. **Minutes 3-2-26**
15. Tracey Chalifour motioned to approve the minutes from the 3-2-2026 Planning Board Meeting. Seconded by Tom Salemi.
16. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote–
17. Keith Ratner – YES
18. Joel Nice – YES
19. Tracey Chalifour – YES
20. Tom Salemi - YES
21. David Frick – YES
22. Pascal Rettig – YES
23. Motion passed 6-0

24. **Signs – 80 Main Street Barn Moth**
25. Nipun Jain commented that the Design Review Committee recommended that the Planning Board approve the sign as submitted.
26. David Frick motioned to approve the sign for Barn Moth at 80 Main Street as submitted. Seconded by Joel Nice.
27. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote–

28. Keith Ratner – YES
29. Joel Nice – YES
30. Tracey Chalifour – YES
31. Tom Salemi - YES
32. David Frick – YES
33. Pascal Rettig – YES
34. Motion passed 6-0

35. **Signs – 2 Merrimac St. - Marker 34**
36. Nipun Jain commented that this needed to go back to the Design Review Committee and would come back at a future meeting.

37. **Continued Hearings – 9 Oakland St.**
38. David Frick motioned to continue the application to the June 8, 2026, Planning Board Meeting. Seconded by Joel Nice.
39. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote–
40. Keith Ratner – YES
41. Joel Nice – YES
42. Tracey Chalifour – YES
43. Tom Salemi - YES
44. David Frick – YES
45. Pascal Rettig – YES
46. Motion passed 6-0

47. **Continued Hearings – Rocky Hill Development**
48. Keith Ratner motioned to continue the application to the June 8, 2026, Planning Board Meeting. Seconded by Joel Nice.
49. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote–
50. Keith Ratner – YES
51. Joel Nice – YES
52. Tracey Chalifour – YES
53. Tom Salemi - YES
54. David Frick – YES
55. Pascal Rettig – YES
56. Motion passed 6-0

57. **Continued Hearings – 29 Lake Attitash Road**
58. Keith Ratner motioned to continue the application to the June 8, 2026, Planning Board Meeting. Seconded by Tom Salemi.
59. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote–
60. Keith Ratner – YES
61. Joel Nice – YES
62. Tracey Chalifour – YES
63. Tom Salemi - YES

64. David Frick – YES
65. Pascal Rettig – YES
66. Motion passed 6-0

67. **New Hearings – 30 Lake Attitash Road**
68. Becky Frey read the legal notice into the record.
69. Kelly Rooney commented that they were proposing to add a 1,000 sf addition. The foundation will be on pilings and there are no appreciable grade changes.
70. Pascal Retting commented that this was here because the house is in the Water Resource Protection District. There are significant standards that an application needs to comply with. They may need an engineer to look at this because a number of things are required with the impervious surface created and the infiltration.
71. Nipun Jain commented that typically with projects like these the Board has retained an engineer to look at calculations especially when the proposal is also subject to the Conservation Commission. It would make it more efficient to have the Planning Board perform those peer reviews because the Conservation Commission can also use that information as well.
72. Tracey Chalifour questioned if they would be relandscaping any of the parcel. Kelly Rooney confirmed they would install shrubbery or greenery that will work with the land and lake. Tracey Chalifour questioned if there would be any tree cutting. Kelly Rooney responded she did not think so. They kept that in mind when coming up with the plan.
73. Tom Salemi commented there was a porch on the house and questioned if they were building beyond the footprint of the home. Kelly Rooney responded they were not building closer to the lake. The addition will be going to the side. Nipun Jain added that the addition is proposed to be 26’ by 16’ and would be added to the right of the house.
74. Pascal Rettig opened public hearing. No one spoke.
75. Tom Salemi motioned to authorize peer review for the application at 30 Lake Attitash Road. Seconded by Keith Ratner.
76. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote–
77. Keith Ratner – YES
78. Joel Nice – YES
79. Tracey Chalifour – YES
80. Tom Salemi - YES
81. David Frick – YES
82. Pascal Rettig – YES
83. Motion passed 6-0

