

RECEIVED

By City Clerk at 3:46 pm, Mar 03, 2026

1. Amesbury Planning Board Meeting Minutes
2. In Person Meeting – November 10, 2025, at 7:03 PM
3. Chairman Pascal Rettig called the November 10, 2025, Planning Board meeting to order at 7:03 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. Signs– 8 Industrial Way**
16. Nipun Jain commented that the DRC reviewed the application and recommended approval for the sign as presented.
17. David Frick motioned to approve the sign for Aqua Laboratories at 8 Industrial Way as submitted. Seconded by Keith Ratner.
18. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
19. Keith Ratner – YES
20. Joel Nice – YES
21. Michael Jewell – YES
22. Tracey Chalifour – YES
23. Tom Salemi - YES
24. David Frick – YES
25. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 26. Motion passed 7-0.**
- 27. Signs– 43 Friend Street**

28. Nipun Jain commented that the DRC reviewed the application and recommended approval for the sign with the recommendations that the applicant consider a darker font and noting that any other signage requires an additional approval.
29. David Frick motioned to approve the sig application for Chloe's Nail Salon at 43 Friend St. with the recommendation they consider a darker font and noting any other signs for the store front windows would need to be submitted for further approval. Seconded by Keith Ratner.
30. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
31. Keith Ratner – YES
32. Joel Nice – YES
33. Michael Jewell – YES
34. Tracey Chalifour – YES
35. Tom Salemi - YES
36. David Frick – YES
37. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 38. Motion passed 7-0.**

39. ANR – 39 Oakland Street and 41 Oakland Street

40. Jennifer Platt commented there are two ANR plans in front of the Board. The two lots are next to each other and with water frontage on the river. They are trying to implement a remediation plan for Boston Gas Company. These ANRs are splitting the upland lot from the back mud flats and land underwater. Boston Gas will purchase the mud flats and underwater portion to complete their remediation. The remaining upland lots are conforming building lots. The portions that Boston Gas are purchasing are identified as non-buildable.
41. Nipun Jain commented that the ANR subdivision regulations are met. The easement on the proposed lots is properly defined. Nipun Jain commented that they were shown on the plan but for labeled for private use. Jennifer Platt responded that there would be pedestrian access for the back portion of the property to allow employees to walk along the back of the property. It is stated in form of the plan and will be part of the deed.
42. Joel Nice questioned if there was a gas line in the easement. Jennifer Platt responded there was not. The gas plant caused some existing contamination. Boston Gas is coming in with a remediation plan. The plan is still being developed. Joel Nice questioned if that remediation plan would go through the Conservation Commission. Jennifer Platt confirmed it would.
43. David Frick motioned to approve the ANR application for 39 Oakland Street and 41 Oakland Street. Seconded by Tom Salemi.
44. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
45. Keith Ratner – YES
46. Joel Nice – YES
47. Michael Jewell – YES
48. Tracey Chalifour – YES
49. Tom Salemi - YES
50. David Frick – YES

