

1. Amesbury Planning Board Meeting Minutes

2. In Person Meeting – April 27, 2026, at 7:02 PM

3. Chairman Pascal Rettig called the April 27, 2026, Planning Board meeting to order at 7:02 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. **Continued Hearings – Rocky Hill Development**
15. Bob Dale with Dale Development commented that their primary goal for this meeting was to go through the architecture. Erica Thornton will talk about the north neighborhood and Michel Abel will talk about the south neighborhood. Once they are finished Steve Sawyer will discuss responses to the VHB memo.
16. Erica Thornton from Union Studios commented that she would review the changes to the north neighborhood since they last presented. The north neighborhood has 296 units total with a mix of building types. There will be an amenity and club house building as well. There were no changes to the 4-story 36-unit buildings. They have updated plans to include the side elevations. The 12-unit building is either all 2 bedrooms or a mix of one bedroom and two bedrooms.
17. Nipun Jain commented there was a key that showed where the different building types are located within the neighborhood on the plans.
18. Erica Thornton commented that they were simple thatched buildings for the first of two types of buildings. They widened the corner boards and clapboards to have a more Greek revival feel. The side elevation is seen on the primary roads, so the elevation is a little more prominent. The second version of the building has bay windows instead of balconies. The stacked townhouse over flat buildings have been simplified by removing the bay windows.

19. Tracey Chalifour questioned if it was a 4-unit building. Erica Thornton responded it was 3-5 units.
20. Erica Thornton commented the second type is a 5 pack building and shows more variety. There are some side elevations that will face primary streets, so they added false shutter windows. There were no changes to the club house. That building will encompass reception, the mail room, a game room, and great room with a golf simulator. There will be a second floor coworking space and outdoor roof patio. The field house will complement the club house. It will be adjacent to the pool, courts and grills. It will have a fitness room and spin studio. The last two buildings are the grill pavilion and the car barns. The barns range from 3-6 bays and are primarily along the edge of the development. We will use neutral and historic palettes for the siding.
21. Joel Nice commented it seemed like there were a lot of dormers on the gambrel and it was a little busy. Were there any comments from the DRC? Erica Thornton responded that they provide light and access to the bedrooms. It's a nod to the design guidelines. Nipun Jain added that they used to be busier. When they met with the DRC they worked to create a rhythm with the individual dormers with the windows below. In a three-dimensional rendering it shows it will create more shades and shadows. It cannot be reduced further without eliminating the dormers.
22. Joel Nice commented he liked the mix of materials and color palettes.
23. Tracey Chalifour commented that the structure of the large flats looked sterile and wondered if there were any conversations around that. Erica Thornton responded that she did not hear that comment specifically. They will have color to them and that will help.
24. Nipun Jain commented the DRC was involved during the design pattern book creation, preapplication and during formal review discussion. This is a culmination of discussion over 5-6 meetings. A lot of details were added. It was designed to fit in with the pattern of the other buildings in the neighborhood. The columns and the railings are more detailed than they appear in the rendering. These buildings are not downtown, so they do not need to be as ornate. This is a collection of buildings that honor the past yet creates a cohesive set of building patterns. When they are translated into construction level drawings the details will show more. They are from the design pattern book that has the details. It's hard to capture all of it in 2-D drawings.
25. Erica Thornton commented that they strived to make a consistent window pattern and incorporate details across buildings.
26. Michelle Abel commented they did the architecture for the south neighborhood. We presented back in December and had met with DRC a few times in the fall. There are 4 product types and an additional club house. The four product types include single families, duplexes, triplexes and fourplexes. Across the entire project the goal was to simplify elevations and have a cohesive window grid pattern with consistent materials. The single-family homes had some dormer changes. There will be two different design types. There will be 20 duplex units. They did focus on a few high profile side elevations for those that face primary roads. Each unit had a nice repetition on them. They are sprinkled through the neighborhood, so it is not all one long line. There will be 36 triplexes. They are rear alley loaded. They are grouped in the interior. There are a couple different front porch details. The dormers will be optional, but it will be nice to add another layer to change the

front elevation. There are 3 fourplexes with 2 elevations. It was all about simplicity. There is one high profile lot that will be the fourth fourplex. There will be a wraparound porch, metal roofing, and stacked windows on either side of the chimney. There will be a clubhouse at the corner. It opens to the back and the side. The overall features and structures were simplified and a nod to the northern neighborhood while also keeping it consistent with the south neighborhood style. There will be a very similar color palette to the north neighborhood. Each of the units will be individually colored.

