

**PLANNING BOARD
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE**

**EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
CITY HALL, MUNICIPAL COMPLEX, 1 JUNKINS AVENUE**

7:00 PM Public Hearings begin

May 15, 2025

MEMBERS PRESENT: Rick Chellman, Chairman; Beth Moreau, City Councilor;
Members Paul Giuliano, Andrew Samonas, William Bowen,
Ryann Wolf, and Alternate Frank Perier

ALSO PRESENT: Peter Stith, Planning Department Manager

MEMBERS ABSENT: Anthony Coviello, Vice-Chair; Karen Conard, City Manager;
Joseph Almeida, Facilities Manager

.....

Chair Chellman called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Alternate Frank Perier took a voting seat for the evening.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Approval of the **April 17, 2025** meeting minutes.

*Mr. Giuliano moved to **approve** the April 17 minutes as presented, seconded by Mr. Samonas. The motion **passed** with all in favor.*

II. DETERMINATIONS OF COMPLETENESS

SUBDIVISION REVIEW

A. The request of **The City of Portsmouth (Owner)**, for property located at **100 Foundry Place**. The project is the subdivision of an existing parcel into five new parcels, with the existing structures to remain as currently existing, and no new construction proposed at this time.

*Mr. Giuliano moved to accept the subdivision review as complete. Mr. Bowen seconded. The motion **passed** with all in favor, with Councilor Moreau abstained.*

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS -- OLD BUSINESS

A. The request of **Aviation Avenue Group (Owner), Kane Management Group LLC (Applicant)**, for property located at **100 New Hampshire Avenue** requesting Amended Site Plan approval to modify a prior condition of approval. Said property is

located on Assessor Map 308 Lot 1 and lies within the Pease Industrial (PI) District. (LU-22-210)

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

[Video timestamp 6:43] Attorney John Bosen was present on behalf of the applicant, with Neil Hansen of Tighe and Bond. Attorney Bosen said the truck entrances were put in place because there was a different user at the time that had a higher traffic count. He said the property now had two users that would generate less traffic, noting that Georgia Pacific would manufacture goods in Newington and transport them to the site where they would be stored. He explained how it would be a more efficient route, with less traffic coming into the Tradeport. He noted that the Board had a letter from the Pease Development Authority (PDA) in support of the request.

[Timestamp 8:45] Mr. Bowen asked if the intent was to build out the other portion of the lot over time. Attorney Bosen said it was not. City Council Representative Moreau noted that it was supposed to be a furniture delivery stop spot. Attorney Bosen agreed and said the traffic count would have been a lot higher. Chair Chellman aside what the difference would be in the number of trucks. Mr. Hansen said it would about half as many at a total of 34 fewer truck trips per day.

Chair Chellman opened the public hearing.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one spoke, and Chair Chellman closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE BOARD

*Mr. Giuliano moved that the Board recommend approval of the request to remove the condition to the Pease Development Authority. Mr. Samonas seconded. The motion **passed** with all in favor.*

- B.** The request of **909 West End LLC (Owner)**, for property located at **909 Islington St** requesting a Conditional Use Permit in accordance with Section 10.1112.62 to allow 98 parking spaces where 103 are required. Said property is located on Assessor Map 172 Lot 7 and lies within the Character District 4-W (CD4-W) (LU-24-221)

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

[Timestamp 11:15] Project engineer John Chagnon of Haley Ward was present on behalf of the applicant, with Meghan Boland of Chinburg Properties. Mr. Chagnon said they were requesting 98 parking spaces where 103 spaces were required and that they also wanted to provide shared parking on an adjacent parcel. He said removing one of the spaces on 99 Islington Street due to the change in use for a restaurant triggered the need. He said they did calculations for the peak hour demand under Portsmouth's shared use table and found that the shared use highest peak was 103 spaces required and that they were providing 98 spaces. He said they worked with the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to improve the lot and provide additional handicapped

spaces. He said they submitted the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) portion of the ordinance requirements and did a parking demand analysis that showed that they were 94 percent conforming. He said they used Shared Occupancy rate and ITT standards and that they were in proximity to residential areas within walking distance and the COAST bus stop. He said the shared parking between daytime and evening would make it an acceptable amount of parking uses. He said they would add bicycle racks. He said the parking spaces were adequate, given the nature of the West End's parking habits. He said the applicant also owned the Frank Jones property that had a similar mix of restaurant and office uses and that the gross parking requirements at that facility had less spaces than the current application and that the square footage per space was higher in the current application.