51. Pascal Rettig – YES
52. Motion passed 7-0.

53. Continued Public Hearings– Rocky Hill Development

54. Bob Dale commented that they were making iterative changes as they were developing the plan. They are presenting the landscape plans and the southern neighborhood architecture tonight. They are also hoping to have peer reviewers selected.
55. Pascal Rettig commented that the Board did not get the materials in time to review, so there will not be a lot of discussion on this new material tonight.
56. Tracey Chalifour commented that at the meeting on October 27th they were told there would be discussion about the traffic and road. Bob Dale responded that they did not think it made sense to bring the traffic engineer back until they received peer review comments.
57. Alan Aukerman commented that they submitted the landscape plan set in August. The landscape drawings are set up to match the civil set. The first buildings in the south neighborhood are 300 feet back from Elm St. They will use that first 300 feet to set the tone of the neighborhood with a street tree pattern. The first big public space in the neighborhood is the village green. It is a large open green with mostly lawn and a scattering of shade trees. The first building in the neighborhood is the amenity building. It is also the gateway to the 400 foot by 50 foot park. There are also pocket parks throughout the neighborhood. The homes are rear loaded so the street scape will have street trees and landscaping. The community building will have patio space. The north neighborhood begins with the club house. Further back from that is the club house and pool with a grill pavilion. There will be pickle ball, a dog park, and a lawn area for lawn games. The homes are fronted on the main street coming in from the boulevard. The front elevations are set up similar to the front walks. There is parallel parking on the streets. There will be pull in parking on the rear of the homes. The main public space is the village green. There is a spur in the north that will provide with trail access to other community trails. There are a lot of street trees in the north neighborhood too. It will have the same edge of street treatment as the south neighborhood. There will be a double alley of trees with a sidewalk. There will be a crisscross path in the northern green to encourage activation. It will be treated like the front yard of the buildings that surround it.
58. Michelle Abel, architect for the southern neighborhood, commented that they have made revisions based on comments from the DRC. There are a total of 83 units, with 11 single family homes and the rest are duplexes, triplexes, and quadraplexes. They reduced the total units to allow for more green space. The single families are located around the perimeter in a more private location of the community. The duplexes are around by the large lawn. They simplified the architecture a little bit. The biggest concern was the side elevations for coming into the neighborhood. They developed a high profile showing the side elevations that would be facing the road. They are pulling that same character from the front down to the sides. They tried to simplify the triplexes again. They repeated elements within the block, but the architecture would be different on the next block. These are homeowners that want to have their own unique home. The fourplexes were again simplified. They pulled the units together as one community. The biggest change is with the club house. They had a lot more detail on the club house originally. They tried to tie it

to the north neighborhood. They added the cupola, reduced window detailing, and added stone around the building. They are still in discussion about vinyl or hardy plank for the siding. They are still trying to provide a pop of color for the front door. Homeowners want individuality and that is what makes it different from the northern neighborhood.

59. Pascal Rettig commented that the Board should hold off discussion to a future meeting, but any clarifying questions can be asked.
60. David Frick commented that the project looked good so far.
61. Tom Salemi agreed and questioned why only one building had a front porch. Michelle Abel responded that building was the first people see coming into the develop. The front porch helps pull the building scale down. There are only four of that type of building in the complex.
62. Bob Dale commented that because these are for sale homes, some items could be added features. They are just showing that at this intersection there will definitely be a porch.
63. Keith Ratner commented that most units have a few stairs up to get in and questioned if they considered accessibility. Bob Dale responded that they expect to be able to build at grade easily. Alan Auckerman added that in the northern neighborhood everything has to be accessible.
64. Nipun Jain added that each unit also has garages so a homeowner will have accessibility there as well.
65. Tom Salemi commented that they were proposing a big common but there are no pathways there. Alan Auckerman responded that they did play around with paths but because of the nature of the perimeter it doesn't make as much sense.
66. Pascal Rettig opened public comment.
67. John Stevenson of 439 Main Street commented that the grant was for the state. The third-party review should be from the same company. They should not look at these developments separately. There will be traffic going to Starbucks and then down Clarks Rd. There is heavy traffic on Evans Place in the morning. They will also stop at Starbucks. Previous traffic reports have only shown 3% of traffic going from Elm St. over to Clarks Road. That should be questioned. Starbucks will generate more than 3%. There is still only one lane for a right turn on Clarks Road as you exit Starbucks. The Starbucks report shows that it will be completed by 2031, and the Clarks Road report shows that it will be completed by 2032. They need to account for the Starbucks enter and exit volume. The target time for Starbucks is 5 minutes for the drive through. They can manage 60-72 people per hour. There will be congestion and confusion. They need to have careful analysis on that. They are not looking at this as one entity.
68. Pascal Rettig commented that they will have the same company look at the traffic for all the projects. The 3% number is for cars going further down Clarks Road. The 2032 was the only number they could pick because that is the timeline they needed to choose for the study. That doesn't mean the road will not be built until 2032.
69. Tom Salemi questioned how long the construction timeline would be. Bob Dale responded it would be about 14-18 months after breaking ground before anyone was living on the property. The goal is to break ground by the end of 2027 beginning of 2028.
70. Nipun Jain commented that staff recommended that the Board authorize VHB to do traffic, stormwater, and civil peer review.