27. Tom Salemi questioned what the common wall would be. Michelle Abel responded it will be a 2-wall fire wall system. They will share a bedroom and bathroom. Tom Salemi questioned who would be responsible for maintaining the exterior building. Michelle Abel responded there will be a homeowner's association. Bob Dale added there will be a single homeowners association for the entire south neighborhood. The north neighborhood will be rental and one owner.
28. Joel Nice commented that he liked the architecture, and all the glass incorporated into it. He liked the small square windows and rear loading garages.
29. Keith Ratner questioned if the club house was just for the south neighborhood. Bob Dale responded that there will be an independent club house and amenities for each neighborhood. The only shared amenity will be the trail network.
30. Tracey Chalifour questioned if homeowners would be able to select items during the build phase or if they would be predetermined. Bob Dale responded they need flexibility for homeowners to choose some things, but the high profile locations will be built as shown.
31. Pascal Rettig questioned how deep the porches were. Michelle Abel responded that they were a minimum of 5 feet deep. There will be a discussion with the civil engineers on what fits.
32. David Frick commented he had no questions and thought it looked great.
33. Bob Dale commented that they expect the next memo from VHB by the end of the week. Realistically they will not be ready by the next meeting to get a response. They did receive fire sign off this week and are working with DPW to confirm capacity. They intend to come forward with a definitive subdivision application soon.
34. Keith Ratner commented there were a couple comments about the trail system being laid out a little more carefully and a comment about widening the sidewalk in one area. Pascal Retting added there was a number of spaces on the proposed trail that looked like it was on the side of the berm. Bob Dale responded that the trail as originally laid out is in regulated areas. The exact layout is likely to change. The basin areas have flat tops, and they did intentionally meander through there.
35. Steve Sawyer commented that he envisioned a bark mulch path 2-4 feet wide. It will be a natural walking path through the woods. Some areas in will be in the buffer and some push back on that. They will pull some of that back and the 3 to 1 slope will be naturally revegetated. The path comes up to the sidewalk because it is close to the wetland in some areas. It will be a mix of natural trail and sidewalk to walk the perimeter of the site. There will be a terrace in a flat area for the path. Pascal Rettig clarified that it will be a trail and not just grass. Steve Sawyer confirmed that was correct. They are going back to the Conservation Commission with a revised layout then will come up with a final layout for the trail. OCED is looking to connect to another project in the area. Right now, they show a stub

off the park in the south neighborhood for that. It is the narrowest part of the wetland for a small footbridge stream crossing.

36. Pascal Rettig commented that the intention of the initial boulevard was that it would be accepted as a public way. Steve Sawyer confirmed that was correct. The civil plan shows a heavy red line from the boulevard to the roundabout. They are looking to have the full extent of the double boulevard accepted as a public way. The two front lots will be permitted through the historic special permit process.
37. Nipun Jain commented that the Board will be responsible for reviewing the subdivision plans. City Council is in charge of the street acceptance.
38. Pascal Rettig questioned if the parking included in the public way area will be public parking. Steve Sawyer confirmed it would be unassigned so anyone could park there. Pascal Rettig commented it would be good to see a parking plan to see where all the parking is. It is not clear in the alleys if you can park behind the garage or not.
39. Joel Nice questioned if trash pickup would be in the alley ways or the main streets. Steve Sawyer responded the interior inner driveways should allow for trash pickup. The dead-end area may need to haul trash to the entry or the curb.
40. Nipun Jain commented that was one of the questions VHB had. The initial civil peer review has been done by VHB and the revised plans responded to that memo. One of the comments was showing the turning templates for trash and how they would operate.
41. Pascal Rettig questioned if they still were planning for that emergency access through the animal hospital. Steve Sawyer responded it is designed. They will be proposing a permeable paved surface. It won't be driven on a lot. They have rights to that right of way.
42. Pascal Rettig clarified that the part of the lot in Salisbury will remain untouched. Steve Sawyer confirmed that was correct.
43. Pascal Rettig commented it would be good to see what units will be deemed affordable units because they have a big mix. Bob Dale responded that the law is very clear on that. It requires 10% of the square footage. They did not plan to designate particular locations now. Pascal Rettig commented it will be good to have those designated. The units should match the mix of what is being built.
44. Nipun Jain commented they can work with the applicant to form a tabular form to show how many will be affordable and which different unit types.
45. David Frick commented that he had no comments and was pleased with the whole development. It will be an asset to the city.
46. Pascal Rettig commented they would forward the applicants the memo from the open space committee.
47. Tracey Chalifour commented that she wanted to make sure she was speaking to some of the issues raised in the memo. Overall, there are only a few small pocket parks not a lot of open space in the plans. It would be good to understand the snow management.
48. Nipun Jain commented that he had spoken briefly about the trails. They are looking at landscape plans, open space, and environmental permitting. They all overlap and need to look at all of the components at the same time. The Conservation Commission has started the review. They are making an effort to coordinate better.
49. David Frick questioned what percent will be open space. Nipun Jain responded it was made up of three different layers. The first is the portion of the site being undeveloped because

