

RECEIVED

By City Clerk at 12:25 pm, Apr 14, 2026

1. Amesbury Planning Board Meeting Minutes
2. In Person Meeting – January 12, 2026, at 7:03 PM
3. Chairman Pascal Rettig called the January 12, 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 – ABSENT
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. Keith Ratner motioned to nominate Pascal Rettig as Planning Board Chair. Seconded by Joel Nice.
16. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote –
17. Keith Ratner – YES
18. Joel Nice – YES
19. Michael Jewell – ABSENT
20. Tracey Chalifour – YES
21. Tom Salemi - ABSENT
22. David Frick – YES
23. Pascal Rettig – YES
24. Motion passed 5-0
25. Keith Ratner motioned to nominate David Frick as Planning Board Vice Chair. Seconded by Joel Nice.
26. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote –
27. Keith Ratner – YES
28. Joel Nice – YES

- 29. Michael Jewell – ABSENT
- 30. Tracey Chalifour – YES
- 31. Tom Salemi - ABSENT
- 32. David Frick – YES
- 33. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 34. Motion passed 5-0

35. Minutes – 9-8-2025

- 36. David Frick motioned to approve minutes from the 9-8-25 Planning Board meeting as drafted. Seconded by Joel Nice.
- 37. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote –
- 38. Keith Ratner – YES
- 39. Joel Nice – YES
- 40. Michael Jewell – ABSENT
- 41. Tracey Chalifour – ABSTAIN
- 42. Tom Salemi - ABSENT
- 43. David Frick – YES
- 44. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 45. Motion passed 4-0-1

46. ANR – 38.5 Rocky Hill Road

- 47. Nipun Jain commented that the objective of the ANR plan is to create two parcels out of the existing parcel. Parcel 3C is going to be combined with the existing lot 3 and the remaining portion will be combined with the abutter's property on the other side.
- 48. David Frick clarified there was no change to the existing access easement. Nipun Jain confirmed that was correct. Staff recommends plan approved as presented.
- 49. David Frick motioned to approve ANR for 38.5 Rocky Hill Road as presented. Seconded by Joel Nice.
- 50. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote –
- 51. Keith Ratner – YES
- 52. Joel Nice – YES
- 53. Michael Jewell – ABSENT
- 54. Tracey Chalifour – YES
- 55. Tom Salemi - ABSENT
- 56. David Frick – YES
- 57. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 58. Motion passed 5-0

- 59. Keith Ratner motioned to take 102 Kimball Road and 6 Lake Attitash Way out of order. Seconded by Joel Nice.
- 60. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote –
- 61. Keith Ratner – YES
- 62. Joel Nice – YES
- 63. Michael Jewell – ABSENT

- 64. Tracey Chalifour – YES
- 65. Tom Salemi - ABSENT
- 66. David Frick – YES
- 67. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 68. Motion passed 5-0

69. Continued Hearings – 27.5 – 29 Clarks Road

- 70. Tracey Chalifour recused herself from the application.
- 71. Nipun Jain summarized what has been done so far and what the applicant has provided in response. The application and supporting documents were sent to VHB for peer review, who issued an initial review letter. VHB has received the applicant's response. A supplemental engineering review indicated that the majority, if not all, comments were addressed. Any outstanding peer review items could be considered addressed through conditions of approval. On the traffic side, the initial review and presentation from the consultant were completed. They indicated certain additional steps and documents were needed. The applicant has provided that. They are finalizing their memo and have not identified any major issues. Nothing indicates that this project requires anything beyond what the applicant has already proposed or what the city requires for other developments in the area. There were two major issues that were still circulating. One was the building design and review. Additional information has been provided on that. The last category is the environmental review. The project does impact buffer zones. A Notice of Intent (NOI) was filed with the Conservation Commission and is still under review. The proposed activities are within the 50-foot buffer zone and include adequate mitigation. They can be considered on their own merits under the Conservation Commission. There are no anticipated conflicting stormwater review issues. The project filed for an ANRAD last year, so resource areas were identified and approved by the Conservation Commission already. Unless there is a dramatic change in the field, most of what is proposed to the Planning Board will meet the environmental standards. At the last meeting, the Board asked that if things were moving in the right direction, draft conditions should be prepared to move toward approval.
- 72. Nipun Jain commented that conditions have been drafted. Most are what has been recommended by the peer reviewers. The other substantial conditions are standard, such as covenants and erosion control bonds. Given the scale and scope of the project, many additional steps are required before construction-level drawings would be produced. The applicant is being asked to provide long-term pollution prevention plans and a SWPPP. While this may seem overbearing, it is typical for a large project.
- 73. Pascal Rettig commented that the Board was sent the conditions before the meeting and needs time to review them due to their volume. It is worth highlighting some specific ones and revisiting them at the next meeting. Nipun Jain commented that the process is moving in the right direction and that all necessary items are addressed. The waivers may be acceptable as conditions rather than requiring immediate submission, such as a marketing plan for the affordable units.
- 74. Nipun Jain commented they used a framework for reviewing both the technical and non-technical aspects. One criterion is connectivity, including sidewalks and trail networks. Plans

