

**PLANNING BOARD
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE**

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

7:00 PM Public Hearings begin

June 18, 2025

MEMBERS PRESENT: Rick Chellman, Chairman; Anthony Coviello, Vice-Chair; Karen Conard, City Manager; Joseph Almeida, Facilities Manager; Beth Moreau, City Councilor; Members Andrew Samonas, William Bowen, and Alternates Frank Perier and Logan Roy

.....

ALSO PRESENT: Peter Stith, Planning Department Manager

MEMBERS ABSENT: Paul Giuliano; Ryann Wolf

.....

Chair Chellman called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. He stated that Item IV.A, City Council Referral for the Coakley Road Extension would be addressed first, and New Business Petition II.H, Brora LLC Owner, and III.A, Design Review Application for 0 Dunlin Way, would be addressed immediately afterwards.

Mr. Almeida moved to take the items out of order to address them, seconded by Ms. Conard. The motion passed with all in favor.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Approval of the **May 15, 2025** meeting minutes.

*City Councilor Representative Moreau moved to **approve** the May 15 minutes as presented, seconded by Mr. Almeida. The motion passed with all in favor, with Ms. Conard abstaining.*

Note: The Board then addressed Item IV.A, Coakley Road Extension.

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS – NEW BUSINESS

At this point in the meeting, Chair Chellman stated that Alternate Mr. Perier would take a voting seat for Ms. Ryann and Alternate Mr. Roy would take a voting seat for Mr. Giuliano.

A. The request of **Sea Level LLC (Owner)**, for property located at **185-187 Wentworth House Road** requesting a Wetland Conditional Use Permit in accordance with Section 10.1017.50 for the required remediation of PCBs by the EPA and associated impacts within a tidal wetland and previously disturbed wetland buffer including removal of sediment from existing salt marsh. The project proposes to add 6” of sand with the addition of planting saltmarsh bulrush plugs and salt tolerant grass mix and

adding boulder armoring and stone riprap for bank stability. Additional proposed impacts to the buffer include the removal of 0.5 cubic yards of soil in two different buffer locations with one of these areas proposed to be covered with a geotextile liner and 5,000 s.f. of concrete cap. Said property is located on Assessor Map 201 Lot 12 and lies within the Single Residence B (SRB) and Waterfront Business (WB) Districts. (LU-25-2)

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

[Timestamp 1:06:16] Project engineer Steve Graham was present on behalf of the owner and explained how they would remove the contamination within the tidal wetland and dispose of it. He said they would also restore some riprap and the retaining wall. Mr. Bowen asked how much of the problem would be fixed, and Mr. Graham said all of it.

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) *Councilor Moreau moved that the Board find that the Conditional Use Permit Application meets the requirements set forth in Section 10.1017.50 of the Ordinance and adopt the findings of fact as presented. Ms. Conard 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) In accordance with Section 10.1018.40 of the Zoning Ordinance, applicant shall permanently install wetland boundary markers, which may be purchased through the City of Portsmouth Planning & Sustainability Department. Markers are to be placed along the edge of the gravel parking area near the restoration area at 50-foot intervals and must be installed prior to the start of any construction.

Mr. Almeida seconded. The motion passed with all in favor.

B. The request of **Jesse Warren Anderson (Owner)**, for property located at **224 Cate Street** requesting an after-the-fact Wetland Conditional Use Permit for restoration work within the City's 100' wetland buffer for unauthorized removal of vegetation within the vegetated no-cut buffer and removal of the groundcover on portions of the property that were within the protected wetland buffer without a permit. Said property is located on Assessor Map 173 Lot 3 and lies within the General Residence A (GRA) District. (LU-25-26)

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

[Timestamp 1:14:45] The owner Jesse Anderson was present and said he restored the property because two dead trees were removed and the equipment damaged the ground. He said the plan was to plant seven dogwoods and three red maples and a conservation seed mix along the vegetation area of Hodgdon Brook. He said he would follow the maintenance plan.

