

1. Amesbury Planning Board Meeting Minutes
2. In Person Meeting – October 27, 2025, at 7:07 PM
3. Chairman Pascal Rettig called the October 27, 2025, Planning Board meeting to order at 7:07 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 – YES
13. Pascal Rettig – YES
14. Also: Nipun Jain (Planning Director) and Becky Frey (Community Development Coordinator)
15. **Minutes – 7-28-25**
16. Keith Ratner motioned to approve the minutes from the 7-28-25 Planning Board Meeting as submitted. Seconded by Tom Salemi.
17. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
18. Keith Ratner – YES
19. Joel Nice – YES
20. Michael Jewell – YES
21. Tracey Chalifour – ABSTAIN
22. Tom Salemi - YES
23. David Frick – YES
24. Pascal Rettig – YES
25. Motion passed by 6-0 vote.
26. **Minutes – 8-11-25**
27. Tracey Chalifour motioned to approve the minutes from the 8-11-25 Planning Board Meeting as amended. Seconded by Tom Salemi.

28. Tracey Chalifour commented that line 108 the word “master” is missing an “R.” Line 113 there was a to do item outlined in the minutes, which was to send out the Planning Board Rules and Regulations.
29. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
30. Keith Ratner – YES
31. Joel Nice – YES
32. Michael Jewell – YES
33. Tracey Chalifour – YES
34. Tom Salemi - YES
35. David Frick – YES
36. Pascal Rettig – YES
37. Motion passed by 7-0 vote.

38. Signs – 23 Main St. – Main Street Marketplace

39. Nipun Jain commented that the Design Review Committee recommended the sign be approved as presented.
40. Tracey Chalifour motioned to approve the sign application for 23 Main St. as presented. Seconded by Tom Salemi.
41. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
42. Keith Ratner – YES
43. Joel Nice – YES
44. Michael Jewell – YES
45. Tracey Chalifour – YES
46. Tom Salemi - YES
47. David Frick – YES
48. Pascal Rettig – YES
49. Motion passed by a 7-0 vote.

50. Signs – 5 Market St. – Needham Bank

51. Nipun Jain commented that the original application was revised, and the most recent version was recommended for approval by DRC. There will be three signs. The first will be a wall mounted on the drive through sign, the second will be a building mounted sign that will cover the existing sign, and the third is a free-standing sign on Market St. DRC recommended these signs because the applicant agreed they would not change the clock sign. There could be another option to put the free-standing sign in the landscape section, which is the only entrance area in the bank. The applicant felt it was a good location and would coordinate with the new city hall signage.
52. Joel Nice clarified that there wasn’t a monument sign there now. Nipun Jain confirmed that was correct, but the tradeoff was to keep the clock sign as is. Joel Nice questioned if black and gold was standard. Nipun Jain responded that it was not but it fit with the historic downtown.
53. Tracey Chalifour questioned if there would be city hall signage down the line. Nipun Jain responded he was not sure where the city hall signage would go.

54. Michael Jewell questioned if the Provident Bank lettering would be removed. Nipun Jain responded that it would.
55. David Frick motioned to approve the sign application for 5 Market St. with the caveat that they work with city officials on sign locations. Seconded by Keith Ratner.
56. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
57. Keith Ratner – YES
58. Joel Nice – YES
59. Michael Jewell – YES
60. Tracey Chalifour – YES
61. Tom Salemi - YES
62. David Frick – YES
63. Pascal Rettig – YES
64. Motion passed by a 7-0 vote.