84. David Frick motioned to continue the application for 30 Lake Attitash Road to the June 22, 2026, Planning Board Meeting. Seconded by Tom Salemi.
85. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote–
86. Keith Ratner – YES
87. Joel Nice – YES
88. Tracey Chalifour – YES
89. Tom Salemi - YES

90. David Frick – YES
91. Pascal Rettig – YES
92. Motion passed 6-0

93. **New Hearings – 28 Haverhill Road**
94. Nipun Jain read the legal notice into the record.
95. Matt Leidner, Civil Design Group; Essek Petrie from Pulte Homes and Robert Michaud, MDM Transportation were present to speak to the application.
96. Essek Petrie commented he was from Pulte Homes New England, which is a wholly owned entity of Pulte Group. They are completely self-funded, so they are not dependent on funding. They have been building in New England since the 1990s. We have been to TRC and did a pre-application meeting in March. We filed an NOI with the Conservation Commission and received the ORAD from the Conservation Commission confirming the resources on the site. We met with the Fire Chief and DPW; both water and sewer departments were present.
97. Matt Leidner commented this is a 13-acre site that fronts on Haverhill Rd. and is next to Amesbury Heights. The existing conditions has a single-family home on the site close to Haverhill Rd. and an old, overgrown orchard area. Everything to the south of that is wooded, and there are wetlands on the site as well. There is a perennial stream, BVW, and it is in the floodplain. Due to these constraints, they cannot develop in the central or southern part of the site. The proposal is for two 63-unit buildings. They will be five stories over subsurface parking. They will all be for-sale condos, a mix of one- and two-bedroom units. Twenty-five units will be designated as affordable. We are proposing driveways on Haverhill Rd. and Route 150, which is MassDOT jurisdiction. They are both being proposed as full access. The project is proposing 216 parking spaces, of which 112 are surface spaces and 104 are in the garages. A total of 44 spaces will be EV spaces. The garages in the buildings will have bike racks, and there will be exterior bike racks as well. There is a proposed onsite amenity area that has been expanded to 1,000 sf. There is a grilling area, pergola, and seating area. The landscape plan is included. Based on pre-application feedback, we evaluated the existing trees along Haverhill Rd and identified one 3 inch oak tree worthy of protecting. That area will be supplemented with shade trees and there will be evergreens around the buildings. 3.5 acres is what is available for development, and that's what we are proposing. The remaining 10 acres will not be developed. We have worked with planning staff to map out 10-acre open space. There will be a small parking area off Haverhill Road. There will be a walkway to the south for a neighborhood park. It is an existing cleared area. In recent years, it started to become overgrown, so we are proposing to clean the area up and put in some picnic benches. From there, further south, they are proposing a trail that would lead to the southern boundary of the site. We will build a trail to connect to an existing trail that crosses the wetlands. It will connect to an existing trail offsite. Along that trail, south of the proposed development, we are proposing a pollinator meadow. There is a substantial grade change from Haverhill Road down to the southern edge of the development. We worked with planning staff to come up with a layout that works with that grade change. The under-access locations for the garages are on the southern side of the buildings. The stormwater will be managed by way of development

techniques and structural best management practices. Almost half the parking is under the buildings, so this eliminates an acre of impervious area, and water off the buildings is clean water. We are proposing to collect the stormwater off impervious areas, treat it, and infiltrate it. There are two proposed stormwater infiltration systems. We will treat and infiltrate up to the 100-year stormwater event. There is not a lot of runoff going off this site. The rate of runoff and volume will be mitigated. For utilities, there's an existing 12-inch water main; we are proposing to tie into that. There will be 6-inch domestic service and fire service. We cannot get sewer to go to Haverhill Rd. with gravity, so we will put in an onsite sewer pump station. It will pump up to a proposed manhole. We met with DPW last week and went through this plan. They did not have any comments that required changes to the plan and are satisfied with the proposal. We met with Chief Serino, and he had no comments.

