

1. Amesbury Planning Board Meeting Minutes

2. In Person Meeting – September 22, 2025, at 7:02 PM

3. Chairman Pascal Rettig called the September 22, 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 – YES
10. Tracey Chalifour – YES
11. Tom Salemi - YES
12. David Frick – YES
13. Pascal Rettig – YES
14. Also: Nipun Jain (Planning Director) and Becky Frey (Community Development Coordinator)

15. Minutes – 6-23-25

16. Tracey Chalifour motioned to approve 6-23-25 minutes. Seconded by Joel Nice.
17. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
18. Keith Ratner – YES
19. Joel Nice – YES
20. Michael Jewell – YES
21. Tracey Chalifour – YES
22. Tom Salemi - YES
23. David Frick – YES
24. Pascal Rettig – YES
25. Motion passed by 7-0 vote.

26. Minutes – 7-14-25

27. Tracey Chalifour motioned to approve 7-14-25 as amended. Seconded by David Frick.
28. Tracey noted minor revisions for lines 41, 65, 75, 102, and 112. The votes are recorded but they all say motion did not pass in error.
29. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –

- 30. Keith Ratner – YES
- 31. Joel Nice – YES
- 32. Michael Jewell – YES
- 33. Tracey Chalifour – YES
- 34. Tom Salemi - YES
- 35. David Frick – YES
- 36. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 37. Motion passed by 7-0 vote.**

38. Signs – 1 Haverhill Rd. Needham Bank

- 39. Nipun Jain commented that the initial application was reviewed by the DRC and revisions were requested. The applicant submitted a revised package, and staff recommended approval based on the revisions.
- 40. David Frick motioned to approve the application for the Needham Bank sign at 1 Haverhill Rd. as amended. Seconded by Tracey Chalifour.
- 41. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
- 42. Keith Ratner – YES
- 43. Joel Nice – YES
- 44. Michael Jewell – YES
- 45. Tracey Chalifour – YES
- 46. Tom Salemi - YES
- 47. David Frick – YES
- 48. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 49. Motion passed by 7-0 vote.**

- 50. Pascal Rettig proposed the Board take the public hearings out of order because there would be significant discussion on Rocky Hill.**

- 51. Michael Jewell motioned to take the application for 9 Alenclair Drive out of order. Seconded by Keith Ratner.**

- 52. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
- 53. Keith Ratner – YES
- 54. Joel Nice – YES
- 55. Michael Jewell – YES
- 56. Tracey Chalifour – YES
- 57. Tom Salemi - YES
- 58. David Frick – YES
- 59. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 60. Motion passed by 7-0 vote**

61. New Public Hearings – 9 Alenclair Drive

- 62. Nipun Jain read the legal notice into the record.
- 63. Joshua Lee Smith, counsel for National Grid Massachusetts Electric Company, commented that this was a rebuild project of an existing substation. It has been in existence for several years and it is located within the R8 District. There are residential properties abutting the

site that is a little over an acre in size. They are looking to expand the substation. The equipment needs to be replaced. Some of it has been in service since the inception of the substation. Behind the substation is a transmission line corridor. They plan to remove the existing equipment and install a metal-clad switchgear enclosure that will be 28 ' by 55'. They are also planning to install new transformers. There will be landscape buffers and security fencing. The metal structure will be situated in the middle and the transformers will be on either side. There will be two driveways on the site. Currently there is only one access point. The additional access point will allow for construction and larger vehicles to enter and leave the site. The overall expansion of the site is 10,000 sf. The new fencing will be 8 feet with one foot of barbed wire on top. There will be some utility improvements with duct banks, sewer, and water because there will be a bathroom in the new metal structure. The proposed landscaping is slightly different than what was initially submitted. They have incorporated feedback that was received from the planning office in the updates. They have included more non-deciduous plantings and added more especially along the front. These updates still need to be confirmed by their internal departments. The new landscaping will be more robust even compared to the existing conditions. They are mindful that this is a residential neighborhood. There will be a wall of evergreens. They did submit a photometric and light location plan. The lighting will be manually operated and will only be on when someone goes to the site. There are some lights on each side of the metal enclosure and fixed task lights for some of the equipment. The foot candles are less than one foot.