[Timestamp 15:16] Mr. Bowen asked if the former gas station at 921 Islington Street in front of the applicant's property would also be a restaurant. Mr. Chagnon said it was planned to convert it to a restaurant but that it was not the subject of the current application. Mr. Bowen said he was thinking about a parking issue if there was another restaurant in that area. He said one of the items on the submitted spreadsheet was Dow's Automotive Repair that showed a requirement of three spaces in the evening and eight spaces during the day. He said the data shown in the parking analysis was based on studies done in Texas and Tennessee about 15-20 years ago, and he asked why that data was submitted instead of the data from what currently existed. He also noted that probably half of the cars in the lot related to Dow's and that many people left their cars overnight. He said Loaded Question Brewing was also on the site and had significant evening activity. He said what the applicant submitted did not seem to conform to the City's recommendation. Mr. Chagnon said the parking demand was based on three things, one of which was Portsmouth's parking demand in the ordinance and quantified some square foot requirements based on the use. He said the spreadsheet had the use of the gross floor area and met the code in the ordinance. He said the required parking per gross floor area calculated to 2.1 and came to 3 rounded up. He said the ITE (Institute of Traffic Engineers) was the standard that they used for the ITE parking demand, which he further explained. He said Portsmouth also had a Shared Occupancy Rate table and that the project took the Portsmouth rates times of 8 to 5 and 6 to midnight and then took the highest ITE number within that band, which resulted in an occupancy rate of 103 during the daytime peak. He noted that Dow's had a fixed number of 10 spaces that they were allowed to use. It was further discussed. Chair Chellman said the Brewery Lane comparison was local data and had 2,500 square feet more as well as five more parking spaces, and he asked what the occupancy ratio was. Mr. Chagnon said Brewery Lane had one space per 350 square feet. Chair Chellman said he was a member of ITE and that their database had voluntarily-submitted information from engineers around the country, which was the reason Texas and Tennessee were included. He said things like parking and the context of an area were not that different geographically.

Chair Chellman opened the public hearing.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

No one spoke, and Chair Chellman closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE BOARD

1) *Mr. Giuliano moved that the Board find that the Conditional Use Permit Application meets the requirements set forth in Section 10.1112.14 of the Ordinance and adopt the findings of fact as presented. Mr. Samonas seconded. The motion **passed** by a vote of 6-1, with Mr. Bowen voting against.*

2) *Mr. Giuliano moved that the Board grant the Conditional Use Permit with the following **condition**:*

2.1) The parking covenant shall be recorded at the Rockingham County Registry of Deeds.

*Mr. Samonas seconded. The motion **passed** by a vote of 6-1, with Mr. Bowen voting against.*

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS – NEW BUSINESS

A. Lawrence Brewer and Joshua Ydstie (Owners), for property located at **253 Broad Street** requesting a Conditional Use Permit from Section 10.814 for the construction of a new single-family dwelling with an Attached Accessory Dwelling Unit. Said property is located on Assessor Map 131 Lot 16 and lies within the General Residence A (GRA) District. (LU-25-54)

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

[Timestamp 29:19] Architectural designer Angela Campbell was present on behalf of the applicant. She said the owner submitted an application for an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) in October 2023 and was granted a 7-ft side yard setback to allow them to put in a second driveway. She said they wanted to add a two-car garage and an ADU on the lower level for the owner's aging mother. She said the footprint was currently 1,500 square feet and they wanted to add another 1,000 square feet to it. She said there was an existing curb cut for a driveway that they wanted to shift to align with the proposed garage, and there was an existing curb cut that they wanted to reuse and have as a new driveway just for the ADU.

[Timestamp 32:15] Councilor Moreau said the applicant was tearing down what was there and starting over, and she asked if it was the current footprint. Ms. Campbell said it was not and explained why. She said since the time when they submitted the plan, they received the CAD survey plan, so they had a slight shift in the footprint of 24 inches.

Chair Chellman opened the public hearing.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Dan Indoe of 239 Broad Street said he lived next door to the applicant and that he wrote a letter in 2023 in support of the 7-ft variance. He said he was in support of the new structure because it would be a nice upgrade to the neighborhood. He said he also supported the double driveway.