98. Essek Petrie commented that the main lobby entrances will face each other on the buildings. The garage entrances are at the back of the buildings. They will be homeownership units, and the units will be a mix of 1- and 2-bedroom units. The garages will be accessed with a FOB or sticker. There will be a garage-level elevator to the lobby. There will be a trash room and secondary means of egress as well. There are ground-floor entrances. The main entrance will have a lobby with a mail area. The second and third floors are identical. There will be 13 units per floor. The fourth and fifth floors are the same, with 12 units each. There will be a mix of 1- and 2-bedroom units. The buildings mirror each other and will have external balconies. The roof level is not occupiable; it would be accessed via a roof hatch. There will be an elevator override and unit condensers on the roof. The architecture is similar to the pre-application. The process started with a very different look; then we met with city staff and looked at the Rocky Hill design guidelines. That has morphed this into a better project. The projected balconies and box bays create shading. There are clear building entries, pedestrian paths, and buffers. The goal along Haverhill Road is to preserve the oak tree and provide more of a vegetative buffer. There will be a split-rail fence and two stone piers.
99. Robert Michaud commented that he would provide a general overview of the traffic impact. They want to make sure to design access to minimize dependence on the signal at Haverhill Rd. We have had conversations with MassDOT about the driveways. Any access approval will be through them. At this point in the planning process, there are two proposed full-access driveways. In the case of Route 150/Hillside, the input to date is that MassDOT may be looking to restrict the left-turn movement. That is not an important movement for the site. But right now, they are assuming full access. MassDOT will be informed by this Board and the Department Heads. The traffic study looks at the nearby signal at Hoyt Ave. and two additional locations, Jacqueline Dr. and Merrill Ave. The proposed driveway is between Merrill Ave. and Jacqueline Dr. The volume metrics and baseline were documented in March. We documented the travel speed and volume at the intersections. Those speeds dictate sightlines, and in both cases, there is clear, unobstructed visibility for the driveways. Despite the posted 45 mph speed, the higher 85th percentile is 38 mph or lower. They are not high-speed roadways. The volume carries 12–14K cars per day. The peak-hour periods are the basis for how traffic may change with the project. The key summary point is to estimate how much traffic is being added. This development will not be a high traffic

generator. It will add one vehicle per minute. At the peak they expect between 30–35 vehicles coming in at the evening or leaving in the morning. That is one vehicle every two minutes. The site is pretty well distributed east and south of the project. All locations operate below capacity and will continue to with this project. MassDOT would be involved in this process as well. They are estimating net traffic based on ITE data. When applied to the number of units there are fewer than 60 vehicles per hour. Fewer than 20 vehicles are expected to be generated in any direction. From an operational perspective, they prepared a level-of-service analysis trying to navigate the intersection. At the signal and any other location, it is operating at D or better, which is acceptable. That is not changing as a result of this project. Folks traveling north and going west can use the unsignalized ramp system for that movement. Ideally, we would like a full-access driveway at Route 150, which would provide direct access to I-495. That movement would result in 14 vehicles per hour in the evening.