71. David Frick noted that VHB was also doing the Clarks Road project peer review.
72. Tracey Chalifour questioned which traffic impact reports the peer review would be specifically looking at. Nipun Jain responded that when the Board retains a peer review consultant they review the traffic impact report prepared by the applicant and any other supporting documentation that goes with it. The Board's consultant will review that material to ensure it meets the standards and is proposing proper mitigation in the plan. Tracey Chalifour questioned how that would factor into the larger off site improvements. Nipun Jain responded that the prepared plans would be reviewed and approved by Mass DOT and independently reviewed by another consultant retained by DPW. Any reports that come out of that can be used by VHB as well.
73. Tom Salemi questioned if the peer review was able to review projects coming down the line as well. Nipun Jain responded that an applicant would take into account proposals before the city that may have an impact to the area. It takes into account that future build out.
74. Tracey Chalifour questioned if it would consider impacts to Main Street and Rocky Hill Road. David Frick responded that the peer reviewer would review the report that was submitted. Nipun Jain clarified that the role of a peer review consultant was not to do another report for the Board. They review the submitted information and provide comment on that.
75. Kieth Ratner motioned to authorize VHB to perform traffic, storm water, and civil peer review for this project. Seconded by Tom Salemi.
76. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
77. Keith Ratner – YES
78. Joel Nice – YES
79. Michael Jewell – YES
80. Tracey Chalifour – YES
81. Tom Salemi - YES
82. David Frick – YES
83. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 84. Motion passed 7-0.**

85. David Frick motioned to continue the public hearing to the December 22, 2025 Planning Board Meeting. Seconded by Tom Salemi.
86. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
87. Keith Ratner – YES
88. Joel Nice – YES
89. Michael Jewell – YES
90. Tracey Chalifour – YES
91. Tom Salemi - YES
92. David Frick – YES
93. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 94. Motion passed 7-0.**

95. New Public Hearings– 0 and 14 Mill Street

96. Nipun Jain read the legal notice into the record.

97. Joshua Lee Smith, attorney representing Massachusetts Electric Company, commented that they were before the Board informally last week. They have been to TRC and did a site visit. They also obtained a variance approval from the Zoning Board of Appeals and an Order of Conditions from the Conservation Commission. The site is located at 0 and 14 Mill St. The area outlined in red is the existing substation. It has been there for decades and there are issues with soil erosion. A transformer has already been relocated down gradient because of that. Since then, there has been further monitoring and inspections of the site. They have determined there was more soil sliding and that has led to this project coming before the Board. The new temporary site is downgradient from the existing substation. It will consist of transformers, a mobile switch gear building, and cabinet. There is an existing unpaved driveway and another access point in the middle. They will provide some landscape screening with arborvitae for the 8-foot fencing with one foot above barbed wire. Some equipment will still be visible. They can provide black privacy screening slats on all four sides of the fence around the substation.
98. Tom Salemi questioned how long they expected the temporary station to be there. Joshua Lee Smith responded that this was tied to the Alenclair Drive project. This will be installed immediately and will remain until Hillside is energized. They are estimating between 2-3 years.
99. Keith Ratner clarified that the old equipment would stay there. Joshua Lee Smith responded that there would be a full decommissioning. Keith Ratner questioned if the wall would be fixed. Joshua Lee Smith responded it would not.
100. David Frick questioned if any of the overhead lines would change for the temporary substation. Carly Evans responded that the existing overhead lines will stay in place until further decommissioning. David Frick questioned if they were adding any lines. Carly Evans responded that they will add three pole sets. David Frick questioned if they were included in the rendering. Carly Evans responded that they were not. There is a separate process to approve the poles.
101. Pascal Rettig opened the public comment.
102. There was no public comment.
103. Pascal Rettig requested that Nipun Jain review the proposed conditions.
104. Nipun Jain commented that this proposal was temporary in nature, so there are less concerns than they would have had for a permanent site. There is an intended development proposal coming in at 33 Mill Street right across from this location. Hence, the screening for that and the existing neighborhood. The existing trees provide screening from the park across the street. The visual impact is mitigated for the temporary use. There are also suggested additional conditions to help ensure if the use extends beyond a reasonable timeframe, then there is an opportunity to revisit it and further modify if needed. There is a recommendation that they suggest the include in condition 4 saying the applicant provide written statement that there is no impact to the flood plain areas. The site is along the riverfront area. They wanted to make sure if there was impact, then it is remediated as the law requires.
105. Joshua Lee Smith commented that they have reviewed the proposed conditions and are comfortable with them.