propose a trail network and open space that would be permanently protected with a conservation restriction. A framework has been proposed outlining the expected trail materials and minimum dimensions. The second criterion is the streetscape when traveling along Clark's Road. This includes the placement and design of the two structures and the primary driveway, with grass strips and vegetated buffers. The building elements, including the architectural features of the two structures, are still being refined, as is the building in the rear. Some additional work is needed on the architectural drawings, which will be provided before construction activity. The project will comply with the East End Smart Growth standards and renderings. Outdoor spaces include various recreational and active uses, ensuring adequate on-site amenities.

75. David Frick recalled there was a discussion and concerns about walking along Clark's Road south to Birchwood Point and crossing to the east side to continue to Main Street. He asked whether that would be completed by the applicant.
76. Nipun Jain responded that the applicant will reconstruct the sidewalk on Clark's Road down to Birchwood Point and continue to the first driveway. On the west side, there is already a sidewalk from Main Street to just before the cemetery. Discussions have included installing a raised crosswalk at the end of the applicant's sidewalk to connect to the west side, with shared contributions for installation. The city is currently conducting survey work to determine right-of-way boundaries and may use Smart Growth funds to complete that section.
77. Joel Nice asked if the applicant would consider making the two front buildings on Clark's Road more traditional in style, including double-hung windows and features consistent with the street scale. Alex Loth stated that updated architectural plans for Eagles Crossing have been uploaded. There have been discussions about scale and the building heights have been reduced by about two feet. The front elevations are more consistent with surrounding buildings. While not single-family homes, they are designed to resemble them, with two doors and a portico. The Design Review Committee (DRC) has been consulted, and further revisions are being made. The windows will be slightly smaller and double-hung, and the upper windows above the pediments will be reduced. Additional details, such as trim board width and clapboards, have been refined.
78. Joel Nice suggested adding a front porch or shutters to enhance the appearance. Alex Loth noted that multiple design iterations have been reviewed and the DRC is satisfied with the current proposal.
79. Pascal Rettig suggested further differentiation between buildings to make them appear more distinct. Alex Loth responded that the entryways and roofs are different and the colors will vary.
80. Nipun Jain noted that one of the proposed conditions acknowledges both the applicant's and the Board's goals around this. As the design of the development progresses, rendered elevations can be refined. The Board and staff are more accustomed to line architectural drawings, but as long as the design goals are clear, the buildings can be refined accordingly. The project can return to the Board as a condition if needed.
81. Keith Ratner asked who would be responsible for trail maintenance. Nipun Jain responded that this is still being determined and is under review by the Conservation Commission.