64. Tom Salemi questioned what the length of the construction timeline would be. Joshua Lee Smith responded it would be 1.5 years. Tom Salemi questioned if any of the equipment required any generators or other equipment that would have noise kick on at odd hours. Joshua Lee Smith responded that the main noise would be from the transformers. There should not be any other noise. This new equipment will be quieter than what is there today.
65. Joel Nice questioned if it was possible to use a fencing material that provided more screening than a chain-link fence. Joshua Lee Smith responded that the chain-link metal is the standard. The mesh between the fencing is smaller to provide more opaqueness. TRC asked if the fence could be black, and we will do that. Joel Nice questioned if they could put inserts in the chain-link to provide more screening. Joshua Lee Smith responded that would not be an option because the fence has smaller mesh.
66. Keith Ratner commented that it looked like a number of trees will be coming down. Joshua Lee Smith confirmed they would be removing mature trees because they were a hazard.
67. Michael Jewell questioned how large the substation was today. Joshua Lee Smith responded that the current enclosure is 200 sf and the proposed enclosure will be 1,500 sf. The existing footprint is around 8,000 sf and the proposed is around 18,000 sf.
68. Michael Jewell questioned if they would be moving closer to the street and neighbors on either side. Brendan Mower, engineer, responded that they located the position to maximize the buffer on all three sides for screening. Michael Jewell questioned if they could push it any further back. Brendan Mower responded they located the new station as far to the rear of the site as they could.

69. Michael Jewell questioned if the new plantings would be high enough to shield the fence from the beginning or will they have to wait 3-4 growing seasons. Sharna Chowdhury from VHB responded that the proposed plants will be 10-12 feet tall at the time of installation which will provide substantial screening at the time of installation.
70. Tracey Chalifour questioned how tall the tallest component of the substation was and how they planned to ensure the new landscaping was watered. Sharna Chowdhury responded that VHB would provide one year of plant maintenance. Then owner is responsible for watering after that establishment period. Tracey Chalifour commented that it would be good to have a landscape maintenance plan. Tracey Chalifour questioned if there would be a period of time power would be offline during construction. Joshua Lee Smith responded that no area of the city will lose power. There will be scheduled outages where some circuits are turned off and others will be used as backups.
71. Carly Gavin from National Grid commented that the tallest structure in the substation will be 24 feet tall.
72. Pascal Rettig questioned why mature trees that were not interfering with the power line had to be removed. Joshua Lee Smith responded that some of those trees are being reassessed to determine if they need to come down. TRC commented on the existing red oak which is an example of one of those trees located within the distribution line. They are waiting to hear back from their internal team to see if it can be maintained. They are looking at trying to preserve some of the other trees. Some of the proposed plantings provide better screening than what is there now. Pascal Rettig clarified that the new plantings would not interfere with the power lines. Joshua Lee Smith confirmed that was correct.
73. David Frick questioned if the power lines ran along the front of the property. Joshua Lee Smith confirmed they did. David Frick questioned where the new power lines would be. Joshua Lee Smith responded that the new lines would be coming in from underground. The existing lines fed the neighborhood.
74. David Frick requested more details on what was happening with the improvements at this substation. Patrick Shan, Project Manager, responded that it was all similar equipment, but it feeds a larger load. There is currently a small substation on Mill St. The soil and wall are deteriorating. The plan is to retire that substation and relocate that load to Alenclair Dr. That is the reason for the expansion. Pascal Rettig questioned what would happen with the Mill St. property. Patrick Shan responded that was to be determined.
75. David Frick questioned how far the fence was from the street today and how far will it be in the proposed project. Patrick Shan responded that the existing fence is 57 feet from the street and the proposed would be 40 feet at its closest point. David Frick commented that it seemed like a lot of trees were coming out that did not need to be removed. The expansion is pretty substantial, and it looks like an industrial site. It would be good to soften that.
76. David Frick questioned why there were two driveways proposed. Patrick Shan responded that it was to provide access on both sides. This will provide access for construction and future maintenance. They could look at curving the driveway to screen it better with shrubs. Normal construction standards recommend that they are straight to accommodate large trucks and equipment.

