

RECEIVED

By City Clerk at 9:13 am, Oct 29, 2024

1. Amesbury Planning Board Meeting Minutes
2. In Person Meeting – July 29, 2024, at 7:05 PM
3. Chairman Pascal Rettig called the July 29, 2024, Planning Board meeting to order at 7:05 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 – ABSENT
9. Lorri Krebs- YES
10. Michael Jewell – YES
11. Tracey Chalifour - ABSENT
12. David Frick – YES
13. Pascal Rettig - YES
14. Also: Nipun Jain (Planning Director) and Becky Frey (Community Development Coordinator)
- 15. Minutes – 6-10-24**
16. Pascal Rettig noted that the Board did not have time to review the minutes, so they would be on the next agenda.
- 17. Minutes – 7-8-24**
18. Pascal Rettig noted that the Board did not have time to review the minutes, so they would be on the next agenda.
- 19. Continued Public Hearings – 87 S Hampton Rd.**
20. David Frick motioned to continue the application to the September 9, 2024, Planning Board Meeting. Seconded by Keith Ratner.
21. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote –
22. Keith Ratner – YES
23. Joel Nice – ABSENT
24. Lorri Krebs- YES
25. Michael Jewell – YES
26. Tracey Chalifour - ABSENT
27. David Frick – YES

- 28. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 29. Motion passed 5-0

30. Continued Public Hearings – 12 S Hunt Rd.

- 31. David Frick recused himself from the application.
- 32. Keith Ratner motioned to continue the application for 12 S Hunt Rd. to the August 12, 2024, Planning Board Meeting. Seconded by Michael Jewell.
- 33. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote –
- 34. Keith Ratner – YES
- 35. Joel Nice – ABSENT
- 36. Lorri Krebs- YES
- 37. Michael Jewell – YES
- 38. Tracey Chalifour - ABSENT
- 39. David Frick – Recused
- 40. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 41. Motion passed 4-0

42. New Public Hearings – 37 Clarks Rd.

- 43. Don Rose, civil engineer from CHA, Jeff Dirk, traffic engineer from Vanesse, and Mark Mussachio from Mussachio Architects were present to speak to the application. Don Rose commented that the application is to build a 2,300 sf Starbucks with a drive through at 37 Clarks Rd. It will replace the building at the closed Friendly's, and it will share the lot with the Fairfield Hotel. The design team has worked with staff, the TRC, and the DRC to come up with this plan. The building configuration will allow for a 15-car queue drive-through line. The average drive through lane accommodates 3-6 cars. They worked with TRC to make improvements to the site circulation. One existing access point will be closed and there will be a sidewalk connection from Clarks Road to the hotel. The proposed parking amount exceeds zoning requirements. Today storm water goes directly into the city drainage. This has been revised to meet storm water standards. There is a slight reduction in impervious area. They plan to connect to existing utilities on the site. The lighting will be dark sky compliant.
- 44. Nipun Jain commented that they are closing one entrance to create a common entrance/exit to the entire site. The drive-through goes around the building and will allow cars to easily exit the site when they are done. The existing parking lot has parking for the hotel patrons. They will also have parking for the restaurant itself closer to Starbucks. The building's primary entrance is next to the handicap spaces. They are proposing an outdoor patio for the Starbucks and pedestrian access from Clarks Road. There is a trash enclosure on site, and it will be accessible from the drive through as well. This application has been reviewed by the TRC and DRC. They have made some observations and comments on infrastructure. There is a proposed detention basin on site. One comment was to consider planting it with plants instead of just grass.
- 45. Don Rose commented that the detention basin will be a foot and a half deep. It is intended to take some overflow from the parking lot to ensure the parking lot does not flood. The

grading and drainage plan shows additional drainage enhancements. They are creating grading pockets to lead to the catch basins.