No one else spoke and Chair Chellman closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE BOARD [Timestamp 35:43]

- 1) *Councilor Moreau moved that the Board find that the Conditional Use Permit Application meets the requirements set forth in Section 10.814.62 of the Ordinance and adopt the findings of fact as presented. Mr. Samonas seconded. The motion **passed** with all in favor.*
- 2) *Councilor Moreau moved that the Board grant the Conditional Use Permit with the following conditions:*
 - 2.1) *Documentation of the conditional use permit approval shall be recorded at the Rockingham County Registry of Deeds, together with an affidavit that either the principal dwelling unit or the accessory dwelling unit will be occupied by the owner of the dwelling as the owner's principal place of residence, as required by Section 10.814.22.*
 - 2.2) *A certificate of use issued by the Planning Department is required to verify compliance with the standards of this Section, including the owner occupancy and principal residency requirements. Said certificate shall be issued by the Planning Department upon issuance of a certificate of occupancy by the Inspection Department. A certificate of use shall not be issued prior to recording of documentation as required by this Ordinance.*
 - 2.3) *The certificate of use shall be renewed annually upon submission of such documentation as the Planning Department may require to verify continued compliance with the standards of this Section. Failure to comply with this requirement shall be deemed a violation of the ordinance and may be enforced as provided in Article 2.*

*Mr. Samonas seconded. The motion **passed** with all in favor.*

Councilor Moreau said she appreciated that the applicant was fitting the project into the footprint of what would be the existing house and thought it met all the criteria.

- B.** The request of **Brian Lampert Revocable Trust (Owner), Lexie's Joint (Applicant)**, for property located at **218 Islington Street** requesting a Conditional Use Permit in accordance with Section 10.440, Use 19.50 for an outdoor dining and drinking area as an accessory use to a permitted principal use. Said property is located on Assessor Map 137 Lot 21 and lies within the Character District 4-L2 (CD4-L2) and Historic District. (LU-25-64)

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

[Timestamp 37:18] Danielle Damsell, General Manager of Lexie's Joint, was present. She said the outdoor summer seating was proposed to be at the front and left of the lot. She said they would have four top tables that would add 16 seats to the restaurant and that they would work on getting a liquor license to extend to the outdoor seating.

[Timestamp 38:10] Mr. Samonas asked if the seating would be just under the overhang and not in front of the restaurant itself. Ms. Damsell agreed and said it would be completely blocked off and that temporary ropes would be added to seal off the area. Councilor Moreau noted that there was another unit and asked if Lexie's would have the use of that one. Ms. Damsell said they would stay within their unit and that the owner of the other unit was in favor of Lexie's having the outdoor seating in the summer.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Chair Chellman noted that the Board received one letter in support of the project. No one spoke, and he closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE BOARD

- 1) *Mr. Giuliano moved that the Board find that the Conditional Use Permit application meets the criteria set forth in Section 10.243.20 and to adopt the findings of fact as presented. Mr. Samonas seconded. The motion **passed** with all in favor.*
- 2) *Mr. Giuliano moved that the Board approve the Conditional Use Permit as presented. Mr. Samonas seconded. The motion **passed** with all in favor.*

C. The request of The City of Portsmouth (Owner), for property located at 100 Foundry Place. The project is the subdivision of an existing parcel into five new parcels, with the existing structures to remain as currently existing, and no new construction proposed at this time. Said property is located on Assessor Map 138 Lot 60 and lies within the Downtown Overlay and Municipal (M) Districts. (LU-25-65)

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

[Timestamp 41:20] Project engineer John Chagnon was present on behalf of the applicant, along with Director of the Department of Public Works (DPW) Peter Rice, John Quелlette of Pinchen Environmental, and DPW project manager Christine Sproviero. Mr. Chagnon explained why they were there to request approval for a 5-lot subdivision. He said Lot 1 was the Rock St parking lot; Lot 2 was Foundry Place; Lot 3 was the parking garage lot; and Lot 4 was the Rock St parking area that included an area of the Foundry Place. He said Lot 5 was leftover land bounded by a retaining wall and that the purpose was to separate areas that were part of the Foundry Place Garage lot, which had restrictions based on historical uses at the site. He said if excavation was ever proposed, it would have to go through a rigorous environmental process. He said it separated the lots that were not germane to that treatment, which he named. He said the retaining wall on Lot 5 would need to be repaired, which would be more difficult if there had to be a lot of reporting under that area of use restriction requirements from the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services (NHDES).

