RECEIVED
By City Clerk at 11:12 am, Jun 10, 2025

1. Amesbury Planning Board Meeting Minutes

2. In Person Meeting – April 28, 2025, at 7:15 PM

3. Chairman Pascal Rettig called the April 28, 2025, Planning Board meeting to order at 7:15 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 – ABSENT
8. Joel Nice – YES
9. Michael Jewell – YES
10. Tracey Chalifour – YES
11. Tom Salemi - YES
12. David Frick – ABSENT
13. Pascal Rettig – YES
14. Motion passed 5-0
15. Also: Nipun Jain (Planning Director)
16. Pascal Rettig noted that 201 Elm St. has requested to continue to the first meeting in May. That is the only public hearing on the agenda tonight. The rest of the agenda items are administrative where the Board does not generally take public comment.

17. **Minutes 3-10-25**
18. Tracey Chalifour motioned to approve the minutes from 3-10-25. Seconded by Tom Salemi.
19. The motion passed 4-0-1. Joel Nice abstained.

20. **ANR – 473 Main St.**
21. Pascal Rettig commented that this was a lot line adjustment. Nipun Jain added that the request was to make a lot line adjustment to the parcel shown on the right. The existing structures will remain. The existing structure on Lot 1 will benefit from additional area. It will make it conform. All the ANR requirements are satisfied, and Staff recommends the Board approve the request as submitted.
22. Pascal Rettig clarified that it did not bring the side setbacks into compliance. Nipun Jain responded that was not required for an ANR. This is under subdivision control law and the setbacks are under zoning. The plan needs to meet frontage, lot area, and access. Both lots meet those standards. Staff recommends approval.

23. Joel Nice motioned to approve the ANR application for 473 Main St. as submitted. Seconded by Tom Salemi.
24. Tracey Chalifour requested clarification on the next step. Nipun Jain responded that this approval does not afford the property any other permission other than changing the lot line.
25. The motion passed unanimously in a 5-0 vote.

26. **Continued Hearings – 201 Elm St.**
27. Tracey Chalifour motioned to continue the application for 201 Elm St. to the May 12, 2025, Planning Board meeting. Seconded by Joel Nice.
28. Michael Jewell questioned if they could request the applicant stake out where the buildings would be. Nipun Jain responded the Board can formalize the request, but he has made that request of the applicant already. Pascal Rettig commented that the Board could organize a site walk informally or with the applicant.
29. Nipun Jain commented that they did receive the revised plans today, so they meet the deadline for the next meeting.
30. The motion passed unanimously in a 5-0 vote.
31. Pascal Rettig commented that it may be better to do an informal site walk, so members could get it in before the next meeting. The site is relatively accessible and visible, so Board members can see it easily. Nipun Jain added that Board members should not go on the private site because of liability issues but they can see it from the public realm easily.
32. Michael Jewell motioned to request the applicant stake out where the structures, curb cuts, and retaining walls would be located so that it is visible from the street no later than May 2, 2025. Seconded by Joel Nice.
33. Tracey Chalifour questioned how that would be communicated to the absent Planning Board members. Pascal Rettig commented that it may make more sense to wait to hear from the applicant that they have staked the site before members go look. Nipun Jain responded that the applicant may need more time to mark the retaining walls because they would need a surveyor. Pascal Rettig commented that staff can communicate when the area is staked, and the Board members will know when to go look at it.
34. Tom Salemi questioned if they would be able to see a set of the revised plan before they go look at the site. Nipun Jain confirmed that they would be able to.
35. The motion passed unanimously by a 5-0 vote.

36. **Administrative – 13 Merrimac St. Modification Request**
37. Michael Sanchez represented the applicant and commented that they were in front of the Board to present the renovation for 13 Merrimac St. This was a condition of the approval for the marina project. They have been to the Historical Commission and the Commission determined that the structure is not historically significant. They have a letter from the Conservation Commission confirming this is out of the buffer zone and they are satisfied with the plan. They have also been to the ZBA and received a finding that they are not making any of the existing non-conformities worse. The building is an existing one over one two family structure. The plan is to make it a side by side two family structure with a garage addition off the back. There should not be any impact on the existing storm water design.