46. Nipun Jain commented that this is an existing restaurant site, and a lot of the proposal is rearranging the parking. The impervious surface does not change. The proposed storm water must meet the standards, so it will be an improvement overall.
47. Nipun Jain noted that there were 3 significant comments about the site plan. The first was about the landscape area along the patio. The recommendation was that they should consider installing a stone wall to provide some screening for patrons and public safety. The second comment was that Starbucks should consider adding a sign to the back of the restaurant on the public facing side. The prominent corner has just a blank wall now. The last major comment was about making a landscaping enhancement in the wide strip between the Macy St. sidewalk and the property. The applicant should look at planting trees in the area to enhance that. They also recommended coordinating the landscape with the hotel's improvement plans.
48. Pascal Rettig noted that the drive through is 12 feet wide, so only one car can go through at a time and questioned if that was typical. Don Rose responded that they worked through that process with Starbucks. Sometimes a drive-through has two lanes and sometimes they have one. Dunkin' Donuts typically has room for 5 cars and then the rest are in the street. This drive through is built around the site with a long driveway but it is not a pass through.
49. Michael Jewell questioned if there would be seating inside. Don Rose confirmed there would be. Michael Jewell questioned how many people it would accommodate. Don Rose responded he was not sure. Michael Jewell noted that the parking plan was somewhat limited for non-hotel spaces. Don Rose responded that the plan shows 9 spaces around the Starbucks and patrons can park 10 spaces along the edge in the hotel lot as well. There will be 15 more parking spaces than at the current site.
50. Michael Jewell questioned what plants would be going in the detention basin. Don Rose responded that they had not confirmed that yet, but it would be something that can take sand and salt.
51. Mark Mussachio commented that the building will be primarily brick with wood paneling at the drive through. The lighter gray areas show the wood. They will be providing a screen for the rooftop mechanical units. There will be signage on all three sides of the building, and they have asked Starbucks to add an additional sign. They provide the shell of the building and Starbucks builds the inside space.
52. Jeffrey Dirk commented that they did a full transportation assessment and followed Mass DOT standards because the location abuts a highway. The scope of analysis included the Carriage Town Marketplace and the highway ramps and Clarks Rd. intersections. The data accounts for seasonal fluctuation. They looked at people getting off 495 to get on 110 and the traffic patterns during the summer. This site is a former fast-food restaurant without a drive through. The square footage is going down, but the intensity is going up. They looked at the difference in traffic between Friendly's and what was being proposed and there was not a substantial amount of new traffic. The morning will be elevated by a net new of 100 additional vehicles. Over half the amount of traffic are pass by trips. Dunkin' Donuts have 90% pass by trips. This is more of a destination. They estimated that there would not be more than 50-55% net new trips to be conservative. In reality it probably will not be that.

53. David Frick requested clarification on the 100 additional trips. Jeffrey Dirk responded that it would be for the morning peak time compared to the Friendly's. They probably had 40 cars and would be anticipating 100 more than that. They would not be putting an additional burden on the signal except for Clarks Road. The signals will need to be re-timed to accommodate the traffic patterns. The study shows this continues to be a high crash location. They will pay special attention to the yellow and all-red clearance times. They are committed to undertaking those signal timing improvements. Re-timing the signal will improve the flow and will fix issues before the project opens. At the TRC they talked about some onsite elements. There are off-site traffic elements to consider as well. They will close one driveway at Clarks Road. There has been discussion about working with the City to straighten out the pinch point. That will help with re-timing. There will be a high demand for the right turn and that may result in some back up on Clarks Road if they can't all clear the light. If they create a right turn only lane, then they would need less time to clear out the vehicles. That would also put the sidewalk back close to the right of way. They looked at the intersection to see if there were ways to tighten that up. They will look at the signal phasing. Mr. Dirk is also working on the project up the road from this intersection and will be looking at it for that as well. That change to the signal timing could effectuate a lot of the needed improvements.
54. Pascal Rettig questioned if cars were allowed a right on red. David Frick confirmed it was allowed there. Jeff Dirk added that could be a significant benefit for the right-hand lane to keep cars moving. It is a simple improvement that could result in a significant benefit.
55. Keith Ratner commented that the hotel will not be a significant generator. It would be good to have signage directing the traffic flow. It may make sense to add employee parking in the 4 spaces near the drive through exits.
56. Nipun Jain commented that this area was discussed and one of the recommendations was to show how fire and emergency vehicles could navigate the area and how the circulation would work. It may make sense to eliminate a parking space to make it easier for larger vehicles to navigate. Another option would be to make it employee parking. They also discussed how to make the entrance more attractive and prevent people from cutting through. Jeff Dirk confirmed they would be able to work with staff on that. They can move parking around to solve circulation issues. They want to keep traffic on separate sides.
57. Pascal Rettig commented that there may be a pedestrian traffic flow from the walking trail across the street. Jeff Dirk confirmed there would be a sidewalk and crosswalk to get pedestrians from the hotel to the walking path. They can put the crosswalks at the stop signs. They could put in a crosswalk to accommodate the pedestrians from the bike trail to the north as well.
58. Keith Ratner commented that there should be safe bike parking on the site.
59. Michael Jewell questioned how many cars could stack from the stoplight to the entrance. Jeff Dirk responded that the drive through can accommodate 15 vehicles. The stop light to the entrance could hold 10-12 vehicles per lane. If they make a right-hand only lane, then they should be able to make it so that right turn lane stays relatively free.
60. Michael Jewell commented that there is a potential development on the other side of Clarks Road. Jeff Dirk responded that there were not any formal proposals filed for any potential development in the area. Any potential developments were not included in the traffic study

because it would all be speculation. They did traffic counts in July 2023. There were 50 or so vehicles going in and out of that driveway.