65. Continued Public Hearings– Rocky Hill Development

66. Bob Dale commented that they were back tonight with two presentations. Steve Sawyer will provide a presentation on engineering infrastructure and storm water and Jeremy Lake will provide an overview of the north neighborhood. There have been a significant number of changes to the plans as a result of the DRC meetings. Now they have an established plan that has been fully engineered to send out to peer reviewers.
67. Tracey Chalifour questioned if anything they were presenting was in their folder. Nipun Jain responded it was not. It is just in the presentation.
68. Steve Sawyer commented that the main entrance will be off Elm St. The plan used to have a fire access connecting the south neighborhood to the north neighborhood. It has changed to a trail. They are coordinating the crosswalk location with Vanesse Associates. They are looking to slide it closer to the corner so it's not a mid-block crosswalk, and they will put in a flashing beacon. The boulevard runs into the site via two one way 14-foot-wide lanes. There are parallel parking spaces that are 8 feet by 23 feet. In the original application they had buildings in one area, but they coordinated with DRC to move them around and create a park. The main portion of the south neighborhood road is a grid network. All of the garages are rear loaded except for a few single units. They are currently finalizing the storm water. The community building has been moved toward the roundabout. They added a central pedestrian way from the community building to the southern terminus of the south neighborhood. The roadway network will have roads 20 foot wide with 2-way traffic and designated parking. They extended the boulevard to the north neighborhood to give 2 means of emergency access. Emergency vehicles can use either the north or south bound access points if needed. That's what allowed them to move the secondary paved access. The main roads A and B are 22 feet wide. The northern neighborhood is all apartments. There was a small cul-de-sac in the original proposal. They have changed the plan so cars can circulate around the building instead of keeping the cul-de-sac. There is full fire access along the whole rear area. The smaller buildings along I-495 are all parking garages. That will help provide some buffer. They will also be maintaining a tree line. The community building will have a pickle ball court, gym, and basketball court. This is the final configuration proposal.

69. Keith Ratner questioned if this would be a public or private road. Steve Sawyer responded that they might look to make the road from Elm St. to the roundabout public. The rest would be private roads. The maintenance companies will be different companies between the south and north neighborhoods. The north trash pickup would be private pick up by the management company. They still need to vet out the southern neighborhood.
70. Joel Nice commented that he liked the addition of the trail parking and questioned if there was room to put some on the east side of the north neighborhood. Steve Sawyer responded that they looked at putting some parking there, but they ran into grading issues. They may be able to slide a few parallel spaces in. Most of the parking will not be assigned to units. The only assigned spaces will be the garage spaces. Joel Nice questioned if they considered putting in a cul-de-sac instead of the hard left at roads A and B. Steve Sawyer responded that they won't generate a tremendous amount of traffic there. There has been discussion about putting a raised tabletop.
71. Joel Nice commented that at the site walk they talked about creating a trail connection in the south neighborhood. Steve Sawyer responded that they were meeting with their environmental consultant to look at the trail network. They will have more information on that when the landscape presentation comes to the Board.
72. Tom Salemi questioned if there would be multiple trail access points or one or two main points. Steve Sawyer responded they were looking at multiple options. The hope is to connect to 297 Elm St. That will need a permit from the Conservation Commission.
73. Pascal Rettig questioned if the backyards in the south neighborhood would be deeded to the single-family homes or if they were all common. Steve Sawyer responded that it would be exclusive areas. Pascal Rettig questioned if they planned to install fences. Steve Sawyer responded they did not.
74. Pascal Rettig commented that they talked about the fill and grading on the site walk and clarified that the tree line shown on the plan is where there will be no further disturbance. Steve Sawyer confirmed that was correct. All the existing trees in those areas will be maintained. The landscape plan will show a significant amount of planned street trees. Pascal Rettig questioned if the trees northwest of the community building would be maintained. Steve Sawyer confirmed that was correct.
75. Nipun Jain noted that some buildings have shifted in the south neighborhood. That was done to scale up the development as people transition from the south to the north neighborhood. There have been discussions around the crosswalks. One of the objectives is to have plans identified to show where formal connections are to identify trail head locations and pathways around the open space. Those plans will come through when the environmental plan is finalized. The two existing houses in the front will also be maintained, which caused some of the layout changes to the southern neighborhood.
76. Tracey Chalifour clarified that they are proposing 83 single family homes and have now added the two homes along Elm St. Steve Sawyer responded that it will still be 83 homes because they lost two when they reconfigured the south neighborhood. Tracey Chalifour questioned what the plan was for the two existing homes. Bob Dale responded that they would be pursuing a historic preservation special permit separately.

