

1. Amesbury Planning Board Meeting Minutes
2. In Person Meeting – March 9, 2026, at 7:04 PM
3. Chairman Pascal Rettig called the March 9, 2026, Planning Board meeting to order at 7:04 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 11-24-25**
16. David Frick commented that the word “suitable” in paragraph 100 should be “durable.”
17. Tom Salemi motioned to approve the minutes from the 11-24-25 Planning Board Meeting.
Seconded by Tracey Chalifour as amended.
18. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call –
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. **Minutes 12-8-25**

28. David Frick motioned to approve the minutes from the 12-8-25 Planning Board Meeting with one amendment. Paragraph 182 says “prudent on them” and it should be “prudent of them.” Seconded by Tracey Chalifour.
29. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call –
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 7-0

38. 31 Main Street - Nunami Sign

39. Nipun Jain commented that the applicant for the sign has some other options they would like to consider first. They will bring an updated package to DRC to review. This application will be on a future agenda.

40. Preapplication – 28 Haverhill Road

41. Matt Leidner from Civil Design Group, Essek Petrie from Pulte Homes, and Dan May from MDM Transportation were present to speak to the application.
42. Essek Petrie commented that they would open with a high-level summary introduction and then give an introduction of the engineering and traffic analysis to date. They are planning to submit the full package in a month or two. Pulte Homes is a wholly owned entity of PulteGroup. They are self-funded and have been building in the New England area since 1994. Matt Liedner is the civil engineer, Bohler Engineering is drafting the landscape plan, MDM Transportation is drafting the traffic report, VHB is permitting the natural resources, and Coughlin Environmental Services is drafting the utility plans. They have been coordinating with DPW. The site is 13 acres at 28 Haverhill Road. There are some natural resource constraints. It's bound by Haverhill Road, 150, 495, and a residential complex. They have had good coordination meetings with OCED staff and other city departments to help refine the plans. They have filed an ANRAD with ConCom and met with TRC.
43. Matt Leidner commented that the site has frontage on Haverhill Rd. and Route 150. The Merrimack Valley Animal Hospital and Amesbury Heights are direct abutters. The site's existing condition is mostly wooded. There is a single-family home with a driveway and yard along Route 110. There is also an old orchard area as well. The site is in the Office Park zoning district and the Amesbury Gateway Village Overlay. They are proposing the project under the overlay provisions. The site has an extensive wetland complex with BVW, a perennial stream, and floodplain. The significant environmental constraints limit the development space. They worked to identify a realistic development area of 3.5 acres. That will leave almost 10 acres of open space. The proposal is for two 5-story buildings with subsurface parking. They will all be for-sale units and will be managed under a condo association. There will be a mix of 1-bed and 2-bed units. Twenty-five units will be affordable, which is 20% of units. There are two proposed driveways access, one on Route

110 and the other on Route 150. They are proposing a total of 216 parking spaces. There will be 112 surface spaces and 104 spaces within the garages of the buildings. There will be a total of 44 EV spaces on site, and there will be interior and exterior bike storage. There is an onsite amenity area for the residents of the project. They are also proposing a parking area/public park area separate from the project that could be accessed from Route 110 on the northwest corner of the site. There is an existing curb cut in that area. They are proposing a pathway down to a neighborhood park. There is an existing cleared site that will need some cleaning up to create the park. Beyond the park there will be a trail across the wetlands with an existing crossing. There is an existing trail system south of the wetland area. They will clean the trails up and define them. That trail system extends to the southern edge of the site, up to the Amesbury Heights community. They can create a through-trail system. They are also proposing a pollinator meadow to the south of the buildings. The grading of the site drops from Haverhill Rd. to the wetland. They oriented the buildings to work with that terrain. The grade is 12 feet lower than the other side of the site. The stormwater design includes structural stormwater best management practices. Parking within the footprint of the building reduces impervious area. They will have rooftop collection and subsurface infiltration systems under the parking lot toward the southern end. The utility design details are being worked out with DPW. There is a high-level of water and sewer available in Route 110. The existing 12-inch water main flow tests show there is enough pressure and flow. They are proposing an 8-inch main off that to the site. There will be two new hydrants on the site and each building will have a 4-inch domestic service and 6-inch fire service. There is an existing 8-inch sewer main on Route 110. They are proposing to connect into that. However, they cannot connect by gravity into the sewer. They are proposing an onsite pump station that will pump from there up to Haverhill Road and onsite gravity flow from there. The proposed buildings will all be electric; no natural gas is proposed.