106. David Frick commented that condition 9 states no more than three years but says 30 months. Nipun Jain responded it says 30 months to give them time to come to the Board to discuss.
107. Keith Ratner commented that condition 2 should say “screened” not “screening.”
108. Pascal Rettig clarified the applicant was ok with the changes. Joshua Lee Smith responded they were and noted they had submitted plans that show compensatory flood storage.
109. David Frick motioned to incorporate revised condition 4. Seconded by Joel Nice.
110. Joel Nice questioned if staff recommended a performance bond. Nipun Jain responded that this was a temporary use, so they were not requiring it.
111. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
112. Keith Ratner – YES
113. Joel Nice – YES
114. Michael Jewell – YES
115. Tracey Chalifour – YES
116. Tom Salemi - YES
117. David Frick – YES
118. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 119.** Motion passed 7-0.
120. Keith Ratner motioned to approve the site plan review application for 0 and 14 Mill Street subject to the 9 conditions laid out in the staff memo dated 11/10/2025 and with the amendments outlined in meeting. Seconded by David Frick.
- Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
121. Keith Ratner – YES
122. Joel Nice – YES
123. Michael Jewell – YES
124. Tracey Chalifour – YES
125. Tom Salemi - YES
126. David Frick – YES
127. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 128.** Motion passed 7-0.
129. Tracey Chalifour motioned to close the public hearing for 0 and 14 Mill Street. Seconded by Tom Salemi.
130. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
131. Keith Ratner – YES
132. Joel Nice – YES
133. Michael Jewell – YES
134. Tracey Chalifour – YES
135. Tom Salemi - YES
136. David Frick – YES
137. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 138.** Motion passed 7-0.

139. New Public Hearings— 9 Oakland Street

140. Nipun Jain read the legal notice into the record.

141. Jeff Roelofs, attorney for owners Kurt and Ken sweet, commented that he was there with architect Stefano Basso and civil Engineer Steve Sawyer. They are working with GPI for a traffic consultant. They will discuss the traffic on a different night. The Board saw this project before in June for a preapplication. They have been to TRC, DRC, and the Historical Commission. They have a number of items they need to address with department heads and will go back to DRC and the Historical Commission.