of resource areas. That is about 55% of the total parcel. The second is the formalized parks and open areas and the third are the other areas that are open for use but not as formalized. Steve Sawyer commented they provided a zoning table on the resubmitted plans. The north and south neighborhood are separated. There's a key plan that colors the formal and informal open space in the area. The informal trails through the woodlands don't count as part of the natural community open space area. Nipun Jain clarified the table refers to developable areas. The undevelopable areas will be left in their natural state.

50. Pascal Rettig opened public comment.

51. Jerry Klima Director of Coastal Trails Coalition commented that they have been working on developing a trail system with Salisbury, Newburyport and Amesbury to make a good network. The last missing link is from the Riverwalk to across Elm St. to the Ghost Trail. That trail has 2.6 million set aside to build it from Rocky Hill Road to the entry roadway on the other side of the Ghost Trail. That trail comes around Route 110 with an acre of shared use to the Animal Hospital then a 5 foot wide sidewalk. One request they made is to try to align this 270 feet of sidewalk to the entry if possible. The other request is for mass highway to provide a rapid flash beacon. They will be asking them to include a hybrid beacon which is the same kind of light where it crosses. They are hoping the Planning Board supports that request to mass highway. They are requesting to safely widen the sidewalk to get people to the trail. It would really enhance the quality of life there. The trail around the project is a 3-4 foot wide pathway. They could upgrade it to stone dust to enhance the amenity.

52. Pascal Rettig questioned what the next steps were. Nipun Jain responded the environmental review has started. They are waiting for the civil review to come back from VHB. Hopefully the applicant will be able to easily address any outstanding issues.

53. Keith Ratner motioned to continue the application to the May 11, 2026, Planning Board Meeting. Seconded by Joel Nice.

54. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote—

55. Keith Ratner – YES

56. Joel Nice – YES

57. Tracey Chalifour – YES

58. Tom Salemi - YES

59. David Frick – YES

60. Pascal Rettig – YES

61. Motion passed 6-0

62. Continued Hearings – 29 Lake Attitash Road

63. David Frick motioned to continue the application for 29 Lake Attitash to the May 11, 2026 Planning Board Meeting. Seconded by Joel Nice.

64. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote—

65. Keith Ratner – ABSTAIN

66. Joel Nice – YES

67. Michael Jewell – YES

68. Tracey Chalifour – YES

- 69. Tom Salemi - YES
- 70. David Frick – YES
- 71. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 72. Motion passed 6-0