61. Lorri Krebs commented that taking a left off the 95 south exit ramp is very difficult especially with increased traffic, and questioned how that impact would be mitigated. Jeff Dirk responded that they did study the ramps, and they would not significantly impact that queue. The impact without adjusting the signal is 1-2 vehicles. Adjusting the signal timing would help to some extent.
62. Pascal Rettig commented that one member, Tracey Chalifour, is not here but she did send in written comments. Tracey Chalifour's written comments included that the transportation impact assessment was completed in July 2023 when the Friendly's was closed, so it is not accurate. The Burger King may have also been nonoperational at that time as well. Jeff Dirk commented that he addressed the Burger King comment earlier. They looked at the existing conditions and Friendly's did not exist at the time they were looking at it. They provided a conservative analysis by showing traffic volumes on a high side. They can't account for an existing use if it is closed for 2 years prior to the study. The State would not accept the study if they did. Pascal Rettig noted that Tracey Chalifour commented that the report notes on page 15 that they have not identified other future developments that would increase traffic. They do not mention the future development on Clarks Road. Jeff Dirk commented that they can't assume anything. When that project comes in, then that team would need to look at how to extend and enhance the mitigation proposed with Starbuck.
63. Pascal Rettig noted that Tracey Chalifour commented that the traffic volume shown is from 2019. Jeff Dirk responded that was because of Covid. Mass DOT made a decision that this is the new normal. There are no more adjustments made unless it is an office park area. They just use the traffic counts. In traffic growth assessment they don't use years 2020 to present because that is an anomaly.
64. Pascal Rettig noted that Tracey Chalifour commented that given all of the proposed development in the area, they should make it a right turn only onto Clarks Rd. Jeff Dirk responded that they can try to make it a natural flow out toward 110. That's where they believe traffic will be headed anyway. However, they don't want to restrict residents from getting there. They could look at implementing traffic calming to deter cars from going that way by tightening the roadway or landscaping.
65. David Frick questioned if they had an estimate for how many people may come from that direction. Jeff Dirk responded that 98% of the traffic would be coming up toward 110. A small amount of traffic would be heading down Clarks Rd.
66. Pascal Rettig opened public comment.
67. Nick Cracknell from the Office of Community and Economic Development commented that this is a doorstep to Amesbury. It is a great opportunity for us to get it right and address traffic issues. It's a great opportunity to position Amesbury and future neighborhoods. Most of the project will be traffic off the interstate and Route 110. It is encouraging to hear Jeff Dirk talk about implanting traffic calming measures on Clarks Rd. It is smart to create crosswalks from the hotel to Starbucks. It will help discourage cut through traffic. Moving the sidewalk to the edge of Clarks Rd. is a good idea as well as extending a right turn lane. This will be a very active pedestrian and bike facility. They need to have ample bike parking

and outdoor seating. Starbucks is underestimating the ability for the site to be a destination instead of just a drive through. They should improve the patio with a wall and add a sign to the end of the building that faces Route 110. TRC encouraged larger trees to insert in the project in the islands or detention basin. Jeff Dirk did a great job explaining answers to good questions. If the conclusion and findings find this is sufficient, then taking additional measures will only improve traffic flow. This is an opportunity to bring people into our community and explore. It is good for Amesbury's economic development. Newburyport has a location downtown. Starbucks is looking at a couple sites on Storey Ave. too. They should consider introducing more bike-friendly spaces before they cross the drive through lane. They could put in pavers with bike racks.

