



Amesbury Technical Review Committee
March 19, 2026

City Hall Auditorium
62 Friend St.
9:30 am

In Attendance:, Chief Bailey, Nick Cracknell, Howard Snyder, Nipun Jain, Amanda
Armington, Jim Wilson, Joe Neipp, Chief Serino, Bill Zentz, and Becky Frey

Absent: Lauren Blatchford, Joe Buckley

Outdoor Dining Applications:

1. Barking Dog – 18 Friend Street

Becky Frey commented that the applicant was not present. The application is exactly the same as last year. They are proposing four picnic tables along the side of the building. This will leave space on the sidewalk for pedestrians and we will not need to set up the jersey barriers at that parking lot entrance.

Chief Serino motioned to send a recommendation of approval to the Mayor for the outdoor dining application for Barking Dog at 18 Friend Street as presented. Seconded by Nick Cracknell. The motion passed unanimously.

2. Silvaticus Brewery – 9 Water Street

Jay Bullen commented that this was the same application they have put in the last 5 years. They will be taking up the 2 parking spots in front of the brewery and the space in front of the driveway entrance. They will reserve space for food trucks as needed.

Chief Serino motioned to send a recommendation of approval to the Mayor for the outdoor dining application for Silvaticus Brewery at 9 Water Street as presented. Seconded by Nick Cracknell. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Market Square Bakehouse 5 Market Square

Theo Dewez commented this was the same application as last year. They will be taking the lower patio area for 4-5 tables with a perimeter barrier. There will be a no alcohol beyond perimeter sign.

Chief Serino motioned to send a recommendation of approval to the Mayor for the outdoor dining application for Market Square Bakehouse at 5 Market Square as presented. Seconded by Nick Cracknell. The motion passed unanimously.

Application Review:

1. 27 Kimball Road – Comprehensive Permit



Amesbury Technical Review Committee

March 19, 2026

City Hall Auditorium

62 Friend St.

9:30 am

Nick Cracknell commented that on December 17, 2025, the TRC held a public meeting to discuss the project as part of the site eligibility process. The TRC is made up of all city employees and it serves as an advisory function to the Planning Board and for 40B's at the Zoning Board of Appeals. In a 40B application, local zoning doesn't apply. It is a one-stop process from the state that goes to the Zoning Board of Appeals, which acts as the permitting authority for all permits. The application has been filed formally at the city level. The public hearing was opened on March 5th at the Zoning Board of Appeals. A presentation was made by the applicant. The ZBA identified potential areas for third-party review and instructed staff to identify consultants who would be hired by the ZBA to review parts of the application. Another item discussed on the 5th was that they would distribute plans to a variety of city departments and land use boards and commissions for advisory comments. That is why the TRC is looking at this. This meeting is being recorded so other boards and residents can watch it. The TRC's role is to identify issues of concern, like we did in December. We need to drill down further now because it has been formally filed. The intent is to provide useful, helpful comments on how to address issues of concern. Peer review will also do that. The TRC standards for review are largely horizontal, focusing on site plan review performance standards. This is slightly different because it's a 40B. The ZBA is the only board that has any authority to direct the shape of the project. Everyone is providing input to that board, just like citizens of the community. Despite the neighborhood, the community, and many of us not being excited about the project given the urban context in a rural site, under the 40B state statute there is very little ability to deny a project like this. We do have the ability to shape the project. The sooner all of us focus on the fact that it is likely going to happen, the better we can shape the project. If denied, the HAC would overturn the appeal. The Vynorious property went to HAC and Amesbury did not win on appeal. It was never built, mostly due to luck. We need to focus on shaping the project. There is a 180-day timeline to close the public hearing. Sometimes it goes longer if the applicant agrees.

Amanda Armington noted that a portion of the site has BVW state-regulated wetlands. The Conservation Commission will be reviewing that as a separate Notice of Intent. Nick Cracknell commented that was important to point out. The applicant has to comply with state regulations, not local regulations.

Nick Cracknell commented that it would be helpful for the ZBA to be the central repository for comments. People can contact the applicant as well.