44. Essek Petrie commented that they had a significantly different façade when they first started. They coordinated with staff and were introduced to the Rocky Hill design guidelines. They made some significant changes based on that. The layout was influenced by the site plan. There will be a mail/package area in the building lobbies. There are secondary means of egress and access to each floor. The garage entrance will be in the backside of the building. The architectural plan shows the building will mirror and face each other. The main entrances have porticos facing each other. There are sixty-three units in each building. The side view of the buildings will face Haverhill Rd. There will be Projected balconies and boxed bays.
45. Dan May commented that they collected traffic data at Route 110 and Route 150. The driveways meet the sightline distance criteria. They know they're a high-crash location. The project will generate 60 peak-hour trips in the morning and the same in the evening. That translates to about 1 per minute. The existing travel patterns are pretty spread out for all directions on both roads. The traffic signal operates at a C level and D level during off-peak hours. They are not anticipating any off-site improvements. They will need highway access permits for a driveway from MassDOT. DOT is hesitant about adding a left turn on Route 150 side. They are expecting pushback on that but are trying to go for full access. The trip distribution shows the highest volume is 17 per hour to the south toward 495. There is

similar distribution in the afternoon. That is about 1 vehicle every three minutes on each leg.

46. Tom Salemi commented that overall he liked the project especially that 20% of the units would be affordable. Tom Salemi questioned how the pollinator meadow would be maintained. Essek Petrie responded that the intent is to plant with a seed mix to invite pollinators. Then they would let it go back to nature with pollinator-friendly plants. It should take care of itself. Tom Salemi questioned how many spaces there were per unit. Essek Petrie responded it was 1.71 spaces. That seems to be the sweet spot for typical homeowners. This reduces the need for a lot of open pavement but allows for everyone to park. Tom Salemi questioned how the EV parking spaces would be distributed. Essek Petrie responded that there will be a number of them coming in off Route 150 as well as the smaller lot. They will be full EV-ready. Tom Salemi commented that he liked the balconies and trails connecting to Amesbury Heights.
-

Joel Nice commented that it was a good project and fits the site. Pulte, is a national contractor, do you use local contractors when you are building? Essek Petrie confirmed they would put it out to bid locally. Joel Nice questioned if solar was an option for the condos. It would be nice for projects like this that are fully electric to have that. Essek Petrie responded that they started going all electric 3 years ago. All the equipment is now on the roof, which limits space for solar panels. We ran the financials on it and could not make it work. The space left on the roof does not provide enough solar power. Joel Nice questioned if there was an option for solar off the building. Essek Petrie responded that they have not found a way to make the numbers work, and the turnaround is not there for New England. Joel Nice questioned what the siding building material would be. Essek Petrie responded they would likely use a stone treatment. They will expose more stone material where the grade drops. It is within the architectural drawings.

48. Keith Ratner commented that they should show the snow storage areas on the plan. Essek Petrie confirmed they would provide that detail. The buildings will have trash chute access on each floor. The dumpster will be in the basement and rolled out to a concrete pad. It will all be private service. Keith Ratner questioned who would maintain the neighborhood park. Essek Petrie responded that the expectation is that the park will not be part of the condo association. We are still talking to the city, but the expectation is that they will turn it over to the city.