77. Tracey Chalifour questioned how many apartments there were. Steve Sawyer responded there would be 296 apartment units. Tracey Chalifour questioned how many units would be affordable. Bob Dale responded 10%.
78. Tracey Chalifour questioned why they would consider making the main road public. Bob Dale responded that would be the decision of the Council. Particularly in the southern neighborhood, the burden of maintaining the road would be excessive for homeowners.
79. Jeremy Lake gave a little overview of the architecture. There have not been a lot of changes to the north neighborhood. They have made some adjustments to the elevations based on feedback from the DRC. There are a series of individual car barn bays. The back corner buildings have 9 units per floor. They are mostly two bed units with a total of 36 units. The 12 unit buildings are all 2-bedroom units. There is one near the clubhouse and one near the greenspace. Some units have balconies. Every building in the southern neighborhood has a front door to the street and back door to the parking. There are 6 six-unit buildings spread around the site. There is a common type of building that has variety with detailing. There are stacked townhouses over flat units. They are connected to look like townhouses. Most of them are a string of four but one is five and one is three units. There will be an amenity building that will have a mail room, club room, and coworking space. It will have a stone façade on part of it and shingles on the other portion. They would like to use metal roof and that is an ongoing conversation with DRC. The last ancillary building is a pool pavilion.
80. Tom Salemi commented that the four doors across the stacked buildings is a little awkward.
81. Joel Nice commented that overall, it was a good layout and color palette. The four doors are a little awkward.
82. David Frick commented that he liked the whole concept and the metal roof idea.
83. Keith Ratner commented that he generally liked the design but agreed with Tom and Joel about the doors.
84. Tracey Chalifour commented that she agreed that the metal roof was a good idea. It looks like a lot of attention was put into making the building looks very nice.
85. Pascal Rettig agreed it looked good and questioned if they were putting in bathrooms and showers with the locker rooms. Bob Dale responded that the lockers would be for storage while people were using the gym. People live there and will not be changing and showering there vs. their home.
86. Pascal Rettig opened public comment.
87. John Stevenson of 439 Main Street. commented that he had more questions on what would happen with the Clarks Road traffic and would hold his comments until then.
88. Nipun Jain commented that there is a very comprehensive design handbook that was established with this zoning and project. It is exciting to see how this development has come to this place. Some environmental areas will be impacted. They are not expecting a lot of discussion about that with the Planning Board because it will be discussed at the Conservation Commission. This Board should focus on the storm water.
89. Pascal Rettig commented that the next step is to figure out the peer review.
90. Nipun Jain commented that was soliciting responses for peer reviews. They are still finalizing the traffic because they are working to ensure they don't repeat work that is being done with the off-site review. They will be able to select a peer review at the next meeting.

91. Tracey Chalifour questioned the status of the grant the city applied for. Nipun Jain responded that the city applied for the Massworks grant and was awarded 3.6 million for offsite improvements to make at intersection of Clarks Road, Elm St., and Route 110 for other development in that area.
92. David Frick motioned to continue to the application to the November 10, 2025, Planning Board Meeting. Seconded by Keith Ratner.
93. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
94. Keith Ratner – YES
95. Joel Nice – YES
96. Michael Jewell – YES
97. Tracey Chalifour – YES
98. Tom Salemi - YES
99. David Frick – YES
100. Pascal Rettig – YES
101. Motion passed 7-0.

102. Pascal Rettig commented that they would take 5-minute break at 8:39 pm.
103. The Planning Board meeting resumed at 8:44 pm.

