

**TOWN OF BEDFORD**  
**February 11, 2019**  
**PLANNING BOARD**  
**MINUTES**

A meeting of the Bedford Planning Board was held on Monday, February 11, 2019 at the Bedford Meeting Room, 10 Meetinghouse Road, Bedford, NH. Present were: Jon Levenstein (Chairman), Karen McGinley (Secretary), Chris Bandazian (Town Council), Kelleigh Murphy (Town Council Alternate), Rick Sawyer (Town Manager), Charlie Fairman (Alternate), Matt Sullivan (Alternate), and Becky Hebert (Planning Director)

**I. Call to Order and Roll Call:**

Chairman Levenstein called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Regular members Randy Hawkins and Mac McMahan, Vice Chairman Hal Newberry, Public Works Director Jeff Foote, and Assistant Planning Director Mark Connors were absent. Mr. Fairman and Mr. Sullivan were appointed to vote.

**II. Old Business – Continued Hearings:**

1. HIR Realty LLC c/o Jiten Hotel Group (Owner) – Request to amend a previously approved architectural plan for a proposed 133-unit multi-family residential building at Goffe Mill Plaza, 121 South River Road, Lots 12-32-3, and 12-32-4, Zoned PZ. (Tabled from January 28, 2019)

**III. New Business: None**

**IV. Concept Proposals and Other Business: None**

Ms. Hebert stated the application has been reviewed by staff and the abutters have been notified. This application was accepted by the Board at the January 28<sup>th</sup> meeting and postponed to tonight's agenda. Staff would recommend accepting tonight's agenda and opening the discussion.

**MOTION by Councilor Bandazian to approve the agenda as presented. Ms. McGinley duly seconded the motion. Vote taken – all in favor. Motion carried.**

1. **HIR Realty LLC c/o Jiten Hotel Group (Owner) – Request to amend a previously approved architectural plan for a proposed 133-unit multi-family residential building at Goffe Mill Plaza, 121 South River Road, Lots 12-32-3, and 12-32-4, Zoned PZ. (Tabled from January 28, 2019)**

Nick Griffin and Andrea Hester of Cube 3 were present to address this continued application requesting to amend a previously approved architectural plan on behalf of the applicant that was postponed from the January 28, 2019 Planning Board meeting. Also present were Jeff Kevan of TF Moran, Haley Marsh, owner's representative, and Lee Fronalson.

Mr. Griffin stated we got approved, as Ms. Hebert mentioned, back in December of 2017 and then we showed up here two weeks ago. I apologize it wasn't super clear, we kind of got off and I want to just step back, talk about where we came from, how we got here and just look at what we have changed and what we are looking to improve.

Mr. Griffin stated from the development from last January, we started to document the building, we made a few small changes on the way, but the big thing is that we decided to relook at the architecture knowing that with this new architecture that we go from the surrounding Market & Main, the Bedford Mall side and up front. So we realized that we are one small part of this very large redevelopment complex in Bedford and we wanted to make sure that we both fit in with what exists and what is to come.

Mr. Griffin continued posted on the board here is what we can reference at any point. Again, you can see our building up in the top left corner that is situated between the existing Whole Foods, the proposed Market & Main and the existing Bedford Mall with the retail up front. In looking at the new architecture, this is somewhat up to date. Mr. Kevan was able to get us these views of Market & Main; there is a lot of contemporary materials, cool materials, with warm accents through all the different buildings along there. This is one of the ones that is closer, the main larger building, again, cool, horizontal materials with these warm vertical accents, a lot of glass at main entries, again, I know it is a commercial building but this is some of the stuff that we had looked at and decided to relook at our building to make sure it worked with the architecture. But we also know that the existing architecture we need to maintain what is here and we need to reflect to that as well.

Mr. Griffin stated posted now is showing the existing Whole Foods and other residential there with the residential and retail up front of our building. Again, as far as the main, I think what we wanted to do is change the colors but the small things just to go over how we got there and what we did other than the colors is we did tighten up the footprint just a little bit, and in the diagram you can see the red is the old footprint and the black is our new footprint. The main leg has come in about 20 feet and the other short leg has straightened out a bit. This was just a very small modification. This just gives you an idea of when we are looking kind of side-by-side at the elevations of why things look a little bit different in a sense of the overall length amounts of ins and outs.