77. David Frick questioned if chain-link fencing was the standard. Patrick Shan confirmed that was correct. David Frick questioned if it could be a different style of fencing. Carly Young responded that any other type of fence proposes a security risk. The outward facing barbed wire and small mesh prevents people from climbing in. They have reached out to their security team to see if they are able to make any adjustments.
78. David Frick requested they mark out the site so the Planning Board could do a site walk. Patrick Shan confirmed they could do that. Brendan Mower commented they will use the existing driveway during construction then they will build a new one. David Frick questioned if they could shift the driveway to save an existing tree. Brendan Mower responded they could not because large equipment would not be able to maneuver the site if they did. David Frick commented that they should work with the neighborhood and work to mitigate impact as much as possible.
79. Keith Ratner questioned how often people visit the site now and if that would increase in the future. Patrick Shan responded that they only visit for general maintenance.
80. Keith Ratner questioned why they were adding a restroom. Joshua Lee Smith responded that it is now required in the state plumbing code.
81. Michael Jewell questioned if other sites were evaluated for this project. Patrick Shan responded that this project has been a few years in the making. This went through a full options analysis and this location was selected.
82. Michael Jewell questioned if the Mill St. property would be turned over to the city to make it a park. Carly Young responded that the Mill St. station was built in the 1940s. The underground condition is not suitable. The goal is to provide a green space after the retirement, and they are trying to mitigate environmental concerns.
83. Pascal Rettig opened public comment.
84. Robert Mistretta 11 Alenclair Dr. commented that he lives next door. His main concern was that this was a residential neighborhood, and the project will impact property values. People keep talking about how there will be less noise, but it will be loud for the 2 years of construction. They are removing the existing trees. The fence is only 20 feet from his property line, and it will look like a prison. Mr. Mistretta was also concerned about the multiple driveways and the fact that something like this would be allowed in residential area. It is hard to believe they have to triple the size here to get the power. Mr. Mistretta was concerned about the electromagnetic and habitat impact. The street will be dug up. It is disappointing that there wasn't a way to find an alternate location outside a residential zone. Even 10 years from now, the trees will not hide those 24-foot-high structures. Mr. Mistretta bought his property 3 years ago and taxes keep going up. It will be more difficult to sell these properties. With all the land in Amesbury, it's hard to believe there's not an alternate location.
85. Mike Gonnais of 10 Alenclair Dr. commented that he lived directly across from the substation and the western most proposed driveway. Mr. Gonnais appreciated they revisited the landscape design. What was shown originally was too low and this is a huge improvement. The second access driveway is proposed directly across the street from his home. Mr. Gonnais requested they revisit that to shift it between his house and his neighbor. They have lived here a long time and seen trucks going in and out. Mr. Gonnais did not understand the need for a second access. If a second access was needed, then they

should put it in the back. The utility trucks that go in there are standard utility trucks. They don't need space for wide turns. Property values will go down. Amesbury has a lot of open land and other solutions should be looked at.

86. Cathy Schlich 4 Alenclair Drive commented that the pictures were deceiving. Today there is a canopy of trees and at night it's pitch black. This is a quiet neighborhood that has coexisted with this substation. It would be good to know exactly what no excessive noise means. This will look like a prison of sorts and the neighborhood will not want to look at it everyday. It is a little arrogant that the applicant did not bring the city and neighborhood into the location selection process. There is better landscaping in this presentation, but they need more aggressive and better landscaping. This is an old sand pit and they need to ensure the vegetation will last. The renderings are beautiful but are they realistic? After the year contract is up who is in charge of maintaining it? When the plants start dying how will they be replaced? Are they deer resistant? Property values will be impacted. The existing trees buffer the substation. This neighborhood was a hidden gem until now. Now it's industrial Mordor. It is important to do a site walk. There is no lighting over there now. The proposal is very stark and industrial looking. They need to soften it. It doesn't belong there.
87. Nicole and Donald Johnson at 6 Alenclair Dr. commented that they look at this view from their bedroom. Right now, it is beautiful and peaceful. They would love if the trees could stay and were concerned about putting the fence close to the street. There is another building going in next to us across from Andyman. They are getting infringed upon on two sides. Having to look out your window and see this industrial substation is a bummer. They would like to be part of the site walk if that is allowed. It would be good to see the markers. Anything they can do to dial it back would be appreciated. Keep in mind people live here and provide good screening.
88. Pascal Rettig clarified this was a site plan review of the project, so the Board was looking at landscaping, structures, and traffic. Unfortunately, they are not being asked to look at the siting of the location. The Board will review the proposal at this site to the best of our ability. Doing a site walk and understanding the boundaries is a great idea. It might be worth asking if they could phase the tree removal after the screening has had time to grow instead of trying to wipe the site.
89. Tracey Chalifour requested more details on the lighting on the site and how that would impact the neighborhood. Patrick Shan responded that the driver for this project is to increase reliability to town and retire the Mill St. station. The side benefit is that it does allow for additional load capacity in the future. Joshua Lee Smith added that the lights will be manually operated. The site will continue to be dark unless someone is performing maintenance and repair. Pascal Rettig questioned if the substation was completely dark at night with no maintenance. Patrick Shan confirmed it was.
90. Pascal Rettig requested clarification on the next steps.
91. Nipun Jain commented that they heard in the presentation that the applicant is listening about incorporating a robust landscaping plan and will need more time to look at that. They are also reevaluating if they can keep the existing trees and looking to see if any fence details can be adjusted. There is still some review work to be performed on the staff side. The Board expressed interest in doing a site visit. That will require some organization and