[Timestamp 1:16:00] Mr. Bowen asked if the property was for sale, and Mr. Anderson agreed. Councilor Moreau asked if Mr. Anderson would pass along to the new owner all the maintenance that would need to be done and if the signs would be put up in time so that the new owner would know where the buffers were. Mr. Anderson agreed. Chair Chellman asked Mr. Anderson if he did the clearing himself. Mr. Anderson said he hired an arborist who was not aware of the City's regulations. Mr. Bowen asked if lot of the ground cover was disturbed. Mr. Anderson said the soil was not disturbed at all because it was backdragged.

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) Vice-Chair Coviello moved that the Board find that the Conditional Use Permit Application meets the requirements set forth in Section 10.1017.50 of the Ordinance and adopt the findings of fact as presented. Mr. Samonas seconded. The motion passed with all in favor.

*2) Vice-Chair Coviello moved that the Board grant the Conditional Use Permit with the following **conditions**:*

2.1) In accordance with Section 10.1018.40 of the Zoning Ordinance, applicant shall permanently install wetland boundary markers, which may be purchased through the City of Portsmouth Planning & Sustainability Department. Markers are to be placed along the 40' vegetative buffer (due to the steep slope) at 50-foot intervals and must be installed prior to the start of any site work.

2.2) A monitoring report for the first two years after planting will be submitted annually to the Planning and Sustainability Department. The first report shall be submitted after the restoration work has been completed. This report will include an update on all plant health, growth, and establishment. Additionally, it should include methods for irrigation and information on routine maintenance practices. The second report must demonstrate at least an 80% survival rate of new plantings after the first two years of monitoring, if not, then replanting will be required.

2.3) Red Maple trees must be 4-6' in height at time of install.

2.4) A note shall be added to the plan set stating that no mowing or cutting of vegetation shall occur between the newly planted area and the top of the stream bank.

2.5) The obligation to complete the restoration plan and the revegetation plan shall be entered into the chain of title in a recorded document, approved by the Planning and Legal Departments, recorded at the Rockingham County Registry of Deeds within 6 months or prior to sale. Once the restoration work is completed, the applicant may request that an appropriate release be entered into the chain of title.

2.6) Restoration work must be complete by June 18, 2026.

Ms. Conard seconded. The motion passed with all in favor.

Note: the motion was amended after Mr. Samonas suggested that the document be recorded at the Registry prior to sale.

- C. The request of Strawberry Banke Inc. (Owner), for property located at 65 Washington Street requesting an amended Site Plan approval for drainage and stormwater improvements. Said property is located on Assessor Map 104 Lot 7 and lies within the Mixed Residential Office (MRO) and Historic Districts. (LU-25-63)**

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

[Timestamp 1:29:38] Project engineer Alex Ross was present on behalf of the applicant and explained why they were requesting an amended site plan approval. He said a lot of work was completed on the Penhallow House and the whole area was notorious for drainage issues. He said they planned to design some rain gardens, swales, and more small catch basins. He said they went before TAC and then worked out some minor issues with the Department of Public Works.

The Board had no questions. 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) Vice-Chair Coviello moved that the Board find that the Site Plan Application meets the requirements set forth in the Site Plan Regulations Section 2.9 Evaluation Criteria and adopt the findings of fact as presented. Ms. Conard seconded. The motion passed with all in favor.*
- 2) Vice-Chair Coviello moved that the Board voted to grant Amended Site Plan Approval. Ms. Conard seconded. The motion passed with all in favor.*

Ms. Conard then moved that the Board consider Items D and E pertaining to the SLF Realty Group LLC together. Vice-Chair Coviello seconded. The motion passed with all in favor.