142. Stefano Basso commented that they found a lot of historical images in their research. The project site is 1-9 Oakland St. along Chestnut St. There is a significant grade change on the street. There is an existing horseshoe shaped building with a parking court on the site. The proposed new part of the building will be in the mill style fitting in with the surrounding neighborhood. The existing building is in pretty good shape from a structural and architectural layout perspective. The sidewalk has a steep grade change with steps on the corner that have failed. They are working with DPW to discuss how they make that a safe environment. They read the Master Plan and the takeaway goals for this neighborhood was to breathe life back into it. They are looking to add housing to the building with a commercial element to liven the streetscape. The site has proximity to the riverwalk, a bus stop, and the municipal parking lot. The upper mill yard is already a destination. The lower mill yard has the potential to become a destination. The proposed project will generate 124 units. Seven of them would be artist live/work studios. Based on comments from the TRC, the number may go up to 9 units. The goal is to get comments from everyone and then come back with revised drawings. The units are mostly one bedroom or studios. There are only 32 two-bedroom units. There will be 3 commercial units on the corners of the buildings. They are proposing 154 parking spaces, which is just under 1.25 spaces per unit. They will do some infrastructure and sidewalk improvements. The lowest level will have a boiler room with a one-story bump out including the entry lobby on Chestnut St. There will also be the lowest level of the parking garage. There will be landscaping on either side of the ramp. There will be an elevator on each knuckle. They will include enclosed bike storage. The next level is below the Oakland St. grade. There will be 3 artist live/work studios with entrances on Chestnut St. There will also be a 2-bedroom unit there. The middle level of the garage will be accessed via a ramp on Oakland St. The next level is the full footprint of the existing building. There will be a parking court with a new curb cut. The location was coordinated with their traffic engineer to ensure the sightlines worked. There will be 23 spaces in the parking courtyard some will be used for visitors, customers, and quick stops. There is another entrance in the parking court to another level of the garage. The building will have interior trash room with chutes and trash storage compactors. They will wheel out dumpsters for trash pickup. There are two commercial spaces on this level at the two ends of the horseshoe. One has a plaza outdoor space. The one on the left has a smaller outdoor space. The building's main entry through the patio will have a mail package room, leasing office, and elevator access. The front units are shown as the artist live/work studios. There is a small sliver courtyard between the buildings that would just be used maintenance clean out. There will be residential units on the upper levels of the building. They will use the existing windows. The top floor will be stepped back 5 feet around the

majority of the building. The roof will have a roof deck and mechanical equipment. They will be locating everything to the center of the roof line to hide them as much as possible. There will also be space for solar arrays. They plan to maintain the existing signage on the front to the extent that is possible. The intent is to add as much glass as possible at the entries and add metal awnings. They will maintain brick throughout except the top floor will be metal. The name of the project may be changing based on feedback from public safety. They will be adding a 6-story addition back toward Chestnut St. It will be set back a little. It may include large format historical images on the building. They are currently showing one story of more of a heavy block along the bottom of the new addition and brick above that. They will add heavy banding around the building. The addition will be complimentary to the existing building.

143. David Frick clarified that the lower three levels would be parking. Stefano Basso confirmed that was correct. The goal was to make it not look like a parking garage. David Frick requested details on access to the garages. Stefano Basso responded that each level would be accessed by its own entry for cars. There will be stairs and elevators for pedestrians.
144. Tracey Chalifour questioned if some of the units in the existing building would have a view of the addition. Stefano Basso confirmed that was correct. The building windows into the courtyard and the new building. The building code dictates the size of the courtyard.
145. Stefano Basso commented that this proposal maintains and redevelops a historic building. Residents can walk to amenities downtown. There will be a reduction in stormwater and the proposed plantings will be native and drought tolerant. The proposal will meet stretch energy code. There will be EV charging stations and interior bike storage.
146. David Frick motioned to extend the meeting to 10 pm. Seconded by Tom Salemi.
147. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
148. Keith Ratner – YES
149. Joel Nice – YES
150. Michael Jewell – YES
151. Tracey Chalifour – YES
152. Tom Salemi - YES
153. David Frick – YES
154. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 155. Motion passed 7-0.**
156. Steve Sawyer commented that Oakland St. slopes to the northeast in a steep grade down to Chestnut St. The site plan will be improving the perimeter sidewalk along Oakland St. They will be doing a 5-foot-wide concrete sidewalk with a raised driveway apron. One challenge here is the corner at Oakland St. and Chestnut St. Right now, it is graded as a sidewalk but after discussion with TRC, it makes more sense to maintain the stairs. They will work with DPW on that. There will be a 5-foot-wide sidewalk down along Chestnut St. There will be another curb cut for the parking garage on the lower level. For utilities the water service is proposed on the lower left corner on Oakland St. There will be a 4-inch domestic service and a 6-inch fire service. The sewer will connect on the opposite corner. They will connect on Chestnut St. Right now, there is no stormwater treatment on site.