82. David Frick questioned if they could limit access on Clarks Road to local deliveries to help with traffic concerns. Nipun Jain responded that the Planning Board/staff does not have enforcement authority over right-of-way restrictions. That would fall under police or DPW. However, the concern can be communicated to the appropriate departments.
83. Pascal Rettig opened public comment.
84. Bill and Anne Ganzenmuller of 464 Main Street submitted written public comment that is attached to the end of these minutes.
85. Tracey Chalifour of 25 Clarks Road submitted written public comment that is attached to the end of these minutes.
86. John Stevenson of 439 Main Street commented that this is a major project with significant concerns especially given the additional development around it. He noted the large volume of traffic reports and the lack of a city traffic engineer. That is making it difficult for Planning Board members to draw conclusions. Mr. Stevenson had concerns about the building scale, and the large rear structure. He raised concerns about Starbucks traffic, estimating 108 cars per hour attempting to enter the site. Capacity appears limited to 60 cars. This could create congestion issues, especially given the single drive-through lane. He also noted the lack of cumulative traffic estimates. He was projecting approximately 3,000 vehicles in the area and urged consideration of the roadway design and reconstruction plans. The Board should carefully consider the building size, Starbucks traffic impacts, and overall road safety.
87. Pascal Rettig noted that one request to DPW is to provide more information on the \$3.6 million dollar grant project for improvements on Clark's Road, as details have not yet been fully presented.
88. David Frick commented that the traffic engineer for the Rocky Hill project, had a pretty good handle on what the traffic changes were going to be. One is a light coming off I-95 South, and from there to the corner of Elm, an extra lane will continue a couple hundred yards beyond that. The light timing will help clear sections. It was also discussed that going down Clarks to Route 110 causes congestion. The change would make the left lane straight or left, and the right lane a right-turn only. Pascal Rettig clarified that they have not gotten exactly what was going to be done since the grant was not for the full asking amount. It is all in DPW's hands, and there has not been any communication from them on design and schedule. Keith Ranter noted they have only received information through the Rocky Hill application.
89. Nipun Jain commented that they discussed the Clark's Road project and its potential impact, including the traffic impact study that was prepared, reviewed, and peer-reviewed. As the peer review consultant has reviewed the traffic impact assessment, it was ascertained that regardless of what happens at this time, this project is not going to require those improvements currently underway. The changes identified in this traffic impact report are nothing to the scale of what is being proposed by the MassDOT project. This doesn't mean people should not know what is happening at that intersection. It can be made a condition of the project that there be a letter from DPW identifying a net positive for this project. Residents can request that DPW give a presentation on the Mass Works improvements, what is actually happening, and the timeframe. This is less about this Board and this project

and more relevant to the Rocky Hill project. A presentation by DPW would be helpful because they can answer questions and explain what is involved.

90. Pascal Rettig commented that he understood the peer review noted minimal changes were needed for this project. The neighborhood is concerned about traffic and understanding what else is going on. Nipun Jain commented this is contributing to the design and improvements that are being coordinated with DPW.
91. Keith Ratner noted that Starbucks is done and permitted at this point in time.
92. John Stevenson, 439 Main St., stated that one concern was that they were considering this project on its own, and so none of these things are an issue. It is the combination of all the developments, including Starbucks, that is the issue. The city needs a master plan. Having four major projects like this on the same road is concerning. Some of those improvements will not be completed for years as noted in the traffic reports. Pascal Rettig agreed with the concerns but noted the Board can only review them one project at a time. They need to understand what is being done by DPW and the overall picture.
93. Joe Finn of 412 Main Street commented that he would like to discuss the two homes on Clarks Road. Initially, they were set back from the road, and now the new renderings show them closer to the road. They still appear close this evening. Someone on the Board questioned why they were moved up. The recollection was that Alex Loth said he would review and get back on that. Joe Finn was wondering if there has been a response.
94. Alex Loth commented that they were originally set further back, but in consultation with the city, it made sense to move them forward because many historical homes are close to the street. This provides more screening and more usable space on the site. The difference is 10 feet. The setback is 20 feet. They studied it both ways and think this approach works best.
95. Joel Nice questioned if they were proposing pitched roofs. He also asked about mechanical equipment on the roof and screening. Alex Loth confirmed there will be a traditional sloped roof with a dropped “bathtub” area for mechanical equipment. This gives the look of a sloped roof without the extra height and hides the equipment.
96. Pascal Rettig noted the Board has an initial draft decision and needs time to review it. The next meeting will provide enough time.
97. David Frick asked if items will be added to the draft before the meeting. Nipun Jain responded this was an initial draft, as requested by the Board, to include conditions based on the peer reviews. Given the scale and scope, they have started adding conditions and do not anticipate many more. Part of today’s goal is to address most, if not all, issues identified. They feel ready, but if the Board has additional items, they can be proposed.
98. Alex Loth added that they will be submitting some comments and edits to staff on the decision.
99. David Frick motioned to continue the public hearing for 27.5-29 Clarks Road to the January 26, 2026 Planning Board meeting. Seconded by Keith Ratner.
100. Nipun Jain commented there is nothing significant needed from the applicant but wants to ensure there is time to respond.
101. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote –
102. Keith Ratner – YES
103. Joel Nice – YES