- D.** The request of **SLF Realty Group LLC (Owner)**, for property located at **400 Spaulding Turnpike** requesting an amended Site Plan approval to change the temporary access path to a permanent access path. Said property is located on Assessor Map 238 Lot 2 and lies within the Gateway Corridor (G1) District. (LU-25-50)

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

[Timestamp 1:33:58] Project manager Stefanie Tetreault of Tighe & Bond was present on behalf of Eversource and SLF Realty/Portsmouth Ford. Ashley Botelho of Eversource Energy was also present. Ms. Tetreault said they were requesting an after-the-fact approval for an amended site plan and a Conditional Use Permit. She explained that Eversource received a Conditional Use Permit in 2003 for right-of-way and utility line maintenance along a section that included a wetland access route from Echo Avenue to access two structures. She said Eversource was then able to secure an access agreement from SLF Realty to access the right-of-way from a more direct route, resulting in a shorter access to the structures and eliminating the direct wetland impact, but it still resulted in a wetland buffer impact so they took a different route from the gravel one that was originally approved. She said they wanted to install a gate to prevent further use of the gravel access path and that the Conservation Commission requested that the access would only be used for accessing the structures and not for vehicle storage or parking. She said they would also install wetland signage at the entrance to the gate.

[Timestamp 1:36:52] Vice-Chair Coviello said an aerial view showed seven cars near where the gate would be located and asked if the gate would allow vehicle access. Ms. Tetreault said the gate was 16 feet wide. Vice-Chair Coviello said it looked like the road had a dirt shoulder that made it quite wide, and he asked if other things would be done to prevent the encroachment. Ms. Tetreault said they did not intend to do anything else because the area to the right was wetland with overgrown shrubbery and the area on the left had even more overgrown shrubbery, so it wasn't an area that one would drive through or park a car. It was further discussed. Vice-Chair Coviello said car dealerships would find places to put cars and that there seemed to be available space. Mr. Stith said the boulders prevented people from parking along Echo Avenue. Chair Chellman asked if SLF Realty owned the dealership and the land. Ms. Tetreault agreed. Mr. Roy asked how often Eversource expected to use the road for maintenance. Ashley Botelho of Eversource Energy said the structure have been replaced so it would be for regular inspections or if there were special pieces of equipment. She said it was maintained once every few years. Mr. Almeida noted said the impact was minimized and was an obvious improvement.

Chair Chellman opened the public hearing.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

[Timestamp 1:44:15] Christine Wade of 1380 Woodbury Avenue said the location where the cars were shown was her family's property. She said it was the first time that Eversource had come onto her property for family generations. She explained that the original approval went through the wetlands to Pole No. 20, which was why Eversource went through the wetlands to get to Pole No. 19, which was on her property. She said Eversource had to replace those poles but decided to go farther up and down on her property. She said Eversource fixed what they needed to fix and that the area was going back to vegetation, so there was no reason to put a gate or keep the access paths permanent because it should just go back to being wetlands.

Julie Patel of 1380 Woodbury Avenue asked why the request was coming from Portsmouth Ford and not Eversource. She said the existing gravel path did not have to be used. She said that Portsmouth Ford did not own all the lots and that there were about nine easements in the area, so they wanted an access gate for Eversource to cut through 75 percent of the area. She said there were currently parked cars in that area and that the gate would not do anything to prevent that.

Patricia Katkin of 1380 Woodbury Avenue said she also owned property at 1400 and 1430 Woodbury Avenue. She said she was concerned that her property could be entered at the bottom from the Ford dealership without filling in a wetland area. She said there was no real road there, but since the dealership added all that dirt, they had cars parked along the roadway and eight cars were parked on her property. She said she asked Ford to move their cars and was told that it was Ford's property. She said another concern was dealing with more development than she had in the past. She said all the water was also being diverted onto her property.

Second Round Speakers

Julie Patel said that under the NH Wetlands Bureau rules, applicants must demonstrate that no less impactful alternatives exist.

Christine Wade said she and her family were there for the residents and not the industries. She said the industries were changing Portsmouth.