73. Continued Hearings – 2-4 Elmwood Street

- 74. Pascal Rettig commented that staff provided a draft decision.
- 75. Matt Langis commented that he appreciated feedback from the neighbors. In response to it they made some targeted adjustments. Previously, they had an 8-foot front setback now it is 10 feet. It is consistent with a lot of the homes on Elmwood St. The other adjustment is the garage placement. They shifted it forward about 3 feet. There are 3 existing trees on the right side of the property line. There was not much concern about the driveway. They are strategically placing the garage between the two to protect the other trees. They are sensitive to the existing vegetation and lot line. In terms of the surrounding neighborhood context the lots in the radius around Elmwood St. range from 5k to 14k sf with homes that range from 1,200 to 3,500 sf in livable sf. There is a mix of single and multi-families. They did a couple renderings to show the house better. They will ensure the site will be maintained and they will take care to protect abutting properties with construction debris. This project has been through several rounds of DRC and TRC. They believe they have made some adjustments to be a better fit for the neighborhood. They believe it fits with the character of the neighborhood.
- 76. Tom Salemi commented that he thought the changes looked great.
- 77. Nipun Jain commented the conversation started in the OCED office when the developer came to us to ask what could be permitted for an ADU. Staff was shocked at what they were trying to put for a structure in that neighborhood. They worked to find something more fitting for the neighborhood. This is what works for the existing structures. That's how we were able to guide the developer. The ADU would not have had any regulation from the Planning Board.
- 78. Pascal Rettig commented that what is being proposed in the neighborhood fits better than an ADU.
- 79. Pascal Rettig requested that Nipun Jain review the specific elements of the draft decision.
- 80. Nipun Jain commented that like all historic preservation special permits a preservation restriction needs to be on record before the sale of the building. All building design and construction drawings need to be consistent with the plans submitted. If there are any changes, then they need to come back to the Board. The landscaping and screening are big items as far as the improvements proposed. One of the conditions proposed on page 16 pertains to the mature trees along the property line. It is critical to protect those trees and ensure they are cared for in construction phase. If they are not able to survive, then they need to provide an evergreen vegetated buffer. Those conditions are in response to comments on the screening and existing mature trees.
- 81. Keith Ratner questioned if the Board would need to approve a final landscaping plan. Nipun Jain responded they have a landscape plan that shows the different screening and buffer. It is not fully developed with species and height. The final plan comes to staff and if it is consistent with the preliminary design then it does not need to come back to the Board.

82. Tracey Chalifour commented that she did not have any comments on the draft decision because it came in late last night. She did think that the renderings show it's an improvement for sure. The feedback the public gave was incorporated. The Planning Board just got this in preapplication in February and it was formally filed in April. Staff tries to get it to a place where it is a better project before it comes to the Planning Board. It is not a perfect process, but it's the process we have.
83. Nipun Jain commented there is a robust process for public participation. When developers file, they can be resistant to change because they already spent a lot of money. They created the preapplication process to encourage developers to show us what they intend to do and engage early in the process. The approval process has been fairly transparent. Nothing is happening behind the scenes.
84. Pascal Rettig commented that there was nothing that prevents the developers from reaching out to abutters early in the process. The preapplication doesn't require abutter notification. The developer could reach out ahead of time. Nipun Jain commented this design development process has been going on for 5-6 months. If it was being done to circumvent review it would not take this long.
85. Pascal Rettig opened public comment.
86. Tatiana Espinal of 8 Elmwood St. commented that the reality was they did not know as direct abutters what was going on until late in the process. She was glad the Board suggested developers talk to the abutters. That would make so much of a difference in these kind of conversations. The applicant mentioned that they had gone around the neighborhood seeing types of houses and lots. They mentioned the density of houses. Elmwood St. has bigger lots. This proposal is totally different to the street. Ms. Espinal was unclear on how the garage between the two trees would work. The other question is if her husband and she ever decide to build, would there ever be any restriction or prohibition to build because they are covering the light and the air of this house with our house. Could these owners say they can't build because of that.
87. Pascal Rettig responded the setbacks define what is possible. Owners can say they don't want it, but it would not be a statutory inhibition.
88. Keith Ratner commented the Board does not control air rights. They can't stop a project because if it meets setbacks but blocks a window.
89. Nipun Jain questioned what the setback from the property line with 8 Elmwood St. was to the house. Matt Langis responded it was 20.5 feet. Nipun Jain commented the setback for the zoning district is 15 feet. Any habitable structure needs to be 15 feet and the garage setback needs to be 5 feet. This proposal meets the setbacks. If the setbacks are met then it would have to be allowed. If the property owner needs relief, then they could go to the ZBA for relief with a public hearing. If someone was proposing a structure and met setback requirements then it would be allowed.
90. Tatiana Espinal commented at the last meeting it was her understanding this was all going to vote at the May 11th meeting. Pascal Rettig commented they asked for a draft decision for this for this meeting. Keith Retner clarified they only contact abutters for the first meeting.
91. Matt Langis commented from the corner of the proposed house along the property line they were shifting forward trying to be proactive and mindful in positioning. They were

trying to eliminate the impact as much as possible. They positioned the garage between the two existing trees to have a smaller impact on both trees.