Andrew Mackin commented that they presented this project to the TRC in December. The design has advanced from an engineering perspective, and many aspects of the design will be peer-reviewed. We will dive deeper into site design, the stormwater



Amesbury Technical Review Committee
March 19, 2026

City Hall Auditorium
62 Friend St.
9:30 am

approach, and how it will be managed. We will also cover circulation and access to the site. Bob Michaud from MDM is present to speak as well as well as Civil Engineer, Chris Broyles, from Allen and Majors. Kephart will present the architecture plan and Copley and Wolff will present the landscape plan to the ZBA on April 9th. The project is a 40B; we have been discussing this with the town since the summer and received a project eligibility letter from the state in January. They have now filed locally. The proposal is a unique product type. It is a 95-unit build-to-rent cottage community that will look and feel like single-family homes, with 1–2 story buildings. Some are detached cottages like a single-family home, and some are paired homes. The attached units will be joined back-to-back. All utilities are accessed from Kimball Road. There will be onsite management and maintenance, coordinating trash pickup, snow removal, landscaping, maintenance, and renter repairs. Access will be off Kimball Road. To the west of the site is Claire Road. There is a BVW along that western edge that is being delineated with the Conservation Commission now. The project is close to abutters on the east of the site; we are aware of that and are working on setbacks and screening. The one- and two-bedroom paired configurations will each have their own front porch and fenced-in yard, with a small patio area. Because they are joined at the rear, it doesn't feel like a duplex. The site has a circular road that opens to the center of the development. There will be a 240-foot-long, 65-foot-wide open space as well as paseos between homes that will create a community feel. In total, there are six different unit types configured in one- to two-story arrangements. This allows different unit combinations that will create roofline and architectural diversity. It will also appeal to a variety of renters. All unit types have a primary bedroom on the first floor. This will appeal broadly, but especially to an aging demographic looking to downsize. The development will offer a maintenance-free lifestyle while maintaining a single-family home feel. This is not a 3–4 story apartment building going into a residential neighborhood. From a height perspective, it blends nicely with the surrounding neighborhood. The front porches face each other along the paseos, providing private yet connected spaces. As you enter the development off Kimball Road, there is a slight grade change. The slope will gradually increase, and the development will be terraced to accommodate the grade change.

Chris Broyles, civil engineer, from Allen & Majors, discussed the stormwater and utilities. Overall, the project has been designed to comply with the stormwater standards for MA DEP for a new development. It does not have to meet the local stormwater bylaw, but they are meeting it as a form of best practice. The site is in the Water Resource Protection District and is complying with those stormwater requirements as well. The project is currently in the middle of an ANRAD review with the Conservation Commission. They also plan to file a Notice of Intent for the BVW with the Conservation Commission. The stormwater report was prepared as part of the ZBA submission. The



Amesbury Technical Review Committee

March 19, 2026

City Hall Auditorium

62 Friend St.

9:30 am

existing conditions show that water flows to Kimball Road for one part of the site and down toward the abutting wetland for another. There is also an isolated wetland on the property. Currently, runoff is uncontrolled and flows down the hillside. The proposal includes a number of best management practices to capture, treat, and discharge stormwater in a controlled manner. This will be an improvement over the existing conditions. The same watershed drains to Kimball Road. Water will be captured in catch basins and directed to water quality units and infiltration chambers to provide treatment and recharge. Then it would be slowly released to another infiltration system. An emergency spillway is included in the basin but is not utilized during the 100-year storm. The design meets the increased NOAA rain intensities. Discharge will go into a closed drainage system to Kimball Road. The stormwater flowing toward the BVW will follow a similar series of systems and discharge to the south in a controlled manner that reduces velocity and erosion. Soil testing was conducted on site to classify soil texture and determine infiltration rates. A closer look at the stormwater system shows catch basins throughout the site capturing flow and underground chambers controlling flow and discharge. The basin will connect to Kimball Road. It is worth noting that for local stormwater conservation regulations, there is a 25–50 foot no-disturb setback. The state has a 100-foot buffer zone. The project is providing a 50-foot buffer to the buildings. While not required, maintaining this separation is important. Water will be serviced by a 12-inch line on Kimball Road. A flow test was completed last fall, and results showed adequate pressure to meet development demand. Water will be looped around the site, with three hydrants proposed. Each building will have its own service line. Sewer currently extends only as far as 15 Kimball Road, so the line will be extended via a forced main. A gravity sewer line from each building will connect to a holding tank sized for 48-hour storage. It then goes through a pump chamber and forced main down to 15 Kimball Road. The project will be 100% electric, with no gas on site. Power will come from a pole on Kimball Road and be distributed underground on site. The transformer location is to be determined.