100. David Frick commented he would support them in having a left-hand turn off of Route 150 into the site. It makes sense. Would you want a left-hand turn lane?
101. Robert Michaud responded the movement would not justify a separate lane. People should not be delayed with that turn.
102. David Frick questioned how much distance there was from the Route 110 signal to the driveway and asked if traffic would back up to the driveway. Robert Michaud responded it was not that close. There would not be an impact to the driveway.
103. David Frick questioned if there would be a left lane like there is for Amesbury Heights?
104. Robert Michaud responded that a dedicated turn lane was typically built for a volume of 50 or so per hour. This is not close to that. It's 8 per hour at the peak.
105. David Frick questioned what the eastbound traffic count was. Robert Michaud responded it was about 600 vehicles per hour, 571 vehicles travel eastbound on Route 110, and 8–20 of those vehicles would be making a turn against that flow. There would be no meaningful delay for that turn.
106. Tom Salemi clarified there were no restrictions on the cars exiting the project onto Route 150. Robert Michaud confirmed that was how it was currently planned, they are allowing for turning both ways. Any movement that would potentially be restricted would be the left-turn exiting movement. It is a very low demand, and there is availability to turn right on Haverhill Rd.
107. Keith Ratner noted they were providing 1.71 parking spaces and was curious why they felt that was necessary. Robert Michaud responded the firm has done a lot of surveys and knows the industry standards. The maximum parking demand per unit is 1.43 or 1.46. They don't want to design exactly to that number; they need some reserve. The sweet spot is 1.65 to 1.75. Keith Ratner commented he was ok to reduce the parking count if needed. Keith Ratner clarified that people can get in both entry ways. Essek Petrie confirmed that was correct.
108. Joel Nice noted some of the proposed spaces were tandem parking, so 1 unit, would get 2 spots.
109. Pascal Rettig questioned if the number presented included those tandem spots. Essek Petrie responded there were 12 tandem spots. The number also meets zoning.

110. David Frick commented they were building for homeownership and questioned if there was a difference between owner and rental for parking. Essek Petrie responded that they need more parking for ownership than rental. There are a lot of other variables in that, too.
111. Tom Salemi questioned how parking would be managed. Essek Petrie responded that the garage spaces will be purchased.
112. Joel Nice questioned if the traffic calming tables were to discourage cut-through. Essek Petrie confirmed that was correct.
113. Tracey Chalifour commented she biked a lot and was in that area of town twice a day. It is interesting how they characterized the queuing going east toward the light at Route 150 and Route 110. She often sees cars backed up there. The counts were done in March and they are only worse in the summer. It is understood you can't build to one season. She has almost been hit and was concerned about the queueing and the way the road banks and curves there. People are at their peak speeding in that area. She was concerned about the cars turning into the development on Route 110 because she was anticipating no slowdown to get into the entryway. These potential issues may not be fully fleshed out.
114. Essek Petrie commented this was a residential use, not commercial. There will be a regular repeated access way which will help with that. Robert Michaud added these were the things MassDOT looks at with the access permit process. The driveway design inherits the same conditions as the roads nearby. DOT will look at it and may introduce a taper for the driveway if they want to. It is up to DOT.
115. Pascal Rettig commented that it didn't look like the level of service would be impacted. People do drive too fast in that area. Has there been any traffic-calming discussion for Route 110? Robert Michaud responded they have done a speed radar count on Haverhill Rd and 150. The speed results show the average mean speeds are between 33–34 mph. The 85th percentile speed is 36–37 mph. It is not much different from the regulatory speed limit. If it was higher, DOT would consider driver feedback signs. There is not a strong warrant for that, but it could be discussed with DOT.
116. Pascal Rettig questioned if there was clear visibility coming into the parking lot for cars to see that cars parked in the corner. Robert Michaud responded that the driveway design and landscaping will provide clear visibility for cars coming in. The curb radii is fairly restricted so the turn speed would be roughly 10–15 mph. Cars would have time to react there is 50–75 feet from the curb line on Haverhill Rd to the first parking space.
117. David Frick questioned if there was a taper turn at Amesbury Heights. Robert Michaud responded he would need to look at it. Tapers are uncommon.
118. Keith Ratner commented he was shocked to see the speed on Route 150 is 45 mph and questioned if they could bring that down. Robert Michaud responded that the 45 mph speed limit sign starts at the driveway ramp; it is not that far away. The speed study shows people are not going that fast. Mass DOT's reservation about a full access driveway is the posted speed limit.
119. Nipun Jain commented on a couple of observations. This will require a MassDOT access permit because of the changes to the entrance at Route 110 and the new driveway. The city's objective is to slow the speeds of existing traffic and introduce those elements on Route 150. They should increase pedestrian sections and connect pedestrian access from I-495 to Routes 150/110. This would allow for accessibility to install the driveway in a safer

manner. Building in traffic calming would have a more beneficial impact if MassDOT considers the driveway. Robert Michaud added they could look at traffic signal adjustments as well. It works pretty efficiently today.

