RECEIVED
By City Clerk at 12:28 pm, Apr 14, 2026

1. Amesbury Planning Board Meeting Minutes

2. In Person Meeting – February 9, 2026, at 7:03 PM

3. Chairman Pascal Rettig called the February 9, 2026, 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 - ABSENT
12. David Frick – YES
13. Pascal Rettig – YES

14. Also: Nipun Jain (Planning Director) and Becky Frey (Community Development Coordinator)

15. **Minutes – 9-22-26**
16. Tracey Chalifour motioned to approve the minutes from the 9-22-25 Planning Board Meeting as submitted. Seconded by Keith Ratner.
17. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote–
18. Keith Ratner – YES
19. Joel Nice – YES
20. Michael Jewell – YES
21. Tracey Chalifour – YES
22. Tom Salemi - ABSENT
23. David Frick – YES
24. Pascal Rettig – YES
25. Motion passed 6-0

26. **Minutes -10-27-26**
27. These minutes were tabled to the next meeting.

28. **Sign – 36 Main Street - MacDaddies**

29. Becky Frey commented that the applicant did not know there was a sign ordinance. They have applied after the fact to bring the sign into compliance.
30. Michael, the representative from MacDaddies, commented that the sign was the same size as the Coop sign.
31. Joel Nice questioned if it was screen printed. Michael confirmed that it was.
32. David Frick motioned to approve the sign for MacDaddies at 36 Main St. as presented. Seconded by Keith Ratner.
33. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote–
34. Keith Ratner – YES
35. Joel Nice – YES
36. Michael Jewell – YES
37. Tracey Chalifour – YES
38. Tom Salemi - ABSENT
39. David Frick – YES
40. Pascal Rettig – YES
41. Motion passed 6-0

42. **Preapplication – 230 Main Street**
43. Lisa Mead presented on behalf of the applicant 230 Main St. LLC and 2 Macy St. LLC. The application is for a Historic Preservation Special Permit. The applicant initially sought a demolition permit for 230 Main St. The Historical Commission instituted the demolition delay. Since that time, the applicant has been working diligently with OCED to come up with a proposal that preserves 230 Main St. They met again with the Historical Commission, and the Commission determined 230 Main St. is eligible for a Special Permit. They also determined that 234 Main is historically significant but not preferably preserved, so it can be demolished. 230 Main, 234 Main, 2 Macy, and 4 Rosedale St. are all part of this project. Preserving 230 Main St. will require taking down all the other existing buildings. They will combine all properties to make 230 Main St. a 5-unit building with a carriage house and 3 additional buildings for a total of 68 units with parking and amenities. 230 Main St. was built in 1745, and then another section was built later in the early 1900s. The proposed new structures will allow the view of the historic house to continue.
44. John Tilton, civil engineer, commented that the total parcel size is 1.85 acres and they are proposing 5 total buildings. Building A will have 18 units, Building B will have 20 units, Building C will have 21 units, Building D will have 5 units, and Building E will have 4 units. The site currently has two large access points off Macy St. There are two exits off Rosedale for the childcare center. They will close the access points on Macy St. and the proposed site will have access on Main St. and Rosedale St. The site will have 70 total parking spaces which includes EV parking and handicap spots. There will be a designated delivery area. There will also be parking for motorcycles and e-bikes. The landscape plan shows they are introducing 300 trees, bushes, and grasses to the site. There will be 20 street trees along Macy St. and Main St. and larger trees in the parking area. There will be a courtyard area between Buildings A and B, and Buildings B and C. There will be another courtyard area between Buildings D and E. They will have subsurface stormwater management.

