

RECEIVED

By City Clerk at 12:40 pm, Mar 10, 2026

1. Amesbury Planning Board Meeting Minutes
2. In Person Meeting – November 24, 2025, at 7:02 PM
3. Chairman Pascal Rettig called the November 24, 2025, 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. Michael Jewell – ABSENT
10. Tracey Chalifour – YES
11. Tom Salemi - YES
12. David Frick – ABSENT
13. Pascal Rettig – YES
14. Also: Nipun Jain (Planning Director) and Becky Frey (Community Development Coordinator)
- 15. Signs– 19 S Hunt Rd.**
16. Tracey Chalifour motioned to continue to the 12-8-25 meeting. Seconded by Joe Nice.
17. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
18. Keith Ratner – YES
19. Joel Nice – YES
20. Michael Jewell – ABSENT
21. Tracey Chalifour – YES
22. Tom Salemi - YES
23. David Frick – ABSENT
24. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 25. Motion passed 5-0.**
- 26. Continued Hearings – 102 Kimball Road**
27. Pascal Rettig commented that the applicant requested to continue to 12-8-25 Planning Board meeting.
28. Keith Ratner motioned to continue the public hearing for 102 Kimball Road to the 12-8-25 Planning Board Meeting. Seconded by Joel Nice.

- 29. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
- 30. Keith Ratner – YES
- 31. Joel Nice – YES
- 32. Michael Jewell – ABSENT
- 33. Tracey Chalifour – ABSTAIN
- 34. Tom Salemi - YES
- 35. David Frick – ABSENT
- 36. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 37. Motion passed 4-0.**

38. Continued Hearings – 6 Lake Attitash Way

- 39. Keith Ratner motioned to continue the public hearing for 6 Lake Attitash Way to the 12-8-25 Planning Board Meeting. Seconded by Joel Nice.
- 40. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
- 41. Keith Ratner – YES
- 42. Joel Nice – YES
- 43. Michael Jewell – ABSENT
- 44. Tracey Chalifour – ABSTAIN
- 45. Tom Salemi - YES
- 46. David Frick – ABSENT
- 47. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 48. Motion passed 4-0.**

49. Continued Hearings – 1-9 Oakland Street

- 50. Pascal Rettig commented that they continued this application to this meeting to approve the peer review.
- 51. Nipun Jain commented that the Board asked staff to get Stantec and VHB contracts. The Board can motion to have Stantec to do the civil peer review and VHB do the traffic peer review. Pascal Rettig confirmed that staff received quotes. Nipun Jain confirmed they have received a firm quote from Stantec and a draft from VHB.
- 52. Keith Ratner motioned to approve Stantec for civil peer review and VHB for traffic peer review for the 9 Oakland Street application. Seconded by Joel Nice.
- 53. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
- 54. Keith Ratner – YES
- 55. Joel Nice – YES
- 56. Michael Jewell – ABSENT
- 57. Tracey Chalifour – YES
- 58. Tom Salemi - YES
- 59. David Frick – ABSENT
- 60. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 61. Motion passed 5-0.
- 62. Pascal Rettig questioned if the Board had any questions or comments before they opened public comment.

63. Keith Ratner commented that he went to the site today and noticed the back of the site was in really awful shape. This will be an improvement.
64. Pascal Rettig commented that he walked it and the sidewalk is not in great shape.
65. Pascal Rettig opened public comment. There was no public comment.
66. Nipun Jain commented that the applicant requested to continue to first meeting in January.
67. Tom Salemi motioned to continue to the first regularly scheduled Planning Board meeting in January 2026. Seconded by Tracey Chalifour.
68. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
69. Keith Ratner – YES
70. Joel Nice – YES
71. Michael Jewell – ABSENT
72. Tracey Chalifour – YES
73. Tom Salemi - YES
74. David Frick – ABSENT
75. Pascal Rettig – YES
76. Motion passed 5-0.