Mr. Griffin stated a couple of things that came up last time that I want to just talk through is the amount of windows and the glazing. Here are the two facades; above is our proposed façade and the bottom is the approved. This is just the south portion that is facing the creek, so, again, just to kind of pare the colors away to just see the windows. This kind of gives a diagram of just the glazing along this façade. And for this portion we have in the proposed there is 162 openings,

and how we calculated that was we took each individual single-hung window, so, again, if we have a triple window, that is three, just to be clear, and then sliders we counted as one. This has 162 openings between the windows, the sliders and then a couple things of the storefront and an entry door to the amenity space in the bottom left corner. Then the approved one had just a few more of 178 openings, and, again, you can see there is more storefront on the bottom left corner and so the total of the building in the same calculation we are proposing 582 and we had approved 590, so there is slightly less. They are distributed differently as you can see. One of the main issues in the proposed we had at the balconies an additional window so there was a lot of glazing in a very small area, and then at the base of the building and the towers it was more spread out, where now it is a little bit more evenly distributed. Posted is just kind of an example comparison on how the openings have changed and kind of the big reason is there are less balconies and less amenity big storefront so that is kind where that number had come from. A lot of them have been replaced by windows but the overall eight or so different openings.

Mr. Griffin continued the other important issue that came up was the mechanical screening so we wanted to just touch base on it. It is in all the views we look at, both in the elevation and the perspective views, so not being able to see it from those views gives you an idea of how it is being screened. Posted now is just a 2-D representation to look at, and this posted on the screen doesn't look great, but this is just to show with the screening how far you have to be on a level ground, understanding that everything is not level, of how far you would have to get away before you could start to see these mechanicals pop up above the parapet on the roof. From the approved version to this version the overall main height of the building has remained the same but the lower parapet we raised 6 inches in order to increase that distance that you would have to see to enhance the screening. So before on the 4-story portion on the top it was about 300 feet, now we've moved it back to 350; on the 5-story portion it was about 380 and we have moved it to 445 increasing that height a little bit, so it just brings up the screening there to hide that mechanical. Now I will pass it onto Ms. Hester to walk through elevation by elevation. We will start with what we are proposing now and the approved down below and kind of walk through the main changes.

Ms. Hester stated posted is the south elevation with our proposed on the top and the approved on the bottom. They are very similar as you can see. You will notice our new elevation because we shortened the footprint, the building length is a little shorter, but we have the stone veneer at the base, which was the original approved material, so we have kept that. The yellow lap siding has changed to the light gray lap siding, we have changed the white siding where we have the balconies to a light brown to bring warmth to the building and we still have the tower elements. Previously they were sort of a dark gray and we thought that was a little dark so we changed those to white panel to sort of lighten the building and bring a little brightness to it. We still have the accent panels adjacent to the windows and those are also white and we thought bringing that white helped kind of lighten the buildings as well, and we have lightened the window frames, those are white as well, so that the building didn't appear as dark. These elevations are very similar, we changed on the left side, the very end, where there was concern that maybe it was too dark, we have changed that to the light brown, so we have brought panel to various portions of the building to kind of add that warmth.

Ms. Hester continued on the east elevation, again, very similar elevations with just those minor color changes, the yellow to a light gray, the white to the light brown, and we removed the balconies from the end elevations. We felt once we worked on the unit configuration they had views to the garage and to the back side of the Bedford Mall, so we removed those. We added some more white trim bands across the building, but, again, very similar really just color changes. As Mr. Griffin described earlier, we thought the light brown added the warmth to the building to kind of relate to the existing context and the grays kind of help us blend in with the Market & Main complex next door.

Ms. Hester stated with the north elevation you see posted we have kept the stone at the base, again, on the same areas, so we have the same approved stone, and again there not many changes just adding the light brown onto the end of the building to bring in the warmth and so just keeping all your comments in mind and trying to have the white and the light gray to just lighten the colors of the buildings.

Ms. Hester stated and now lastly the west elevation that is posted. Here you have the building entry in the center with the light brown and we wrapped the light brown panel at the right end of the building as well. We still have the stone base, we added the white trim bands so, again, very similar to what was approved.