They will provide sub-surface infiltration systems to collect storm water in the parking lot. The garage will have 6 sub-surface infiltration areas. They will be connecting the overflow to the city system. The proposal is meeting the storm water standards. The interior garage will not go into the storm water. It will connect to the sewer. They will talk with DPW about providing a road diet to Chestnut St to provide easier access to the units.

157. Stefano Basso commented that he would provide a quick overview of the GPI traffic study. It concluded that peak parking demand would be overnight with 153 parking spaces on a weekday and 129 on a Saturday. When they run the calculation of use typical to apartments, then they meet the parking demand. This development is studio and one bedroom heavy, so they may even need less. The municipal parking lot supplements the commercial demand. They will not have assigned resident parking. This proposal is advancing the Master Plan goals with the long-term preservation and reuse of a historic building. It will be creating more housing, extend the downtown, improve the streetscape, and generating tax and permitting fees for the city.
158. Tom Salemi commented that he thought it was a fantastic project and questioned what a live/work unit was. Stefano Basso responded that a person could live and do art there. Tom Salemi questioned if they would have a parking management plan. Stefano Basso responded it would be open parking. Tom Salemi commented that it was unreasonable think people will park at Water Street and walk to that space for commercial use. Tom Salemi questioned if there would be any space for coworking. Stefano Basso responded that they called out a community room and fitness room for now. Tom Salemi commented they should evaluate if a crosswalk is needed at Oakland St. and Chestnut St. Stefano Basso commented that DPW brought that up and they will coordinate with them.
159. Stefano Basso commented that the zoning makes an allowance for commercial parking within a certain radius of the property and they meet that criteria. If they do not assign parking spaces, then it provides flexibility for everyone. Pascal Rettig clarified that zoning doesn't allow for overlap, so they are checking off the commercial requirement with the Water St. lot.
160. Joel Nice commented he would like to see less parking and more commercial activation. Especially in the alleyway along the neighboring property and potentially where the garage opens up on either side. Joe Nice agreed that he did not think the parking demand would be as high. Joel Nice commented that he did not like the historic signage because it's ugly and utilitarian. It doesn't add to the building. The proposed addition is a big mass of a building in the back. They should look for any other relief to break up the grid of windows.
161. Michael Jewell questioned if they were keeping the old chimney in the back. Stefano Basso confirmed they were. Michael Jewell commented that it looked like a great project.
162. Keith Ratner questioned if they would be all rental units. Stefano Basso confirmed they would.
163. Tracey Chalifour commented that she was concerned about the front lot staying transient. There should be a mechanism to prevent people who live there from parking there. Having units that just face a garage is not desirable. Otherwise, Ms. Chalifour liked the project. This is a place where density belongs.
164. Keith Ratner questioned what they would have in the courtyard space on the ground. Stefano Basso responded it would not be a usable space.

165. David Frick questioned how parking would work between residents and the commercial spaces. They may need a parking management system. They are asking for fewer parking spaces than are required, so they should to address it. Jeff Roelofs responded that was a fair question. The parking logistics came up at the TRC meeting too. They will continue to work on that.
166. Pascal Rettig questioned if they did not have any off-street parking requirements, then how many parking spots would they want to build. Jeff Roelofs responded they were providing the number of spaces they felt they needed for the residents and commercial use on site. The off-site in municipal lot is bonus. Pascal Rettig commented in an urban setting you don't necessarily want more cars. He was wondering if there wasn't a parking requirement if they would want to provide less parking.
167. Ken Sweet commented that they discussed the parking a lot. They do need the parking they are proposing. They have committed to putting in the parking garage because they can't imagine not being able to park one car per unit. David Frick questioned if they would assign parking to tenants. Ken Sweet responded that they did not want to assign parking because they want it to be shared between tenants and commercial. They may need to isolate some spaces to prevent tenants from parking in them during the day. They will be hiring a management company for the property.
168. Tom Salemi commented that he rented space at 12 Oakland St. That lot is full pretty quickly today.
169. Jeff Roelofs commented that they want to be able to retain flexibility to manage parking spaces the way it works best.
170. Tracey Chalifour motioned to continue the meeting to 10:15 pm. Seconded by Tom Salemi.
171. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
172. Keith Ratner – YES
173. Joel Nice – YES
174. Michael Jewell – YES
175. Tracey Chalifour – YES
176. Tom Salemi - YES
177. David Frick – YES
178. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 179.** Motion passed 7-0.
180. Pascal Rettig opened public comment.
181. Daniel Kendall owner of 17 Chestnut St. and resident of Belmont St. commented that he was concerned about the storm water runoff and wanted to ensure they would not be impacted by the new development. This space is zoned Industrial and they expected it to stay that way. Residential spaces coming that close to his property is concerning. The parking garage and residential units are on the property line. The view out of those spaces would be metal and tin roofs in the industrial area. When they moved in there for the metal shop they went through a lot of back and forth about industrial soils. Mr. Kendall is not allowed to build residential spaces on his space because of soil contamination, which is