104. Michael Jewell – ABSENT
105. Tracey Chalifour – Recused
106. Tom Salemi - ABSENT
107. David Frick – YES
108. Pascal Rettig – YES
109. Motion passed 4-0
- 111.
113. **Continued Hearings – 102 Kimball Road**
114. Nipun Jain commented that 102 Kimball has been reviewed by staff and the Board. The Board has been provided a draft set of conditions. The project is located in the Water Resource Protection District. The goal was to preserve a large portion of open space as undeveloped land and secure it as city property to protect the critical resource.
115. David Frick clarified that the land closest to the water would be the protected open space. Nipun Jain confirmed that was correct. It abuts land already owned by the city. This proposal and site plan achieves that protection goal. They are splitting the land into 2 buildable lots and 2 unbuildable lots. One unbuildable lot is the open space parcel and the other is the common access driveway. The rear portion of the property will be deeded to the city. The common access driveway will be privately maintained by the property owners.
116. Pascal Rettig commented that this was a special permit, and they got the draft decision last night, so he wanted to ensure everyone had what they needed. The Board needs 5 people to vote yes on this for it to pass, so if anyone has any questions or concerns raise them now. Then they can review more before moving forward.
117. No one from the Board had additional comments or questions.
118. Pascal Rettig opened public comment. There was no public comment.
119. Joe White, engineer for the project, commented that they reviewed the draft decision and had nothing else to add.
120. David Frick motioned to accept decision drafted by staff for 102 Kimball Road and approve the Definitive Subdivision and Special Permit. Seconded by Keith Ratner.
121. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote –
122. Keith Ratner – YES
123. Joel Nice – YES
124. Michael Jewell – ABSENT
125. Tracey Chalifour – YES
126. Tom Salemi - ABSENT
127. David Frick – YES
128. Pascal Rettig – YES
129. Motion passed 5-0
- 130.
131. Keith Ratner motioned to close the public hearing for 102 Kimball Road. Seconded by Joel Nice.
132. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote –
133. Keith Ratner – YES
134. Joel Nice – YES
135. Michael Jewell – ABSENT

- 136. Tracey Chalifour – YES
- 137. Tom Salemi - ABSENT
- 138. David Frick – YES
- 139. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 140. Motion passed 5-0

141. **Continued Hearings – 6 Lake Attitash Way**

- 142. Nipun Jain commented that this is a Water Resource Protection District special permit. Again, the Board has seen this in preapplication and the formal hearing. The project meets the criteria to minimize disturbance on site. They have received approval from the Conservation Commission, so it meets the environmental regulations. The buffers are maintained, and they are protecting resources. There have been concerns about storm water runoff on the parcel and existing roadways. This project will make improvements on the site and any improvements made will reduce runoff on the public way as well. The proposed improvements are traditional and fit in with the character of the neighborhood.
- 143. Brian Marchetti, engineer for the project, commented that they reviewed the draft decision and had minor edits around the maintenance and replacement. Nipun Jain commented that on page 9 item 6.1 allowed uses was edited to add the line provided however maintenance and replacement in kind does not constitute as improvements which is appropriate.
- 144. Pascal Rettig commented this was also a special permit that needed 5 votes, so the Board should raise any questions or comments on the application.
- 145. The Board did not have any questions or comments.
- 146. Pascal Rettig opened public comment. There was no public comment.
- 147. Joel Nice motioned to approve the special permit for 6 Lake Attitash Way with the draft conditions and one amendment supported by staff. Seconded by Keith Ratner.
- 148. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote –
- 149. Keith Ratner – YES
- 150. Joel Nice – YES
- 151. Michael Jewell – ABSENT
- 152. Tracey Chalifour – YES
- 153. Tom Salemi - ABSENT
- 154. David Frick – YES
- 155. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 156. Motion passed 5-0