45. Steve DeFuria, from Phoenix Architects, commented that the goal is to maintain and restore 230 Main St. They will use clapboard siding, and either replace it in kind or retain what is currently there. The windows and doors will be replaced. The existing Victorian had an addition that was put on, so they are trying to differentiate between the two eras. Building E will be complementary to the 230 Main St. historic house and detailed like a carriage house. The next three buildings are new construction off Macy Street; they follow similar styles. There will be decorative entries and covered porches at the access points. The primary driving force of Building C is the massing. They are trying to keep the sightlines and scale open at the corner of Main St. and Macy St. Building D has more ornate detailing with off-white siding, Italian ornate trim, and bronze windows and trim. Lastly, Building A, located by Rosedale St., will have a mansard-style building and the third floor will be in the roofline. There will be a mix of townhouses and flats. The rest of the buildings are flat style. This will have darker siding with a dark gray roofline.
46. Pascal Rettig commented that when the Board sees Historic Preservation Special Permits, usually there is a little density bonus. This project is going from 3 units to 68 units, with the historical building in the back corner of the lot. By-right with a mixed-use development they can have a fair amount of density. Pascal Rettig questioned if they looked at what the density for a mixed-unit development could be. Lisa Mead responded that they have had discussions over the past year and a half about what could be done by right vs. with the HSP and saving the house. The desire is to save the house and add residential housing in town. In order to make that work, this is what they came up with. The design started differently, and staff helped guide it in this direction. They could take the historic building down and do a very different development. Originally the numbers were far in excess of this proposal. They can pull together the specifics when they formally apply. Pascal Rettig commented that would be helpful. It would help to understand the trade-offs. Lisa Mead commented that the open space and affordable housing are the major waivers. The setback waivers are being requested to put parking in the back and locate the carriage house.
47. Michael Jewell requested they speak to why they felt the proposed parking was adequate. Lisa Mead responded they will need a parking waiver too. They will present the traffic report in the formal filing. The zoning requires 102 spaces, and they are proposing 78 spaces. They are providing just over 1 space per unit. They feel it is sufficient based on their experience with units this size. Michael Jewell questioned what they would do for visitor parking. Lisa Mead responded they felt they it was adequately addressed with the parking onsite and at Rosedale St.
48. David Frick commented that he was concerned about the parking location. There are a lot of units between buildings C, D, and E and only 27 parking spots nearest to those buildings. There are some pretty good distances to walk depending on what building a resident is in vs. where they park. That could present some challenges. Lisa Mead responded they will address those issues in the filing.
49. David Frick commented that he considers it a high priority to save 230 Main and construct the carriage house. They are doing a nice job trying to blend the architecture that fits with Amesbury. It would be good to understand the by right density to understand the tradeoffs with this proposal. Lisa Mead responded that 230 Main St. went up for auction. Her client was looking at it, and there was some encouragement by the city to look at it and restore it.

David Frick commented that they could look at rotating the buildings. Lisa Mead responded the buildings have been turned a few times in this development. They are trying to provide good open space and street activation.

50. David Frick questioned what the trash management would be for the site. Lisa Mead responded there will be two dumpster locations on the site. David Frick questioned what was between them. Lisa Mead responded that would be delivery parking and then the transformer pads. David Frick questioned if the mechanicals would be on top of the buildings. Steve DeFuria responded that each building will have its own mechanical room in the building and rooftop mechanicals. They are hoping to screen it with the roofline.
51. Keith Ratner commented this was a major change to the streetscape and appreciate all the attention to that. That will be really important with this project. There are tennis courts right in the back area they should address screening with those courts if possible.
52. Tracey Chalifour requested to have some of the TRC minutes and information available to the Planning Board members when they formally file. It would be good to see some of the DRC comments as well. Parking as a whole is not adequate because there's an assumption there's one car per unit and no visitor parking. The plan is not showing any places for snow storage. Lisa Mead responded that it will be shown in the formal filing. Tracey Chalifour requested clarification on the tandem parking on the top right corner adjacent to the tennis courts. John Tilton responded that was the delivery service parking. Tracey Chalifour questioned if that was counted in the parking total. Lisa Mead responded they will clarify that in the formal filing. Tracey Chalifour questioned if the EV parking was counted in the parking total. Lisa Mead confirmed it was. Tracey Chalifour questioned if those EV parking spaces were required. John Tilton responded Mass Electric required a certain percentage, some spaces will be EV ready, and some will be installed right away. Lisa Mead confirmed they will provide EV-ready vs. EV spaces. Tracey Chalifour commented that she would like more discussion on the setbacks.
53. Pascal Rettig commented that there was a lot proposed on the site, so it would be good to understand what density is allowed by right. The zoning has a requirement for 200 sf of open space per unit. There will be a whole bunch of additional waivers being asked for; it would be good to understand those. The buildings are very handsome. They are just large because of the 3 stories and roofline. They will dominate that area. Given that it's a discretionary permit, the Board would like to understand what the alternative could look like.
54. Joel Nice commented that the most prominent building rotation on the corner has the most boring detailing. The mansard roof is a little bit of concern; it needs to be done well to make sure it works. Jole Nice questioned if there was any consideration given to a different shingle material. Steve DeFuria responded that they are looking at a couple different profiles and working with the client on that. The buildings will not all look the same.
55. Tracey Chalifour questioned what the proximity of the development was from the Main St. entry/exit and the school entry/exit. She would be curious to see if the study was done respective of the school day and everything related to that. It should also take into account the bank entrance and exit relative to the Main St. access. Lisa Mead responded they can do that. It is not a new opening. They will narrow it and control it. It will not be any closer to