The design is bringing architectural components back to the building with roof accents and historic windows. It is a better building design than the existing property. The garages will be accessed by the gravel lot at 13 Merrimac St. Other than a set of stairs, this stays within the existing footprint.

38. Nipun Jain commented that the existing footprint is shown on the plan. The back of the existing structure has an existing driveway. There may be some remnants of a foundation in the back. This is not an undeveloped area, and it is an existing two-family structure. The site plan that was approved by the Planning Board for the 2 and 13 Merrimac St. project. It shows the marina, parking, and circulation improvements. There are no changes being proposed on the marina side for this amendment. The change is only on the 13 Merrimac St. side, and they would expand the existing non-conforming structure. The back addition will go over the area that is currently being used for parking, which will include a garage for the units. There will still be parking on the site outside of that. It will not reduce the amount of parking that was approved on 13 Merrimac St. as part of the marina approval.
39. Pascal Rettig questioned what approval they got from the ZBA. Michael Sanchez responded that it was approval to put the addition on the existing non-conforming structure. Nipun Jain added that because it is a pre-existing non-conforming structure any alteration to it requires relief from the ZBA. The setbacks from the lot lines remain unchanged, but because the structure is expanding in the back it requires relief.
40. Paul Gagliardi from Dalton and Finegold commented that they whenever someone is modifying a preexisting non-conforming structure, they need to go to the Zoning Board to get a finding/special permit. The ZBA determined this proposal was not substantially more detrimental to the neighborhood than the existing non-conforming structure. That is what they determined.
41. Pascal Rettig clarified that this was before the Board because the Board made this a condition of the decision.
42. Joel Nice commented that he liked the design with pervious pavers. Storm water management will be better than it was before. It will function better than having the water just sheeting down into the road.
43. Michael Sanchez commented that the proportions on the existing gambrel did not make sense. Nipun Jain commented that the south and east elevation are what face Merrimac St. The north faces the parking, and the west faces the sewer treatment plant. The two units are shown in two different colors. The units are a mirror image of each other. Michael Sanchez commented that they were raising the structure slightly to make it a more traditional gambrel. The goal with the south elevation is to maximize the views of the river. They are putting sliders or French doors on the front which enter into the living rooms and the primary bedrooms on the second floor will also have larger windows.
44. Pascal Rettig questioned if the top window was a bay window that projects out. Dan Ricciarelli from Seger Architect commented it is deceiving because there is not a lot of space. The window comes out 6 inches and they are in-setting the first floor.
45. Joel Nice noted this was an extensive renovation and questioned if they had priced out the difference between tearing it down and rebuilding and renovating. At this point the proposal is just saving the walls. They could get into a lot of engineering issues. Joel Nice commented that he would still consider it a minor amendment if they tore it down and

rebuilt. Michael Sanchez responded that they had looked at it. They have not come to a final conclusion yet, but they were concerned about triggering a major modification. There is some existing historic timber frame that they are trying to save, but they are running a cost benefit analysis with the framer.