104. **Continued Public Hearings– 9 Alenclair Drive**
105. Joshua Lee Smith commented that they met a few weeks ago and introduced the project. They had a site visit, a meeting with TRC, and several discussions with staff. They are working diligently to update the landscape plan. They are proposing 2 access driveways. There were concerns about the two accessways, but they are necessary. The duct lines have been reconfigured and rerouted to reconfigure some of the plantings. The fencing is black powder coated. One of the big comments from TRC and this Board was about the preservation of trees along the front. The red oak at the front can be preserved. There is another evergreen that can also be preserved. Joshua Lee Smith showed renderings in comparison. The plantings have gone up 4 feet in height at installation. Some of the evergreens will be 12 feet in height at installation. Some trees will grow to at least 35 feet in height. The gate could be black or green depending on what the Board would prefer.
106. Keith Ratner commented that it seemed that this seemed to addresses a lot of the concerns. It's a shame this use was in a residential neighborhood. The goal is to make it the best they can.
107. David Frick questioned what the outside of the building was made out of. Joshua Lee Smith responded it would be metal. David Frick questioned if it could be a different color than the proposed white. Then it could blend better.
108. Carly Evans responded she was not sure they could change the color. It is more of a medium gray than what is shown on the rendering. It will be similar to what is there now in color.
109. Keith Ratner commented that he liked the green gate. Michael Jewell and Tom Salemi also liked the green gate.
110. Pascal Rettig commented that he appreciated the work that had been done and the consideration given to the site.

111. Tracey Chalifour agreed the improvements are welcome and highly noticeable and questioned if there would be irrigation for the plants installed on site. Sharna Chowdhury responded that they were proposing 3-year plant maintenance for this project. After that there will be an inspection with the landscape architect. Then the property owner will take over the maintenance. There will not be any irrigation, but the contractor is responsible for watering the trees. They will use a site water source or a water truck. They will be using a tree diaper at the root level to keep hydration. Tracey Chalifour noted that she was still concerned about the health of the shrubs.
112. David Frick questioned how big the capacity upgrade was for this facility. Patrick Shan responded that it was a capacity upgrade. They will have 4 feeders with 13,000 volts. They are essentially doubling the capacity size.
113. Pascal Rettig opened public comment
114. Cathy Schlich of 4 Alenclair Dr. commented that it would be helpful to see the northeast and the east side views. There is an increased landscaping plan, and they need to address in writing how it will be maintained after the three-year contract. Ms. Schlich would like more reassurance that things won't die and be ignored. They should be replaced appropriately. The northeast corner tree may not be worth saving. It's looking sad and may need to be replaced instead. There is room in the northeast corner for more landscaping to extend down toward the street. Ms. Schlich was concerned about noise generation. Will the noise increase with the capacity increase? What height level will the lighting be located at? Is it motion detected? In the past during storms trucks would idle there. Will they still be doing that with motion detection lights? Is there a similar site development example that we can compare this proposal to?
115. Rob Mistretta of 11 Alenclair Dr. commented that he thought they did a great job with this if it's going to happen. The timeline of this project is projected to be 2 years. Mr. Mistretta requested that they leave existing screening landscaping in place until they are ready to install the proposed landscaping. Mr. Mistretta was also concerned about dust coming over into his property during construction. Mr. Mistretta also questioned why the proposed site was placed at an angle with one corner much closer to his property line vs. the other corner instead of running parallel to his property.
116. Victor Carraba submitted written public comment that is at the end of these minutes.
117. Pascal Rettig questioned what would happen after 3 years if any plants die. Joshua Lee Smith responded that if any plants die, then they would no longer be in compliance. They would be replaced to stay in compliance with this plan. The company is very interested in making sure this happens. This is not a typical landscape plan, and they will ensure this remains in good shape. Pascal Rettig clarified that no lights will be on at night unless someone is at the site. Joshua Lee Smith responded that lighting will be dark sky compliant. There will not be any glare or spillage on the street. The light fixtures will be located facing inward at the enclosure and equipment. They will have shields. They will be manually controlled; not motion censored. There may be a flood light there today which will be removed.
118. Pascal Rettig questioned if they had any specifics on the noise. Joshua Lee Smith responded that the noise was evaluated based on the manufacturer's specifications. It will be lower in terms of overall noise generation of the site. The older equipment is louder.