77. Administrative – 2026 Schedule

78. Tracey Chalifour motioned to approve 2026 schedule as presented. Seconded by Tom Salemi.
79. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
80. Keith Ratner – YES
81. Joel Nice – YES
82. Michael Jewell – ABSENT
83. Tracey Chalifour – YES
84. Tom Salemi - YES
85. David Frick – ABSENT
86. Pascal Rettig – YES
87. Motion passed 5-0.

88. Administrative – 27 Kimball Road

89. Pascal Rettig commented that the Board was asked to comment on this. This is not a public hearing, and the Board will not make any recommendations on this. They have been asked to provide comments similar to when they did for 276 Main Street.
90. Nipun Jain commented this was not a routine aspect of the Board. When a 40B project is intended in the city there are multiple steps before an application is formally filed with the Zoning Board of Appeals. The first step is get a letter of eligibility from the state. The city received a request from Mass Housing stating that a developer intends to file a 40B. Right now, there is a comment period where the city and residents can provide comment to the state. Staff have circulated the application to departments and city boards that would be involved at a local level under local regulations. When a Chapter 40B is filed they are not subject to local zoning or environmental regulations. This is an opportunity for the Planning Board and other committees to provide input based on what they would typically review in their applications. The intent is to give initial feedback. Nipun Jain recommended looking

at this from the lens of if it was a site plan was that filed under the Planning Board. They would look at certain performance standards like access, traffic, utilities, offsite impact, stormwater management, erosion control, site grading, density, amenities and general impact to the neighborhood. Board members can provide feedback to staff, and they can send it back to Mass Housing.

91. Nipun Jain commented that the proposed site is in the Water Resource Protection District. That normally adds a layer to any development proposal. They should evaluate the impact to the environmental resources on how the storm water is managed and controlled. It is critical for the proponent to keep as much open space as possible which would help meet the intent of the Water Resource Protection District.
92. Pascal Rettig questioned what the total development allowed in this overlay would be. Nipun Jain responded it would be significantly lower. It would be similar to Brielle Way. That is an important aspect that should be highlighted.
93. Joel Nice commented that the proposal was very dense with a lot of buildings and impervious surface. Right off the bat they may encounter grading issues with that large of a driveway. This is a heavy impact project. Nipun Jain commented that the applicant has identified wetland resources in the back. The back portion of the site is in the buffer zone. That will be reviewed further if and when it is filed. Generally, the area could be better protected.
94. Joel Nice questioned if they would be required to provide a wetland delineation to the property and if the traffic impacts would be considered. Nipun Jain responded that it's 1.5 miles from the 495 on and off ramp. It's not too far from the regional transportation network. It is not located too far from Route 110 however Kimball Road is a very narrow street. The amount of traffic generated from this development would be significant. The lack of sidewalks and width of the road is a concern.
95. Pascal Rettig commented that there was no way for pedestrians to get anywhere. There is no accessibility. The goal is to create affordable units, but everyone in here will need a car. This is one of the worst places to put a 40B. Nipun Jain commented that Amesbury is in the Boston region, so the rent ceilings are higher than market rate. It is not truly affordable for Amesbury.
96. Keith Ratner questioned what percentage they were at on the SHI right now. Nipun Jain responded they were at 8.4-8.5%.
97. Tracey Chalifour commented that she found this project as egregious as what will happen on Clarks Road. There are no sidewalks, and it is a narrow road. There is only one way in and out, which is concerning for this number of units.
98. Tom Salemi commented that this was incredibly dense and inappropriate for the site. There's a bend at Kimball Road right before this driveway. The sightlines are concerning. They are proposing two parking spaces per unit. It looks like a mall parking lot. It is not suitable for the site.
99. Pascal Rettig questioned if there were any trail connections. Nipun Jain commented that at this point the Board should be looking at whether or not it works. Pascal Rettig noted that his point was there are tiny little backyards, but no accessible recreational area except wetlands.