Third Round Speakers

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

[Timestamp 1:55:53] Mr. Samonas said he wondered what the easements meant in respect to access, location, size, and capacity to the subservient property and if the Board was ruling on something they had no control of. Mr. Stith explained that Easement 7 was a sewer easement and the public service easement was a 300 linear foot transmission line easement across an area into the Katkins property. He said a lot of the other easements were drainage, slope, and utility ones but were farther away. Mr. Samonas said the utility company then had the ability to change, maintain, and improve their service. Chair Chellman asked if the building of the access road exceeded the utility's rights for maintenance or their previous approval. Councilor Moreau said normally the Board ensured that the access had to be returned. Vice-Chair Coviello said he had concerns about whether the Ford property was meeting their site plan approval, and he did not

know if the site plan allowed them to park on Echo Avenue. Chair Chellman said he had thought there was only one landowner, so he felt that the Board might need more information before acting. Mr. Almeida asked if it was the only access easement to the site. Chair Chellman said the restoration that would normally occur had not occurred, and he wondered if the driveway could continue in its current location or if it exceeded its rights in the first place. Mr. Almeida asked if the owner could accept the access agreement and rent parking to Portsmouth Ford on their lot. Mr. Stith said that parking as a principal use was not allowed, and it was further discussed. Mr. Samonas said findings of fact would suggest that the Board did not have all the information they needed, due to possible negative impacts from runoff and residual drainage on the subservient property. He asked if a drainage study should be done. It was further discussed.

DECISION OF THE BOARD

[Timestamp 2:06:48] After some discussion, the following motion was made:

*Vice-Chair Coviello moved to **continue** to the July meeting in order for the applicant to provide more information on easements, stormwater flow onsite due to grade changes; provide information on wetlands, and compare impacts before and after for restored accessway vs not restored; look at possible alternative access points, and provide clarification on lot boundaries and wetland exhibits. Ms. Conard seconded. The motion passed with all in favor.*

- E.** The request of **SLF Realty Group LLC (Owner)**, for property located at **400 Spaulding Turnpike** requesting an after-the-fact Wetland Conditional Use Permit for permanent wetland buffer impacts that were not included in the original wetland conditional use permit for this project. The new request is an increase in wetland buffer impacts from 1,644 square feet to 3,685 square feet. Said property is located on Assessor Map 238 Lot 2 and lies within the Gateway Corridor (G1) District. (LU-25-50)

DECISION OF THE BOARD

See above.

[Timestamp 2:15:33] At this point in the meeting, the two postponed items were brought up, Petitions F and G for GIRI Portsmouth 505 Inc.

*Vice-Chair Coviello moved to **consolidate** Items F and G and **continue** them to the July meeting. Councilor Moreau seconded. The motion passed with all in favor.*

- F. REQUEST TO POSTPONE** The request of **GIRI Portsmouth 505 Inc. (Owner)**, for property located at **505 US Route 1 Bypass** requesting an amended Site Plan approval, and a Conditional Use Permit for Electric Vehicle fueling space B to install 4 EV fueling stations for 8 charging spaces. Said property is located on Assessor Map 234 Lot 5 and lies within the Gateway Corridor (G1) District. **REQUEST TO POSTPONE** (LU-25-66)

DECISION OF THE BOARD

*The item was **continued** to the July meeting.*

G. REQUEST TO POSTPONE The request of **GIRI Portsmouth 505 Inc. (Owner)**, for property located at **505 US Route 1 Bypass** requesting a Wetland Conditional Use Permit in accordance with Section 10.1017.50. The project includes 1,434 square feet of impacts within the wetland buffer including 303 square feet of temporary impacts, 173 square feet of permanent impacts in the wetland buffer and 958 square feet conversion from pavement into grassed areas within the wetland buffer area. Said property is located on Assessor Map 234 Lot 5 and lies within the Gateway Corridor (G1) District. **REQUEST TO POSTPONE (LU-25-66)**