- 157. Keith Ratner motioned to close the public hearing for 6 Lake Attitash Wat. Seconded by Joel Nice.
- 158. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote –
- 159. Keith Ratner – YES
- 160. Joel Nice – YES
- 161. Michael Jewell – ABSENT
- 162. Tracey Chalifour – YES
- 163. Tom Salemi - ABSENT

- 164. David Frick – YES
- 165. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 166. Motion passed 5-0

167. Continued Hearings – 9 and 9#RR Oakland Street

- 168. Keith Ratner motioned to continue the public hearing to the February 23, 2026, Planning Board Meeting. Seconded by Joel Nice.
- 169. Pascal Rettig initiated roll call vote –
- 170. Keith Ratner – YES
- 171. Joel Nice – YES
- 172. Michael Jewell – ABSENT
- 173. Tracey Chalifour – YES
- 174. Tom Salemi - ABSENT
- 175. David Frick – YES
- 176. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 177. Motion passed 5-0

178. Administrative – Master Plan Update

- 179. Pascal Rettig commented that he has communicated with the mayor's office with the updated land use element. They have been going back and forth with some data elements on that but are hoping they can get a final draft and approve the Master Plan soon.
- 180. Tracey Chalifour questioned when it went to the mayor's office. Pascal Rettig responded the land use section was sent this week.
- 181. Tracey Chalifour commented that hopefully they could get this done soon. It has been almost 2 years now.

182. Adjournment

- 183. Keith Ratner motioned to adjourn at 8:26 pm. Seconded by David Frick.
- 184. Pascal Rettig initiated 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 6-0

Public Comment – 27.5-29 Clarks Road - Bill and Anne Ganzenmuller - 464 Main Street

We are writing with comments on the proposed impact of the 152 unit development planned for Clarks Road to be discussed tonight. We did email comments for the December 22, 2025 meeting, but, they were not read aloud. I am not sure if this is the correct avenue to have comments read. Please confirm.

We have cc'd both the mayor and the police chief, as we understand that they need to address some of our below concerns, as they may fall out of the jurisdiction of the Planning Board.

We have a dog and typically walk a couple times/day. We understand the city has a plan for a sidewalk down the entire length of Clarks Rd. We actually first learned of this at a neighborhood party in June 2024, however, we have yet to see any official plan/work being done. We believe the planning board needs to understand the city's plan before approving any project in this area so that the developers on the projects could be responsible for building/funding the entire sidewalk before these projects are completed. A portion of sidewalk will not do anyone any good - "sidewalks to nowhere". There are already "portions" of sidewalks on that road near 110, however, continuing down towards Main is extremely dangerous as there are currently NO sidewalks. It is a treacherous road to walk and will only get worse with the proposed developments adding more cars and people walking. The hill on Clarks Rd also presents a problem for drivers, coming up from Main, as drivers do not have a good sight line to seeing pedestrians. If the sidewalks are not continuous, it will require a crosswalk and ideally a flashing yellow to alert drivers.

In addition, the crosswalk at Rocky Hill and 110 needs a cross button with flashing lights. It is the main access from Main Street to the beautiful rail trail, but you take your life in your hands crossing 110. Can the developers help finance making that crossing safer before more cars/people are added to the area? In the relatively recent past, someone died crossing 110. All assistance should be available to prevent another such tragedy.

We moved to Amesbury from another town, also on a main street. But we are still amazed at the volume and speed of the traffic on Main St Amesbury. It is dangerous to pull out of our driveway and to cross the road walking. With any more traffic it will only get worse. I

found plans on the town website for traffic mitigation and a grant from over 3 years ago, before any of these new developments were adding cars and it seems nothing has been done.