100. Nipun Jain commented that the only identified amenities are the neighborhood park and the dog run. The park is actually a glorified sub surface basin area. It is not as suitable for recreational use.
101. Nipun Jain commented that if this plan moved forward, then they would look for more open space and a larger recreation area. The parking could be reduced. It is not as sustainable as one would hope. The proposal is for tiny units with a lot of parking. If they need a certain number of units to make the project more economically viable, then there are better building types to allow for better open space on site.
102. Tracey Chalifour questioned if the proposal was 100% rental units. Nipun Jain confirmed that was correct. Tracey Chalifour commented that a lot of the projects coming before the city do not have affordable home ownership options. There is no attempt to provide that opportunity for people. Nipun Jain clarified that was not something the city could impose.
103. Tom Salemi questioned if they would be required to abide by setbacks. Nipun Jain responded that they would not. The waiver list says that this was customarily proposed in 40Bs. One suggestion is that any waiver should be provided with justification. The applicant has many options available to meet their density with other setback requirements and other building types. They have not provided any justification. They have requested waivers from storm water management and the bylaws. That is not something that should be considered lightly, especially given the location.
104. Pascal Rettig commented that this applicant built a cottage development in Lancaster. They had a number of nice renderings presented with nice concrete curbs and sidewalks. However, in reality that project was built without an elevated sidewalk. Pascal Rettig questioned to what extent they were held to for project execution with a 40B.
105. Nipun Jain responded that renderings can be misleading. They need to look at all the details. If this comes to the ZBA, then there is a proforma that can be evaluated. They can condition what is important.
106. Keith Ratner commented that it seemed they could be more innovative with their proposal.
107. Nipun Jain commented that it looked like the company who did the building design and layout has done most of their work in the south and on the west coast. The climate is very different than in the northeast. That is an important aspect to point out. They need architecture that is consistent for what you would find in Amesbury. Tracey Chalifour commented that it did not look like they've allowed space for snow storage.
108. Joel Nice commented that the construction type is not good for this environment because there is less insulation.
109. Nipun Jain commented that the intended outdoor use may not be practical. It doesn't work best for this environment. Pascal Rettig commented that they could get better density with better open space by doing something similar to what Rocky Hill Road is doing. Nipun Jain agreed it would be a better layout with a more New England type ideology and amenity building. That is one way to make the development more desirable.
110. Pascal Rettig questioned how they should capture feedback. Nipun Jain responded they could summarize the discussion and lay it out in a memo format. They heard the opinions about the site location, site layout, and traffic. If the Board would like to discuss this more,

then they have more time. The state agency has indicated the city can request a 15-day extension for the comment period.

111. Pascal Rettig commented that they could summarize it and bring it to the next meeting. The Board could make a non-binding recommendation to bring this back to the Board for further discussion at the 12/8/25 meeting if the 15 day extension was granted. If not, then they will forward a memo of this discussion to the state agency.
112. Keith Ratner motioned to make a non-binding recommendation bring this back to Board for further discussion at the 12/8/25 meeting if the 15 day extension was granted. If not, then they will forward a memo of this discussion to the state agency. Seconded by Joel Nice.
113. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
114. Keith Ratner – YES
115. Joel Nice – YES
116. Michael Jewell – ABSENT
117. Tracey Chalifour – YES
118. Tom Salemi - YES
119. David Frick – ABSENT
120. Pascal Rettig – YES
121. Motion passed 5-0.