the school than it is today. The traffic report will detail all that, and the study was done in the fall.

52. Michael Jewell questioned if the traffic study should take into consideration the beach traffic. Lisa Mead responded the study was completed in the fall. They will see if adjustments are needed.
53. Scott from Vanasse Associates commented that they did not take into consideration the analysis with beach traffic. They can give an adjusted traffic analysis. The analysis takes into consideration pedestrian phasing and signal timing.
54. Pascal Rettig questioned if there were any comments from staff. Nipun Jain commented that the design team and applicant have been working collaboratively with the city to get to this point. It's a tricky site. It can be an attractive site because of the proximity to schools. Kids can walk to school. It is in close proximity to other areas in town for recreational purposes. This is in the R8 district and the neighborhood around it, lends itself to higher density. The primary driver was saving the historic building. A lot of work needs to go into that building. This fills in the gaps. There are some existing challenges and it is important to remember those. There is some refinement that needs to be made on the parking and justification. A lot of work has been done on the buildings. The DRC suggested revisions to Building C. The Italian building was more ornate previously, and DRC suggested they be mindful that it blends with the project. The roofing material on Building A will matter a lot. They have incorporated the entryway feedback. There will be an entry foyer for residents and packages.
55. Tracey Chalifour questioned if the mechanicals would be able to be hidden on Building B because it was a flat roof. Nipun Jain responded that the pre-application went to DRC for an informal discussion. They have not gotten to that level of detail, but there is a dugout in the center.
56. Nipun Jain commented that they also focused a lot on the outdoor space trying to make it all blend with the site.
57. Pascal Rettig questioned if they had to come one more time before filing. Lisa Mead responded that they will go to TRC and circle around to assess if they should come back or address questions.
58. **Preapplication – 2 Elmwood Street**
59. Scott Brown, representing the applicant for 2 Elmwood St., presented another request for a historic preservation special permit. The 13,000 sq. ft. lot has 132 feet of frontage, and an existing two-family Victorian, built in 1891. It is in a prime position to split the lot with a preservation restriction and construct a new residence on the side lot. There is an existing dilapidated two-car garage that will be removed. The property has two curb cuts on Elmwood St., large enough for four vehicles, and an existing driveway. This is the proposed site plan submitted with the pre-application. They met with DRC Tuesday, TRC Thursday morning, and the Historical Commission Thursday night. They received positive feedback from all of them. The Historical Commission voted the project eligible for the special permit. The new residence will be rather narrow. Both buildings will have new single-car garages. DRC and TRC commented that neither committee liked the driveway orientation. The applicant responded by pivoting to a new

site plan with a different driveway orientation. The existing two-family house has a two-car garage and provides space for each unit, with tandem parking for each. The new lot will be slightly under 5,000 sq. ft. to accommodate the new driveway. The applicant will also request a waiver for the side and front yard setbacks. The new house has a slightly different footprint from the previous version. The existing photos of the house were presented. Much of the work has been done using materials consistent with what is typically desired in projects like this. A key issue is that the front porch was added in the 1960s and is not sympathetic to the Victorian style. The house is fully sided, and windows are installed, with some trim also completed. However, some work remains unfinished, including the front porch. The proposed street elevation includes single-car garages for both structures. Rather than keeping the enclosed front porch, the plan is to open it up. The design is still in progress. The original design lacked front-facing gables, but it has since been revised to include both front- and side-facing gables, similar to another house completed on Maple St. At some point, the chimneys were removed; the plan is to add two faux chimneys. Two-inch historic sills will be added to all windows, along with decorative features in the gables.