[Timestamp 46:00] Mr. Bowen said the Board had many meetings regarding 361 Hanover Street, Lot 5, and the wall. He asked if there was any implication for the 361 Hanover Street property. Mr. Rice said there was no connection to the proposed development at that site. He said the

intent was to separate that from the use restrictions and repair the wall and that it would be easier for Public Works to do maintenance. Mr. Quellette said that, as part of the remedial action plan they did for the property before it was built, there was a requirement at the end to do an Activity and Use Restriction, so they were shrinking up as much as possible the area that restricted them from developing the property going forward. He said the contamination that was defined on the property from the past were Lots 2 and 3. He said if anything were done to the other lots, it would have to go through a rigorous process with the State. He said the Activity and Use Restriction that they would submit to the State would go in as a draft so that there could be feedback from the State. Mr. Rice agreed, and it was further discussed.

Chair Chellman opened the public hearing.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Mr. Chagnon said the State needed a definite area and currently the only one was Tax Map 138, Lot 60. He said the acquirement of that land was a number of different parcels and that it would be difficult to say which parcel had which deed, so the plan defined Lots 2 and 3.

No one else spoke, and Chair Chellman closed the public hearing.

DECISION OF THE BOARD

*1) Mr. Samonas moved that the Board grant Preliminary and Final Subdivision Approval with the following **conditions**:*

- 1.1) The subdivision plan, and any easement plans and deeds shall be recorded simultaneously at the Registry of Deeds by the City or as deemed appropriate by the Planning Department.*
- 1.2) Property monuments shall be set as required by the Department of Public Works prior to the filing of the plat.*
- 1.3) GIS data shall be provided to the Department of Public Works in the form as required by the City.*

*Mr. Giuliano seconded. The motion **passed** with all in favor, with Councilor Moreau recused.*

V. PRELIMINARY CONCEPTUAL CONSULTATION

- A.** The request of **Service Credit Union (Owner)**, for property located at **126 Lang Road** requesting Site Plan approval for construction of workforce housing in two 70-unit apartment buildings, a 30-unit workforce housing building, a 30-unit veteran housing building with possible daycare on the first floor and 35 market rate townhomes in 5 buildings with associate site improvements. Said property is located on Assessor Map 291 Lot 1-1 and lies within the Gateway Corridor (G1) District. (LUPD-25-7)

[Timestamp 51:37] Attorney John Bosen was present on behalf of the applicant and introduced Mike Mulhern of Service Credit Union that owned the parcel, Alex Finigan of the Preservation of Affordable Housing, project engineer Nicole Duquette, and architect Alan Tang of PROCON. Attorney Bosen said the program involved a master plan and proposed 170 workforce housing units that would also include veteran housing, a potential nonprofit daycare center, and 24 market rate townhomes to help subsidize the project's affordability. He said the intent was to use the low income tax credit and that the application was due by the end of September, so they proposed to break up the project into two applications. He said the first application was for the 270 workforce units and the parking that would need to be approved to meet the September deadline. He said the second application would be the phase for the rest of the project.

[Timestamp 54:35] Project engineer Nicole Duquette explained the history of the lot, which used to be Ralph's Trucking. She said Ralph's left in 2010 and the credit union was planned. She said there was a lot of wetland on the parcel and that about 10-1/2 acres of it could be used and the rest would remain as wetlands and some debris. She reviewed the master plan and said there would be two 70-unit buildings, (Buildings A and B), with a parking lot and other parking that would comprise the first application for the low income housing tax credit. She said the second application would be the 30-unit veteran housing with a potential daycare and an expanded parking lot, and to the north would be a potential workforce housing building of 30 units with parking to the north, and five 7-unit market rate townhouse buildings. She discussed the community space, green space, courtyard, concrete areas, and walking trails. She reviewed the stormwater and bioretention area and said there were some ledge on the site as well as some unsuitable material that would have to be moved. She said there was no water line in front of the site and that they would connect the Longmeadow Rd lines onto Lang Rd. She said they met the parking demand and would see if they needed less parking for the 140 units.