<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.amesburyma.gov%2F644%2FTraffic-and-Transportation-Concerns&data=05%7C02%7Cfreyr%40amesburyma.gov%7C8dc17eb5761c447c1a2608de520c07f1%7Cb671b6fcf41546efbadf7cc4661c04d6%7C0%7C0%7C639038408807211998%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJFbXB0eU1hcGkiOnRydWUsIlYiOiIwLjAuMDAwMCIslIAiOiJXaW4zMilslkFOljoiTWFpbCIsIldUIjoyfQ%3D%3D%7C0%7C%7C%7C&sdata=jQjHQVqiVsl0ZjNOpgcPAx6jLMPXXP1tr6m4lEUOsBw%3D&reserved=0>

I was not able to find proof, but understand the MassDOT grant money for the Main Street traffic mitigation was moved to another project. In our opinion, that traffic mitigation work needs to be done BEFORE any of the developments are completed that will add more cars to a street already identified as having issues. (Starbucks, Clarks Rd, Elm Street, new marina...)

Please consider these safety concerns before approving developments in this area.

Thank you for your time.

Anne and Bill Ganzenmuller

464 Main Street

Amesbury, MA 01913

Public Comment – 27.5-29 Clarks Road – Tracey Chalifour 25 Clarks Road

General Statements

1. Only one point of entry/egress for the quantity of units and vehicles still problematic
2. For other projects, OCED Director Nick Cracknell has stated - "Traffic issues are real - you guys live there, we don't" - the city must listen to the residents that are conveying these lived experiences.
3. proposed road improvements on Clarks - it would be helpful for those documents to be shared in the project file, whether it is city work or applicant work.
4. In the list of 29 Clarks Road documents, was one from 2004 (NJCAT TECHNOLOGY VERIFICATION - Stormceptor®) when this project was originally introduced as a 40b. A lot has changed since then adjacent to 29 Clarks, including the reconstruction of the Route 95 Whittier bridges and surrounding ramps, abutments, impervious surfaces, the addition of 13-15 homes on Point Shore Drive and more that will change anything in a 2004 report. This document should not be considered as an acceptable submission. In addition to this, I hope PB members have caught on to the fact that the Drainage and Groundwater Calculations reports were done during a drought period this past summer/early fall.

5. Regarding the proposed Trails and Open Space

There is no proposed parking at the trail head on this site, nor on Point Shore Drive. If the trails are going to be as popular as everyone has stated, parking will be needed.

Also, The trail is right on the property line of 27 Clarks

Some Waivers Requested that I would like to speak to and ask the PB to weigh carefully

5.2.2.a -

To build one building containing 146 units, where “no more than forty-eight (48) units per building” are allowed, “provided that the minimum allowable as-of-right density requirements for residential use specified in Section 7.1 shall apply”.

This would essentially triple the # of units per building allowed.

7.2.1 -

to build two three family buildings each 10' from the front property line, where 20' is required.

Moving the building closer to the road would not allow for more historically appropriate streetscape - the PB should look at the houses and condos on the street - none of them are that close, and none of them are that scale.

1.5.b.1 -

To allow 1.33 parking spaces per unit where 1.5 spaces are required. the applicant wrote: "With approximately 65% of the units planned to be studios or one bedroom, the applicant's experience with similarly located projects of similar unit breakdown,

The PB should be asking: where is the "similarly located projects of similar unit breakdown" they are referring to, with all the same conditions?

10.5.b.3 -

the applicant stated: "Reduction in Parking Requirements notes the PAA may consider “d. Age or other occupancy restrictions that are likely to result in a lower level of auto usage.”

The PB should ask the applicant what data source they are basing that comment on?

10.5.b.4 -

The applicant wrote that they want "16 compact spaces" to accommodate more fuel efficient vehicles - what does that mean? most fuel efficient vehicles are not smaller than traditional vehicles. and, what if the tenants don't have those vehicles? parking space quantity/availability will be compromised.

The PB should consider that more parking is necessary because people living in these units will mostly need to commute to jobs, since there is a lack of jobs in Amesbury

10.5.c.3

"to allow for stockade fences and chain link fence. Stockade fencing is proposed as a visual buffer to adjacent properties. Black chain link fencing is proposed around dog run and play areas, chosen for its limited visual impact, allowing for better views of surrounding nature.

The PB should insist on more visually appealing fencing to buffer adjacent properties.