120. Nipun Jain commented that the northbound traffic backs up to the 495 ramps around 3:30-4:30 pm, which does not make sense. On Route 110, the sun angles in winter are almost blinding. They should use a seasonal adjustment for speed and traffic counts, especially around Jacqueline Drive, and accounting for that curve. Introducing bike lanes in the corridor may help to slow traffic. It may not change what we have now, but make sure to take it into account to make sure it is safe. Robert Michaud commented that they focus on typical peak hours but also account for other times like school dismissal time to identify if it is appropriate to adjust signal phasing. Nipun Jain commented that he would recommend peer review on traffic.

121. Tracey Chalifour commented that if there was a driveway there, it may make sense to bake in a crosswalk with a signal light. Robert Michaud commented that he was anticipating at a future point there will be a sidewalk and system on the roadway. The driveway design anticipates that future connection.

122. Tracey Chalifour commented that a safer, pedestrian- and bike-friendly connection to Amesbury Heights would be good. Nipun Jain commented there may be a need for flashing beacon because of that connection. Robert Michaud responded there was a desire to connect to the park as well. They were all about pedestrian accommodation.

123. Tom Salemi questioned which one will be the main driveway. Robert Michaud responded both will feel like primary driveways. Tom Salemi questioned if one entrance would be designated for deliveries. Essek Petrie responded they will be treated the same from a site-plan perspective.

124. Tom Salemi commented that the private/public space by the parking lot seems like an odd location. The two designated areas are appreciated, but it still feels like an afterthought. Maybe it should be a little more programmed. Essek Petrie commented that building 2 is further away; there will be a lot of screening around it. It will be a well-used amenity space. There will be signage to designate it private. Tom Salemi commented that the parking should be identified and they should put in more landscaping. It seems like in this rendering this space is more what's leftover and they are turning it into a public space. It is not a robust public space. Essek Petrie commented that they were not trying to create a large gathering space. The goal of that was to create a trail-system amenity. The public space will be pretty well used.

125. Tracey Chalifour questioned if there was going to be any consideration of mimicking that space for the corner of Building 2. Tracey Chalifour was also concerned about that gravel parking lot near that amenity space. There is a banked curb there. Tracey Chalifour was concerned about the safety of that in proximity to the grilling area. There is a proposed fence there, but it seems a little unsafe. Pascal Rettig commented that they did go over the sightlines and speed there. Tracey Chalifour commented that there should be similar amenities for Building 2 and she had safety concerns about the parking adjacent to amenities in this area.

126. Essek Petrie commented that the size of the amenity space, from our experience, is proportional to units proposed. There is a balance between putting in an amenity space

that may be oversized for the community. They have similar-sized communities in other locations and found this is a good balance for space.