time. They asked the applicant team to see if there's a way to shift the expanded limit of work slightly so they have the ability to preserve the trees along the Alenclair edge. Right now, there is 10 feet between the fence and the landscaping. There may be an opportunity to use that 10 feet. They could add more canopy trees and landscaping. The renderings should be to scale to ensure what they are showing is accurate. They should include more renderings on the right side to show the abutter what it will look like. Pascal Rettig noted it would be good to see a rendering from the other corner as well.

92. David Frick questioned if those overhead lines could be buried. Patrick Shan responded they did not plan to do that.
93. Pascal Rettig commented that it was reasonable to continue this to the October 27, 2025, meeting. Hopefully they will have answers on the landscaping and driveway. The Board will try to do a site walk before that.
94. Nipun Jain commented that the applicant would need to provide revised drawings 2 weeks before the October 27th meeting. If the applicant does not think that's possible, then they can continue it to the first meeting in November. Joshua Lee Smith responded they would do their best to meet the time constraints for the October meeting.
95. David Frick motioned to continue to the application for 9 Alenclair to the October 27, 2025, meeting. Seconded by Tracey Chalifour.
96. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
97. Keith Ratner – YES
98. Joel Nice – YES
99. Michael Jewell – YES
100. Tracey Chalifour – YES
101. Tom Salemi - YES
102. David Frick – YES
103. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 104.** Motion passed by 7-0 vote.

105. New Public Hearings – Rocky Hill Development

106. Pascal Rettig commented that the Planning Board would take a 3 minute break.
107. Pascal Rettig resumed the meeting at 8:58 pm.
- 108.** Nipun Jain read the legal notice into the record.
109. David Frick motioned to extend the meeting to 10:30 pm. Seconded by Joel Nice.

Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –

110. Keith Ratner – YES
111. Joel Nice – YES
112. Michael Jewell – YES
113. Tracey Chalifour – YES
114. Tom Salemi - YES
115. David Frick – YES
116. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 117.** Motion passed by 7-0 vote.

