



Haverhill

Economic Development and Planning
Phone: 978-374-2330

AUG 19 AM 10:04
HAVCITYCLERK

CITY OF HAVERHILL PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

July 8, 2026 – 7:00 PM
City Hall, City Council Chambers, Room 202

Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 PM by Acting Chairman Nate Robertson.

Roll Call:

Present were; Members Mike Morales, April DerBoghossian, Freddy Perez, Nate Robertson and Ismael Matías. Also present were Planning Director Jacki Byerley and Head Clerk Samatha Lamberti

Conduct of Hearing:

The Board read the standard conduct of hearing procedures into the record.

Public Hearing:

Approval of Minutes:

On a motion by Member Robertson, seconded by Member DerBoghossian, the Board voted to approve June 10, 2026, meeting minutes. Vote: (5-0)

Amend Chater 255 Zoning Ordinance and Zoning Map: Attorney Russell Channen introduced himself and his client Ronald Mailloux and his company Pentucket North Development, Will Schkuta from Morin-Cameron Group, Inc who is the engineer also Scott Brown the Architect and Michael Joy and Robert DiBurro who are members of Coldwell's Banker and the marketing team. They are looking to take a portion of the Cedardale property which is currently zoned Commercial Highway and rezone it into a Planned Development District. As the Planned Development District allows for some flexibility because it does not require minimum lot size. The project is on Boston Rd. off I Street. Attorney Channen said this small subdivision will allow for 14 units, 6 duplexes, and 2 single units which will be sold and won't be rental units. It will fit in nicely with the area. The needs will clearly be met because of the dire need for housing in the area. We don't believe there will be any environmental impact due to the location of the property which is about rte. 125. He mentioned the utilities water and

sewer are set up and Will Schkuta will verify that as well. The proper flows and studies will be done. He mentioned a traffic study to be done as was mentioned in the Development Review. He says it's not completed yet but hopes by the August 12 meeting will have the information to you by then. He would like members of the team to come up and say a few things, starting with Mr. Mailloux.

Ronald Mailloux from 12 Ruby Circle in Bradford, he is the president of Pentucket Development North, stood up and introduced himself, his son and son in law. Mr. Mailloux says that they are proposing 14-unit upscale condo development project off I Street in the Bradford section of Haverhill. The property is currently owned by Cedardale Health Club. The 2-acre parcel originally zoned as residential was converted to commercial highway back in the early 90's. Cedardale has no plans to expand to the parcel and chose to sell a portion of the property. The applicant stated that the proposal seeks to return the property's zoning classification to residential and develop homes that are compatible with, or exceed, the value and character of the surrounding neighborhood. The applicant described his background as a local contractor with longstanding ties to Haverhill and Bradford and stated that his projects are intended to positively impact the community. He also referenced his experience in residential and commercial construction, involvement in the reconstruction of Cedarvale Health & Fitness following the 2017 fire, and participation in local civic organizations and community improvement projects. The applicant noted that a professional project team has been assembled to assist with the development review process.

The applicant's project engineer described the proposed subdivision of the approximately two-acre parcel and the planned residential development. He reviewed the existing site conditions, noting that much of the rear of the property is already cleared and that minimal tree removal is anticipated. He explained that the development includes a turnaround for emergency vehicles, three parking spaces per unit, underground stormwater management facilities designed to meet state and local regulations, and connections to existing water, sewer, and underground electrical utilities.

The project architect then presented the proposed building design, stating that the development consists of two single-family homes and eight townhouse units. He described the units as being approximately 1,800 square feet with three bedrooms, including a flexible first-floor room that could serve as a bedroom or other living space. Each unit includes a garage, an open-concept second floor living area, a rear deck with stairs to the backyard, and a gambrel-style roof. Color renderings of the proposed buildings were presented to the Board.

Planning Director Byerley made a comment about the requirements within the zoning ordinance that they must draft the new zoning ordinance.

Member Robertson opened questions from the Board. Member Moraes said that he would like to hear from the reality development team. Member Morales said he'd like to see how they are going to be marketed in terms of what market rates will be had for that neighborhood and if there would be an affordable unit as well.

Member Perez had the same question as Member Morales weather or not there will be affordable units as well, He continued with who is your targeted market, what are the questions? Attorney

Channen said he'd let the real-estate experts talk about that. He is aware that the City Council may request affordable housing, but as of now it hasn't been brought up.