68. Michael Jewell questioned if there was a traffic study done on bikes.
69. Jeff Dirk confirmed the traffic counts included bikes. They have not predicted an increase.
70. Pascal Rettig questioned if there was any other public comment.
71. There was none.
72. Nipun Jain commented that the applicant has met with the Design Review Committee and the team will provide material options to look at that are alternative to the materials currently shown in the renderings. There is value in creating a more subtle design palette. They will be working with applicants' team on that.
73. David Frick questioned if the Technical Review Committee reviewed this. Nipun confirmed they had, and they have relayed their comments.
74. Pascal Rettig questioned what the next steps should be. Nipun Jain commented that the Board has heard the application. They have taken comments from TRC and DRC and have come up with plan to make improvements to traffic related issues. There are no substantial changes needed. The applicant is agreeable to the improvements that have been suggested. The non traffic related issues like landscaping, patio, and outdoor seating can be incorporated and reviewed by DRC and staff. That can be conditioned to make sure it is addressed.
75. David Frick commented that he felt satisfied they could close the hearing. Nipun Jain responded they don't have to wait for TRC or DRC to give formal sign offs because there are not any significant issues. The Board can make conditions that the comments are satisfied with TRC and DRC and closed out in a final memo.
76. David Frick motioned to approve the Site Plan Review application for 37 Clarks Road with the condition that the applicant satisfy outstanding comments from the Technical Review Committee and Design Review Committee and submit corresponding revised plans and memo summarizing the addressed comments. Seconded by Keith Ratner.
77. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote –
78. Keith Ratner – YES
79. Joel Nice – ABSENT
80. Lorri Krebs- YES
81. Michael Jewell – YES
82. Tracey Chalifour - ABESSENT
83. David Frick – YES
84. Pascal Rettig – YES
85. Motion passed 5-0

86. David Frick motioned to close the public hearing for 37 Clarks Road. Seconded by Keith Ratner.
87. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote –
88. Keith Ratner – YES
89. Joel Nice – ABSENT
90. Lorri Krebs- YES
91. Michael Jewell – YES
92. Tracey Chalifour - ABESENT
93. David Frick – YES
94. Pascal Rettig – YES
95. Motion passed 5-0

96. New Public Hearings – Bill 2024-085

97. Nipun Jain read the legal notice into the record.
98. Nipun Jain commented that the presentation will show what they hope to achieve with the amendments, how they apply, and what a project could look like. This is a two-part change. One is to the cluster residential permit and the other is to the water resource protection district. These amendments would allow limited small development in a portion of the Water Resource Protection District (WRPD.) The amendments are sensitive to building and site design to allow for max protection of open spaces and provide an opportunity for permanent protection for the majority of the property. These large swaths of land appear to be attractive to 40B development. This would be an alternative to the 40B. Local zoning which regulations do not apply to 40B developments. The yellow area is where the amendment is targeting. Zone A currently does not allow any development. Zone B allows people to get a special permit to add on or build new. IWPA does not allow for anything new but will allow improvement to existing structures. They cannot expand the footprint. This amendment requires an existing structure, and the proposal would need to have 90% of the property permanently protected. The remaining area could allow for an additional structure or improvement to the existing structure. It would require 2 acres per dwelling a maximum of up to 4 units. The total limit of work could not be more than 10% or 10,000 sf. If the property has existing uses, then they can make improvements, but they are capped at 4 units. This amendment would prevent major development in the WRPD by allowing limited development.
99. Nipun Jain showed one example of how the amendment could be applied. There is an existing structure serviced by water and sewer. The site has a lot of impervious surfaces that have been disturbed and mined. If this zoning was to pass, then it would allow 90% of the parcel to be permanently protected. It could possibly have two 2-unit buildings. The development would be compatible to other structures in the area. The public benefits include a pathway to better long term water resource protection by limiting what can be built. There will be better site design and performance standards. It would allow for a public greenway along the Powwow River and protect against 40B applications.
100. Pascal Rettig clarified that this will require a special permit. Nipun Jain confirmed that was correct. In this zone if the property owner does not have an existing structure, then

they cannot build anything new. This provides a mechanism to give property owners an opportunity to put in a reasonable development while improving the storm water management and put in permanent protection.

101. David Frick motioned to send a positive recommendation for Bill 2024-085 as written to City Council. Seconded by Keith Ratner.