49. Tracey Chalifour questioned if unit owners would be allowed to rent their units. Essek Petrie responded that would be part of the condo docs, owners would be restricted to a one-year lease minimum to prevent short-term rental units. Tracey Chalifour questioned if there was a limit to how many units can be rented at a time. Essek Petrie responded we do not restrict that. Tracey Chalifour thanked the developer for the consideration of adequate parking onsite. Ms. Chalifour is part of a community of 126 units, and it is tight at 190 spaces. The plans definitely need to show considerations for snow storage and trash. Essek Petrie responded smaller push dumpsters will be brought out to a concrete pad and the trash truck will pick them up from there. There will be a level surface area for that. Tracey Chalifour requested architectural diagrams showing mechanicals on the roof and the elevator shaft. The amenity area is close to the public parking and park. Would the amenity area be fenced in to keep it private for condo owners. Essek Petrie responded that there is a fence in that area. Tracey Chalifour questioned what is the thought process for placing EV

spaces along Route 150 and the pump station lot. Essek Petrie responded that some are on the sidewalk closer to Building 2 as well. We have found in coordinating with the fire department there is a preference to locate them in a place with good access that presents the least threat to the building because of fire hazards. Tracey Chalifour commented that the recycling seems very far away from the trash. That may discourage participation in recycling if it's too far away. It would be good to know where the chutes are located. Essek Petrie responded we are trying to balance expectations to keep the recycling area clean and tidy, and we also preferred to keep it farther away from the building.

50. David Frick commented that he was excited about the project and hoped the state is liberal in providing full access on Route 150. It would be an enhancement for the site. There are probably more people heading to 495 in the morning; an exit onto 150 would be awesome. David Frick questioned if there was any interior meeting or common spaces in the building. Essek Petrie responded there were not any community spaces inside. There will be a mail and package room and elevator in the lobby. David Frick questioned if all the mechanicals were on the roof. Essek Petrie confirmed that was correct. David Frick questioned if it was possible to put in a rooftop deck. Essek Petrie responded that was not possible. David Frick questioned if the trail would connect to Amesbury Heights. Essek Petrie responded that where the property ends, it would connect to Amesbury Heights. David Frick questioned if there would be sidewalks on Route 150. Essek Petrie responded that they currently do not plan for that. It doesn't make sense to put in sidewalks to nowhere, but they are happy to have that conversation. David Frick questioned if there would be stairs up to the garage. Is there a way to loop up to Building 1 without stairs? Essek Petrie responded that they cannot avoid the stairs because of the topography.
51. Tracey Chalifour questioned if there would be an onsite maintenance office. Essek Petrie responded that the condo association would contract with a management company.
52. Michael Jewell commented that the project looks great. I like what you are doing with the land and parking access on both sides. Michael Jewell questioned if there would be a backup generator for the sewer pump. Essek Petrie confirmed that was correct.
53. Tom Salemi requested clarification for DOT concern about the exit at Route 150. DOT may not allow cars to exit left and right, but would cars be able to enter from both directions? Essek Petrie responded that our preference would be to have a full access driveway. That is our preference, but MassDOT is hesitant to grant full access at this time. That is still in discussion. We are requesting full access. Tom Salemi questioned if there would be traffic calming through the property. Essek Petrie responded that they are proposing speed bumps or tables at the crosswalks on the site to prevent cut-through traffic. Tom Salemi questioned what was the size of the neighborhood park. Essek Petrie responded they will give more context in the filing. They flagged the perimeter and it is approximately 6,000 sf. Tom Salemi questioned if they would build both buildings at once or in phases. Essek Petrie responded that they would build them one at a time.
54. Pascal Rettig commented that the overall project is great. One concern is that Route 110 is a weird area with a residential neighborhood. A 5-story building can somewhat fit in the context of the neighborhood; but it comes down to landscaping and feel. Landscaping around the front to buffer the visual impact. It seems like there is a little bit of greenery between the buildings. Is there any way to get more trees in between there to soften it? It

also looks like this project will not need any or many waivers. Essek Petrie confirmed they were not asking for any waivers. Pascal Rettig commented there was not much green space for residents. The trail and park help. They should consider if there is an opportunity to put more effort into the community space. A lot of packages will be dropped off and there is no place to park for deliveries; people will be blocking or parking in handicap spaces. They need places for them to pull in and not block traffic. Pascal Rettig questioned what the siding on top of the building would be. Essek Petrie responded it would be composite siding. They will include more detail in the formal package. We appreciate what you are saying about the streetscape on Route 110. We can potentially save at least one existing tree and look at what they can do to enhance the area. Pascal Rettig questioned if there was anything worth saving in the old apple orchard. Essek Petrie responded there was not. We will provide detail on the trail and park in the formal package.