119. Pascal Rettig questioned if they have a comparable neighborhood substation site they could point to as an example. Carly Evans responded that they don't have anything with the same layout, however, there is an example on Hoover St. in Dracut, MA. Matt Watkins added that they do have a number of substations in residential neighborhoods, and they have a list they could share. The Lowell station upgrade is close to finishing a rebuild. They haven't put the landscaping in yet.
120. Keith Ratner motioned to extend the meeting to 10:30 pm. Seconded by Tracey Chalifour.
121. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
122. Keith Ratner – YES
123. Joel Nice – YES
124. Michael Jewell – YES
125. Tracey Chalifour – YES
126. Tom Salemi - YES
127. David Frick – YES
128. Pascal Rettig – YES
129. Motion passed 7-0.
130. Pascal Rettig questioned how they would keep a buffer and prevent dust issues during construction. Joshua Lee Smith responded that there would be a construction mitigation and management plan that would be submitted. That would be accounted for.
131. Pascal Rettig questioned why the site was at an angle instead of parallel to the property. Brennan Bower responded that they need to keep clearance from the existing lines.
132. Pascal Rettig requested details on the trenching project associated with this upgrade. Matt Watkins responded that they initially did outreach on the project because it ties into the substation. That work will be pushed to early spring. They will have a community open house for that project.
133. David Frick questioned if they could coordinate the timing of removing the existing vegetation when they are ready to install the new landscaping. Matt Watkins responded that generally they remove landscaping at the beginning and install plantings at the end. They will have a construction fence. David Frick questioned if the construction fence would be opaque or chain-link. Matt Watkins responded that they could make it opaque. Rob Mistretta commented that an 8-foot opaque fence would allow him as an abutter privacy.
134. Tom Salemi questioned what the process for informing the public on the construction schedule would be. Matt Watkins responded that there would be a start of construction notification and further outreach when they reach different milestones.
135. Pascal Rettig questioned how soon after approval the project would start. Matt Watkins responded that they would need to kick off as soon as they get approval.
136. David Frick motioned to continue the application to the November 3, 2025, Planning Board Meeting and requested that staff draft a decision. Seconded by Keith Ratner.
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 – YES
- 144. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 145. Motion passed 7-0.

146. New Public Hearings– 102 Kimball Road

- 147. Nipun Jain read the legal notice into the record.
- 148. Joseph White, civil engineer with BSC, represented the applicant and commented that they were proposing to subdivide the existing property at 102 Kimball Road and build a duplex. There will be a common access driveway. The property is in the Water Resource Protection District, so it requires a special permit. They have already met with the DRC and got good feedback. They are in the process of providing responses to that and the fire department comments as well.
- 149. Joel Nice commented that it was a straightforward proposal and he liked it.
- 150. Joseph White commented that they were creating the common access driveway to create the frontage for the new 2-unit building. There is 30 feet for the open space parcel. David Frick asked about the side yard setback. Joseph White commented that for lot 1 they did the best they could to provide as wide of a side setback as possible. The common access driveway is its own lot.
- 151. David Frick requested more details on the units. Joseph White responded that they would be similar in style to what was built on Market St.
- 152. Nipun Jain commented that staff asked them to add a zoning compliance table to the plans. They will have sewer to Kimball Road. For the Planning Board it is important to understand this site is in the Water Resource Protection District. This is a large parcel in WPRD that is surrounded by a lot of publicly owned areas for protecting drinking water resources. The primary goal was look at how to protect the open space portion. That was the primary objective for how the site has been laid out. It is the basis of some of the waivers that are being requested for setbacks etc. Once they submit the house plans, the DRC will review it. It will be very similar to 130 Market St. It is important for the Board to at least see draft easements to ensure the maintenance responsibilities are clear. Staff will be working with the applicant to provide that. There were a few questions in TRC in regards to the fencing and any screening requirements given that some accessways were close to the existing structure. The applicant is looking at what is acceptable to them. There is a proposed gate to prevent vehicles going in and out of that driveway. It would be pedestrian access from that point on.
- 153. David Frick clarified that the goal for tonight was to make sure the applicant can present the project, and the Board can ask any questions before continuing the hearing.
- 154. Joel Nice commented there is an existing dirt path that goes close to the resource area. Restricting the vehicle access beyond that point and allowing that land to heal would be a big pro for this project.
- 155. Keith Ratner questioned if the structures in the back of the photo would be removed. Joseph White confirmed that was correct.
- 156. Pascal Rettig commented that this was a great project and would allow the homeowner to unlock extra value while the city gets open space. It is a win win.