127. Nipun Jain commented that they have shown that area as an outdoor amenity space for residents of the development. How it is configured and designed will be fleshed out. They could still change the orientation or have more definition to it. How the space is laid out and designed differs from what is there. Essek Petrie responded that the general idea follows a design pattern used in other spaces that has been successful. Nipun Jain commented this would be looked at with the Design Review Committee.
128. Keith Ratner questioned who would maintain the park and pollinator garden. Essek Petrie responded that they would be coordinating with the city, but it will be deeded to the city. Nipun Jain commented they were working on that component and was including the environmental jurisdictional area.
129. Pascal Rettig commented that the buildings are 51 feet back from the road and questioned anything that could be done to minimize the impact of the size of the buildings on the road is beneficial. If there is a waiver required, then the Board will need to know that. Nipun Jain commented that in this subdistrict, for multifamily, it's a minimum of 20 units per acre of developable area. That is what will drive the number of allowed units. From there, you can go up if you wish to make that request via waiver; the maximum is 150.
130. Essek Petrie commented that they did request a Section 7.1 waiver for the density. Nipun Jain commented that they will need to look at that request and it depends on further refinement of the riverfront area. Pascal Rettig commented that he was mostly comfortable with the higher density, but they should also be finding a way to accommodate the neighborhood context. They could look at adding a step to the building. This is a much better development than an office park. It is a lower impact on the neighborhood. That being said, it does feel like it will be a sizeable building. The Board needs to understand what is developable by right. Essek Petrie confirmed he understood.
131. Tracey Chalifour commented that she would like to see a shadow analysis for the neighborhood. Essek Petrie confirmed they could provide that.
132. Joel Nice commented that the scale of the buildings on Route 110 is huge, and it may benefit from more treatment on those facing the street. What will the affordability look like for this development? Essek Petrie responded that there is an affordability requirement; it will be 25 units. Nipun Jain commented that the affordability is 80% of the AMI. They have to follow certain standards prescribed by the state.
133. Joel Nice questioned if there would be a wetland crossing. Essek Petrie responded there is an existing crossing on the wetland. Matt Liedner added it's an earthen crossing with a culvert beneath. Joel Nice questioned if the condensers would be inside the building. Essek Petrie responded that they would be on the roof and screened by parapets. Nipun Jain commented that they have not seen a cross-section of that.
134. Tracey Chalifour requested more detail on the proposed trail. Matt Liedner responded that the section of the walkway from the public parking to and through the neighborhood park is proposed to be 5 feet wide and accessible. The trail from the park onward will be more rustic. They will clean up the existing trail and make it 4 feet wide with a 3-inch layer of clean woodchips on that trail.

135. Nipun Jain questioned if it connected to 150. Matt Liedner responded that the public trail does not. The internal sidewalk could connect to 150.
136. Tracey Chalifour commented that they discussed the trash management in the preapplication, and the method would be to roll out dumpsters. Nipun Jain commented that the recycling will be outside the buildings and the trash inside and will be wheeled out. Essek Petrie added the floors will have trash chutes. Tracey Chalifour questioned what the plan was for snow storage. Matt Liedner responded that the site plan shows the snow storage. Snow will be placed in some of the satellite parking spaces. They would still meet zoning requirements with that plan. One of the requirements for snow storage is to place it in an area that drains to stormwater managment, and this plan achieves that.
137. Pascal Rettig opened public comment.
138. Jim Fitzgerald, of 5 Hoyt Ave, commented he has lived there for 37 years. Exiting out to Route 110 can be very difficult especially when trying to turn left. Looking at the design for the public parking, it could cause accidents with Hoyt Ave. The entrance and exit on Route 110 could be an issue. The entrance and exit should be on Route 150. There are no houses there. Hoyt, Merrill, and Jacqueline Drive are dead-end streets. The traffic study was in April and there is a school vacation that month. Summer on Route 110 is horrendous. Adding 120 apartments with over 200 cars will exacerbate that. This is a dangerous area. There is a commercial property with residential units going in on the corner of Route 150 and Route 110. That will cause even more traffic. Mr. Fitzgerald supported the project but recommended only putting in a driveway on Route 150. A driveway on Route 110 will be a problem as an abutter. Mr. Fitzgerald has talked to the chief of police about putting a car on Hoyt Ave. The Chief responded that they don't have enough police.
139. Pascal Rettig questioned if the problem was that people are driving too fast from the east or the west or both. Jim Fitzgerald responded that it's both. Hoyt Ave. is at the bottom of the hill and there is a curve, so it's already hard to exit. If you could put the entrance and exit on Route 150, then there will be no issues. The public parking lot should be put somewhere else.
140. Joe Kubik of 3 Hoyt Ave. requested clarification on the retaining wall at the southernmost portion of the park from the corner of the wall to the pollinator garden. Is that a 23-foot wall? Matt Leidner responded that they were working with site grade change as much as they could. At its maximum it is about 23 feet and tapers out to nothing. Joe Kubik commented that the pollinator meadow was sandwiched between the wall and existing trees. It would be managed by the town. Given that this is a passive space, he saw that disappearing over time. He would like to hear more about it as it progresses. The existing tree is near a substantial slope, and they are filling about 4 feet of that area. That fill will go over roots. Not sure it's realistic. Last bit is more the public amenity space goes to—right now there's no pet area. No other adjacent park given that it's in a buffer, and reality is because it's even though technically green space it ends up being impervious space. What does that space look like? Would it be better to leave undisturbed given it's in the stream buffer? Allow runoff going into the pond. Adding more runoff to a system that can't handle this.
141. Chuck Walker commented that his family just moved to 5 Merrill Ave. He just found out about the buildings across the street. They will lose trees and privacy with this