60. Joel Nice suggested it would be helpful to see an updated elevation with the garage matching the new driveway orientation. He noted it is good to see the scale. Scott Brown explained the goal is to create equity between the two units. Joel Nice asked if they were adding a second floor to the garage. Scott Brown responded they were not.
61. David Frick stated this is a great use of the special permit, noting it will improve the building and create a positive change in the neighborhood. He observed that the building on the left in the picture is wide. Scott Brown noted the existing structure is 38 feet wide, while the proposed will be 26 feet.
62. Tracey Chalifour asked if the new house will be a single-family home. Scott Brown confirmed it was.
63. Keith Ratner asked whether the units would be ownership or rental. Scott Brown responded that the new house will be for sale, and the existing building will remain a two-family.
64. Pascal Rettig asked what waivers are needed beyond dimensional requirements. Scott Brown responded he believes that was all they needed. Pascal Rettig suggested they put in a fence dividing the right side due to the tight site.
65. Nipun Jain noted there are mature trees on the right side. Scott Brown clarified there is a chain-link fence and that the mature trees are not on this property. Nipun Jain recalled earlier discussions about switching the driveway and the house, considering the excavation and root structures, and noted it made more sense to place the driveway on that side. Scott Brown added that a more detailed landscape and buffer plan will be included in the formal application.
66. Nipun Jian noted the revised site plan changes the driveway and wanted to ensure that each unit has adequate parking, including a garage space. He suggested a traditional driveway layout that starts as a single-car width and widens further back. He also recommended landscape buffers along the shared property line to give the new lots distinct identities and soften the visual appearance from the street. There was continued discussion about the porch design, which remains a challenge and needs

further refinement to better fit the structure. The rear covered porch design is also not yet finalized and differs on each side; it is expected to become more symmetrical. Scott Brown noted the design is still a work in progress and that the windows were ordered to fit existing openings.

14. Nipun Jain asked if any original photos of the house were found. Scott Brown responded they were not able to locate any.
15. Pascal asked about the fencing. Scott Brown responded a privacy fence is planned between both properties in the rear area.
16. Nipun Jain asked about the setback along the garage and moving the lot line toward the new lot. Scott Brown explained that this side of the garage needs a door for access, so the lot line was shifted to the right to allow entry. Nipun Jain asked if the door could be placed on the left side instead. Scott Brown responded that there will be doors on both sides.

56. **Preapplication – 19 Prospect Street**
57. Everett Chamberlain commented that there was an existing 2-family structure on Prospect Street, built in 1870. The lot is oversized for the neighborhood at almost 19,000 sf. They are submitting a historic preservation special permit, and the existing historic structure will be restored. They will be removing the addition that was put on in the 1950s and replacing it with a smaller addition. The new structure will be a Greek Revival and look like a single-family home but will have 3 units. They will be putting in a 3-car accessory structure to go with that building. At the meeting with TRC they suggested adding a single-car garage for the existing property. They will remove the existing shed. There is a fairly steep drop past the back of the current parking area. The sewer currently goes out to Market St. through the back as well. They will plan to connect on Prospect St. The existing siding is roofing material. The existing front façade has three sets of windows and historic research shows this is how it was built. They will keep that and restore that as well as the porch with wood columns. The new addition will be one-story in the back. The single-story garage will be part of the formal application. The new outback garage will be downhill and hidden. They are looking to complete the streetscape with this project.
58. David Frick questioned how the house would be divided. Everett Chamberlain responded that it would be up and down. Right now, the third floor of the existing house is not up to code. They are renovating the first floor, second floor, and basement.
59. Pascal Rettig questioned what was happening with the chimney. Everett Chamberlain responded that they have been to the Historical Commission, DRC, and TRC are working to incorporate the comments. They will either remove the fireplace or make it electric. The second floor will have a roof deck. They will be providing more material details on the new residence. They will maintain the 2-over-2 window configurations and incorporate shutters. The AC units will be installed on the downhill, so they will be screened from the street side. The front of the house will have plantings. In the back, they will have a couple steps down. There will be a small roof deck for the third unit. The three-car garage will have 3 different doors and access on the right side and the rear. The landscape plan shows they will put in some street trees and bushes to screen the concrete foundation concrete. There will be brick walkways coming in. They will be redoing the sidewalk with concrete. The retaining

