

RECEIVED

By City Clerk at 11:13 am, Jun 10, 2025

1. Amesbury Planning Board Meeting Minutes
2. In Person Meeting – March 24, 2025, at 7:06 PM
3. Chairman Pascal Rettig called the March 24, 2025, Planning Board meeting to order at 7:06 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. David Frick 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 – YES
13. Pascal Rettig – YES
14. Motion passed 6-0
15. Also: Nipun Jain (Planning Director) and Becky Frey (Community Development Coordinator)
16. Tracey Chalifour motioned to make David Frick chair for the March 24, 2025, meeting.
Seconded by Joel Nice.
17. David Frick initiated roll call –
18. Keith Ratner – Absent
19. Joel Nice – YES
20. Michael Jewell – YES
21. Tracey Chalifour – YES
22. Tom Salemi - YES
23. David Frick – YES
24. Pascal Rettig – YES
25. Motion passed 6-0
- 26. Minutes 2-10-25**
27. Tracey Chalifour noted that sentence on line 145 needed to be cleaned up.
28. Tracey Chalifour motioned to approve minutes from 2-10-25 as amended. Seconded by Joel Nice.
29. David Frick initiated roll call –

- 30. Keith Ratner – Absent
- 31. Joel Nice – YES
- 32. Michael Jewell – YES
- 33. Tracey Chalifour – YES
- 34. Tom Salemi - Abstain
- 35. David Frick – YES
- 36. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 37. Motion passed 5-0-1

38. Continued Hearings – 31 Newton Road

- 39. Hazem Dani, engineer, spoke on behalf of the applicant. Over the past few months, they have worked closely with the Planning Board, Conservation Commission, and Stantec to resolve the storm water comments. There have been a few comments that have not been addressed yet. They can be addressed before construction and will not change the plans in any substantive way. They have received an order of conditions from the Conservation Commission and an approval from the Board of Health. The site is located on 31 Newton Road and has a uniform slope toward Newton Road. The wetland line has been confirmed with the Commission and they have received the order of conditions to allow the wetland alteration and work in the buffer. They need to alter the wetland at the driveway to access the site. They will be installing double barrel culverts and those would be maintained by the homeowners. There will also be a French drain runoff for overflow. This property is in the R80 zone and Water Resource Protection District Zone A and B. This plan complies with the zoning bylaw by locating the structure and septic outside of Zone A. The building footprint is 1,200 sf and will be serviced by a septic system. The front of the house will have a little asphalt area for parking and a catch basin structure that will catch runoff. The roof drains will collect runoff as well. The driveway will also have pervious pavers that will provide some infiltration and recharge. In extreme events runoff will go to the adjacent conveyance channel to basin 1. There is also riprap for the overflow. In the northeast wetland area, they are proposing an 1,100 sf wetland replication area. They are not changing the drainage patterns of the site. The proposed storm water design employs best management practices to capture all runoff as required.
- 40. Tom Salemi questioned if the septic system was a pump system. Hazem Dani confirmed that was correct.
- 41. Joel Nice questioned if the intention of the grading on the west side was to build up a berm to keep water from running off. Hazem Dani responded that the swale directs runoff to the stormwater treatment area. Joel Nice commented that he liked the use of the pervious pavers and underground catch basins. The entry of the driveway is a small impact. The wetland in that area is probably the culmination of road runoff. Overall, the design was carefully done in terms of grading and site work.
- 42. Michael Jewell and Pascal Rettig did not have any comments.
- 43. Tracey Chalifour requested clarification on the memo from the Conservation Commission that was dated last Thursday. Becky Frey commented that the memo was to confirm the Commission approved the Notice of Intent for 31 Newton Rd. and confirm the conditions included in the Order of Conditions. David Frick commented that the Planning Board

Decision should reference the OOC, the most recent Stantec memo, and the differences between the project approved in 2017 and this one. It may make sense to use that 2017 draft as basic decision and modify it as needed.