The applicant's representative discussed the proposed market for the development, stating that the units are intended to appeal to active couples and first-time homebuyers rather than larger families due to their layout. In response to Board questions, the applicant stated that the number of units was based on the size and constraints of the site. The applicant also explained that the townhouse driveways are spaced approximately 10 feet apart and that each unit includes two driveway parking spaces in addition to a garage.

Member Perez asked how they determined the number of units, Mr. Joy said that would be a question for Mr. Mailloux but it's probably because of the limited space, there is a little over 2 acres.

Member Perez asked how close the driveways would be as they look fairly close on the plan. Mr. Joy said that in the condo units they would be close to each other.

Mr. Brown said that they wanted a variety of options as well. There is about 10 feet between the driveway themselves. Parking they have 2 spots and option to park in the garage as well.

Mr. Joy said the average house goes for around 700k and condo's go for about 400k.

Member Morales asked if he read the plan correctly that there is only 1 in and out to this place. Yes, but meets fire requirements.

Member Robertson opened comments to the public.

Scott Plume 25 Oxford Ave. spoke about how his parents bought the house he lives in back in 1957. I street was a dirt road and there was no route 125. He says that he can speak for most of the people living on I street that the last thing they want is more traffic. The street is barely big enough for 2 cars, so they are going to be required to widen the street. He also mentioned that the address is 931 Boston Rd. and as far as he can tell it has nothing to do with Boston Rd. He doesn't believe that it will be good for the neighborhood, as they don't know the history of what has been there through the years.

Planning Director Byerley clarified that the address of 931 Boston Rd. was our assessors has the map block and lot.

Douglas Shafford of 33 E Steet. I've been here since 1980. Same piece of property that they were going to put up against a wall of building that would face Route 125. And we'd face the back. We got it knocked down because they were going to make the traffic double. We raised a lot of kids on that street. He mentions another development in Haverhill and he said it fits, it's near the highway, has wide streets. He said that the neighborhood was laid out by the shoe company back in 1892. He doesn't understand adding all those cars to that small street. "I've lived there for 46 years and have to keep going through this and I don't like it, I've served my country like many others did, like my son did."

Carlene Giovanni, I live at 66 I Street I moved in in 2018. She mentioned that the first person who spoke said that we are looking for the needs of the community. And I know there is housing and a dire need for housing, and I believe that we have sufficiently fulfilled it with the James, it's a very large project. It's the perfect location for it too; it's right at 125 and Boston Rd. It works great. And there is another condo development where the old Josephs was on Cross Rd. or Street across from the Irving Duffy area. She suggests that they create themselves for 931 Boston Rd, if there is a way to travel through Cedardale on a little road that they create themselves that would fulfill the needs of the developers that would make more sense. Where I live on I street it's probably the last of the 1980's neighborhoods left in the City of Haverhill. Kids are out playing basketball and whiffle ball. Soccer it's like the world cup going on as it's dead-end. It's one of the last neighborhoods that I am in, and I know there are other parents that want their kids to play and be a safe spot. It's not going to be safe with construction vehicles going up and down a very narrow street. I don't think it will be a good fit for our neighborhood, if there is a way to figure it out through Cedardale. I think that just because Cedardale didn't utilize the property when they built the pool and such, that the residents of I street shouldn't get penalized that they must have access to it.

Loranna Bobby Day, I live on I Street in Bradford, MA and I'll be repeating some of the points the others have already mentioned. I'm here to speak on the opposition of 931 Boston Rd. project. I have been a resident of Bradford for 28 years. The property for this proposed project is right out my front door. She mentioned the other projects that will have substantial homes. Oxford crossing 6 stories with 230 units with a 2.5 retail building. She says it's too much for our neighborhood. The Beck 290 units at the Bradford railroad. The Haverhill factory district with the 5-acre site with 395 units and 790 parking units. She says that we are a small intimate neighborhood with families with small children where we currently feel safety living on a dead end. She said the only route the project is through I street She said that making access from behind the street makes better sense. She had a question about trash pickup. She is concerned about the amount of traffic. She asked I assume you have plenty of parking, but what If they have a party or more people in that family. Where are they all going to park? I street? You can barely fit there now. The mail doesn't even come down the street.