157. Pascal opened public comment.
158. Charlie Denehy of 6 Harrison Eaton Lane commented that he spends a lot of time in the open space. Right along the edge of the line drawn is a canal that drains to the Powwow River. Mr. Denehy wanted to ensure they are protecting the wetland area and make sure not it was not overused.
159. Pascal Rettig clarified that everything besides the front area will be under a permanent conservation restriction.
160. Tracey Chalifour motioned to continue the application to the November 24, 2026, Planning Board Meeting. Seconded by Keith Ratner.
161. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
162. Keith Ratner – YES
163. Joel Nice – YES
164. Michael Jewell – YES
165. Tracey Chalifour – YES
166. Tom Salemi - YES
167. David Frick – YES
168. Pascal Rettig – YES
169. Motion passed 7-0.

170. **New Public Hearings– 6 Lake Attitash Way**

171. Nipun Jain read the legal notice into the record.
172. Brian Marchetti, civil engineer, represented the applicant and commented that this project started back in 2019. The majority of the parcel has a steep topography. Initially, they had put the house in the middle of the site and filled in the isolated wetland. In May they presented this plan to the Conservation Commission with the house in the middle. After that first meeting, they met with OCED staff to figure out how to better fit the house on the site. The intent was to address the Conservation Commission's concerns and have it better fit in the neighborhood. This is the plan before you today. They were required to go to the ZBA for a variance, and they were approved last week for that. The house is now located in the front of the lot with a garage. Everything is outside of the 25-foot buffer of the isolated wetland. They will monument mark the buffer and will put in a permanent conservation restriction. Three quarters of the property will be in that conservation restriction. The property is in the WRPD Zone B overlay. Both driveways will have pervious pavers. The detached garage and house will have concrete dry wells. They have provided drainage calculations. They meet the standards above and beyond what is required. The dry well for the garage is 300 gallons and the house is 1000 gallons. In 2019 they had a conversation with DPW who wanted us to look at runoff from the wetland. It runs down the driveways. The pavement condition on Lake Attitash Road causes the runoff to bypass the catch basins. They are proposing to put a catch basin downstream of the wetland and connect it to the stormwater infrastructure. There is a serious runoff issue in this neighborhood and the applicant is proposing to do something to address that. It will be a big improvement to that neighborhood. It may not solve the problem 100%, but it will make a big impact. That is all under review right now by the DPW. The drainage is separate because they meet the regulations without it.