46. Pascal Rettig commented that they first step of the Board was to determine if this was a major or minor modification. A minor modification would keep it an administrative adjustment to the decision. There was a public hearing with the Zoning Board of Appeals filing. Michael Sanchez confirmed that was correct. Nipun Jain commented that this is small in context to the larger project. It was discussed in the marina public hearing, and the goal of the Board was to keep the residential look and feel of the build environment for the marina and this site. That is what is very important to keep in mind when looking at the proposed modification. Then there is the building design itself which does play into the site plan. This is in one of the oldest areas of the city, and they should keep that in mind when proposing the renovations. They are at least aiming to achieve that with this proposal. The applicant had other iterations when they went to the ZBA, and staff applauds them on working with staff on comments. The Board needs to make a determination for the first step. The Board should look at the site plan aspects like parking, access, landscaping, lighting, and trash removal. None of those typical standards are changing significantly. The majority if not all changes are associated with the building design. Some of the architectural components proposed are appropriate for the architectural style.
47. Michael Sanchez commented that they are taking the building down to a shell, but the goal is to have this complete when the marina project is complete. It could cost extra to reframe the existing structure, but we are pretty far down the road. Joel Nice commented that they were planning to put a whole new roof on the structure without a new foundation. Michael Sanchez responded that it was a solid foundation. This plan works with the targeted schedule. They are making significant improvements to the building. The biggest goal is to maximize views to the Merrimack River.
48. Nipun Jain commented that staff reviewed the architectural drawings, and they generally feel that it is in keeping with the architectural style of a Georgian gambrel. Most of the elevations reflect correct proportions. The Board could ask for Design Review Committee help on providing input on the final architectural details before applying for a building permit. That would take care of some details like shutter placement and other small details that need adjustment. Staff agrees with the goal of providing views on the south side. They are moving in the right direction with the bay window idea. However, as Pascal Rettig pointed out it is surprising that what appears to be a bay window is actually flat. It would make sense to pursue a classic bay window in those locations. Nipun Jain showed examples of that it could look like. It would create a rhythm and symmetry and provide a lot of glazing on that facade. They encourage the applicant to think about it.
49. Michale Sanchez agreed it had been a positive design evolution process but did not feel they needed to go back to the Design Review Committee. That would delay this even further.
50. Nipun Jain commented that they the permit granted was for a project that includes this property and this was subject to site plan review as a result. The Board has to review it and verify if meets the criteria. That includes architectural design. There is no heavy

handedness or punitive action. This was discussed during the public hearing process and the applicants were not ready for this discussion at that time. This is the first time the Board is having a discussion on this proposal, and they will decide if they want it reviewed by subcommittees.

51. Tracey Chalifour commented that it was important they go to the DRC. Tracey Chalifour questioned if these would be apartments or condos. Michael Sanchz responded that they would continue to be apartments. Tracey Chalifour questioned what the construction timeline would be. Michael Sanchez responded that the goal would be to have it line up with the marina. Tracey Chalifour questioned if the construction phase would impact parking access at all. Michael Sanchez responded that it would not. It should be mostly complete before the marina opens. Tracey Chalifour questioned if the height increase of the building would impact abutters' views. Dan Ricciarelli responded that they were only raising it 2.5 feet. The height is still well below the zoning height limit for a 2.5 story home. Zoning allows for 35 feet, and this will be at 28 feet.
52. Pascal Rettig did not think that neighbors' views would be impacted with this house. This modification is part of a site plan review, and the bylaws dictate site plan review projects are reviewed by the Design Review Committee. This was one of the conditions of the special permit and the architectural changes were deferred until now.
53. Nipun Jain added that it would not be a whole scale review that a new proposed structure would get. There is a solution here to promote the glazing and use traditional design. DRC will help expedite that solution. The east, west, and north elevations have minor components that need to be addressed. The south elevation is the most prominent and important elevation. It will be the most visible from all angles
54. Tom Salemi commented that it would be good to send this to the DRC to discuss the south elevation. Dan Ricciarelli commented that he had not seen the staff suggested elevation until tonight. Bay windows are not appropriate for the Georgian architecture. They did not want to create a bay window to give some relief and open space to the front. Michael Sanchez commented that the Board could determine this was a minor modification and refer it to DRC.
55. Nipun Jain commented that staff originally proposed traditional windows. The next step was to propose the bay window in keeping with what was presented in the application. They took the spirit of what the applicant was trying to do and kept it in the more traditional bay window style. It is not a perfect solution, but a traditional window could still be an option. They could be larger. They can solve this during DRC and bring it back to the Board at their next meeting.
56. Tracey Chalifour motioned to refer the proposed modification for 13 Merrimac St. to DRC and come back with recommendations to the Planning Board for a determination and final approval of the modification. Seconded by Tom Salemi.
57. Pascal Rettig clarified that they would not make a determination until the next meeting. Nipun Jain noted that the determination for a minor or major modification should be based on the final design outcome. The only outstanding issue is the front south elevation. This can go to DRC and be back to the Board by the May 12th meeting. Nipun Jain questioned if the Board saw any other issues with the proposed modification. Pascal Rettig responded that the only outstanding item was the architecture.