Bob Michaud from MDM Transportation commented that they are not doing this in a vacuum and welcome department input and peer review. The primary gateway intersection is Route 110 and Kimball Road. The study extended north to Lions Mouth Road and evaluated roadway speeds and crash statistics along that stretch. The study included a detailed evaluation of traffic speeds near the site access. The posted speed limit is 25 mph, while the 85th percentile speed is 31–32 mph. This informs the driveway design to ensure clear visibility. More detail is provided in the traffic report, which exceeds the requirements. From a safety perspective, five years of crash data (2020–2024) were reviewed for intersections and roadway segments. The intersections part of the study are not high-crash locations. While crashes do occur, rates are well



Amesbury Technical Review Committee
March 19, 2026

City Hall Auditorium
62 Friend St.
9:30 am

below average. Most crashes are single-vehicle incidents. There are no trends indicating an immediate need for mitigation. Kimball Road itself had 10 crashes, which is well below average. Most involved single vehicles, often hitting trees. There is no specific section that requires immediate safety counter measures, though some improvements have been suggested. The development's peak hour is expected to generate fewer than 50 vehicle trips. In the morning, about 11 vehicles will enter and 34 exit; in the evening, about 27 will return and 21 will leave. Traffic will primarily distribute toward Route 110, with a smaller portion heading toward Lions Mouth Road. Approximately 60% will travel eastbound and 35% in the opposite direction on Route 110 itself. Kimball Road currently carries about 2,100 vehicles per day. The existing traffic patterns are expected to continue, and the increase from this development will not significantly change traffic characteristics or intersection functionality. At Lions Mouth Road and Route 110, only modest delays are expected. The goal is a Level of Service (LOS) D or better; this project is expected to achieve LOS C or better during morning and evening peaks. The access design meets safety criteria for Kimball Road while allowing proper fire access and circulation. The driveway will have a boulevard-style design with a mountable separator, allowing large vehicles to enter and exit. Site analysis shows that ladder trucks and service vehicles can maneuver throughout the property. Safety enhancements are proposed at the intersection of Route 110 and Kimball Road. It is currently not well defined. A utility pole sits in the middle of the intersection, and there are multiple turning paths. The crosswalk is long and could be improved. A conceptual design proposes protecting the pole with a raised island and better defining the intersection. The island would also allow reorientation of the crosswalk and provide a mid-crossing refuge. This improvement would require MassDOT approval but is considered achievable. It would also allow for formal curbing at the intersection. Swept path analysis confirms fire vehicles can navigate the improved layout. Given the higher speeds on Kimball Road, traffic calming measures are recommended. Driver feedback signs have proven effective and can reduce speeds by about 4 mph. These would increase driver awareness and align speeds more closely with the posted limits.

Andrew Mackin concluded the presentation by outlining next steps and opening the floor to questions. On April 9th, the project will be presented to the ZBA. At that meeting, peer review proposals are expected to be received and selected. The project architect and landscape architect will also present. The team has coordinated with town staff and received at least 40 letters from abutters. They welcome the opportunity for a community meeting or forum and plan to hold a public dialogue. While they recognize not everyone will support the project, they hope to find reasonable compromises and address concerns through mitigation.



Amesbury Technical Review Committee

March 19, 2026

City Hall Auditorium

62 Friend St.

9:30 am

Chief Serino commented that he has received a few emails on this and has been in discussion with the developer. The project needs to meet 527 CMR capabilities. There are two general concerns to be aware of. The biggest concerns is traffic and he will review that report. Chief Serino recommended hiring a third-party fire protection engineer to review the proposal. Chief Serino felt the project met the codes as they stand, however, this should be reviewed and signed off by a fire protection engineer. Chief Serino was concerned about accessing buildings 29 and 23, based on the way they are set up. Another concern is fire flow capacity within the project, specifically, the availability of water. He has not yet seen reports confirming this. Given the number of housing units and existing infrastructure, water flow is a concern. There have been periodic water issues on Kimball Road.