118. Bob Dale with Dale development commented that his firm has done development from Philadelphia up through New England. This is their first project in Massachusetts. The plan has been further refined and much of the success is based on the quality of what they build. This proposal has gone through collaboration with the city and staff. They have been working on this for 3.5 years. They met with DRC and TRC. The MBTA zoning includes a set of design guidelines. They have obtained an ORAD from the Conservation Commission and will be applying for a Notice of Intent there soon. They are not requesting any waivers or exceptions with them. This project went through MEPA and the final statement is pending. They've got their hands around the traffic improvements and all the other broader impacts of the proposed development. There have been countless conversations with staff about developing the plan. They understand this is a gateway into Amesbury. This proposal is important for Amesbury and the region. They are proposing to provide housing to appeal to growing demographics of single professionals, empty nesters, and smaller families. The application team here tonight are Alan Aukerman for landscape from Ryan Associates, Architect Jeremy Lake from Union Studios, Engineer Steve Sawyer from Millenium, and Jeff Dirk from Vanesse and Associates.
119. Alan Aukerman commented that they have worked with DRC on solving some of the challenges with the layout. The internal shape of the development is defined by the wetland setbacks and topography. The primary access is off Elm St. and the first building is 300 feet back from Elm St. They plan to restore the existing white farmhouse and yellow gambrel. The north neighborhood will have 296 apartment units, and the south neighborhood will have 84 condos for sale. The biggest change on this plan is that the boulevard will continue past the rotary. The north neighborhood has 29 buildings. The entrance at that neighborhood will have an amenity building, pool, and pickle court. There will be a village green at the main intersection and an additional park and courtyard spaces between the buildings and trail connections. The primary neighborhood roads will have parallel parking. The majority of the parking will be located behind the buildings. The southern neighborhood will change to make a village green in the horseshoe area. The community building will be located on the rotary. The garages are almost entirely rear loaded. They pulled ideas and inspiration from the residential pattern book. It is a 60 page document laying out the vision for the development. The hierarchy of the street design allows for a close-knit neighborhood that slows traffic. There are neighborhood streets with uninterrupted sidewalks. All streets have sidewalks on both sides. There is a network of community spaces with village greens, parks, community spaces, trail networks, and pedestrian and road access. Every home has an array of private/semiprivate spaces like porches, decks, or patios.
120. Jeremy Lake commented that the south neighborhood was technically being done by a different firm. The goal was to get a variety of building types, massing, and details. They are trying to base it on the vernacular of Amesbury. The majority of the site is an equal mix of different townhouse building types and a handful of fourplexes. They intentionally put the south as a lower density because that's what you may see from Elm St. There is a slow transition to the largest building. The largest buildings are the furthest back in this project. The corridor buildings are 12 unit buildings and 6 unit buildings. There are also stacked townhouses with two-bedroom units over one another. There is a lot of variety baked into

the project with the materials, massing, and detail. They are working with the DRC to simplify some of that. The amenities in the northern neighborhood include a club house, management office, and coworking space. There is a field house with a fitness room, yoga room, enclosed half court, and a pool. There are also grill pavilions. The majority of the northern parking is surface parking but there are some single bay garage spaces.

121. Tracey Chalifour questioned where the maintenance facilities would be located. Bob Dale responded that the north neighborhood could have it behind the grill building or in the bank of detached garages. They usually take two of those garages and make a workshop. They will have full-time maintenance people.

122. Jeff Dirk commented that they filed an environmental notification form which included traffic. The city commented on that and that helped form the final impact report, which is under review by the state. Route 110 and the highway are under DOT jurisdiction. They did not receive any significant comments on the proposed improvements. The state commented that they did not require any further analysis on the transportation. Peer review may be something the Board wants to do. They are fully compliant with the transportation impact assessment. It meets State requirements and is consistent with the city's evaluation criteria. They are looking at motor vehicle, pedestrian, and biker safety. The city and state spent a significant amount of money on a robust bike and pedestrian connectivity network. The goal is to connect this project to those trail networks and provide access to public transportation. This project will generate 200 peak hour trips. They measured the increases in delay in vehicle queuing at the intersection before and after the added vehicles. The queue would not increase by more than 6 vehicles in an hour. They are proposing improvements that will help mitigate that. Vehicles exiting onto Elm St. have a single point of access. They will not see any significant delays on Elm St. They would see delays trying to get out of that site. The queue in the driveway was not any longer than 5 vehicles in peak hour. The significance of that study is determining if they needed a traffic signal. The study shows they do not meet the traffic light criteria. The state won't allow them to put one in. The next step was to look at emergency vehicles. They can still get into the site and if they needed to exit vehicles can move out of the way because the road is wide enough. They did identify 2 high crash areas on the corridor. The first was the Route 110 and Merrill St. intersection. It has been a high crash location for some time. They are eligible for state funding and advancing those improvements. The second intersection is Elm St. and Clarks Rd. That is not on the state high crash list, but the number of crashes based on volume is disproportionate. The sightline safety for the driveway onto Elm St. was assessed. The statutory speed is 25 mph and cars measured a speed 30-35 mph. The sightline for 35 mph is 200 feet. The sightlines available today exceed 300 feet. That far exceeds the safe operation requirements of the intersection. The study area evaluated was the Route 110 corridor from the 495 interchange and into Salisbury at the Rabbit Rd. intersection. That includes the 95 interchanges. They also looked at the Elm St. corridor from Clarks Road to Rocky Hill Rd. It shows the connectivity of the site for sidewalks and bike trails. There is the ability to connect to the Amesbury Riverwalk, Ghost Trail, and Garrison Trail. There are opportunities for the project. They are proposing improvements at the Carriage Town Marketplace. They are proposing improvements for a safe crossing to that side of the road for the marketplace and a MEVA bus stop. Route 17 follows Elm St.