92. Tom Salemi commented that they should contact the abutters before cutting any trees down.
93. Mary Ellen Lawler questioned how much frontage there was without the front porch from the front door to the street. She appreciated they moved the house back, but it was not equal with the main house. It is more level with their porch.
94. Matt Langis commented it's 9.3 feet to the porch and another 7 feet of depth for the porch. If they pushed it back to line up with the existing house, they would create a pinch point. They are being sensitive to the property line by positioning the garage a specific way. They need to maintain separation between the house and garage. The left side to the corner is 3.5 feet from the property line. The was the balance to appease as many people as possible. They can push the garage back to 5 feet off the property line but it would negatively impact the trees.
95. Becky Frey read a public comment letter from Carolyn Welch attached to the end of these minutes.
96. Keith Ratner motioned to approve draft decision provided by staff for 2-4 Elmwood St. Seconded by Tom Salemi.
97. David Frick commented that it sounds like we have some neighbors who want the house pushed further back and 8 Elmwood St. is more interested in keeping the trees beside the garage. If Ms. Espinal wanted to forgo one tree to the rear of the lot to move the house and garage back, then they could entertain that. This is a good project.
98. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote—
99. Keith Ratner – YES
100. Joel Nice – YES
101. Tracey Chalifour – Abstain
102. Tom Salemi - YES
103. David Frick – YES
104. Pascal Rettig – YES
105. Motion passed 5-0

106. Keith Ratner motioned to close the public hearing for 2-4 Elmwood St. Seconded by Tom Salemi.
107. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote—
108. Keith Ratner – YES
109. Joel Nice – YES
110. Tracey Chalifour – YES
111. Tom Salemi - YES
112. David Frick – YES
113. Pascal Rettig – YES
114. Motion passed 6-0
- 115.
116. Keith Ratner motioned to extend the meeting to 10:30. Seconded by Joel Nice.
117. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote—

- 118. Keith Ratner – YES
- 119. Joel Nice – YES
- 120. Tracey Chalifour – ABSTAIN
- 121. Tom Salemi - YES
- 122. David Frick – YES
- 123. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 124. Motion passed 6-0

125. **New Hearings – 84 Congress Street**

- 126. Nipun Jain read the legal notice into the record.
- 127. Payson Cahill commented he was applying to convert an existing garage to an ADU. It is a two-story garage, and the proposal is to convert that into a second story ADU with one bedroom and one bathroom.
- 128. Pascal Rettig commented that the proposed parking plan showed 2 parallel spots next to the house. It looks like it will be a little tight because they are under 19 feet to the property line. What is a normal parking spot width? Nipun Jain responded that a standard parallel spot was 8' by 22'. There should be a 12-foot travel lane. Pascal Rettig commented there was a 19-foot pinch point that would not allow for a legitimate spot.
- 129. Nipun Jain commented that the applicant has an existing 2 family structure and the accessory dwelling unit would be on the second floor of the garage. The applicant provided photos indicating 3 parking spots in the front yard on the left and parallel paces next to the principal structure in the pinch pint. Nipun Jain did not think they could park two cars there and still access the garage. He probably does not need all those spaces by regulation so one can be eliminated and he can put one parking space in the garage and one in front of it. Payson Cahill confirmed that would work.
- 130. Nipun Jain commented that they can't park a car on the side of the house. They will need to decide which spaces would be for the principal structure. The ADU only needs one parking space. Payson Chaill agreed.
- 131. Nipun Jain commented that the existing staircase that leads to the second floor and the entryway and porch entrance to the second floor should be evaluated if it meets code. There is a proposed emergency staircase on the left side. It does not appear that they would be able to put that in and meet the setback. It may end up on the property line. They may need to relocate the staircase. There is a blank wall on the back of the garage. They should put in windows for the bedroom and living room. The application says they will use first floor for parking. The Board should condition that this would need to come back for approval if they decide to finish that to ensure it does not exceed the allowable square footage. This needs to go to inspections to make sure meets building code requirements.
- 132. Nipun Jain commented there is a proposed evergreen buffer in the section that closely abuts the ADU. Pascal Rettig requested they enumerate the details in a memo.
- 133. Joel Nice commented that the scale of the fire escape looked small. Nipun Jain said it is 5.3 feet from the property line to the garage. He did not see how it would work. Pascal Rettig commented they should confirm if they need a second egress. Nipun Jain commented that typically they are not so particular. However, given that structure is barely meeting the setback for an accessory structure they should look at it.