Ms. Hester continued here we are looking on the top what we are proposing now versus what was presented a couple of weeks ago, and we wanted to address your concerns that the building looked too dark, that we had gotten rid of some of the stone, and weren't necessarily paying attention to the existing context, so you will see the difference that what we are proposing now is much lighter. We have removed the 2-tone brick at the base, which appeared very dark and heavy, and we have brought the stone veneer back to the base of our building. We have lightened up the dark gray to a light gray, again, so that the building didn't appear as dark and the light gray towers are now a white tower, which helped brighten up the building. We changed our window frames to white window frames to just help with the overall lightness of the building. Here on the east elevation we have added stone to the base of the building similar to what was previously approved, so in just keeping with the rhythm we now have the stone base across the majority of the building with the light gray lap siding above. The accent panels next to the windows are, again, white versus previously they were a light gray, so we feel as though we listened to your concerns last week and we looked at everything and we feel as though this is a much better design that fits in with the existing context but also compliments the new Market & Main design next door. Mr. Griffin stated and on this end too we had the full kind of dark gray along this whole end facing Market & Main and we kind of brought half of that warm brown and the light gray to help break that up. Ms. Hester stated and with the north elevation, again, on the left side we have gotten rid of that dark gray panel and lightened it up to bring more warmth to the building and with the light panel on the left side. Ms. Hester stated so overall the building just feels lighter and has more of a brightness to it with the warm color pallet. Now with the west elevation, again, overall just to lighten the building, the right side at the end we have swapped that out to a light brown panel as well to add more warmth. Mr. Griffin stated and we brought the stone back at the base.

Ms. Hester stated on the boards now here is just taking a look at what we are proposing, again, just so you can see them on one board, our proposed elevations, and then the north and the west. The building views, just so you can see the previously approved view from the Whole Foods deck with the previous scheme, and now our proposed view from the Whole Foods deck, and we feel that this is warmer, it has more of the light brown to bring warmth in and relate to Market & Main as well as the existing context. Again, the previous view from the pedestrian walkway and the proposed view. Then the previous view from the Bedford Mall parking and the proposed view. Mr. Griffin stated and we do still have that roof deck area. It is just tucked back because that fifth floor pushed back a little so you can't see in this particular view but there is still a trellis and deck up there. Ms. Hester stated now posted is the previous view from Route 3 and the proposed view. We changed this outside corner to the light brown panel because there were concerns that maybe the white was too bright against the Starbucks. With our building materials we have a board here on the left. I am just highlighting the materials we are using. The fiber cement panel, we have white and then the light brown as well as the light gray lap siding and then the stone veneer at the base of the building. Mr. Griffin stated I do have a larger sample of the stone that I can pass around.

Chairman Levenstein asked for any questions from the Board.

Mr. Fairman stated two weeks ago you stated you weren't going to be doing the restaurant at this time. What are you going to do with that land? Are you going to landscape it or pave it or is it not going to be that long a time before it is developed? Mr. Kevan responded right now it would just remain. It is now stabilized, it is loamed and seeded, so that front area would just remain in that condition at this point in time. The path has been put in but that area would be left. We don't know how quickly that will be developed. Mr. Fairman stated we wouldn't want it to be just overgrown and not maintained for very long. If it is going to be a long period of time, I would think we would want to make sure it is landscaped. Mr. Kevan responded the owner will take care of it to make sure it doesn't become overgrown and what have you. Mr. Fairman stated thank you.

Ms. McGinley stated with regard to the mechanicals that are on the roof; there is a lot going on in that area and I am not expecting that it won't be seen by the people on the top of the parking garage, but the buildings that are in front of it closer to South River Road, so do you have any idea about when mechanicals can be seen. Mr. Griffin replied yes. We have them in the model here and they are visual from here, this is just ahead of Route 3, so on that 4-story version it was the 350 feet, which puts us just out past Route 3, so from that retail you shouldn't see the mechanicals. Ms. McGinley stated I don't really expect that people driving down South River Road would look over and be bothered by it. I was thinking if it is the land closer to the building. Mr. Griffin responded as you get closer to the building within this walking path it won't be viewed. Ms. McGinley stated thank you.