DECISION OF THE BOARD

*The item was **continued** to the July meeting.*

H. The request of **Brora LLC (Owner)**, for property located at **0 Dunlin Way** requesting Design Review 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)

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

[Timestamp 20:16] Project engineer Neil Hansen of Tighe & Bond was present on behalf of the applicant, along with the project team. Mr. Hansen said the site was at the end of Portsmouth Boulevard and there would be 274 residential units in three buildings (A, B, and C). He said parking spaces would be under Building C and the amenities space would be in Building B. He said the section of Portsmouth Boulevard in front of the development would be upgraded and rebuilt with an enhanced streetscape, parallel parking spaces, sidewalks and so on. He said the traffic study would be completed as they got more into the TAC process. He noted that the public comment on the City's website from the Osprey Drive development was mainly traffic related and that there were concerns about the proposed gate at the end of Portsmouth Boulevard where it meets Dunlin Way. He said the developer was open to exploring that.

[Timestamp 23:05] Councilor Moreau said she lived in a neighborhood that had an emergency access gate that worked well, and she suggested that the gate be placed behind the driveway where Building C was proposed. Mr. Hansen said all access to the site exited out to the Market Street and Portsmouth Boulevard traffic signal, so they anticipated that most of the traffic would take a left out of the site. Mr. Bowen said the parking totals did not add up and explained how they totaled about 89 percent of the City's standard. Mr. Hansen said there was an allowable 20 percent reduction for being near a bus stop that they were using to meet the parking requirements. He said the unit sizes would likely change through the permitting process and would be updated

to ensure that the project stayed within the requirements. Mr. Bowen said having one parking space per unit would not work for a lot of people, so the Board had the authority to issue a Conditional Use Permit based on a variety of other factors, like incentives for shared car and van pooling, a transit subsidy offered to the residents, or shared parking on a separate lot. He noted that there was a lot of vacant parking space in the nearby office complex and asked how many residents would park a second car in that lot. He asked if the design of the building could be changed if the development was not trying to shoehorn something to meet an arbitrary parking requirement that the City might impose. Mr. Hansen said they could consider a design with less parking. He said they were adding four spaces within the right-of-way that were not included in their calculation, and those would likely be used by visitors to the site and would be added to their parking ratio. Vice-Chair Coviello asked what the ratio would be. Mr. Hansen said it would be around 1.3. Vice-Chair Coviello said it was a delicate balance because on one hand, excessive parking was the worst, but on the other hand, it was next to a residential neighborhood, and he asked how to ensure that no one would be parking in front of the homes because the parking lot was full. Mr. Hansen said it was about 1-1/4 spaces per unit currently. Vice-Chair Coviello asked why the project was removing so many trees, even beyond the parking lot. Mr. Hansen said they needed the space to chase the grade back up the hill. Chair Chellman said the parking details would be vetted and more information provided. He suggested that the applicant provide examples of similar NH or Portsmouth projects to the Board. Mr. Almeida said the extent of the tree removal going up the embankment was a complete removal of all vegetation. He said a few previous parking designs showed the parking curving up with the buildings that could potentially minimize how far they had to go up the embankment for clearcutting. Mr. Hansen said the goal was to get as high up as possible to minimize the amount of cutback into that slope.