134. Pascal Rettig opened public comment.
135. Karen Webber property owner of 86 Congress St. commented that she has lived there for over 30 years and appreciated the work they were doing tonight. The Board addressed most of her concerns tonight. The secondary exit looked like it went over the property line. That is the primary play area for her grandchildren and where their inground pool was. It is where they enjoy their property. This garage is sitting right on top of it. Ms. Webber just wanted consideration to make sure it's legal and not encroaching on her property. If it does need to be there, then make sure it's aesthetically pleasing. The property is not aesthetically pleasing, so any improvements would be appreciated. She understood and respected it's an investment property. She just wanted to ensure it was considering the neighbors.
136. Joel Nice questioned if there were existing trees there. Karen Webber responded there were evergreens on the property line. Joel Nice questioned if they provided screening now. Karen Webber responded they were not thriving. One is half dead. There is a sewer cap down there and it goes under the garage out to Congress Street. She did not know how that would impact if it has to be created.
137. Keith Ratner motioned to continue the application for 84 Congress Street to the May 27, 2026 Planning Board Meeting. Seconded by Joel Nice.
138. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote—
139. Keith Ratner – YES
140. Joel Nice – YES
141. Tracey Chalifour – YES
142. Tom Salemi - YES
143. David Frick – YES
144. Pascal Rettig – YES
145. Motion passed 6-0
146. **New Hearings – 29 Water Street**
147. Nipun Jain read the legal notice into the record.
148. Mike Sanchez represented 21 Water St Realty Trust. They came in a month ago for a preapplication with the Planning Board. They have met with DRC and the Historical Commission. Generally, they have incorporated the suggestions. They are going for a Historic Special Permit and looking for a parking waiver. This building was built in 1878 and was long term manufacturing in 200 feet of the river and flood plain. There is almost a 0 lot line. There will be 6 residential units. The Conservation Commission issued them a negative determination for their RDA.
149. Sam Colombo commented the building takes up most of the lot. It is a redevelopment project. They are not proposing any storm water features. There is no parking on the site. The roof runoff is considered clean in the MA storm water handbook. They are not increasing the impervious area on the site. The site plan shows at the front north building along Water Street they are proposing a pervious paver walkaway to tie into an existing sidewalk. They will upgrade to brick across the frontage of the building. Along the rear of the building there will be another pervious paver walkway. There is 5 feet around the entire building where they will have proposed landscaping. That will require an easement

with the city. The utilities come in off Water St. For the construction they are requesting permission to use about 25 feet of the property for staging and have enough room to get construction vehicles in. The entire site will be lined with construction fencing as well as erosion control silt sock. Following construction the entire area will be reseeded.

150. Aileen Graf commented the majority of the building is made up of brick. The restoration details in the materials bring back the glory of the industrial era. The front elevation is facing Water Street. They will replace the existing windows with 8 over 8 based on the Historical Commission recommendations. They will bring the door openings back to a proportion that feels appropriate. Balconies help provide outdoor space. They will wrap the dormers in metal. They added more openings to bring back more repetition and rhythm. The small rectangular areas have been added at the lower level to insulate the flood vents. They are adding one additional door for outdoor space. They will put the condensers on the south side. The building occupies most of the site. One option is put it outside or in the interior. The Historical Commission recommended interior but they will need to convert 3 windows to louvers to accommodate that. The top gable end shows where the penetrations will come out. The first floor will not have any living space. It will be the entry point to the building and they will have unit storage on the first floor. The second floor is four units and third floor will have two more units. They are 1-2 bedrooms and 800 sf to 1,400 sf. The landscape plan shows they are proposing to replant the lawn around the property and a 5 foot zone to add some softening landscaping.
151. Mike Sanchez commented they were excited about the project. The landscaping was a suggestion from David Frick in the previous meeting. They will restore the impacted grass. They will put in landscaping as long as they can coordinate with the city on that.
152. Tom Salemi commented that he was excited about the project and questioned where deliveries would go. Mike Sanchez responded he would confirm where they would go and get back to them.
153. Joel Nice commented he liked the idea of extending the brick all the way across. The city can coordinate on the landscaping with you and the architecture looks great.
154. Keith Ratner agreed it was exciting to see and questioned if they would be subdividing anything. Mike Sanchez responded the city sold the land to 21 Water St. at the time the applicant gave some of the land back to the city to help with the parks there. That's why they have a zero lot line.
155. Paul Gagliardi commented that this was the old DPW garage owned by the city. The city sold it to the Amesbury Carriage Museum. The city bought it back and sold it to Dan Healey. It's already its own lot.
156. Mike Sanchez commented that in previous iterations everyone wanted to use the ground floor sf and could not figure out how to make it work economically.
157. Tracey Chalifour questioned if it would be home ownership or rental. Mike Sanchez responded it would be condos. Tracey Chalifour questioned if there was any consideration of no easement and getting the land back needed back for landscaping. Mike Sanchez responded there was not. They would like to start the project this summer. The easement can be written in a way that the condo association would need to maintain the plantings. Tracey Chalifour questioned if there would be signage. Mike Sanchez responded they are not proposing any design.