Town Manager Sawyer stated something that I guess I didn't really see before if you can go to one of the elevations, I guess it is the banding. When you look at the elevations, you don't really see the bands going across from window to window to window. I am not sure what the right term is for that, but in the perspectives they do jump out at you and I guess I kind of like the spacing where the windows are in a bigger wall section but when you get the bands, it seemed a

little more distracting to me. If we look at this same elevation in one of the perspectives, you see the bands. I don't know how strongly they would be in reality, how thick that band is. You see it in the more blown up section. Mr. Griffin responded we would plan on it being the same color, at least initially, as the siding. I know we didn't have it everywhere in the approved and part of the decision was to add more trim or make more prominence, so we could look at potentially making it a different color if you wanted it to pop but we felt like a good texture to keep it about the same color as the siding. Town Manager Sawyer stated please go to one of the perspectives to look at this again. You see the bands dramatically there but you don't really see them in the section drawing and for whatever reason, I seem to like the section drawing where it is more of a full wall segment versus the banding of each story. That may just be me personally and those don't seem to be the same color as the siding, they seem to be contrasting. Mr. Griffin responded it is tough with the rendering because there are lines in there so it feels darker and on the elevations we have the elevation marker so it does get in the way. Town Manager Sawyer stated right. I think initially I was thinking some of those were just the stationing of the elevation drawing. It is not really a question; it is just that I noticed it a lot more in the perspective. On the screen in the blown up sections you certainly see the bands there but I guess I am thinking I like it better without the bands. Ms. Hebert stated I noticed it really prominently and because it was darker on your previous design with the darker gray, there seemed to be more of a horizontal banding across the whole façade. It may just be the way that is reading. Mr. Griffin responded right, we didn't increase or decrease it from the previous version. We increased it since the approval, again, just based on that request to add more prominent trim in the decision.

Mr. Sullivan stated I was just going to say that driving north from Boston recently there is an apartment complex in the Assembly Row area that had the same color scheme as what you had presented a few weeks ago, and while it works in that rather austere environment, it wasn't a good fit here, whereas what you have done for this presentation is much better. Mr. Griffin responded thank you.

Ms. McGinley asked can you describe again the size of the units and the spread of the different size units that is planned? It has been a while since we have talked about that. Ms. Marsh responded there is 133 units with 8 studios of approximately 500 square feet, 83 1-bedroom units of approximately 750 square feet, and there are 40 2-bedroom units of approximately 1,050 square feet. Ms. McGinley stated thank you. Mr. Fairman asked that hasn't changed since the approval? Mr. Griffin responded that is correct; that is unchanged.

Chairman Levenstein asked for any comments or questions from the audience. There were none.

**MOTION by Ms. McGinley that the Planning Board grant architectural approval of the revised building design for the construction of a 133 unit apartment building, HIR Realty, LLC c/o Jiten Hotel Management (Owner/Applicant), 121 South River Road, Lot 12-32-1, 2 & 3, Zoned PZ as shown on plans by Cube 3 Studio Architects dated February 6, 2019, with the following precedent conditions to be fulfilled within one year and prior to plan signature, and the remaining conditions of approval to be fulfilled as noted:**

- 1. All conditions of the October 6, 2014 and November 20, 2017 approval shall remain in full effect.**

**Mr. Fairman duly seconded the motion. Vote taken - all in favor. Motion carried.**

**V. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meetings:**

Amendment: Change the date in the title box to January 28, 2019 from January 28, 2018.

**MOTION by Town Manager Sawyer to approve the minutes of the January 28, 2019 Planning Board meeting as amended. Councilor Bandazian duly seconded the motion. Vote taken – all in favor. Motion carried.**

**VI. Communications to the Board:**

Ms. Hebert stated a reminder that the design review application for the Bow Lane apartment building will be on your next agenda for February 25<sup>th</sup> and that meeting will be held here.

**VII. Reports of Committees: None**

**VIII. Adjournment:**

**MOTION by Town Manager Sawyer to adjourn at 7:30p.m. Ms. McGinley duly seconded the motion. Vote taken – all in favor. Motion carried.**

Respectfully submitted by  
Valerie J. Emmons