102. Pascal opened the public comment. There was no public comment.

103. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote –

104. Keith Ratner – YES

105. Joel Nice – ABSENT

106. Lorri Krebs- YES

107. Michael Jewell – YES

108. Tracey Chalifour - ABESSENT

109. David Frick – YES

110. Pascal Rettig – YES

111. Motion passed 5-0

112. David Frick motioned to close the public hearing for Bill 2024-085. Seconded by Michael Jewell.

113. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote –

114. Keith Ratner – YES

115. Joel Nice – ABSENT

116. Lorri Krebs- YES

117. Michael Jewell – YES

118. Tracey Chalifour - ABESSENT

119. David Frick – YES

120. Pascal Rettig – YES

121. Motion passed 5-0

122. New Public Hearings – Bill 2024-086

123. Nipun commented that the goal of this amendment is to encourage re-adaptive use of the properties by expanding the uses from residential zones to other zoning districts. The three added zones are commercial, office park, and central industrial. We are adding those additional districts because we have seen there are historic structures in those areas, but they cannot be protected by using this special permit today. This amendment would provide opportunity for this use in those areas and restoring buildings to keep the neighborhood character intact. They used a tight formula to arrive at the density. They are limited to the number of units, not parcel size or building size. They are expanding the ability to apply in other areas. The buildings could be larger like the mill buildings. They added more language to allow the developer and Board to look at the density of allowed uses with performance standards and requirements. They also included language that protects key architecture like towers, window battens, and other character defining elements. These buildings would be protected by the historic preservation restriction. They are required to have up to 15% affordable units. Nipun Jain showed a presentation of how

the permit has been applied in the past at properties like 20 Maple St., 6 Center St., 5 Sparhawk St., 140-142 Main St., and Horace Man. The permit provides so much flexibility. The buildings are different, and the context is different. The owner at the old animal hospital at 230 Main St. has filed for a demo permit. Given the historic context and significance this amendment would allow for the restoration of the building and enhancing the site. This permit would also be available to the mill building at 9 Oakland St. as well. It could protect historic budlings and allow for additional uses on the remaining site. It provides an alternative to the demo permit. It will support economic development and cultural tourism. It is an opportunity for adaptive reuse and sustainability.

124. David Frick motioned to extend the meeting to 10 pm. Seconded by Keith Ratner.

Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote –

125. Keith Ratner – YES

126. Joel Nice – ABSENT

127. Lorri Krebs- YES

128. Michael Jewell – YES

129. Tracey Chalifour - ABESENT

130. David Frick – YES

131. Pascal Rettig – YES

132. Motion passed 5-0

133. Keith Ratner requested clarification on the 10-15% housing restriction.

134. Nick Cracknell commented that the base line is 15% and the Board can weight it to 10%.

135. David Frick commented that the results of the historic preservation permit have been fantastic. Nipun Jain agreed that it has worked to bring back a property in a good way.

David Frick noted that extending it just makes sense.

136. David Frick motioned to send a positive recommendation for Bill 2024-086 to City Council. Seconded by Lorri Krebs.

137. Lorri Krebs commented that the visual is very helpful to see how the permit has been actualized.

138. Nipun Jain commented that nothing changed from the exiting historic permit. They are just expanding beyond the district. Pascal Rettig questioned how many projects total have used this permit because it has been on the books for a while. Nipun Jain responded that it has been on the books since 2007-2008. There was a project approved on Lionsmouth Rd. where the homestead is, but it didn't go anywhere. Beyond that, there has been 6 projects that have happened in the past decade.

139. Pascal Rettig opened public comment.

140. Joe Finn of 412 Main St. spoke as the Chairman of the Historical Commission and was totally supportive of this Bill.

141. Nick Cracknell commented that 4 of those 6 projects were his clients and the project last one he did was 6 Center St. It was not easy to get their arms around the building. It had limited historical significance. If it didn't have the story it had, then it would have been a harder sell. They all learned a lot about this ordinance and community. A lot of people would have torn that house down and his client would have lost a significant amount of money if not for this permit allowing for the additional unit. Sparhawk St. is now bringing in \$75,000 in taxes, and 6 center St. was bringing in \$8,500 in taxes and is now approaching

\$50,000. 142 Main St. went from \$0 to \$125,000. 51 Market St. went from \$1,500 in taxes to over \$10,000. 20 Maple St. went from \$15,000 to over \$50,000 in taxes. There is a 15-fold increase in taxes, and it provides historic control on the renovation and future use. It also has indirect values on abutting properties. They have created 31 new housing units with this permit.