58. Michael Jewell commented that this proposal was a huge improvement and questioned if they could determine it was a minor modification tonight.
59. Michael Sanchez commented that they could continue to work with DRC even if they make that determination tonight.
60. Tracey Chalifour did not want to amend the motion. It did not make sense to make a determination until they received feedback from DRC.
61. Joel Nice commented that this will go to DRC before the next meeting so it would not impact the timeline. It will most likely be a minor modification.
62. Michael Sanchez commented that they did not need to go to DRC if the Board was happy with the design. Joel Nice responded that the Board was not happy with the design.
63. Pascal Rettig called the vote.
64. The motion passed 4-1. Michael Jewell opposed.
65. **Administrative – 130 Market St. Payment In Lieu Request**
66. Pascal Rettig commented they received a memo from the applicant.
67. Nipun Jain commented that they have a few items to discuss for 130 Market St. the memo before the Board is a request for a modification to the payment in lieu of the affordable unit for the 10-unit development. The last two units are up for sale. That requires the Board to release them from the covenant and an establishment of a performance bond. They have also requested a reduction in the erosion control bond.
68. Paul Gagliardi of Dalton and Finegold commented that he represented Wojcicki Holdings. Mr. Wojcicki sent the Board a letter that outlined the request and reasons for the payment in lieu modification. This project has improved a blighted site significantly. The development encountered a number of increased costs. One related to connecting the sewer to the South Hampton Road and there was an environmental cost. They did more off site improvements, for example with sidewalks, than required. When the applicant originally came in, they asked for a $200,000 payment in lieu of providing the affordable unit. The Board decided on $300,000 with no basis in fact. Since then, Staff has been working on codifying the payment in lieu of affordable units and is going to file a zoning amendment for it. They have been looking at adjoining towns and most base a payment in lieu on a percentage of the sale price. 130 Market St. has closed on 8 of the units and they have paid $30,000 for each closing to contribute to the affordable housing trust. Wojcicki Holdings is asking that they be allowed to sell the last 2 units without contributing any further payments into the trust. That will be more in line with the upcoming ordinance codification. If the Board allows this request, then the city will receive $240,000, which is 1.2% of the sale prices. They are hoping to get a decision on this before selling the final two units. As stated in the letter the first units were sold in the $800,000 range. They expected the sale prices to increase, but they did not, and they dropped to the $745,000 range. For those reasons they are asking the Board to reconsider the payment in lieu amount.
69. Pascal Rettig requested staff elaborate on the ordinance change research and the proposal. Nipun Jain commented that the Board and staff have had trouble establishing an amount for a payment in lieu of affordable units in the past. This impacts smaller projects more than larger ones. There are housing needs, especially affordable housing, it is a sensitive issue. Staff looked at several aspects of affordable housing as it related to the payment in lieu. They focused on research in the Northshore and Merrimack Valley for

similar sized towns. Payments in lieu in those towns are typically tied a percentage of the unit sale price. The percentage ranged from 2.5%-4%. Similar sized communities were consistently between 2% and 3%. Pascal Rettig noted that the 3.1% the applicant is proposing is in line with what research showed for other towns. Nipun Jain confirmed that was correct.