44. Nipun Jain commented that this property received a Planning Board approval in 2017. The project was similar in scope and concept. Nothing changed for resource areas along the road and storm water management. Largely the Board's decision will remain unchanged with conditions on the project in 2017. There will be a few minor changes involving the BMPS, storm water management, and recommendations from the peer reviewer Stantec. If the Board chooses, they could keep the existing decision from the 2017 approval and replace the storm water management conditions and repeal some of the conditions relating to retaining walls along the driveway. They would also need to include conditions of approval recommended by the Stantec memo and include reference to the OOC.
45. Joel Nice motioned to approve the site plan and special permit applications for 31 Newton Road with the conditions outlined by staff. Seconded by Tracey Chalifour.
46. David Frick opened public comment.
47. Timothy Ryan of 13 Wells Ave. commented that he was one of the original owners of Quimby Lane and had a question about drainage. There were drainage plans that was supposed to be done at Quimby Lane and it wasn't. The Board has not done anything. There were 5 or 6 major building code violations on the Quimby Lane property, and this Board has not helped. The developer used the wrong bricks, and no one came forward. The Board makes the conditions and people don't enforce it. Projects run amuck. Things were promised and it wasn't done. Now there is major flooding. The Board makes rules and then there is no enforcement.
48. David Frick commented that was something worth addressing in general. He has seen that with signs as well. Storm water protection is important especially in this district.
49. Tom Salemi questioned what the difference of elevation was for the driveway and wetlands. Hazem Dani responded that they were the same level.
50. David Frick initiated roll call vote –
51. Keith Ratner – Absent
52. Joel Nice – YES
53. Michael Jewell – YES
54. Tracey Chalifour – YES
55. Tom Salemi - Abstain
56. David Frick – YES
57. Pascal Rettig – YES
58. Motion passed 5-0-1
59. Pascal Rettig motioned to close the public hearing for 31 Newton Rd. Seconded by Micheal Jewell.
60. David Frick initiated roll call vote –
61. Keith Ratner – Absent
62. Joel Nice – YES
63. Michael Jewell – YES
64. Tracey Chalifour – YES

- 65. Tom Salemi - Abstain
- 66. David Frick – YES
- 67. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 68. Motion passed 5-0-1

- 69. Joel Nice motioned to waive the tree survey requirement. Seconded by Tracey Chalifour.
- 70. David Frick initiated roll call vote –
- 71. Keith Ratner – Absent
- 72. Joel Nice – YES
- 73. Michael Jewell – YES
- 74. Tracey Chalifour – YES
- 75. Tom Salemi - Abstain
- 76. David Frick – YES
- 77. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 78. Motion passed 5-0-1

79. New Hearings – 201 Elm St.

- 80. Nipun Jain read the legal notice into the record.
- 81. Bill Nolan, Architect, represented the applicant and commented they were seeking a historic preservation special permit. They met with the Board for a preapplication and are scheduled to meet with the Historical Commission on April 3rd. The lot size is 36,409 sf and is currently comprised of 2 lots. The existing home is the whole purpose of this project. It starts with the preservation of the structure. It is currently in a state of disrepair to some extent. The original house 4 rooms they are intending to refurbish. The back of the house was reviewed by a structural engineer, and they evaluated the existing conditions. There are some structural failures in the addition, and they were granted the ability to remove this section. The intent is to rebuild that addition in kind and refurbish the rest of the house. The third part of the house is a series of additions stacked on each other. This portion is not historic in nature and that portion will be coming down. Historic pictures show there was a barn building that has since been removed. The applicants met with the Board and since the preapplication have met with the Design Review Committee twice. The DRC had a lot of good suggestions. They have also been in communication with OCED. The goal for this project is historic preservation. They are now proposing 3 parcels and looking to create 4 units with the existing single-family home and 2 additional structures. The proposed barn will be a duplex and they are proposing a new cape style single family home. The comments they got from the DRC were too recent to turn around and get information to the Board ahead of the meeting. Some of the plans they are presenting were not in the initial submittal. There are significant changes proposed on the original antique home. There was conversation about the parking in between the antique home and the barn. There was concern about too many cars in that shared driveway and not enough turn around radii. The DRC recommended flipping the garage to the opposite side of the property and make the antique home its own parcel. The proposal would make use of the existing curb cut on Elm St. That is the genesis for the redesign. Flipping the garage to the

opposite side would allow just 2 units in the barn parking lot and relieve possibly 4 cars from that part of that. They plan to use the existing curb cut to create a detached garage in the back with a hammerhead turnaround. That also allows them to build the addition back in kind to its proper form. Now it can have the original roof line. The barn has very few changes. The biggest change is the elimination of the large exterior stair. DRC suggested looking at doing a little site work and putting in a door to enter at grade level.