William Zents, represented DPW, and noted the Public Works Director would like to schedule an in-person meeting with the developer, along with the city's sewer and water staff, to discuss this development.

Amanda Armington noted that there was an isolated vegetated wetland on the plan and the applicant requested a waiver for that under the local regulations. Amanda Armington questioned if there were plans for replication, mitigation, or restoration for the filled area. Andrew Mackin responded that they are requesting a waiver for that specific fill area. They are open to considering mitigation as part of the project if possible, but at this time are seeking a waiver without replication. Amanda Armington expressed concern about filling the area without replication and the potential for flooding. Chris Broyles responded that he is not concerned about flooding. The isolated vegetated wetland is a low point, so when filled, it will capture stormwater runoff and provide treatment.

Howard Snyder commented that his concerns are primarily horizontal planning issues being addressed by the Planning Department. He has thoughts on buffering for abutters, but will reserve comments until the landscape architect presents. Most observations are being addressed through planning review.

Chief Bailey commented he was looking forward to reviewing the traffic study, which appears comprehensive. He noted Kimball Road is unique, it is narrow and winding. The 85th percentile speed is typically lower than what is perceived. The Police Department has conducted several studies, and while the perception is that cars travel very fast, data tends to align with this traffic study's results. Regarding the driveway, Chief Bailey asked whether sightlines have been considered given the curve. Bob Michaud responded that sightline standards were the first consideration, and they are being exceeded. Any



Amesbury Technical Review Committee

March 19, 2026

City Hall Auditorium

62 Friend St.

9:30 am

features within the sight triangle must remain below three feet. A tree on the left may need to be removed because it interferes with sightline standards. Driver feedback signs can collect data and could be included. This would allow police to gather better data and target enforcement. Chief Bailey responded that he would like that data collection feature included. Pedestrian activity is limited in what can be controlled. People may walk from the site to the town forest, but it is not a safe walking area. Care should be taken in modifying Kimball Road, as its current condition naturally slows traffic. Bob Michaud added that walking may not be advisable. In similar environments, people may walk along the shoulder without incident, though it is not comfortable. Most people will likely drive and park. Shared roadway signage for bicycles could be considered, along with traffic calming features.

Chief Bailey asked about sidewalks from the site to Haverhill Road for access to public transportation. Bob Michaud responded that it is not precluded. If Amesbury wanted that infrastructure, grant programs could support it. There has been success with city partnerships on similar improvements. Chief Bailey agreed it was worth exploring given the proximity to public transportation.

Nick Cracknell stated that he has reviewed the project extensively over the past six months and has identified several areas of concern that have been shared with the applicant. These include the high limit of work, the amount of parking proposed, and increased impervious surface. He is concerned there is not enough open space, and that the open space provided is mostly along edges and may not adequately screen the project from abutters. He also raised concerns about the usability of the paseos, noting that many buildings are only 12 feet apart. While the design is unfamiliar, that does not mean it is necessarily bad, but it needs further evaluation for livability and functionality. He also wants to assess the number of mature trees on site and whether full site clearing is necessary. Some building footprints are quite large, which presents architectural challenges. These issues will be reviewed further at the next ZBA meeting. Technical issues such as traffic and civil engineering will be peer reviewed by outside consultants hired through the ZBA. Both on-site and off-site impacts will be evaluated.

Chief Bailey invited members from the public up to speak.

Rick Brunelle of 6 Kimball Road asked whether Kimball Road was the first choice for site access or if alternatives were considered. He questioned whether this is truly the best location for an entry point. He also asked about the site road width, noting the proposed conditions include parallel and pull-in parking. At the narrowest point, he asked what the distance is between parked cars and whether it meets the requirements for a fire



**Amesbury Technical Review Committee
March 19, 2026**

**City Hall Auditorium
62 Friend St.
9:30 am**

apparatus access. Mr. Brunelle expressed concern about the lack of secondary access, noting that for developments over 30 units, secondary access is strongly recommended. Without it, additional safety mitigation measures may be needed. He also asked whether the internal circulation is one-way or two-way.