development. He was here to find more information on the project. He drives his 7-year-old daughter to school every day. It is hard to get out of the street. He has to look both ways and become patient. This will add extra traffic. People speed coming around that curb, anyone coming off the side streets needs to hit the gas to make the turns. This proposal will be adding two more access points on that road. They will have to contend with more people. He would support the road off Route 150. He had a couple quick questions: how high are the buildings going to be?

142. Pascal Rettig responded they were proposed to be 50–55 feet.
143. Chuck Walker questioned what the projected timeline of the project was.
144. Essek Petrie responded this was the first meeting with Planning Board and they just had their first Conservation Commission meeting. The review will take a few meetings each. They anticipate 6–8 months of permitting. Our goal would be to start construction as soon as we have permits and be ready to begin the spring of 2027. That is a fair guesstimate. The construction timeline will probably take 11 months for each building. It will be a 2-year construction period. They usually build one building at a time.
145. Chuck Walker questioned if the condenser units on top of the buildings would produce any audible sounds or risk.
146. Essek Petrie responded they would not. The buildings will be all electric. The noise studies show there would be very minimal noise. They have not had any complaints from homeowners in the building.
147. Keith Ratner motioned to continue the meeting to 10 p.m. Seconded by Tom Salemi.
148. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote –
149. Keith Ratner – YES
150. Joel Nice – YES
151. Tracey Chalifour – YES
152. Tom Salemi - YES
153. David Frick – YES
154. Pascal Rettig – YES
155. Motion passed 6-0
156. Chuck Walker questioned what type of financial impact this would have on the surrounding real estate. Essek Petrie responded that was not his expertise.
157. Becky Frey read public comment from Craig Cipolla that is attached to the end of these minutes.
158. David Frick commented that the applicants did a traffic study. The Board will be hiring a traffic engineer to study their study to make sure it makes sense.
159. Joel Nice commented that if he lived at this property, he would not use the Route 110 driveway. Robert Michaud confirmed Route 150 will be used at a higher level and Route 110 would principally be a right-turn movement. He did not anticipate a left-hand turn there. They will be refining their study based on the MassDOT discussion.
160. Nipun Jain commented that staff recommended the Board retain services for peer review and make sure they are covering areas that need to be reviewed. Typically they review civil engineering and stormwater, zoning compliance, traffic, and environmental review. The Conservation Commission authorized an environmental peer review. The Board

can coordinate with the Commission to not duplicate efforts. If that's the pleasure of the Board, staff will seek out peer review and have the Board formally vote on it.