70. Pascal Rettig commented that they received a note from Board member David Frick who could not attend the meeting. The note indicated that he wanted to provide his input because he was the one who proposed the $300,000 payment in lieu amount. After reviewing the memo submitted by the developer, David Frick was in favor of the proposed reduction to the payment in lieu amount.
71. Tom Salemi commented that he bought a house from Mark Wojcicki 5 years ago, and just wanted to disclose that he had that connection. He did not have any current business interaction with Mark Wojcicki.
72. Joel Nice commented that it seemed reasonable to lower the payment in lieu amount to $240,000. The improvements made by the developer have gone above and beyond. It is reasonable to accept the lower amount. The Board wants to encourage this type of development and the amount is in line with other communities.
73. Joel Nice motioned to accept the request to reduce the payment in lieu to $240,000. Seconded by Tom Salemi.
74. Tom Salemi commented that it was appropriate, and fair based on the improvements made to the city and the sale price.
75. Tracey Chalifour questioned if there was a late modification request on the Horace Mann School as well. It is concerning that this could be a pattern. Nipun Jain responded that when the Horace Mann originally went out to bid the city did not get any responses because of the high cost related to the redevelopment. The city had not invested in building improvements. The city did a second round, and they got a nominal amount for that property. There are challenges with an existing building, and they can find other issues. The city was adamant on keeping the slate roof and that was a lot more expensive to repair than they thought. There were many other improvements needed, for example the sidewalk along Congress St. That's why the applicant requested a payment in lieu especially where it was only 8 units. Sparhawk was also a small project. That was 4-units, and one single family home was added to it. They need to balance the historic preservation, neighborhood character, and off site implements.
76. Paul Galiardi commented that Mark Wojcicki did not ask for a reduction in payment in lieu for either of those developments. When they were here to request a payment in lieu for this project, the proposed number and the Board's number were not based on the research that has now been completed. The option was to build the affordable unit or pay the payment in lieu. This reduction request would make it a percentage of the sale price and is a rational foundation for the amount. The city is going to propose this as an ordinance, and they are asking for it now.
77. Joel Nice commented that the pattern he is seeing is due to circumstances. If they were seeing this with higher project numbers, then it would be more concerning. Establishing a percentage will help developers calculate risk and build strategy. The city would be providing a smarter way forward for developers.

78. Pascal Rettig agreed that if the number was not arbitrary, then developers could calculate it out it in their proforma. Hopefully they will codify it soon.
79. Tracey Chalifour questioned if the Housing Trust was counting on receiving $300,000. Nipun Jain commented if that Committees should not make future plans based on expected revenue. Nothing concrete should have been based on those numbers. If it was done, then it is outside of the Board's control at this point. The Board has received a factual request, and this was what was missing during prior payment in lieu discussions.
80. The motion passed unanimously in a 5-0 vote.
81. Nipun Jain commented that the applicant already made payments for 8 units. Paul Gagliardi clarified that they made 7 payments and are holding the check for the 8th payment. Nipun Jain commented that the Board should take another vote to not require a payment of $30,000 for the last two units.
82. Tracey Chalifour motioned to waive payment for the last two units because 8-unit payments will satisfy the $240,000 payment in lieu. Seconded by Joel Nice.
83. The motion passed unanimously in a 5-0 vote.
84. Nipun Jain commented another request from the applicant is to release the last 2 units from the covenant which was recorded and requires a few things to be in place. They have requested to reduce the erosion and sedimentation control amount to $14,200 and to establish a performance bond. They are still waiting for a final as built from the applicant. It is not possible to come up with accurate assessment of what has and has not been completed. Based on a site assessment it appears to be complete. The off-site improvements required 2 utility connections to be updated and public utility easement granted. There were also sidewalk improvements. Those items should have been signed off from DPW and they are still waiting for that letter. Most of the site is stable and the developer is ready to deliver the last 2 units. Staff recommends releasing $10,000 of the erosion control bond and retaining $4,200 until the Conservation Commission issues a Certificate of Compliance. The landscaping and site stabilization needs to go through 2 growing seasons. They need to submit the final as built and they need the developer to keep the responsibility for requesting the Certificate of Compliance and monitoring the site. They need to make sure it is in a complete condition when they are making a request. Individual unit owners will need to maintain the storm water system and wetland areas. It should not become a responsibility for the city at any time. The developer needs to submit a letter acknowledging that. There needs to be terms and conditions and the amount of the performance bond should be $25,000. The 4 conditions for the performance bone should be submitting the final as built, a letter from DPW signing off on offsite improvements, a letter from the developer indicating he is the responsible party for the Certificate of Compliance and making sure the site is functioning and operating, and a letter from the residents acknowledging they are responsible for perpetual maintenance.
85. Tom Salemi questioned if there was an HOA. Nipun Jain confirmed there was.
86. Paul Gagliardi commented that the condo trust does have a provision about storm water management and things of that nature. Nipun Jain commented that the plan set should be and exhibit in the master deed. Paul Galiardi responded that the plans are recorded separately, and they can get that to the city.