[Timestamp 1:07:08] Mr. Samonas asked if the front-facing 70 units would be hidden by the credit union building that was visible from Route One. Ms. Duquette said it would be visible but that the grades would go up toward Lafayette Rd and the building would sit farther down than the credit union lot. Mr. Samonas asked why the southern side of the 30 workforce housing units did not sit parallel to the veteran housing instead of toward Lang Rd. Ms. Duquette said it was a bioretention area owned by the City as an easement and that they also had to stay out of the buffer. She said the intent was to have the parking lot built in Phase 1 so that it could be expanded in Phase 2 without the expense of tearing it up. Mr. Samonas asked if there was a second egress plan in Phase 2. Ms. Duquette said there wasn't one currently. Mr. Samonas asked if the circular pavement area in Phase 2 would be able to egress toward the townhomes onto Lang Rd, noting that there would be a lot of traffic congestion. Ms. Duquette said it wasn't planned but would be no different than what the credit union had for their parking lot and that they would have the same amount of parking spaces. She said they could consider having a secondary access but might not be able to slope it down enough to do it.

[Timestamp 1:13:17] Mr. Giuliano said the south unit for the veteran housing was good but the ones above it were facing the parking lot. Ms. Duquette said the intent was to have a sidewalk in the Phase 2 that would continue the road for the townhouses and possibly add a bit of a buffer to make it feel like a neighborhood road. Councilor Moreau said she was excited about the project because it included workforce housing and that she liked the idea of having the building

perpendicular so that one would not see just two giant buildings from the street. She suggested having shared parking with the credit union so that there would be less parking lots. She said she liked the idea of having trails through the buffer. She suggested that the applicant think about different aspects of the green space and the daycare and possibly a playground for the kids to make it family friendly. She said the COAST bus stop should be brought up in the application and that bike racks would be a good idea. Mr. Bowen suggested that the architectural style of the project look like "Portsmouth" and said it was asked at the community meeting that the architect consider State Street as an example. He said the head of COAST bus service would decide what the bus routes would be and would do what he could to accommodate the project. He said he was a veteran and was concerned about veteran housing but did not think there was a real need for it in Portsmouth, and he suggested that the applicant ensure that it was necessary instead of just doing it because they thought they should.

[Timestamp 1:22:32] Ms. Wolf asked if child care numbers were included in the parking space calculations. Ms. Duquette said the maximum enrollment for the daycare would be about 75 children but that they had not analyzed the parking yet. Ms. Wolf asked what ages the children would be. Mr. Mulhern said they were looking at another nonprofit to run the childcare center, so it would start with infants and would fall into the nonprofit's existing portfolio of childcare. Ms. Wolf asked if the applicant planned on having playground structures. Mr. Mulhern said they hoped to have a playground. Ms. Wolf asked how the townhouse residents would feel about having a childcare center next to them. Mr. Mulhern said the top priority was workforce housing and affordable childcare and that they would analyze the risk. In response to other questions from Ms. Wolf, Mr. Mulhern said the childcare center would be on the first floor and that the second and third floors would be veteran housing. He said Service Credit Union would be responsible for security for the childcare center. It was further discussed. Mr. Perier asked how far the existing debris extended into the wetlands and how it would be removed. Ms. Duquette said it would be discussed with the Conservation Commission.

[Timestamp 1:31:45] Chair Chellman asked if there was an environmental reason for the delineation between Phase 1 and Phase 2 or if it encompassed the first two buildings. Ms. Duquette said the first application would not require a CUP for encroachment into the wetland buffer but the second application would. Chair Chellman asked if the 30-unit building by itself would. Ms. Duquette said it would not but that the driveway onto Lang Road would. Chair Chellman said he saw some design opportunities that the applicant could think about. He asked why the 30-unit building couldn't be brought down by wrapping another building to have a bigger central area with more common space. He said the current plan had a wasted triangular space and a building that fronted on parking with two sides. He said the buildings could be shifted around and that there was an opportunity for more usable space and more parking efficiency. It was further discussed. He said it was important that workforce housing provide dignity to its residents and that there was a tension between creating an economical design and something people would be proud to live there. He said the applicant had done a lot but thought he could do a bit more. Mr. Samonas said there was a short turn for people coming from Lang Road and asked if a stop bar could be put at the exit of the small turnaround. He said delivery and emergency vehicles would have to have access all the way across the Longmeadow Road entrance to the Lang Road corner. Ms. Duquette said they would discuss it with the City Traffic Engineer. She said a stop bar on Lang Road might cause people to look back instead of just

looking left and right. Mr. Samonas said Beechstone Apartments had four egress points and the applicant just had one. Ms. Duquette said a second driveway on the lot would require a variance. Mr. Samonas asked about trash pickup. Ms. Duquette said there would be dumpsters in the south lot and a striped area for UPS vehicles, U-hauls, etc. Mr. Bowen asked where Amazon deliveries would go. Ms. Duquette said each building would have its own package room.