and there is a stop that is a 2-minute walk from the site. They conducted traffic counts at the intersections and on the road. They did counts in June, September, and February. They were all adjusted to be average or above average conditions. Elm St. accommodates 11,200 vehicles per day. The peak morning is 730-830 vehicles. The evening peak hour was 430-530 vehicles the total was close to 950 vehicles. There was a higher flow in the evening. They also looked at the weekday and Saturday. The traffic on Saturday is more dispersed. The auto centric pre-covid numbers do not account for the work from home phenomenon. The traffic dispersal shows the majority of vehicles go toward Route 110 and further disperse from there. They need to create capacity and address the safety at the Elm St. intersection. The study included all this project and the additional 250 units in other development projects, the Starbucks, and the Amesbury marina. They worked with OCED to understand all the incoming projects and are accommodating the build out of this area. The intent is to make sure the corridor functions with this project and other projects. They generated site circulation and access recommendations for public safety access, stop lines, textured pavement, raised crosswalks, sidewalks, paths and trails on the site. They plan to connect to trails in the area. There are a series of offsite improvement recommendations. The state has concurred with these recommendations. The improvements will create capacity and increase safety. There are a series of traffic signals on the Route 110 corridor. There has been a discussion of adding a new signal at the 95 ramps. They want to ensure the traffic lights are timed properly and coordinated. That will allow us to hold traffic outside the system. They will time traffic to not introduce cars into the system until the intersection can accommodate it. The goal is that once a vehicle is in the Route 110 coordinated system, then it will keep moving along. It should be the same or better travel time as today. There will be a traffic monitoring program requirement. They will need to monitor traffic upon the issuance of the first certificate of occupancy. That extends for 5 years after the last certificate occupancy. The Route 110 corridor improvements are a large part of this development. The applicant cannot fund everything, however, the state has incentive to create multifamily zoning. There is a reward for doing that. The state offers grants for municipalities that supports affordable housing. The city has applied for those grants. The state is reviewing that now for a much larger improvement. Those improvements would go all the way through the 95 interchange. They are creating additional lanes on Route 110 from the westbound travel lane from 95 to 495. They will drop the additional lane after that. There is a lot of traffic heading toward the 95 interchange. Adding a travel lane allows them to create capacity. They don't need as much time to pull vehicles through the intersection. They can apply that to Elm St. Irrespective of the grant these improvements will take place. All of the proposed third lane is in right of way. It is all in state control. They are widening the Ghost Trail and the crossing is not signalized today. It will be tomorrow. The 95 interchange does meet traffic signal criteria and will allow for signal timing. That is part of the Massworks Grant application. There are safety improvements at Merrill St. and Clarks Road intersections. The city did a road safety audit by a separate firm and the recommendations were incorporated into the Massworks Grant application. They will incorporate safety improvements even if the grant is not awarded. Elm St. has a crosswalk where the hotel is today, and they will add a rapid

flashing beacon. They will coordinate with the city to confirm final location. They do think having a bus stop at the project site will be important and they are working on that.