82. Tracey Chalifour commented that the top photo looks like there is no change to the overhang on the garage. Bill Nolan responded that they were proposing a metal copper roof in the new iteration. It is the same roof style and size just different material.
83. Bill Nolan commented that they lifted the new proposed cape by 3 feet to be out of the water table. There is a low retaining wall to lift the grade. They are keeping the garage at the same grade to create a hierarchy to the look of the principal structure. They received suggestions to remove the dormer on the garage, and they have. They have the same footprints for the barn and cape. The driveways are a little different. They created more room for 2 spaces outside the garage on the cape. The barn has enough space for 4 cars in the garage and 4 cars in driveway. The biggest changes are on the antique home. They are removing the haphazard additions and adding a two-car garage that is not currently on the submitted plans. The driveway will have a hammerhead so cars can turn around and enter Elm St. headfirst. This presentation shows how the lots could be subdivided. The retaining walls will create some flat area. At the preapplication presentation the Board asked about the proximity of abutting house. It is 36 feet from the proposed house to the abutting existing house. There is also an elevation change. The first floor of the abutting house is above their garage. They are working with a landscape designer who has made suggestions on screening plants and gardens. They are proposing to terrace the retaining wall for a garden opportunity too. The antique house will have some contemporary additions. The barn will not have a basement. The floor plans are pretty much same other than the entrance. They are proposing a copula. The orientation and footprint of the cape stayed the same. They are making use of the walkway to the driveway to make use of the grade change.
84. Mira Cousins is an engineer at Civil Design Consultants and commented that 6 Monroe St. is currently a vacant lot. There are no wetlands on the site. The lot is triangular which creates design challenges. There are steep slopes ranging from 135 feet to 90 feet. There is a 32-foot elevation change. There are no existing storm water controls on the site. They are proposing to reconfigure the lot lines to create 3 lots. Lot 1 will contain the antique house with a garage. It will have a total lot area of 19,000 sf. The driveway will access onto Elm St. Lot 2 contains the proposed 2 family barn dwelling with driveway access to Monroe St. Lot 3 contains the proposed single-family dwelling which will also have driveway access to Monroe St. Due to the steep slope, they are proposing retaining walls to build and provide backyards. Underdrains will be installed parallel to the wall to catch run off and run along to daylight to grade in the side yard. The plan meets local and state storm water standards. There will be sub surface storm water chambers installed to capture roof runoff. They will be submitting formal revised plans to reflect these updates.
85. Tom Salemi clarified that the drainage at the tope of the wall would be diverted. Mira Cousins confirmed that was correct. It would daylight in the side yard.

86. Joel Nice commented that the garage structure is kind of problematic. They are carving into a hillside to create a somewhat level surface. That is a lot of disturbance. Attention to the execution will be important. The driveway onto Elm St. could be problematic given the traffic situation. The cars will be entering right at the entrance of the traffic light. Joel Nice commented that the three buildings have a different architectural feel and questioned if they were meant to be a cohesive look. Bill Nolan responded that the proposed cape was supposed to be its own element. There will be some screening between the barn and the house. The barn and the antique house are related, and the cape is meant to be the neighbor down the street. The third property is intended to stand alone. It is a traditional cape architecture, which is seen elsewhere in Amesbury.
87. Tom Salemi questioned if the cape on lot 3 would be the same height as the abutting house. Bill Nolan responded that it would still be well below it.
88. Tracey Chalifour questioned how this proposed development would meld into the neighborhood. Bill Nolan responded that they are in keeping with the neighborhood for the scale. The cape style is prevalent throughout Amesbury.
89. Tracey Chalifour commented that the retaining wall at 6 Monroe St. seemed like a tight wall to the edge of the structure. There is not a lot of leeway. Bill Nolan confirmed that it was a tight site, but it was workable. The retaining wall is 8 feet tall. Tracey Chalifour questioned if they would consider reducing the house size. Bill Nolan responded that anything was on the table, but the house is not oversized. They believe this proposal works.
90. Michael Jewell requested clarification on the storm water management and questioned if they would see more detail on how it would be handled. A lot of water is coming off that hill. Mira Cousins confirmed that they will capture it on the underdrains. It will be diverted to the side yard. They are containing and collecting the roof runoff. There will be chamber systems for each lot. They will be submitting formal revised site plans and a drainage report.
91. Michael Jewell questioned if there would be landscaping along the top of the slope. Bill Nolan responded that they have a plan from the landscape designer. There will be ornamental trees on the front and screening between the houses. There will be screening coming down Elm St. They will infill with some year-round evergreens in the existing wooded area on the hill.
92. Michael Jewell commented that he was concerned about the type of landscaping they put on the end of the driveways especially for the driveway on Elm St. It will be hard to get out of that driveway. Any landscaping that impacts sightlines will be a challenge. Mira Cousins confirmed that they will review the sight lines at the driveways.
93. Pascal Rettig noted that in the future it would be good to be able to review these changes in advance of the meeting. The renderings are helpful, but the massing of the buildings is all coequal. They are calling the middle unit the barn, but it looks coequal to the main structure. It doesn't really play as a barn. It is just 2 big buildings next to each other. It would be great if those two buildings had a visual relationship. The last building is long and big. It looks like 3 large structures piled up next to each other. Pascal Rettig questioned if they had talked to fire and safety about making the Elm St. driveway the primary access for the antique house. It will be complex getting out of that driveway. Bill Nolan commented that they did go to TRC. Ethan Petersohn added that they have been to the Design Review