Matthew Day, I live at 72 I Street. He listed the same projects that are going on now. There are no sidewalks on this road. He said the one thing that he is most against is direct access to this plot which is on I street directly in front of my house. Having access to a small residential street is not ideal. I believe it will be very problematic. Everything I was going to say has already been touched on before. I do have 1 question, mail service as my mom mentioned we don't have mailboxes they are out at the end of I street, are they going to re-route the mail, so they get mail delivery or are we getting more mailboxes at the end of I street? My biggest thing is the traffic.

Ethan Mahoney 59 I street, just moved in back in May. His fiancé's family has lived there since the 60's. He said that he has a couple of questions, state my opinions that may be a little more general, my first question is what type of families do you want in your Haverhill communities? We plan on having kids. We are signing a 30-year mortgage, so essentially, we'll be here for 30 or more years. We want to raise kids just like everyone on this street has. One of the main concerns about this project is the traffic, but what I'm thinking of is what type of people will it bring to the neighborhood. He believes that the way the houses are laid out is not going to attract

families. If you have 2 kids, you'll be sleeping on the first floor. A whole floor away from your kids. I don't think people are going to see the desirability about that. I think that this is just an attempt to fit as many houses as possible into possible in a small plot of land. He says the concerning thing is that he believes that you'll have a lot of people moving in and then moving out in a few years. You won't have people that aren't going to contribute to the community. You'll have a lot of turn around. They aren't going to be staying; they aren't going to be members of Haverhill like everyone here. He mentioned around what his house was for and what the units would go for, between 400k-700k. To him that is not a range and probably will end up on the higher side. That is not desirable for entry level. He also mentioned the square space is not desirable for entry level. He believes the design and the setup of the roads are also not desirable for entry level families. There is a housing crisis going on and this is not a solution to the housing crisis.

He feels this is just a quick attempt to grab cash from a community that has clearly shown up and spoken their opinions. I'll see you all on August 12th.

Cynthia Deroche, I live at 45 I Street, I've lived on I Street since 1974. She saw the property across the street from her get developed. A single lot turned into a family home. She mentioned the same developments going up over Haverhill. She said that I Street currently has 15 residents on over 5 acres of land and the new proposal would be 14 homes on just over 2 acres. She said I street doesn't have drainage to handle the runoff. In short, she does not support the granting of the special permit. She also doesn't support a project that violates the CH zone.

Member Robertson asked if there was anyone who was in support of the project. There were none.

Ed Wilkins, I live at 30 I Street. He mentioned that there are 13 homes and 24 cars. The street isn't wide enough. Also, there is no water drainage on it at all. The only drainage we have is our yards. My house at 30 is the lowest on the street therefore I get everyone's drainage. I am concerned about more water. Water seeks the lowest point. Not sure why a traffic study hasn't been done as it will increase our traffic by 150% on that street, a dead-end street where kids play. He doesn't understand why I street is going to be used as an entry way. He is concerned with storm water runoff and winter icing. It's a quiet neighborhood that's mostly built with single family homes. I Street is also in disrepair. There are potholes all over it. I'm concerned about trucks going up and down the road for the next what 7-8 months or 2 years. I don't care if you build it but have the entrance on 125 or Cedardale-, they own the property.

Member Robertson closes the public comments of the hearing and turned the comments over to the Planning Director for comments.

Planning Director Byerley says that the applicant has some additional information they need to submit. Also, when you have the traffic study done have your traffic engineer present so he may answer any questions. Whether there are improvements or access from another street, and to provide any additional information on the storm water, regarding concerns raised about the storm water, along with the information that was needed for the draft ordinance that can also be reviewed. She also reminded the group that this is a 2-part process. The Planning Board and the

Planning Board's function is to make a recommendation to the City Council. The City Council is the one who will issue or not issue the special permit with the rezoning. This is one part in the process. The next process is in front of City Council. Their next meeting is on the August 25th potentially depends on what happens with the Planning Board whether we get the information from the traffic study and everything else if the Board feels satisfied to make a recommendation. If the board is ready, I would suggest making a motion that would include August 12 and potentially September 9th if we don't get all the information for our August 12, meeting.

Member Robertson made motion to continue with this on the August 12th meeting, Member Morales seconded. Motion passed 5-0

Marijuana Social Consumption Establishments Ordinance -

Planning Director Byerley, we had previously opened the hearing and then immediately continued the hearing for the zoning ordinance that was submitted by Haverhill Stem LLC to establish a marijuana social consumption ordinance that the person has since requested to withdraw that, so the board has to vote allow the withdrawal.

Member Robertson clarified that they are voting on the allowing of withdrawal.