123. Steve Sawyer commented that he can do dive deep into storm water and utilities at a later date. The access boulevard will have two 14 foot one way lanes. There will be parallel parking along the road. The interior main secondary roads will be 20 feet wide for easy access. There is designated parking so there will not be any parking encroachment. The south neighborhood has 2.9 parking spaces per unit. The north neighborhood necks down to a 22-foot-wide road out to the T intersection. There will be 498 spaces in the north neighborhood which is 1.7 spaces per unit. The driveways are 16 feet in the south neighborhood.
124. David Frick questioned how they came up with the percentage of the traffic distribution. Jeff Dirk responded it was based on car counts and census data. David Frick questioned if they were adding a right turn lane for Starbucks. Jeff Dirk confirmed that was correct. They also extended it back to create capacity. That was part of the Starbucks project. David Frick commented that made sense and he was blown away with how it looks.
125. Michael Jewell questioned what year the traffic study was done. Jeff Dirk responded it was done in November 2024. They published another study in July of this year at the request of the state to look at all the improvements needed. They got 10% of trips reduced with bus transportation. Michael Jewell clarified that Starbucks and the Clarks Road development were included. Jeff Dirk responded that was correct.
126. Keith Ratner commented it was good they were adding a westbound lane for a third lane, but cars will have to merge again when it necks down. Jeff Dirk responded that they will extend the lane to give time to merge. It will account for the amount of cars that need to merge. Keith Ratner requested clarification on the secondary access vs. single access. Jeff Dirk responded that the secondary access was still shown on the plan for emergency access.
127. Joel Nice questioned when the last time the signals on Route 110 were timed. Jeff Dirk responded that they try to retime them every year, but they have to reset the system when there is a power outage. Generally, they retime them if there is a problem. When the work is done here, they are actually looking at an adaptive signal system that would measure and monitor traffic and adjusting as needed.
128. Joel Nice clarified those improvements were dependent on the grant. Jeff Dirk responded that the state determined the 95 interchange signal was not required for this project but is desirable. It is part of the grant.
129. Tom Salemi questioned if deliveries like amazon were included in the study. Jeff Dirk confirmed it did.
130. Tom Salemi questioned if the 95 signal coming off the south side would be triggered by a car. Jeff confirmed that was correct. There will be additional sensors in place to prevent large queuing. Tom Salemi questioned if the right on the westbound side going onto Elm St. would be a right on red. Jeff Dirk confirmed that was correct.
131. Tracey Chalifour motioned to extend the meeting to 11 pm. Seconded by Tom Salemi. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
132. Keith Ratner – YES
133. Joel Nice – YES

- 134. Michael Jewell – YES
- 135. Tracey Chalifour – YES
- 136. Tom Salemi - YES
- 137. David Frick – YES
- 138. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 139.** Motion passed by 7-0 vote.
- 140. Tracey Chalifour commented that she lives in that area and has a lived experience that traffic studies cannot address. Clarks Road is already experiencing backups. She was not aware Starbucks was putting in a right hand turn lane. Tracey Chalifour clarified that they would plan to implement some items even if the city doesn't get the grant. Jeff Dirk confirmed that was correct. It is outlined in the traffic impact document. Tracey Chalifour questioned when that was published. Jeff Dirk responded it was published in November of 2024 with the data that was collected. Tracey Chalifour requested clarification on the numbers. Jeff Dirk responded that the peak hours are the smaller numbers, and they are assessed in the study. The remainder of the day is less than the peak. They do 24-hour counts. There were 2,783 over 24 hours. Tracey Chalifour questioned if the counts factored in the June through October weekends. Route 110 east is a nightmare in the morning and west in the evening. Tracey Chalifour did not think the calculations on what impacts Clarks Road and Main St. were reality. Jeff Dirk responded they were trying to not make Route 110 traffic worse to exacerbate what she was talking about. The goal is to keep regional traffic on regional roadways, not local roads. That is why they are focusing improvements on Route 110. The other thing that can be done in discussion with the city, if they create a capacity opportunity, is to look at traffic calming. Jeff Dirk noted he does a fair amount of studies on Cape Cod, Marthas Vineyard, and Nantucket. They never mitigate summer conditions because it create excess capacity that creates unintended consequences. They design for the majority of the year. The adaptive systems are intended for those summer flows, so they can manage traffic during high flow periods. Bill 2024-124 discontinued certain sections of Elm St. from state highway. This section is state highway. Tracey Chalifour commented that the Elm St. backups have not been addressed.
- 141. Tom Salemi questioned if bus stops would be at the entrance at Elm St. Jeff Dirk responded that a school bus stop would be up to city. MEVA would not go into the site. Pascal Rettig questioned if they would be adding a bus shelter to make it more accommodating. Jeff Dirk confirmed they could coordinate with the city on that.
- 142. Pascal Rettig questioned why the rotary scenario was rejected. Jeff Dirk responded that the state required them to look at both the signal and rotary scenario. In this case because of the volume on Route 110 it would have to be a large rotary to accommodate tractor trailer trucks. The rotary did not solve the queuing problem. It was not feasible because of land area that would be needed and the queuing.
- 143. Michael Jewell commented that that going on Elm St. towards Route 110 cars the road curves and when traffic starts to back up it blocks a gas station entrance/exit. Michael Jewell questioned if there was any consideration to alleviate that issue. Jeff Dirk responded that they were creating capacity on Route 110 and giving more time to cars on Elm St. That will reduce queuing in Elm St. to pull more cars through.
- 144. David Frick questioned if they could connect the trails in the back to Elm St.