158. Tom Salemi questioned if this would require a historic placard. Nipun Jain confirmed that would be in the decision.
159. Pascal Rettig questioned if the roof penetrations were discussed with the historical commission. Mike Sanchez responded that it was. Pascal Rettig questioned if the elevator require anything. Mike Sanchez responded that it did not. It should be within the structure of the building. Pascal Rettig clarified that they updated the plans to move the mechanicals inside. Mike Sanchez confirmed that was correct and they added the louvers. Pascal Rettig questioned what the actual option for the side of the dormer was. Mike Sanchez responded it was a painted flat aluminum seam. Pascal Rettig questioned if they had any additional thoughts about what may go on in the first floor. Mike Sanchez responded it will be well lit but they really cannot put a lot down there without the risk of flood damage. They are still thinking it through.
160. Tom Salemi motioned to extend the meeting to 10:40 pm. Seconded by Keith Ratner.
161. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote—
162. Keith Ratner – YES
163. Joel Nice – YES
164. Tracey Chalifour – YES
165. Tom Salemi - YES
166. David Frick – YES
167. Pascal Rettig – YES
168. Motion passed 6-0
169. Nipun Jain commented they will have more comments back from TRC, DRC, and the Historical Commission. A lot of ground has been covered between the preapplication and today. The landscape is in the city's court to look at more closely. The city will grant an easement if desirable. It would be almost impossible to give to them a certain portion of land for perpetual use. It can be easily done through an easement. The two things they didn't touch upon are the affordable unit and the parking waiver. That has been discussed and staff would provide a formal recommendation to the Board.
170. David Frick questioned what would happen with trash and recycling. Mike Sanchez responded that there was a trash room inside the structure, and it would be the individual condo owners responsibility to bring trash out every week.
171. Tracey Chalifour questioned how they would do storage on the first floor if there was risk of flooding. Mike Sanchez responded they were showing hanging storage and are proposing to minimally heat the space.
172. David Frick motioned to continue the application for 29 Water St. to the May 27, 2026 Planning Board meeting. Seconded by Keith Ratner.
173. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote—
174. Keith Ratner – YES
175. Joel Nice – YES
176. Michael Jewell – YES
177. Tracey Chalifour – YES
178. Tom Salemi – YES
179. David Frick – YES
180. Pascal Rettig – YES

181. Motion passed 6-0
182. David Frick motioned to pay the invoices listed below. Seconded by Tracey Chalifour.
1. A Stantec invoice for Bailey's Pond in the amount of \$866.25
 2. A Stantec invoice for Oakland Street in the amount of \$1,763.50.
183. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote—
184. Keith Ratner – YES
185. Joel Nice – YES
186. Michael Jewell – YES
187. Tracey Chalifour – YES
188. Tom Salemi – YES
189. David Frick – YES
190. Pascal Rettig – YES
191. Motion passed 6-0
192. **Adjournment**
193. Keith Ratner motioned to adjourn the meeting at 10:39 pm. Seconded by Tom Salemi.
194. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote –
195. Keith Ratner – YES
196. Joel Nice – YES
197. Tracey Chalifour – YES
198. Tom Salemi – YES
199. David Frick – YES
200. Pascal Rettig – YES
201. Motion passed 6-0

Public Comment – Carolyn Welch

Dear committee,

Carolyn Welch. 9 Elmwood Street.

I am unable to attend tonight's meeting. Should the permit for sub dividing the property that is 2-4 Elmwood Street be seriously considered, I have a request.

Elmwood Street homes have a consistent **18-20 foot** setback from sidewalk to primary structure. The **proposed 8 foot** setback of the new primary structure breaks that historic site line. This house will visibly sit forward of every other home on the street. That disrupts the established streetscape and neighborhood character. If a permit is considered, I ask the committee to **require this house be moved back to align with the existing homes.**

Thank you,

Carolyn Welch