173. Joel Nice questioned if the runoff from the garage and shed would go toward the street. Brian Marchetti responded that it would be collected in roof gutters and piped underground for infiltration.
174. Tom Salemi questioned how many parking spaces they would have. Brian Marchetti responded there would be two spaces.
175. Michael Jewell commented that this seemed like a workable plan for the site.
176. Pascal Rettig clarified that the city was doing an internal review of the storm water. Nipun Jain confirmed it was being internally reviewed. They wanted to make sure the resources on the parcel were being protected. Even though the stormwater runoff problem is not because of this parcel, they are making an effort to solve it. The house they are proposing is very traditional in design. It really does address all the issues you typically don't see addressed in a small project. This will go to DRC and the Consecration Commission in November. This is the least impactful the proposal can get.
177. Keith Ratner motioned to extend the meeting to 10:40 pm. Seconded by Tracey Chalifour.
178. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
179. Keith Ratner – YES
180. Joel Nice – YES
181. Michael Jewell – YES
182. Tracey Chalifour – YES
183. Tom Salemi - YES
184. David Frick – YES
185. Pascal Rettig – YES
186. Motion passed 7-0.
187. Pascal Rettig opened public comment.
188. Sarah Lamson of 7 Beech Lane submitted written public comment that is at the end of these minutes.
189. Renee Spellman submitted written public comment that is at the end of these minutes.
190. Sarah Lamson of 7 Beech Lane submitted written public comment that is at the end of these minutes.
191. Luke Guttadauro of 73 Lake Attitash Road submitted written public comment that is at the end of these minutes.
192. Pascal Rettig commented that it sounded like the runoff issue is being addressed. Brian Marchetti responded that the solution here will significantly help that situation. The property will have a large portion of the lot put into the conservation restriction. Right now, the lot is a dumping ground for the road.
193. Nipun Jain commented that when they reviewed it with the applicant's team they thought about those issues. A lot of the runoff flows freely. It will not do that as much with this proposal. They are adding the catch basins that will capture it. It will infiltrate into the wetland. Most of the runoff is not because of the property. It's a result of the condition of the road itself. What the applicant is proposing will help, but it will not solve the problem. The surrounding existing conditions part of the problem.
194. Tracey Chalifour motioned to continue the application to the November 24, 2025, meeting. Seconded by Keith Ratner.

- 195. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
- 196. Keith Ratner – YES
- 197. Joel Nice – YES
- 198. Michael Jewell – YES
- 199. Tracey Chalifour – YES
- 200. Tom Salemi - YES
- 201. David Frick – YES
- 202. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 203. Motion passed 7-0.

204. **Adjournment**

- 205. Tracey Chalifour motioned to adjourn at 10:38 pm. Seconded by KeithRatner.
- 206. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote –
- 207. Keith Ratner – YES
- 208. Joel Nice – YES
- 209. Michael Jewell – YES
- 210. Tracey Chalifour – YES
- 211. Tom Salemi - YES
- 212. David Frick – YES
- 213. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 214. Motion passed 6-0

Public Comment – 9 AlenClair Drive - Victor and Pamela Carabba of 15 Hillside Ave.

Ms. Frey, Mr. Buckley, Mr. Jain,

We are writing in follow up to the recent Sept. 22 Planning Board Public Hearing regarding the proposed National Grid Substation project on Allenclair Dr. with system upgrades along Hillside Ave and Highland Street. Project plans include significant trenching and underground vault/manhole installation from the new substation along the entire length of Hillside Avenue (minus a very short distance from Allenclair Dr. south to the rte 110 intersection.). NGRID has not yet identified specifically where in the roadway they will be trenching- ? down the center, ? in a travel lane/ north or south direction, or ? close to the curbing. We were told that it is estimated to take approximately 3 weeks to pass by an individual residence for excavation, installation of the conduit, backfill, and temporary restoration.

We are very concerned about the road conditions of Hillside Ave post construction. We strongly urge that this project be required to include the restoration of Hillside Ave (and affected areas of Allenclair Dr. and Highland St.) to its current smooth status without trenching patches along its length, free of defects which can cause pooling, poor drainage and dangerous driving conditions.