122. Administrative MassGrow Minor Modification

123. Nipun Jain commented that the request is to expand a portion of the existing facility for use by the business for non-cannabis uses. They have asked the Board to make a determination of a minor modification and approve the modification to the site plan as requested. Staff finds the request reasonable and recommend approval.
124. Keith Ratner questioned if the request was for the building or just a raised dock. A Representative from Massgrow, Kevin Conroy, responded that the request was partially for a loading dock and partially for building space.
125. Nipun Jain commented that the key to the request was that it will not be used for cannabis related activities. If it were, then they would have requested additional information for securing the area. There is change to the site plan building or layout of access. It does not trigger any other site plan review items.
126. Pascal Rettig questioned if they would just get major trucks in there. Kevin Conroy responded that they would be delivering soil and other products in the involved in the cultivation process. This change would accommodate trucks without lift gates. The existing loading dock can only do trucks with lift gates.
127. Keith Ratner motioned to determine that this is a minor modification and approve the request as presented. Seconded by Joel Nice.
128. Pascal any board questions.
129. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
130. Keith Ratner – YES
131. Joel Nice – YES
132. Michael Jewell – ABSENT
133. Tracey Chalifour – YES

- 134. Tom Salemi - YES
- 135. David Frick – ABSENT
- 136. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 137.** Motion passed 5-0.

138. Administrative- Bailey's Pond

- 139. Nipun Jain commented that the Board has received a request from the applicant and staff sent the request to Stantec. They have provided a response to the request. They do have some concerns about the request. They want to see that the landscaping and site stabilization survives 2 growing seasons. There was a lot of cut and fill and it was a dry summer. They are in discussion with the Conservation Commission Agent to see how they have evaluated the stabilization in the buffer zones. Staff requests the Board continue this to the 12/8/25 meeting.
- 140. Tom Salemi motioned to continue this discussion to the 12/8/25 meeting. Seconded by Joel Nice.
- 141. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
- 142. Keith Ratner – YES
- 143. Joel Nice – YES
- 144. Michael Jewell – ABSENT
- 145. Tracey Chalifour – YES
- 146. Tom Salemi - YES
- 147. David Frick – ABSENT
- 148. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 149.** Motion passed 5-0.

150. Administrative – 24 S Hunt Rd.

- 151. Nipun Jain commented that this request was for the Munter's facility which is now 14 S Hunt Rd. The Stantec memo that came in late Thursday indicates there are still outstanding issues. The applicant responded to that memo today. Staff recommends continuing this to the 12/8/25 meeting as well.
- 152. Keith Ratner motioned to continue this request to the 12/8/25 meeting. Seconded by Tom Salemi.
- 153. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
- 154. Keith Ratner – YES
- 155. Joel Nice – YES
- 156. Michael Jewell – ABSENT
- 157. Tracey Chalifour – YES
- 158. Tom Salemi - YES
- 159. David Frick – ABSENT
- 160. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 161.** Motion passed 5-0.

162. Administrative – 99 Lake Attitash Road

- 163. Pascal Rettig commented that they received a request to release the full bond amount and any remaining review fees. This project is long done.
- 164. Nipun Jain confirmed it was complete and at this time they are trying to close out projects.
- 165. Joel Nice motioned to release the bond amount and any outstanding review fees for 99 Lake Attitash Road. Seconded by Tom Salemi.
- 166. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
- 167. Keith Ratner – YES
- 168. Joel Nice – YES
- 169. Michael Jewell – ABSENT
- 170. Tracey Chalifour – YES
- 171. Tom Salemi - YES
- 172. David Frick – ABSENT
- 173. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 174. Motion passed 5-0.

175. Administrative – Master Plan update

- 176. Nipun Jain commented that they were very close to wrapping up the land use section. They are looking to see if it's critical to have a composite land use map. It may not be as critical as we originally thought. They hope to have something for the Board to consider shortly. Pascal Rettig commented that he has not heard back from the mayor on those revisions. Nipun Jain responded that they will give the mayor the land use component to incorporate.

177. Adjournment

- 178. Joel Nice motioned to adjourn at 8:28 pm. Seconded by Tracey Chalifour.
- 179. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote –
- 180. Keith Ratner – YES
- 181. Joel Nice – YES
- 182. Michael Jewell – ABSENT
- 183. Tracey Chalifour – YES
- 184. Tom Salemi - YES
- 185. David Frick – ABSENT
- 186. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 187. Motion passed 5-0