Committee and Technical Review Committee. The only comment police and fire had was to put a right turn only sign for the Elm St. driveway.

94. Pascal Rettig commented that the retaining wall to the cape house would make snow removal hard. The retaining wall is close to the property line and Pascal Rettig questioned if they considered how, it would be engineered so it doesn't require crossing the property line. Bill Nolan responded that it was 8 feet off the property line and he was confident they could engineer it. Pascal Rettig commented that the trees that were removed absorbed a lot of storm water. It will be wonderful to see a full storm water report and calculations. They need to make sure they are not generating a giant puddle on Elm St. Mira Cousins confirmed that they would provide that.
95. Michael Jewell agreed that the snow removal would be problematic and noted that they couldn't put it in the street.
96. David Frick questioned if he was talking about the antique house, barn, or cape. Michael Jewell responded that he was concerned about all 3 structures. They are large driveways that will accumulate a lot of snow. Mira Cousins responded that the antique house has areas along the side of the drive for snow storage. The two-family barn has some space along one side. Nipun Jain added that there was enough level space on the left edge of the driveway and the right side for snow. Bill Nolan commented that the chances of the cape being plowed are slim. It will take a pretty good sized snow blower to get it over the 8-foot wall. Mira Cousins noted that the retaining wall tapers down, and they can store snow there.
97. Joel Nice commented that the barn is a two-family structure and a lot of times there will need to be coordination with the two owners. Bill Nolan commented that one could be plowed.
98. Joel Nice questioned if they had considered turning the barn to face the street more and have less hardscape. Bill Nolan responded that was one of the first inclinations in the design process. However, working with the DRC they elected to keep it as it is. Joel Nice questioned if there was any thought to putting the house on the street front and parking in the back. Bill Nolan commented that would be harder to accomplish that with the hill grades.
99. Nipun Jain commented that they looked at all angles when considering where to place a structure. They are trying not to make it look like a parking lot along Monroe Street. Making the barn parallel to Monroe Street would put more focus on the parking. This orientation shows more of the barn. They can focus on making a landscape edge along the intersection to screen the parking from Elm St. They will have to cut into the slope more if they make the building parallel to Monroe St. Right now, they are only cutting in with the left corner into the slope. Lastly, if that barn was lined up along the street edge, then it would be less organic. Bill Nolan showed one of the original images they had of a barn building in that location. Nipun Jain commented that they talked about different paving materials in front of the barn to reduce the visual impact. Joel Nice agreed that was a good idea.
100. David Frick commented that they did a great project on Center St. and they need a list of all the waivers they are requesting. Everyone has mentioned storm water, and he was not sure how they get away from peer review on this. David Frick questioned what percent

of impervious surface they were adding. Mira Cousins responded they were adding 6,000 sf. David Frick commented that they were adding a lot. They need to assure everyone that the water coming off this site is less than or equal to the current storm water condition. They are putting a lot more building and driveway on a site where there wasn't anything before. The cape doesn't really fit. It feels like an afterthought. It may make sense to make it smaller and deeper to fit in more with the other buildings. David Frick commented that he would rather see the barn or a combination of the barn and the antique home and eliminate the third one altogether. It would be good to have feedback from the Historical Commission on the determination. Bill Nolan commented that they had a meeting with them on April 3rd. David Frick questioned if they would provide thoughts on all of the structures or just the historic home. Nipun Jain responded that they would only comment on the historic structure.