55. David Frick commented that there is one community space near Building 1 and questioned if it would have any grill space. Essek Petrie responded that typically their common spaces have two grills with café seating and picnic tables. David Frick commented that they should see if there was space to put grills near Building 2 as well.
56. Pascal Rettig noted that there were members of the public present, so they would take public comment.
57. Sue Hirsick lives on Merrill Ave. directly across from this proposal. No one talked about the impact to the streets across the way. There will be 600 passings of cars with this complex. It is already difficult to leave their street. There is excessive noise from the concrete down the street. They have asked the town before for a change in the signaling. All of this planning is supposed to be considering Amesbury citizens, but you have not taken the people across the way into consideration at all. I am extremely disappointed. I do not know how long this project is going to take. I have not heard about how getting out of our streets will be impacted. Even though this is a pre-application, it sounds like a done deal. Pascal Rettig commented that there will be a full application with a traffic study. Abutters will get a mailing to let them know about the upcoming hearing. There will be a number of public hearings. Sue Hirsick commented that she hoped that their voices will be heard and citizens' well-being would be taken into consideration. Property values would be going down.
- 59.
61. Tracey Chalifour commented that Ms. Hirsick should continue to stay engaged. There will be many opportunities for you and your neighbors to come forward.
63. Joel Nice commented that dust control management is a big issue and it should be mitigated. Essek Petrie responded they would include the details on that. Joel Nice questioned if there were plans to engage the neighborhood. Essek Petrie commented they could set up a neighborhood meeting and engage the neighbors.
64. Joe Kubic of 3 Hoyt Ave. commented that right now, the way the public trail is aligned, it has a bike path that terminates at a dangerous point to cross the street. People don't cross Route 110 at Hoyt Ave. because it's dangerous. That section of sidewalk on 110 is only between the Heights and the trails. To go further west, you need to cross, and that's dangerous. The only place to cross is at the Route 150 and Route 110 intersection. Lining the trail up at Hoyt Ave. is setting up a dangerous crossing. The public park in the

plan looks like a usable space, but it is not flat. Essek Petrie responded they did go onsite and can provide a topographical plan. The area is fairly flat.

- 65. Tracey Chalifour commented that the schematic shows a hashed mark area on Route 110 that does not exist right now. Is there a plan to work with MassDOT and coordinate that? Essek Petrie responded that there is no intent to perform work in the right of way for Route 110. Anything being proposed is within the property boundaries.
- 66. Tom Salemi questioned what the construction timeline would be. Essek Petrie responded it would be about 2 years.
- 67. Joe Kubic from 3 Hoyt Ave. commented that the apple trees were replaced about 15 years ago. They are now newer, healthy trees. They are all relatively young, sizeable trees, and it could be a good effort to save some."

62. Continues Hearing – 9 Oakland St.

- 63. David Frick motioned to continue the application for 9 Oakland Street to the March 23, 2026, Planning Board Meeting. Seconded by Keith Ratner.
- 64. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call –
- 65. Keith Ratner – YES
- 66. Joel Nice – YES
- 67. Michael Jewell – YES
- 68. Tracey Chalifour – YES
- 69. Tom Salemi - YES
- 70. David Frick – YES
- 71. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 72. Motion Passed 7-0

73. Continued Hearing – 5 and 13 School Street

- 74. David Frick motioned to continue the application for 5 and 13 School Street to the March 23, 2026, Planning Board Meeting. Seconded by Tom Salemi.
- 75. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call –
- 76. Keith Ratner – YES
- 77. Joel Nice – YES
- 78. Michael Jewell – YES
- 79. Tracey Chalifour – YES
- 80. Tom Salemi - ABSENT
- 81. David Frick – YES
- 82. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 83. Motion Passed 7-0

84. Continues Hearing – 14 Maple St.

- 85. Scott Brown commented that this was a Historic Preservation special permit application. They are rehabbing an existing historic house and adding a house on the left side. They were last in front of the Board on January 29, 2026. This revised plan is a better fit than what was proposed before. There were minor changes to the proposed site plan discrepancy in the zoning matrix, so that was cleaned up. They added a privacy cedar fence

located on all three sides of property. There will not be a fence between each parcel. The back left-hand corner shows an optional two-car garage. That was suggested by the DRC. At this time, the applicant doesn't want to commit to it. They are leaving that in the plan as optional.