[Timestamp 33:45] Mr. Samonas said the previous plan had trees along the end of Building C toward Dunlin Way but that they were not on the current plan. Mr. Hansen said there would be a full landscape plan and that the area would be revegetated. Mr. Samonas said his focus was toward Dunlin Way where there were residential single-family homes, and he hoped more robust planting with full mature trees could be done. He asked if the development would have beeping, lights or other forms of alert, like in some other garages. Mr. Hansen said it had not been designed yet and that he had not seen flashing or audible alarms on the ones that exited into the street. Mr. Samonas said it would be helpful to see a massing or shadow study that showed the perspective down or up from the neighboring properties. Councilor Moreau asked if there could be loading zones for deliveries. Mr. Hansen agreed. Vice-Chair Coviello asked if the applicant would have to provide a public benefit due to the project's massing. Mr. Hansen said they did not have to in that district but that there would be incentives through land donations. Chair Chellman asked how the project might change other than going up in the number of units if the land transfer was successful. Mr. Hansen said they would be allowed up to 360 units but the lot wasn't big enough to handle that, so it would be about 274 units. Chair Chellman asked if the applicant had the scoping discussion about traffic with TAC. Mr. Hansen said they had not. Chair Chellman asked about intersections, and Mr. Hansen explained where they would be. Mr. Samonas suggested wayfinding signs and directionals for the off-site traffic in back of Congress Way exiting to Woodbury Avenue for deliveries and so on. Vice-Chair Coviello said he would like to see building aesthetics and elevations when the applicant returned and the locations of the entrances and the public access if there was overflow parking. It was further discussed. Chair

Chellman said a site walk would be important due to the grade and other issues. Mr. Bowen asked if the project would grow into more similar projects in that area. Mr. Hansen said there would likely be another development. Chair Chellman asked if test pit studies had been done along the slope and if there was any ledge. Mr. Hansen said they used some borings and would probably have to do a lot of grading. It was further discussed.

Chair Chellman opened the public hearing.

SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Rich DiPentima of 16 Dunlin Way said his main concern was safety. He said there were 18 homes and 329 apartments on Dunlin Way, Osprey Drive, and Blue Heron Drive behind the development, and traffic from 270 new units would create a safety hazard for more than 400 residents and many children who played on the streets. He said a barrier must be placed at the end of Building C after the last house on Dunlin Way. He handed a signed petition to the Board.

Second Round Speakers

Rich DiPentima said there were risks from having that many cars traveling through a densely populated residential neighborhood where many children play. He said he and his neighbors supported the project but wanted to protect the lives of the residents and felt that it was the major public safety issue that must be addressed.

Third Round Speakers

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

DISCUSSION OF THE BOARD

[Timestamp 56:00] Mr. Almeida asked if it was reasonable to request a site safety plan on how the applicant might come up with ideas to address things unique to the site and a plan that spoke to neighborhood safety in terms of traffic. He said it could address crosswalk locations, lighting, sidewalks, and so on. Chair Chellman said the requirements of the traffic study could be augmented to include the impact on the neighborhood, vehicular circulation, and so on, and the professionals doing the study could consider that as part of their scope. He said the gate would be important to include in the GSP system for delivery drivers. It was further discussed. Mr. Almeida said he wanted all those things made evident so that it was clear to the residents and that he would need to see that information in future stages of the project. Councilor Moreau said she liked the idea of the applicant increasing the scope of their traffic study as far as the bus stop. She said the Board could also request that the development end up on Portsmouth Boulevard so that it had that address and that a dead end could be created on Dunlin Way before getting to Portsmouth Boulevard. Ms. Conard said she thought the applicant would be amenable and that they City would make sure that all the hurdles were cleared with the Fire Department and so on. Councilor Moreau said the site visit could be done after the additional items were shown to the Board. Mr. Samonas said those issues would be remedied through the TAC process, and the

intent was public safety and preserving the established communities. Vice-Chair Coviello said the gate would make a lot of the issues go away. It was further discussed.

DECISION OF THE BOARD

Ms. Conard moved that the Board find that the design review process is complete. Mr. Samonas seconded. The motion passed with all in favor.

III. DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION

A. 0 Dunlin Way

DECISION OF THE BOARD

See above.