101. David Frick commented that any retaining walls over 4 feet needs to be engineered and they will need the details on that.
102. Tracey Chalifour commented that the Board has spent an hour and a half on something they don't have paperwork for. They will need to see the storm water calculations.
103. Tom Salemi requested details on the retaining wall for the cape. Bill Nolan responded that it will be a 4-foot retaining wall for the level area and it drops down to the side house. It will retain the earth in the back. The wall along the edge of the driveway will definitely need to be engineered.
104. David Frick questioned if they would have enough room for the tiebacks for that wall. Bill Nolan responded that they could tie back in both directions. They have not done the calculations but were confident it could be done.
105. David Frick opened public comment.
106. Tim Ryan of 13 Wells Ave. commented that there are not any wetlands there but it is only 3-4 foot down to the water table. It may be hard to get the footings in the retaining wall for that site. There are so many apartments in Amesbury. This house will be built on the water table and have pumps in the basement.
107. Mira Cousins commented that the retaining wall will be designed by the structural engineer.
108. Joel Nice questioned if any soil testing would be required. Mira Cousins responded that they dug 4 test pits where the sub surface systems are proposed. The subsurface system is 6 feet below grade. Bill Nolan responded that they were not likely going to be in the water table. Walls will be designed to meet building code and will be safe.
109. David Frick questioned what the minimum separation for the water table and the basement should be. Bill Nolan responded that they try to do 4 to 6 inches above the minimum and add a sump pump. David Frick questioned where they would drain out to. Bill Nolan responded that they would go into the sub surface system.
110. Matthew Gillard of 3 Dewey St. submitted a written letter that is attached at the end of the minutes.
111. Nipun Jain commented that the Planning Board should read the Brown Hill Overlay District section in the Zoning Ordinance.
112. Nipun Jain commented that the applicant and team have gone before TRC, and they will provide minutes of that meeting. They have also met with the DRC twice. They have taken

those comments to heart and made revisions to the design. The DRC mostly focused on the building design and not so much site planning. Once they go before the Historical Commission it will come full circle.

- 113. Tracey Chalifour motioned to continue the public hearing for 201 Elm St. to the April 28, 2025, Planning Board meeting. Seconded by Joel Nice.
- 114. David Frick initiated roll call vote –
- 115. Keith Ratner – Absent
- 116. Joel Nice – YES
- 117. Michael Jewell – YES
- 118. Tracey Chalifour – YES
- 119. Tom Salemi - YES
- 120. David Frick – YES
- 121. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 122. Motion passed 6-0

123. **Administrative – Board Appointments**

- 124. Joel Nice was seeking reappointment to the Community Preservation Committee.
- 125. Tracey Chalifour motioned to appoint Joel Nice to be the Planning Board representative on the Community Preservation Committee. Seconded by Tom Salemi.
- 126. David Frick initiated roll call vote –
- 127. Keith Ratner – Absent
- 128. Joel Nice – YES
- 129. Michael Jewell – YES
- 130. Tracey Chalifour – YES
- 131. Tom Salemi - YES
- 132. David Frick – YES
- 133. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 134. Motion passed 6-0
- 135. Joel Nice commented that they had their first official meeting last Thursday. They will have one public meeting per month, and he was happy to provide updates to the Planning Board.
- 136. David Frick commented that they had discussed setting up a working group for rules and regulations.
- 137. Pascal Rettig commented that he could provide more information. There has been some question on what the Board's exact procedures are. The rules and regulations are not up to date and not reflective on how the Board operates. It will be a good opportunity to review the regulations and present a draft to of recommendations to the Board about process deadlines and dates. It can be a two-member working group to review the rules and regulations to update any inconsistencies and make some suggestions. Once they have reviewed it, they can bring recommended changes to the Board.
- 138. Nipun Jain commented that they had a subcommittee previously chaired by Keith Ratner led to a revised document. That happened at the end of 2020 and the city systems changed. They cannot locate the old files as easily and will need to look for it. The Board should agree to set up the legislative working group and have 2 members volunteer.

- 139. David Frick and Joel Nice agreed that they should set up a working group.
- 140. Tracey Chalifour volunteered to be in the working group. Pascal Rettig did as well.
- 141. Tom Salemi motioned to establish a legislative working group to discuss Planning Board policies and procedures. Seconded by Joel Nice.
- 142. David Frick initiated roll call vote –
- 143. Keith Ratner – Absent
- 144. Joel Nice – YES
- 145. Michael Jewell – YES
- 146. Tracey Chalifour – YES
- 147. Tom Salemi - YES
- 148. David Frick – YES
- 149. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 150. Motion passed 6-0

151. Administrative – Planning Board Trainings

- 152. Nipun Jain commented there were two other things they would like to bring to the Board. Staff sent out links to trainings that are free and encourage the Board to take them. They are not required but they are good tools available to all members. They provide a lot of basis for working as a Planning Board member. They are mostly free and if not, then there is some money in the budget. The second is the open meeting law webinar staff sent out. It is important to refamiliarize yourselves with it.
- 153. Nipun Jain commented that they have a Master Plan status update. OCED staff is working on the land use component, and they need to coordinate with MVPC on that. There is some turnaround time on that. They are trying to figure out how to do it with existing nonpayment technical hours. They will give another update when the remaining components are complete.
- 154. Tracey Chalifour commented that there were more items outstanding for the Master Plan as well.