86. Tom Salemi questioned why there was no fence between the two properties. Scott Brown responded the landscaping plan was not part of the original submission. There is a row of arborvitaes along 14A that would provide enough privacy. Nipun Jain commented they have looked at that exact issue. It is critical to decide if there is going to be a fence or not. They did suggest to the applicant they should plan for the property owner to want to put in a fence. It is better to determine what kind of fence can go there. Landscaping matters in relation to the fence. They can adjust the landscaping accordingly. They can accomplish screening without the fence and add a fence later if they want. Staff recommends moving the landscaping onto the new lot for snow storage and more space. Scott Brown agreed with the recommended changes.
87. David Frick commented that the existing house does not have a fence between the property line and 16 Maple St. If the builder wants to do that, then fine. The Board doesn't need to dictate it goes all the way around. Nipun Jain commented they were not suggesting it has to be installed but it should show how a fence would be installed there if they choose to put it in.
88. Joel Nice arborvitaes on property line. Then each property will have a row, which will be nice.
89. Scott Brown commented they have new proposed street elevations that incorporate comments from the Historical Commission and DRC. They changed the window pattern. They stripped the detail to make it more of a working-class Victorian. That makes it more consistent with neighborhood. The footprint and massing are the same. The house is white. One change to the existing house is the added decorative shingles at all the gable ends.
90. David Frick questioned if the garage doors were overhead or sideways. Scott Brown responded that they were overhead.
91. Tom Salemi questioned what was happening on the far right of the existing house. Scott Brown responded that they are keeping both entrances. Both have covered porches. They are changing the door on the right side to de-emphasize it. They are moving it to the side under the porch.
92. Nipun Jain commented that the existing house was deemed historic by the Historical Commission. The Commission reviewed the proposed renovations. There are a couple minor things they are still wrapping up. Most of those things Mr. Brown spoke about today. They have been supported and recommended within context and rubric of the special permit. The finishes on the outside building, patios, driveways, and accessory structures in compliance. TRC has recommended approval. There are no additional improvements needed for utilities. There are no changes to infrastructure upgrades. The sidewalk in front of the new house may be damaged, so when it is being fixed, they recommend it is repaired to follow the true grade. The next steps would be to come back with a draft decision with conditions for the Board to review.
93. Keith Ratner motioned to ask staff to draft a decision for the application for 14 Maple Street. Seconded by Joel Nice.

95. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call –

96. Keith Ratner – YES

97. Joel Nice – YES

98. Michael Jewell – YES

99. Tracey Chalifour – YES

100. Tom Salemi - YES

101. David Frick – YES

102. Pascal Rettig – YES

103. Motion Passed 7-0

104. Pascal Rettig opened public comment. There was no public comment.

105. Tom Salemi motioned to continue the application for 14 Maple Street to the March 23, 2026 Planning Board Meeting. Seconded by Joel Nice.

106. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call –

107. Keith Ratner – YES

108. Joel Nice – YES

109. Michael Jewell – YES

110. Tracey Chalifour – YES

111. Tom Salemi - YES

112. David Frick – YES

113. Pascal Rettig – YES

114. Motion Passed 7-0

115. Continued Hearing – Rocky Hill Development

116. Nipun Jain commented that VHB had prepared the traffic review memo and they have their traffic consultant Patrick Dunford present to speak to it.