We have lived on Hillside Ave for 32 years and during that time, many of us have endured dealing with the State and City for the planning and lengthy construction phases of the very expensive Rte 150 project. We now have a street with smooth road conditions serving as a welcoming entry to our city. While we still have a large volume of traffic and traffic noise, if Hillside Ave is not returned to its current conditions and left with patches of trenched areas, the road noise will be significantly worse, and the integrity of the road will be greatly compromised leading to further degradation especially during winter, or heavy rain conditions. Additionally, poor road conditions are dangerous, will increase repair and maintenance workloads for DPW and costs to the taxpayers (for a road we have all paid heavily for), devalue neighborhoods and the reputation of the City.

This vital aspect of the NGRID project needs to be addressed and included in the scope of the project work with specific standards established for fully restoring Hillside Ave to a high quality, newly and fully paved roadway free of defects. This should include proper line striping and crosswalks. All conditions to be returned to equal or better at no cost to the City Taxpayers.

We look forward to your attention to this aspect in anticipation of the Oct. 27 Planning Board meeting.

Thank you,

Victor and Pamela Carabba

Public Comment – 6 Lake Attitash Way – Sara Lamson of 7 Beech Lane.

Hello,

I just need to express my concern and opposition of the project at 6 Lake Attitash Way. I have great concern about the runoff and drainage from this project, and while there are plans to add rain gardens with this project, it is important to recognize that the removal of vegetation and mature trees, as well as the addition of non-permeable surfaces will increase runoff, especially when we already struggle with it in this zone today. Especially in the winter, when the runoff freezes downhill making it unsafe for walkers and vehicles. The added pressure on the lake of this runoff will cause the health of the lake to suffer, requiring more maintenance—and I have to ask if that's feasible for the lake Attitash association to maintain?

Additionally, this is an area for wildlife. It is a smaller parcel, but wildlife have been pushed into our neighborhood, and will continue to be affected. It was stated that the wetlands won't be disturbed, but if you've haven't seen the property, I recommend it. It's hard to believe how it won't.

I know this is a smaller parcel, but it's a smaller neighborhood and the effects will be felt.

Thank you so much for your time and consideration.

Sarah Lamson

Public Comment – 6 Lake Attitash Way – Renee Spellman.

Hello,

I am writing about 6 Lake Attitash Way. My husband and I live at 8 Lake Attitash way. We are concerned about the plan for building at 6 Lake Attitash Way. Most importantly, the issue of the water and run off from that property into our property. We are also concerned about the pools in the design which will be a breeding ground for mosquitoes which can carry disease. We have 2 small children. Lastly, we are concerned that if these pools overflow that there will be negative consequences for our property specifically water that could get into the basement.

This piece of land has not been buildable for years-why is it now?

We see deer in the land and behind our house every few days. There is much wildlife and fire flies in the summer. Destroying this parcel of land has environmental consequences not ot mention the potential large amount of run off that will go into Lake Attitash.

--

Renee Spellman

Public Comment – 6 Lake Attitash Way – Luke Guttadauro of 73 Lake Attitash Road.

6 Lake Attitash Way:

My name is Luke Guttadauro and I live at 73 Lake Attitash rd which is diagonal to the property of topic. The main concern I have with this development is storm water management. As it currently stands without a structure on the property the water from Lake Attitash Way runs past the storm drain on the top corner of Lake Attitash Way and Beech Ln to continue down to Lake Attitash Rd. It then passes the storm drain on the side of 71 Lake Attitash Rd to the again go past the next storm drain in between 68 and 70 Lake Attitash Rd with a final destination of going right down the right of way to wash out the stairs and wash out the front of 72 Lake Attitash Rd and ending in Lake Attitash. The run off is already significant before the land is filled in and a structure is built right off the road with the land being pitched towards the road. The solution needs to be more than a permeable paver driveway and a water garden that could fail down the road. The property currently already has a huge water management issue where it drains continuously all winter long on to Lake Attitash Rd causing major icing and the town to have to continuously sand and plow to try to create safe driving and walking conditions which the town already isn't able to keep up with. The water runoff issue needs a solid solution to stop runoff from further polluting the lake and erosion that is happening to surrounding properties.

Thanks