155. Administrative – Contracts, Bills, and Invoices

- 156. David Frick commented that there were three invoices from Stantec.
 - 1. A Stantec Invoice for 80 Haverhill Rd. in the amount of \$953.25
 - 2. A Stantec Invoice for 14 S Hunt Rd. in the amount of \$2,212.50
 - 3. A Stantec Invoice for 31 Newton Rd. in the amount of \$2,204.25
- 157. Joel Nice motioned to pay the Stantec invoices listed above. Seconded by Tom Salemi.
- 158. David Frick initiated roll call vote –
- 159. Keith Ratner – Absent
- 160. Joel Nice – YES
- 161. Michael Jewell – YES
- 162. Tracey Chalifour – YES
- 163. Tom Salemi - YES
- 164. David Frick – YES
- 165. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 166. Motion passed 6-0

167. Adjournment

- 168. Joel Nice motioned to adjourn the meeting at 9:30pm. Seconded by Tracey Chalifour.
- 169. David Frick initiated roll call vote –
- 170. Keith Ratner – Absent
- 171. Joel Nice – YES
- 172. Michael Jewell – YES
- 173. Tracey Chalifour – YES
- 174. Tom Salemi - YES
- 175. David Frick – YES
- 176. Pascal Rettig – YES
- 177. Motion passed 6-0

Matthew Gillard 3 Dewey St. Public Comment

Good evening planning board,

My name is Matthew Gillard. I live at 3 Dewey St. Amesbury. I'm speaking before you tonight. In regards to 201 Elm St.

In 1980 my parents bought 3 Dewey St. Which is located directly behind 201. In 2004 I purchased three Dewey from my father. I'm currently living in the house with my wife and two children. We are proudly raising another generation in it.

We have major concerns about the proposed development of 201 Elm st. The first most which I don't believe has been addressed. Is this property is in the "Brown hill overlay District". This overlay district is to make sure sensible development is adhered to. Starting on Page 176 in the Amesbury zoning regulations and ending on page 179 is where the Brown Hill Overlay District is referenced. In the B.H.O.D there are several guidelines that the project at 201 Elm St. directly violates. The two most concerning for me are.

1 "discouraged development of steep vegetated slopes."

2 "preserve with the wooded area behind Bay and Dewey Street".

Unfortunately the developer did not consider this when they deforested / clear cut all the trees off the steepest section of the hill. This is a major concern for me because our home is directly on top of it and I'm concerned about erosion of the bank. It was fairly insulting, seeing such a blatant disregard of what the neighborhood wants.

I assume the planning board members are aware of the B.H.O.D verbiage. But I will please ask that you review it before making any ruling today. It would be nice if there was a neighborhood representative from the Brown hill overlay district that could be included.

Furthermore there are a lot of traffic concerns at the junction of Monroe and Elm Street. Unfortunately, I have a great view of the new stoplight that they put in there and there are at least a half a dozen accidents at that intersection a year that I witness. Adding a new driveway and that many more residence, that close to the dangerous intersection would be irresponsible. There are no sidewalks on that side of the street and assuming these more affordable housing that's on top of each other will probably have new families. We will now have more children standing at the corner of a dangerous intersection.

It does not appear in this proposal that the developer is considering any public infrastructure upgrades i.e. sidewalks, or stormwater management allowances. I've noticed a significant more amount of water shedding off of the hillside in that section during rain, due to the deforestation. If the town allows, the developer to put even more impermeable surface on that hillside the water/flooding at the corner of Elm and Monroe will be a hazard. Currently there is

no pavement at 201 Elm St. it's a dirt driveway. The town will have to address the flooding and icing of the road.

I'm a restoration brick mason by trade specializing in restoring first period colonial fireplaces and chimneys. I deeply want to see this house restored. My fear is the restoration is just gonna be a cover for a developer to slam more houses in. That will be taxing our infrastructure, endangering our roads and not respecting our town ordinances.

Thank you for taking the time to read this sincerely, Matthew Gillard