117. Patrick Dunford commented that VHB found that left-turn movements face longer delays than right turns. Some level of delay is expected at peak times. Backups will generate about 75–175 feet. That is generally 3–5 cars. They are not excessive and should not interfere with the operation of the site. One other element is that this project has been under development for a while. Traffic projections were based on ITE data. They were asked to revisit it, and they did. The impact was negligible. VHB was also doing a parallel site and civil engineering review on the project. In that letter, there was some confusion over parking supply, and they asked for a concise parking table. That was covered under a separate letter. They were asked to look at it from a functional perspective using ITE data on parking needs. The parking demand based on this data was greater than the proposed supply. However, looking at it more closely, it still appeared overstated. It does not reflect the current 2026 reality. The actual parking experience tends to be lower than textbook estimates. The proposed parking works. There is other data from the metro area that could be referenced. On Elm Street, they noticed unrelated base traffic counts showing a disproportionate demand for turning from Rocky Hill to Route 110. They were asked to look at the reverse movements. Some drivers may be inclined to turn right and then left. Given the nature of the improvements elsewhere, they did not feel there would be significant demand for that. They could explore it more, but ultimately it is a public road, and they

would want to make sure it is not overrun. The Elm Street driveway showed notable delays for exiting traffic. They looked at whether a traffic signal was warranted and did a detailed analysis showing it was not warranted or appropriate. Adding striping would encourage most people to obey and keep the intersection clear so the site entrance and opposing intersection are not blocked. A MEVA bus shelter is proposed on Elm Street, and they will be asking for more detail on that. The road is tight between the right-of-way and the sidewalks. Overall, there are no major deal breakers.

118. Keith Ratner commented that they were looking at facilitating pedestrian access with a pedestrian-actuated signal at the existing crosswalk on Elm Street near the Hampton Inn. There is also a bike path coming in behind Stop & Shop, and they are looking at another signal farther down Elm Street. There should be coordination on that. Patrick Dunford suggested an RFB crossing signal. Keith Ratner noted it may be more confusing if there are two crossings so close together.

119. Joel Nice commented if the queuing on Elm Street gets too long, people will turn right and then go down Rocky Hill Road. He does see this project impacting that cut-through traffic. Patrick Dunford commented they showed analysis indicating vehicle queuing should not extend to the driveway. He stood by his comment that there is some potential for this to happen, but it should not occur because traffic is not expected to be completely blocked. The best way to accommodate cars accessing the site is to improve conditions so drivers want to come down Elm Street to Route 110. There is proposed mitigation at the Elm Street/Route 110 intersection aimed at preventing cut-through traffic.

120. Pascal Rettig requested more information about backups on Route 110 and the use of plastic bollards to prevent drivers from jumping the left-turn lane. He asked what improvements are planned in those lanes. Patrick Dunford responded that there are major improvements planned on Route 110. All of the notable improvements should relieve much of the frustration. Pascal Rettig commented that in theory, there is work being done to mitigate the project's impacts. Some of it is being funded by the applicant and some by the MassWorks grant. Who is responsible for that work. Patrick Dunford explained that the intersection improvement plan discussed is part of the MassWorks application. Vanesse showed analysis of what was needed to mitigate impacts, and the planned improvements collectively address those issues. Funding is in place. Pascal Rettig noted that there should be coordination on the timing of the improvements.

121. Jake Camordy from Vanesse Associates commented that the project's mitigation requirements are spelled out in the Chapter 61 findings. The project must complete that mitigation. Regardless of whether the grant is awarded, the project still has those commitments. As written in the Chapter 61, the project is not relieved of the commitment to complete the work before occupancy of the site. They put together a few slides on the MassWorks grant. The city submitted an application last year to the Community One Stop program. As part of that application, it listed three residential developments at 283 Elm, the Rocky Hill Development on Elm St. and 27.5-29 Clarks Road, totaling to about 700 residential units. The purpose of the grant is to construct improvements in the public right-of-way to support economic development and housing production. The application included a whole list of improvements totaling \$5 million. The city was awarded \$3.6 million of the \$5 million requested and can apply again next year for the remainder. The roadway

improvements are under MassDOT design review, and a permit from MassDOT is needed to complete the work. The permitting process is ongoing. The hope is to begin construction in late summer and continue through the next construction season. Improvements include Route 110 traffic signal coordination, Route 110 corridor improvements (including three westbound lanes), reconstruction of the Route 110/Elm Street/Clarks intersection signal, safety improvements at Route 110/Clarks/Elm, Route 110/Rabbit Road/Merrill, the Elm Street crosswalk, and the Elm Street bus stop. These make up the \$3.6 million project.