161. Keith Ratner motioned to request staff gather quotes for peer review for engineering, traffic, stormwater, utility, and environmental. Seconded by David Frick.
162. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote–
163. Keith Ratner – YES
164. Joel Nice – YES
165. Tracey Chalifour – YES
166. Tom Salemi - YES
167. David Frick – YES
168. Pascal Rettig – YES
169. Motion passed 6-0

170. Keith Ratner motioned to continue the application for 28 Haverhill Road to the June 8th Planning Board meeting. Seconded by Tom Salemi.
171. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote–
172. Keith Ratner – YES
173. Joel Nice – YES
174. Tracey Chalifour – YES
175. Tom Salemi - YES
176. David Frick – YES
177. Pascal Rettig – YES
178. Motion passed 6-0
179.
180. **Admin - 77 Elm St.**
181. Nipun Jain commented that they need to close out outstanding issues. They are currently trying to close out the parking lot issue. There was an issue because there was no oversight of the construction at that time with the stormwater management. In 2023 Stantec did a review of the site. They are assessing what landscaping can be done, clean up Fruit Place, and formalize the public easement. There were Conservation Commission issues as well.

182. **Admin – 101-107 Market St.**
183. Nipun Jain commented that the Board is currently holding an erosion bond for 101-107 Market St. The applicant has provided an almost finished as built. They are asking the Board to consider converting the erosion control bond into a performance bond and then the applicant will prepare the documents needed for the Board to endorse. The site is in operation and the Conservation Commission has issued a partial CoC. The final pavement, fires safety, and guardrails are complete. The outstanding items are mostly landscape and the final as built.
184. David Frick motioned to convert the erosion control bond into a performance bond for 101-107 Market St. Seconded by Keith Ratner.
185. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote –
186. Keith Ratner – YES

187. Joel Nice – YES
188. Tracey Chalifour – YES
189. Tom Salemi - YES
190. David Frick – YES
191. Pascal Rettig – YES
192. Motion passed 6-0

193. **Admin – 9 Alenclair Bond and Covenant**
194. Nipun Jain commented that they did get the final documentation and it is being reviewed and endorsed. Staff recommends the Board move to approve the covenant and the erosion control bond in the amount of $11,078 for 9 Alenclair Dr.
195. David Frick motioned to approve the covenant and the erosion control bond in the amount of $11,078 for 9 Alenclair Dr. Seconded by Joel Nice.
196. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote –
197. Keith Ratner – YES
198. Joel Nice – YES
199. Tracey Chalifour – YES
200. Tom Salemi - YES
201. David Frick – YES
202. Pascal Rettig – YES
203. Motion passed 6-0
204.
205. Keith Ratner motioned to add a condition that the covenant would not be released until the landscape is complete or a landscape bond is in place. Seconded by Joel Nice.
206. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote –
207. Keith Ratner – YES
208. Joel Nice – YES
209. Tracey Chalifour – YES
210. Tom Salemi - YES
211. David Frick – YES
212. Pascal Rettig – YES
213. Motion passed 6-0
214.
215. **Admin – 2 Merrimac St.**
216. Nipun Jain commented that they don't have anything yet, but will come up with a list of outstanding items to establish a performance bond.

217. **Adjournment**
218. David Frick motioned to adjourn the meeting at 9:48 pm. Seconded by Keith Ratner.
219. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote –
220. Keith Ratner – YES
221. Joel Nice – YES
222. Tracey Chalifour – YES
223. Tom Salemi - YES

224. David Frick – YES
225. Pascal Rettig – YES
226. Motion passed 6-0

Public Comment – 28 Haverhill Road – Craig Cipolla

I live at 13 Merrill Ave. My question is about traffic mitigation. The new units at 28 Haverhill Road will include parking for more than 100 cars. What will the town or developer do to mitigate the traffic congestion? At certain times of the day it now takes me 5-10 minutes to make a left out of Merrill Ave onto Haverhill Road due to traffic. This issue will only get worse with 100+ cars added to our area. I understand that there are two entrances to the planned development, but one of them is directly across the street from my road, not to mention Jaqueline Dr. and Hoyt Ave.

Beyond traffic congestion, the area is already dangerous for residents who have to turn out onto Haverhill Road. Again, this will only get worse with 100+ cars added to the neighborhood.

Has the town or the developer already done a traffic study? If not, this should be done before plans move forward.

Thanks for your time. Take care, Craig Cipolla