87. Tracey Chalifour motioned to extend the meeting to 10 pm. Seconded by Joel Nice. The motion passed unanimously in a 5-0 vote.
88. Nipun Jain commented that they could reduce the erosion control bond to $4,200 and can include that provision in the performance bond establishment.
89. Tracey Chalifour motioned to release $10,000 from the erosion control bond. Seconded by Joel Nice. The motion passed unanimously in a 5-0 vote.
90. Joel Nice motioned to establish a $25,000 cash performance bond with the following conditions:
    1. The developer shall submit an As Built.
    2. The developer shall provide an offsite improvement sign off letter from DPW.
    3. The developer shall be responsible for obtaining the Certificate of Compliance.
    4. The developer shall provide a letter from residents acknowledging they are responsible for perpetual maintenance.
    5. The remaining $4,200 of the erosion control bond will be released after the Certificate of Compliance is issued.
91. The motion passed unanimously in a 5-0 vote.
92. Nipun Jain commented that based on establishment of performance bond, the Board can release the last 2 units from the covenant that is restricting their sale.
93. Joel Nice motioned to release the final 2 units from the covenant. Seconded by Tom Salemi. The motion passed unanimously in a 5-0 vote.

94. **Administrative – 276-280 Main St. Comment Request**
95. Nipun Jain commented that they have a request from the ZBA to provide comments in an advisory role for the project at 276-280 Main St. They have filed with the ZBA for a comprehensive permit, and it proposes to add 4 new structures on existing site. Each structure will have 2 units in each. They are single story one-bedroom units. They are small cottages. There is also a proposed management building. This is being proposed by Housing Support Inc which currently operates on the site. They will extend the driveway which already exists and improve emergency vehicle access. The parking spaces are being removed from the front of the site and reconfigured in the back. If this project or something similar to it came to the Planning Board it would most likely be a site plan review. A comprehensive permit is required to be reviewed by the Zoning Board of Appeals and assess reasonable conditions if any need to be imposed for certain regulations cannot be satisfied. Public safety did not see any issues with the driveway and location regarding access or sightlines. The ZBA has retained peer review for storm water and drainage. Given that there is independent review under those elements it is fair to say the Planning board should support the review of site improvements and encourage the ZBA to take recommendations and make conditions of approval. That leaves one major bucket under site plan review which is building design and landscaping/screening buffers associated with adjoining properties. The Planning Board should reference input from the DRC as it relates to building design and finishes. It would benefit the neighbors and ZBA to have those recommendations. The Board can appreciate that this is a tight site with existing structures around the property. There may be fencing needed. The Board could ask the ZBA to

consider vegetated and solid fencing for screening. They could consider 6-foot wood fencing solid up to 42 inches and lattice to the top.