122. Pascal Rettig questioned if the initial \$3.6 million covered the southbound I-95 light. Jake Camordy responded that they are designing that light so it can be submitted in the next grant round.

123. Jake Camordy commented that reconstructing the signal will include underground equipment to prepare for the future signal. Keith Ratner questioned whether the MassWorks grant goes to the developer or the city. Jake Camordy clarified that the MassWorks grant goes to the city, while the developer is working to design and permit the improvements. Once construction documents are approved, it becomes the city's responsibility to hire contractors and complete the work. They will bring sidewalks up to ADA compliance beyond Starbucks, replace the water main across Route 110, and replace the sewer siphon. The light would accommodate left turns while adding a third lane on Route 110 to help move traffic.

124. Keith Ratner made a motion to continue the meeting to 10 pm. Seconded by Tom Salemi.

125. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call –

126. Keith Ratner – YES

127. Joel Nice – YES

128. Michael Jewell – NO

129. Tracey Chalifour – YES

130. Tom Salemi - YES

131. David Frick – YES

132. Pascal Rettig – YES

133. Motion Passed 6-1

134. Jake Camordy commented that other work at the intersection includes rebuilding the signal at Clarks Rd. and Elm St. They will install a completely new traffic signal and replace curb ramps and crosswalks. A new crosswalk will be added on Clarks Road. They are also adjusting the signal phasing slightly, including changing Clarks Road to include a right-turn lane. This can be timed to run simultaneously with crossing left-turn movements. They are also proposing safety modifications at the Rabbit Road intersection, including crosswalk improvements and signal timing changes.

135. Michael Jewell questioned if the right turn lane for westbound traffic turning right from Route 110 onto Elm St. would be modified. Jake Camordy responded that right-turn lane would remain. The curb would need to be moved back to accommodate the new westbound lane, and the bike path would be rebuilt. Michael Jewell noted that westbound drivers on Route 110 trying to access I-95 South converge with drivers trying to turn right onto Elm Street. That makes it confusing. Jake Camordy explained that the two westbound lanes would remain configured as they are today. David Frick commented that they were

widening it to three lanes. That should reduce congestion by creating a dedicated lane. Michael Jewell responded that the current right-turn lane is too short for the number of cars wanting to turn right. Jake Camordy said they are adding a through lane, but the length of the right-turn lane would remain the same. David Frick noted that better signals should improve traffic flow. Jake Camordy agreed.

136. Joel Nice questioned whether the third lane is being extended back as far as possible. Jake Camordy responded it cannot be extended any farther because of the I-95 ramp and the new signal.
138. Pascal Rettig outlined the remaining issues, but as it's been presented to us, what is being done for MassWorks cover mitigation needed for the project even without the South 95 light? What's been presented and highlighted in yellow has successfully impacted traffic. Patrick Dunford responded the amount of roadway improvements done will mitigate traffic. He was comfortable with it. A lot of people are looking at it. Pascal Rettig clarified that the last memo had no red flags. Patrick Dunford confirmed there were no deal breakers. The outstanding items are mostly just documentation and the cut-through matter.
139. Tom Salemi questioned if they needed to make any considerations for construction traffic. Nipun Jain responded they can look at that based on if additional traffic is generated for some time and look at it for temporary impact. It can be discussed with public safety and the city. Vanessa can give a timeframe and more explanation on that.
140. Pascal Rettig commented that they received a memo from VHB and responses from the applicant. Their engineering memo had a number of comments and noted a number of missing documents and waivers. When do you think you will have responses on that? Bob Dale responded that they intended to respond this week. The hope is to come to the March 23rd meeting. They went through an extensive MEPA review on this project. They would like to hear from the Board if there is a requirement for an environmental impact report that isn't covered by MEPA. Nipun Jain responded that there was no need for a new report. They can provide sections from the MEPA to satisfy some of the engineering peer review. Pascal Rettig asked if there are any other documents they don't think they can provide. Bob Dale responded that no one requested a sound impact study, and they will not be doing one. However, they will have a detailed response on why and how they will mitigate it. They will handle it within the buildings themselves. The other issue is on the Geotech study. Typically, they do not do a Geotech until they are preparing construction documents.
141. Pascal Rettig commented that there is not enough time to review a response if it comes in on Friday or Monday. The Board has a large agenda for March 23rd. Bob Dale questioned if any other consultants need to come back to discuss. They have heard from the architectural review and traffic. They hope to close out that testimony. When this project does come back, they are assuming there will not be any strong opposition. Pascal Rettig responded that he thought they were good on traffic. The engineering and landscaping are still open. Bob Dale agreed they will consider that open. Pascal Rettig questioned if there were any significant changes in architecture. Bob Dale responded there were not and he hoped to be done with DRC.
142. Pascal Rettig commented they have not seen the open space plan and it would be great to get that plan before the end of the month.