IV. CITY COUNCIL REFERRALS

A. Petition to Layout a New Public Highway – Coakley Road Extension

SPEAKING TO THE PETITION

[Timestamp 8:30] City Engineer Eric Eby via Zoom was present. He reviewed the connector road layout, noting that they would remove the signal on the bypass at the Coakley Road and Cottage Street intersection and allow access into the neighborhood when the bridge was constructed. He said they would provide street parking on the connector road and that the few spaces on Coakley Road would have a sidewalk built along the new roadway so that residents would have direct access to the multipaths along Borthwick Avenue. He said two new driveways would be constructed into the Fairfield Inn and one new driveway into the Granite Group. He said about 6,000 square feet was needed from each site to build the roadway as well as temporary construction easements and that the project would have to come back for a Wetlands Conditional Use Permit. He said easements were also needed due to construction on each site to build the new driveway, reconfigure the parking spaces, and tie in the new sidewalks. He said there would be temporary easements and that only the right-of-way for the roadway would be permanent. He reviewed the Next Steps diagram. He said all the landowners were aware of the project and that the applicant would meet with them.

[Timestamp 12:48] Councilor Moreau asked what the overall time line would be. Mr. Eby said the current project would last until next year and a street bridge would be built in 2028. He said the Coakley Road culvert would be done in 2027 and the signal removal on the overpass would be the last step and was scheduled for 2031 but could be done sooner. Vice-Chair Coviello asked whether a process would be in place if the work got done sooner so that the lights could be bagged. Mr. Eby said the signal and building the median would be done at the same time. Vice-Chair Coviello asked if the two main landowners were in favor of the project. Mr. Eby said they were in agreement so far. Mr. Roy asked if there were any data sets or statistics showing the traffic changes or the current traffic standing data for that intersection and what was proposed to

be improved. Mr. Eby said as part of the Western Yards approval process, a traffic study was conducted and they looked at the alternative if the proposed project was put into place. He said they analyzed it and that the City would be part of that study to accommodate the shift in the traffic as far as the left turns are concerned. Mr. Bowen asked if the arrangement of traffic had an implication for what would be seen for the Podium property in the future. Mr. Eby said Podium was aware of the project and would look at an alternative if the signal went away.

DECISION OF THE BOARD

Vice-Chair Coviello moved that to recommend that the City Council acquire legal rights over privately owned land to complete the connector road between Coakley Road and Borthwick Avenue. Mr. Almeida seconded. The motion passed with all in favor.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

- A. 1035 Lafayette Rd** – Requesting 1-Year extensions to the Site Plan Review, and Development Site, Density Bonus and Off-Street Parking Conditional Use approvals that were granted on August 15, 2024. (LU-24-92) [Timestamp 2:16:24]

Vice-Chair Coviello moved that the Board grant a one-year extension of the approvals granted on August 15, 2024 to August 15, 2025. Ms. Conard seconded. The motion passed with all in favor.

- B. 806 US RT 1 Bypass** – Requesting 1-Year extensions to the Site Plan, which was granted a second extension on June 20, 2024, and the amended Site Plan approval granted on the same date. (LU-22-81)

Mr. Almeida moved that the Board grant a one-year extension of the site plan approval to June 23, 2026. Ms. Conard seconded. The motion passed with all in favor.

C. Chairman Updates and Discussion Items

Chair Chellman said the Board would see several zoning amendments soon, including one that directly affects the co-living application. He said the way the building footprint was defined in the ordinance was a problem for downtown buildings that touch each other. He referred to the topic that came up during the 224 Cate Street petition with regard to after-the-fact applications and said there seemed to be two types: one was inadvertent and the other was an “I don’t care” type. He said the second one is a zoning violation and that the applicant was subject to a per diem fine by State law. He said he would like the Board to discuss it with the City’s Legal Department and City Staff to see if the Board could make a recommendation for how to address it. Vice-Chair Coviello said he was in support and suggested that the fines collected should be tied to some sort of environmental effort. It was further discussed.

Chair Chellman said the Master Plan process had begun and there would be a work session with the Planning Board and the consultant soon.

D. Board Discussion of Regulatory Amendments and Other Matters

There was no discussion.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 9:23 p.m.

Submitted,

Joann Breault
Planning Board Meeting Minutes Taker