145. Steve Sawyer commented that they have taken an initial look at the trails throughout the property. 297 Elm St. will be coming in as a new project with MinCo. There is an area at the end of the south neighborhood where they have to cross a drainage ditch that runs along 95. There is a fairly short section there they may be able to cross. There is plenty of upland to connect to the Ghost Trail. The Planning Department is interested in trying to loop it on the back side of the bog. They will revisit it.
146. John Stevenson of 439 Main St. commented that his real concern was about Clarks Road. In the meeting they talked about Starbucks adding a lane. As of today when you exit there's one exit and one road. Mr. Stevenson worked for Starbucks and they look at location and traffic flow. They haven't considered the traffic on Main St. Elm has 12,000 and Main St. has 10,000 cars. Starbucks will draw cars up from Main St. It's not clear if those routes have been considered in the numbers. There is no sidewalk on Clarks Road. It backs up tremendously on both ends. It would be good to have report taking Starbucks traffic into consideration. There is one exit from Starbucks. Mr. Stevenson thought this was a good project, but they are really underestimating the traffic that will be created when Starbucks is open.
147. Pascal Rettig questioned if Starbucks was considered in this report.
148. Jeff Dirk responded that they went through Starbucks when they were discussing the left, through and right lanes. They are changing lane use on the approach. They are evaluating it again with this. David Frick commented that he thought the lane was a condition of the Starbucks approval.
149. Nipun Jain responded that it was, and they discussed the timing would depend on when the Clarks Road project was permitted. The residential addition on Clarks Road will tip the scale. Jeff Dirk confirmed it will happen as part of that or this project. It is not included in the existing conditions, but it is included in the 2031 conditions. That doesn't mean it won't happen until 2031. There will be two lanes on Clarks Road from the driveway to the signal. There is only one driveway to get to Starbucks.
150. David Frick motioned to extend the meeting to 11:15 pm. Seconded by Tom Salemi.
151. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
152. Keith Ratner – YES
153. Joel Nice – YES
154. Michael Jewell – YES
155. Tracey Chalifour – YES
156. Tom Salemi - YES
157. David Frick – YES
158. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 159. Motion passed by 7-0 vote.**
160. David Frick motioned to continue the application to the October 27, 2025 Planning Board Meeting. Seonced by Tracey Chalifour.
161. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
162. Keith Ratner – YES
163. Joel Nice – YES
164. Michael Jewell – YES

- 165. Tracey Chalifour – YES
- 166. Tom Salemi - YES
- 167. David Frick – YES
- 168. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 169. Motion passed by 7-0 vote.

170. Administrative – Covenants and Bonds

- 171. Nipun Jain commented that staff recommended releasing the review fees for Hatter's Point.
- 172. Keith Ratner motioned to release the remaining review fees for Hatter's Point in the amount of \$2,842.94 and any remaining interest. Seconded by Tom Salemi.
- 173. Pascal Rettig initiated a 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 by 7-0 vote.

- 182. Nipun Jain commented that Bailey's Pond made a bond release request. Given the report from the Conservation Agent, staff suggests releasing the surety erosion control bond and keeping the balance of the cash bond.
- 183. Tracey Chalifour motioned to release the surety erosion control bond in the amount of \$122,401.25 for Bailey's Pond. Seconded by Joel Nice.
- 184. Pascal Rettig initiated a roll call vote –
- 185. Keith Ratner – YES
- 186. Joel Nice – YES
- 187. Michael Jewell – YES
- 188. Tracey Chalifour – YES
- 189. Tom Salemi - YES
- 190. David Frick – YES
- 191. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 192. Motion passed by 7-0 vote.

6. Adjournment

- 7. Tracey Chalifour motioned to adjourn at 11:16 pm. Seconded by Joel Nice.
- 8. Keith Ratner initiated roll call vote –
- 9. Keith Ratner – YES
- 10. Joel Nice – YES
- 11. Michael Jewell – YES
- 12. Tracey Chalifour – YES

13. Tom Salemi - YES
14. David Frick – YES
15. Pascal Rettig – YES
16. Motion passed 7-0