Nick Cracknell noted the developer confirmed that the circulation is two-way. Chief Serino added that their ladder truck is the maximum standard vehicle. Based on initial review, the design appears to meet fire code requirements, including a minimum 20-foot width.

Rick Brunelle noted that blockages must be considered. Chief Serino agreed and reiterated that while secondary access is recommended for projects over 30 units, there are provisions under NFPA-1 that may allow alternatives. He emphasized the importance of a fire protection engineer reviewing and certifying that the plan meets all codes. This would be the most effective way to confirm compliance. Chief Serino shared concerns about Buildings 29 and 23 and recommended this review to address them. Rick Brunelle emphasized the need for the community to feel safe and confident that the plan meets code, noting potential liability if it does not. Chief Serino confirmed that the fire protection report would be a public record.

Armand Bisson of 14 Kimball Road commented that while he understood this was a 40B project, the community should still have input. Safety is a major concern. Drawing on his experience as a construction safety consultant, he noted that data alone does not always reflect real-world conditions. He described firsthand experience with Kimball Road, including large trucks using it and difficulty exiting his driveway. He expressed concern about increased pedestrian and bicycle use, stating the road is not suitable for either. He also raised concerns about the Route 110 intersection and sewer infrastructure.

Nick Cracknell responded that community input is welcome and being considered.

Chief Serino acknowledged these concerns, noting that while the perception and data can differ, safety will be addressed to the extent possible within code requirements. Armand Bisson added that he often has to stop traffic just to exit his driveway, reinforcing that the road is not well designed.

Robin Shell of 5 Ashley Drive expressed concern about traffic safety, especially during winter conditions with snowbanks. She asked about long-term road maintenance, especially given increased traffic and construction impacts.



Amesbury Technical Review Committee

March 19, 2026

City Hall Auditorium

62 Friend St.

9:30 am

Pam Gilday, City Councilor, said she would raise additional questions at future meetings, but noted the proposal includes three fire hydrants and emphasized the need to ensure adequate water flow.

Chief Serino responded that all projects undergo fire flow testing as part of the review.

Pam Gilday also raised financial concerns about the long-term maintenance of stormwater infrastructure and whether the city could eventually bear those costs. She also noted concerns about sewer and water capacity.

Bill Zentz responded that was one of the primary reasons the DPW Director is requesting an in-person meeting.

Andrew Mackin stated that safety is a priority for the project team. While Kimball Road is not ideal, the traffic study indicates it can support the development. If an alternative or secondary access becomes available, they are open to that discussion. He noted the driveway width will be 24 feet, supporting two-way traffic. Walking along Kimball Road is discouraged, and the focus is on internal site walkability. Stormwater maintenance plans have been submitted to the ZBA, including an operations and maintenance manual with annual reporting requirements. The system will be privately maintained in perpetuity by the developer. Andrew Mackin agreed that third-party fire and safety review is appropriate and has been done on past projects prior to final design approval.

Chief Bailey closed the application review, thanking everyone for their feedback and participation.

Administrative Review:

1. [19 Prospect Street – Site Plan and Special Permit](#)

Becky Frey noted that 19 Prospect Street had formally filed and will begin the permitting process with the Planning Board. The application has not changed significantly from the preapplication presentation they made at TRC. If anyone has any comments that need to be considered during the Planning Board process, then they should be sent in memo format to me to pass on to the Board.

Administrative:

1. Minutes – 2-5-26; 2-19-26; 3-5-26



**Amesbury Technical Review Committee
March 19, 2026**

**City Hall Auditorium
62 Friend St.
9:30 am**

Nick Cracknell motioned to approve the minutes from the 2-5-26 and 3-5-26 TRC meetings. Seconded by Chief Serino. The motion passed unanimously.

The 2-19-25 minutes were tabled to the next meeting.

General Communications:

Adjourn:

Nick Cracknell motioned to adjourn the meeting at 11:22 am. Seconded by Chief Serino. The motion passed unanimously.