VI. DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION ACCEPTANCE

- A.** The request of **Brora LLC (Owner)**, for property located at **0 Dunlin Way** requesting Design Review application for acceptance for the construction of three (3) six (6) story multifamily residential buildings consisting of approximately 270 dwelling units with associate site improvements. Said property is located on Assessor Map 213 Lot 12 and lies within the Office Research (OR) District and Gateway Neighborhood Overlay District (GNOD). (LUPD-25-6)

[Timestamp 1:40:45] Neil Hansen of Tighe and Bond and Kimery Poldrack of the Kane Company were present. Mr. Hansen said they wanted to return in June for a design review meeting. He noted that they submitted some updated site plans and detailed engineering plans.

[Timestamp 1:42:16] Chair Chellman asked what the parking numbers were and if they conformed to the CUP. Mr. Hansen said they were at 301 spaces and required 271. He said the plan had parking under Building C, and along the reconstructed frontage, there were 36 spaces that were not part of the count but would be utilized by site visitors. A possible parking deck was discussed. Mr. Hansen said they had parking under Building C but that a parking structure was not feasible for the project. Mr. Samonas asked if the parking arrangement could be done differently so that more recreational and green space could be added so that there wasn't a giant site of pavement. Mr. Hansen said 301 parking spaces for 274 units was already tight. He said they were utilizing the 20 percent public transit reduction, so they were lower than what would be required. He said the design would be refined further after more feedback. Chair Chellman suggested coordinating a site walk with the Conservation Commission, and it was further discussed. Mr. Hansen said they were trying to keep as big of a buffer as they could. Councilor Moreau recommended that the applicant discuss the project with the Dunlin Way residents. The barrier to Osprey Landing was discussed. Mr. Bowen asked what the traffic flow would be. Mr. Hansen said they would do a full traffic study. He said exiting through Dunlin Way would put someone into the Osprey Landing neighborhood, so it was not the most efficient way to leave the site. Mr. Bowen asked if Dunlin Way would be open or if the barrier would remain in place. Mr. Hansen said it would be up to the approval of TAC, the Fire Department, the Planning Board, and so on. Chair Chellman asked if it was a maximization of the site as far as density. Mr. Hansen said land-wise it was as much as they could fit in and that the parking was the limiting factor. Mr. Bowen asked if the applicant intended to do anything to differentiate the buildings architecturally from the other planned developments in Portsmouth to make the site more interesting. Mr. Hansen said their architect would speak to the design. Ms. Wolf said children might run through the parking lot and asked if there was anything to avoid that. It was further discussed, and Mr. Hansen said they would research it more when they got into the landscape design. Chair Chellman asked if there were amenities within the buildings. Ms. Poldrack said the first floor of Building B would have space for amenities like a possible gym and other things

normally in a multi-family project. She said they might do a play area on other nearby properties that they owned and that the applicant would also look into traffic calming. Chair Chellman asked if there would be a master plan at some point. Ms. Poldrack said they might do one in the future. Chair Chellman said it would be useful if the applicant shared broader ideas.

*Councilor Moreau moved that the Board accept the application for Design Review and schedule a public hearing at the June 18, 2025 Planning Board meeting. Mr. Samonas seconded. The motion **passed** with all in favor.*

VII. CITY COUNCIL REFERRALS

A. Islington and State Street Easements

[Timestamp 2:00:51] Mr. Stith said the easements were drainage ones in coordination with the work being done on Islington Street and that the work to secure easements across properties and connecting to State Street had been done.

*Mr. Giuliano moved that the Board recommend that the City Council accept the drainage easements on 547/549 State Street and 72, 86, and 96 Islington Street. Councilor Moreau seconded. The motion **passed** with all in favor.*

VIII. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Chairman Updates and Discussion Items

[Timestamp 2:02:33] Chair Chellman said he would let the Board know when the workshop discussion about the Master Plan would take place. He said the contract was signed. Mr. Stith said the City was having five weekly meetings with the consultants. He referenced two recent projects that had two driveways because of the large lots and said that the zoning ordinance had a section about driveways that met the standards for general access ways and driveway designs and stated that there could only be one driveway per lot. Chair Chellman said the Board would come up with a way to fix that, and it was further discussed.

B. Board Discussion of Regulatory Amendments & Other Matters

See above.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 9:05 p.m.

Submitted,

Joann Breault
Planning Board Meeting Minutes Taker