- 142. Nipun Jain also pointed out that various types of private and public owners have participated in this permit.
- 143. Evan Coburn 10 Chester St. submitted written public comment expressing concern about the major erosion of the zoning ordinance in the City over the past year. The historic preservation special permit is being exploited by opportunistic developers and allow for development on undersized lots. They are using the permit to shoehorn in additional units. This development negatively impacts the abutters and the City. It is allowing residential development to eat up the small commercial districts.
- 144. David Frick commented that gentleman was the only abutter to 6 center St. who opposed it. His property value increased because of that project. All other abutters were happy with it.
- 145. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote –
- 146. Keith Ratner – YES
- 147. Joel Nice – ABSENT
- 148. Lorri Krebs- YES
- 149. Michael Jewell – YES
- 150. Tracey Chalifour - ABESSENT
- 151. David Frick – YES
- 152. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 153. Motion passed 5-0
- 154. Keith Ratner motioned to close the public hearing for Bill 2024-086. Seconded by Michael Jewell.
- 155. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote –
- 156. Keith Ratner – YES
- 157. Joel Nice – ABSENT
- 158. Lorri Krebs- YES
- 159. Michael Jewell – YES
- 160. Tracey Chalifour - ABESSENT
- 161. David Frick – YES
- 162. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 163. Motion passed 5-0

164. **New Public Hearings – Bill 2024-087**

- 165. Nipun Jain commented that this is the same amendment that was presented to City Council last year. It was to expand and the existing Retail Marijuana Overlay District (RMOD) that is currently in place into the downtown areas. This version is amending the overlay district boundaries and creating building design standards that would be then permitted in the overlay district. The downtown area is broadly comprised of the Central Business District (CBD) and the Central Industrial (IC). This overlay would be expanded over

a portion of the CBD and IC. The amendment also proposes expanding to the Carriage Hill area. The difference between the prior version and this one is the requirement of 500 feet between allowed uses. There are design standards around the storefront display along the public facing side of the store. They are trying to avoid dead zones along the sidewalks in pedestrian friendly zones. The intent is that the window fronts would still be available for a visual experience for pedestrians. The idea is there would be a false back to the store front windows to allow for window display. The public benefits for this amendment would keep downtown revitalization and economic development. It would also increase tax revenue and pedestrian activity.

166. David Frick motioned to send a positive recommendation for Bill 2024-087 to City Council. Seconded by Michael Jewell.

167. Pascal Rettig opened public comment.

168. Kirby Mastrangelo, owner of Hempire at 45 Main St., has been in the City for over 7 years. This is something they would like to pursue. They have reached out to as many abutters as possible and received over 50 signatures from residents and businesses. They did not encounter opposition. This amendment would allow them to further invest in the space and improve the storefront windows.

169. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote –

170. Keith Ratner – YES

171. Joel Nice – ABSENT

172. Lorri Krebs- YES

173. Michael Jewell – YES

174. Tracey Chalifour - ABESENT

175. David Frick – YES

176. Pascal Rettig – YES

177. Motion passed 5-0

178. **Administrative – Bill 2024-083**

179. Pascal Rettig noted that this was just an FYI because someone from the Planning Board will be a representative on this committee.

180. **Administrative – 19 Pond View – Bailey’s Pond – Bond Reduction Request**

181. Nipun Jain commented that they have received a bond reduction request, and Stantec has provided a list of items that are needed before they reduce it. Staff will reach out to the development team.

182. **Administrative – Contracts, Bills, and Invoices**

183. David Frick motioned to extend the meeting to 10:05 pm. Seconded by Keith Ratner.

184. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote –

185. Keith Ratner – YES

186. Joel Nice – ABSENT

187. Lorri Krebs- YES

- 188. Michael Jewell – YES
- 189. Tracey Chalifour - ABESENT
- 190. David Frick – YES
- 191. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 192. Motion passed 5-0

193. Nipun Jain commented that they needed the Board to approve a money transfer of \$11,500 from the Planning Board Stantec Peer Review account to the Conservation Commission BSC Peer Review account for the Munter's project at 14 S Hunt Rd.

194. David Frick motioned to approve the money transfer of \$11,500 from the Planning Board Stantec Peer Review account to the Conservation Commission BSC Peer Review account for the Munter's project at 14 S Hunt Rd. Seconded by Keith Ratner.

195. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote –

196. Keith Ratner – YES

197. Joel Nice – ABSENT

198. Lorri Krebs- YES

199. Michael Jewell – YES

200. Tracey Chalifour - ABESENT

201. David Frick – YES

202. Pascal Rettig – YES

203. Motion passed 5-0

204. Adjournment

205. Lorri Krebs motioned to adjourn the meeting at 10:03 pm. Seconded by Michael Jewell.

206. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote –

207. Keith Ratner – YES

208. Joel Nice – ABSENT

209. Lorri Krebs- YES

210. Michael Jewell – YES

211. Tracey Chalifour - ABSENT

212. David Frick – YES

213. Pascal Rettig – YES

214. Motion passed 5-0