96. Pascal Rettig commented that it was currently all chain-link fences. The action of the Board in this case is to send a memo back to the ZBA.
97. Tracey Chalifour commented that she interpreted the ZBA memo differently. A lot of questions came up that applicant could not answer and the ZBA referred it to many sub committees. They want comments, which means the Planning Board has to dive into the application. The Board can't comment on it without reviewing the information.
98. Nipun Jain questioned what she expected to comment on. Tracey Chalifour responded that this was not under the Board's purview perse, but the ZBA is asking to comment.
99. Nipun Jain commented that the Planning Board could go down to a very detailed level or outline the most useful feedback to the ZBA. That is why the Board should look at this like at site plan review application to assess the criteria items like traffic impact. This will not generate a concerning level of traffic.
100. Tracey Chalifour commented that infrastructure concerns were raised and questioned how they could comment on things they did not know. Pascal Rettig commented that they were doing peer review the hope is that infrastructure and storm water review are addressed with the peer review and feedback from other committees. That leaves landscaping, parking, and building design. They can provide comment via a memo as a Planning Board. Members can also provide comment as a member of the public for review. The ZBA asked for it before May 8th. As a board they need to decide what they think is most important on the project and provide some level of feedback. There is no statutory requirement or power to affect the project. Nipun Jain commented that they urged the ZBA to seek comments from other Boards and Departments because they do not often review a project like this. The Planning Board is generally tasked with sit plan review applications. The Planning Board is in an advisory role for this application.
101. Tracey Chalifour commented that to her the only thing the Planning Board can do is say they agree with referring it to the other committees and peer review
102. Nipun Jain commented that the Planning Board can reinforce in their memo that the ZBA should consider feedback from the DRC and TRC. If agree the Board agrees with general comments, then they can ask staff to draft the memo on behalf of the Planning Board to expand on the comments enumerated here tonight. The memo would include that the Board supports a Stantec review, DRC and TRC review, and adding screening and fencing.
103. Pascal Rettig added that the finishes of the cottages and how they are built are important. They need to be designed well to fit into the neighborhood. Otherwise, they will stand out. They cannot be mini vinyl boxes.
104. Nipun Jain commented that this did not have to be the only time the Board provides input either. The Board can participate based on feedback sent back from DRC and TRC.
105. Tracey Chalifour recommended that the Board watch the ZBA meeting.
106. Joel Nice motioned to draft a memo as outlined above and send it to the ZBA. Seconded by Tracey Chalifour. The motion passed unanimously in a 5-0 vote.

107. **Administrative – Meadowbrook Parcel Authorization of Consulting Services**

108. Pascal Rettig questioned if there was anything else.

109. Nipun Jain commented that when the Board received a request from Meadowbrook to withdraw the Board had indicated they were interested in evaluating the future development potential and sought a professional appraisal of both parcels. The appraiser would establish a fair market value of the properties and the city could understand what a fair price would be. The goal would be to try to acquire the property and conserve it. In order to arrive at that value, they need to have the parcels appraised accordingly. They do not need the Board to vote tonight on this. They had requested a professional appraiser to provide an estimate and it does fall within the Planning Board consulting budget. However, they need to reach out to the property owners and have them agree to evaluate a reasonable proposal. It is important to get the property owners written consent on the proposals. After that, the Board can approve up to a certain limit value for appraisal services. They are working on this request.

110. Michael Jewell clarified that they were asking an appraiser to evaluate the property for a potential purchase by the city. Nipun Jain responded that an appraiser would determine the value based on the highest and best use of the property. Michael Jewell commented that could be a slippery slope because it may be suggesting a better development. Nipun Jain responded that the highest and best use will be determined by what's allowed. Michael Jewell responded that the highest best use could be single family homes. The property owner could turn around and use that with an expectation for approval.

111. Pascal Retting commented that the appraiser has no connection to the city. The appraiser would not approve projects.

112. Joel Nice added that the appraiser would not go outside what's allowed. Nipun Jain commented that they would take into account fair appraiser standards. They can bring the scope to the Board as well for the appraiser.

113. Michael Jewell clarified that they were asking the homeowners if they could do an appraisal, but it doesn't mean the Board is going to do it. Nipun Jain responded that the Board is looking for additional information before they make an official decision about hiring an appraiser.

114. Joel Nice motioned for staff to seek written consent from the property owners to agree to an appraisal. Seconded by Tracey Chalifour. The motion passed unanimously in a 5-0 vote.

115. Adjournment

116. Joel Nice motioned to adjourn at 10:00 pm. Seconded by Tom Salemi. The motion passed unanimously in a 5-0 vote.