wall in the back will help work the grading in. Each unit has one garage space and one tandem space. There will be snow storage in the back and trash for the units along the 3-car garage. There will be stormwater infiltration in the back near the three-car garage that will pick up roof leaders too. The infiltration unit in the other driveway will be pulled forward to accommodate the single-car garage. They are maintaining the existing tandem parking. There will be a new sewer line on Prospect St. and the water line for the historic home will be evaluated at construction. The existing structure will not be sprinkled, but the new one will be.

60. Michael Jewell clarified that they were adding a garage for the historical house. Everett Chamberlain confirmed they were adding a single-car garage.
61. Joel Nice commented it was a good project and he liked that they were incorporating different decks for an interesting living space.
62. David Frick agreed it was a good project and huge improvement to the neighborhood. David Frick questioned if the bones of the existing house were good. Everett chamberlain confirmed it did. The foundation is rubble and brick.
63. Nipun Jain commented that there was an access door to the basement and walkway to the that door that may need to include some steps to access it. Everett Chamberlain agreed they needed to work out some issues like that.
64. David Frick commented that this property looks so awful. This will be such an improvement to the neighborhood.
65. Keith Ratner agreed and noted that the 38–40 Prospect St. project was helping to improve the neighborhood as well.
66. Tracey Chalifour questioned how tall the retaining wall would be. Everett Chamberlain responded that it would be 5 feet. It's a small concrete retaining wall so people can bring the lawn equipment down. Tracey Chalifour noted the DRC suggested that area for snow storage. Is there a vision that part of the top of that wall will store snow too? Everett Chamberlain confirmed it would. The doors are in the back of the garage, so they need to make sure they are not blocking doors. One of the other things they talked about at DRC is that the back open space it not accessible to the historic house. They will move the property line to make a backyard for the 3-unit building. The existing building will have a roof deck and patio.
67. Pascal Rettig commented the plan feels like they are setting people up to walk up to the house from the garage. Everett Chamberlain responded that adding the single-car garage will help funnel people to their house. Pascal Rettig commented there was not a lot of open space for the new units except out back. Everett Chamberlain confirmed it would be common use. There is some deck space and a porch area, but otherwise the open space is the common use backyard. The third single-bed unit has no real private outdoor space. Pascal Rettig questioned if there was any thought to make the back open area more usable like with a patio. Nipun Jain responded that the area next to the new house on the left could be used for that unit. Removing those totes makes it a usable space in good weather and could be a better patio location.
68. Everett Chamberlain commented that the retaining wall is only a couple feet high. The driveway is 16 feet wide so they can push the snow to the side too.

69. Pascal Rettig questioned if there was one affordable unit. Everett Chamberlain responded they were creating 3 new units. Nipun Jain noted that because 2 are existing, the requirement for the affordable unit is based on new units. Because they are only creating 3 units, it does not trigger the affordable unit. Everett Chamberlain commented they will need waivers for setbacks.
70. **Adjournment**
71. Keith Ratner motioned to adjourn the meeting at 9:19 pm. Seconded by Tracey Chalifour.
72. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote –
73. Keith Ratner – YES
74. Joel Nice – YES
75. Michael Jewell – YES
76. Tracey Chalifour – YES
77. Tom Salemi - ABSENT
78. David Frick – YES
79. Pascal Rettig – YES
80. Motion passed 7-0