Member Perez made motion to allow them to withdraw the proposal.

Member DerBoghossian, seconded. Motion passed 5-0.

Site Plan Review Dover Use

Jony Perez stood up and introduced himself. They are proposing to redevelop the existing building that is already there on the lot. The building has been empty for a while. The top 3 floors haven't been used since the 1950's. The bottom floor had a dentist, and he stopped operating last summer. We are planning on installing a day care on the first 2 floors. I have been running day care for over 20 years now. I opened two in Lawrence. They have been successful, there is a waiting list of children, we are hoping to bring that level of quality to Downtown Haverhill. We are planning on building 12 apartment units on the top 3 floors. It will be loft style. Some of the issues that have come up are traffic and parking. Those have been our biggest issues. In terms of parking, we have been working with Laz, they manage the car park down the street. We are working on a contract with them; we haven't finalized anything as we don't have any dates, we are still in the process. So, parking we feel that it has been addressed. In terms of traffic, we hired a engineering company and they should be starting anytime to do a traffic analysis. Last month we had an issue with vandalism, the police just called it in and once we can work on the building that would minimize that. There will be workers going in and out. I do have a security system there now, but that doesn't stop the vandalizing. So, what they are looking for is the Planning Board to allow them to work on the building and make it beautiful.

Planning Board Director Byerley said that we don't have the say on when you can start work, that's the building dept. And there were some concerns, myself and the police regarding your parking plan and drop-off plan and as yet we haven't received any information answering those concerns. Just for the Boards information I'm going to suggest we continue this to our September meeting to allow them time to put in the traffic review and for our police to review the traffic report.

Member Perez said he knows the area, used to run a business across the street. I know the dentist.

Jony Perez said at the back of the building they would have a playground for kids and 6 parking spots for drop-offs.

Member Perez said I agree with my fellow board members, there is a lot going on there or downtown Haverhill. I was down there for 20 years, we always had an issue with parking and traffic, I'm interested in seeing the report to figure out the parking.

Jony Perez said that they are leasing the parking lot.

Planning Director Byerley asked how many parking spots they had. He said right now we have 15 but we are going to need the traffic study done, I'll need 12 for the apartments, the day care is something they will tell us.

Member Robertson asked if there were any more questions from the board.

Member Robertson made a motion on recommending that we move this project forward to be reviewed by City Council.

Member Morales, disagreed with Member Robertson decision to make a motion, saying like the Planning Director recommendation on waiting for the traffic report conducted prior to making a recommendation to City Council

Member Morales denies the plan review at this time pending a traffic study in favor of the planning director and police department accordingly.

Member Perez seconded.

Jony Perez says they are working with the City Council to get the apartments approved.

Member DerBoghosian made a motion to continue to our September meeting. Member Matis seconded. Motion passed 5-0

Member Robertson called the next and last case of Crystal Lake Golf Course- 890 North Broadway.

Crystal Lake Golf Course- 890 North Broadway

Erica Cousins with Civil Desing Consultants the goal of this project was to expand the parking lot, and to build a club house and cart barn. Construction will be of a new clubhouse of 4,710 square feet. 5,000 sq foot cart barn and a paved parking with associated utilities and storm water management and improvements. Some background this was originally approved by conservation back in 2009. It's part of a larger golf course and subdivision. What's currently there now are a makeshift pro shop and a gravel parking lot. What we are proposing, the current proposal, represents the next phase of development of the golf course. Currently going through peer review

through conservation.

The architect described the proposed one-story clubhouse, which will include a café with a commercial kitchen, a business office, and three golf simulators. The applicant explained that the project is intended to expand the existing clubhouse amenities, provide additional indoor and outdoor gathering spaces, and encourage year-round use of the facility. The proposed building will include basement storage for café supplies and will feature a New England Cape-style architectural design with double-hung windows and a welcoming main entrance. Construction is anticipated to begin next year.

Escrows:

Michael Anthony Definitive Subdivision – Bond reduction and renewal request.

Planning Director said that there is a bond reduction or Michael Anthony Way to reduce the bond to \$210,383.88 and renew line of credit with Salem cooperative bank that is to expire on 7/22/2026.

Member Robertson made a motion to move forward with the bond reduction and renewal request, Member Morales seconded. Motion passed 5-0

Adjournment:

On a motion by Member Robertson seconded by Member Morales, the Board voted to adjourn.
Vote: 5-0

The meeting was adjourned.