downhill from this proposal. This is a significant impact for smaller businesses in this area. Mr. Kendall was also concerned about the parking impact from this proposal.

182. Ryan Stack submitted written public comment that is at the end of these minutes.

183. Pascal Rettig commented that the next steps are to figure out peer review. Nipun Jain commented that the site plan has the typical performance standards for parking, storm water, and landscape. The special permit is for historic preservation. They have already been to the Historical Commission. They are going back to review the final design elements and historic preservation restriction. They will also go to the Design Review Committee and back to TRC. They might postpone until the peer review is done. Staff recommends the Board proceed with selection of peer review consultants. They will seek out and bring them back for the Board to vote on.

184. Tom Salemi motioned for staff to get peer review quotes for civil and traffic review.

Seconded by Keith Ratner.

185. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –

186. Keith Ratner – YES

187. Joel Nice – YES

188. Michael Jewell – YES

189. Tracey Chalifour – YES

190. Tom Salemi - YES

191. David Frick – YES

192. Pascal Rettig – YES

193. Motion passed 7-0.

194. Keith Ratner motioned to continue the public hearing to the November 24, 2025 Planning Board Meeting. Seconded by Tom Salemi.

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. Tracey Chalifour questioned if there was an update on the Master Plan. Pascal Rettig responded that he had not heard back from the Mayor.

205. Adjournment

206. Keith Ratner motioned to adjourn the meeting at 10:13 pm. Seconded by David Frick.

207. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote –

208. Keith Ratner – YES

209. Joel Nice – YES

210. Michael Jewell – YES

- 211. Tracey Chalifour – YES
- 212. Tom Salemi - YES
- 213. David Frick – YES
- 214. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 215. Motion passed 7-0

Public Comment - Ryan Stack – 9 Oakland Street

Hello,

I'm writing in regards to the proposed project at #9 Oakland St in Amesbury.

I am a small business owner in that area and a life long resident of Amesbury. My business has been in the Oakland St area since the early 2000s. Its always been an industrial and commercial area where many small business and craftspeople have gotten their start and continue to thrive. While ive sadly watched 9 Oakland sit vacant for many years, im highly concerned about the impact that a major residential project will have on the businesses in the area. On any given day, a drive through Chestnut and Oakland Street will bring loud noises, smells and sights that are typical of any industrial area. Trying to integrate market rate housing into this will eventually lead to these businesses being forced to relocate out of town, or even close completely, mine included.

Many former industrial parts of this town have already been developed into housing or mixed use, leaving craftspeople, artists and small business owners with little to no option to relocate within Amesbury.

While the model rendering of the project is visually pleasing, the proposed apartments will only add to the burden on our already-stretched infrastructure and resource funding. More commercial and light industrial workspaces for business, artists and artisans would have a much lower resource impact, attract a diverse population of workers and would be a much better fit into an already thriving business community. CI Works and The Trades Mills are great examples of this.

I ask the planning board to consider seeking an alternative project that better suits the area and the town in general.

Thank you for taking the time to consider a different perspective on this matter.