143. Pascal Rettig commented that they should clarify which units are in the 10% affordable. David Frick commented it's a condition of approval. Pascal Rettig commented that they just wanted to understand the distribution of units and where they are located within the development. There has been discussion on what has been deeded to the city and what has not. Bob Dale said part of the subdivision will be a separate application. Pascal Rettig commented that part of the goal of the MBTA zoning is around non-car transportation, so understanding how the property will connect to adjacent properties and the street is important.
144. Keith Ratner commented that the snow removal plan should be more detailed.
145. David Frick commented that this was a great project but there were items that still needed to be completed to finish up. The civil VHB memo had 56 comments in it that need to be addressed.
146. Bob Dale noted they would be responding to everything in the peer review memo.
147. Tracey Chalifour questioned if the environmental report from August was the most recent version. Bob Dale confirmed it was. It is the result of a state process. The city engineer suggested doing an environmental impact statement independent of MEPA, but that is not necessary.
148. Pascal Rettig opened public comment. There was no public comment.
151. Keith Ratner motioned to continue the application for the Rocky Hill Development to the April 13, 2026 Planning Board. Seconded by Joel Nice.
152. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call –
153. Keith Ratner – YES
154. Joel Nice – YES
155. Michael Jewell – YES
156. Tracey Chalifour – YES
157. Tom Salemi - YES
158. David Frick – YES
159. Pascal Rettig – YES
160. Motion Passed 7-0
161. David Frick motioned to continue the Planning Board meeting to 10:10 pm. Seconded by Keith Ratner.
162. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call –
163. Keith Ratner – YES
164. Joel Nice – YES
165. Michael Jewell – YES
166. Tracey Chalifour – YES
167. Tom Salemi - YES
168. David Frick – YES
169. Pascal Rettig – YES
170. Motion Passed 7-0
171. **Continues Hearing – 29 Lake Attitash Road**

172. Tom Salemi motioned to continue the application for 29 Lake Attitash Road to the March 23, 2026 Planning Board Meeting. Seconded by Tracey Chalifour.
173. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call –
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 7-0
182. **Administrative - Michael Jewell Resignation.**
183. Pascal Rettig thanked Michael Jewell for his attendance and diligent hard work.
184. David Frick motioned to accept Michael Jewell's resignation and forward it to City Council. Seconded by Joel Nice.
185. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call –
186. Keith Ratner – YES
187. Joel Nice – YES
188. Michael Jewell – YES
189. Tracey Chalifour – YES
190. Tom Salemi – YES
191. David Frick – ABSTAIN
192. Pascal Rettig – YES
193. Motion Passed 6-0-1
194. David Frick abstained.
195. **Adjournment**
196. Keith Ratner motioned to adjourn at 10:02 pm. Seconded by Tom Salemi.
197. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call –
198. Keith Ratner – YES
199. Joel Nice – YES
200. Michael Jewell – YES
201. Tracey Chalifour – YES
202. Tom Salemi – YES
203. David Frick – YES
204. Pascal Rettig – YES
205. Motion Passed 7-0