

**TOWN OF BEDFORD**  
**March 9, 2020**  
**PLANNING BOARD**  
**MINUTES**

A meeting of the Bedford Planning Board was held on Monday, March 9, 2020 at the Bedford Meeting Room, 10 Meetinghouse Road, Bedford, NH. Present were: Hal Newberry (Acting Chairman), Chris Bandazian (Town Council), Rick Sawyer (Town Manager), Randy Hawkins, Mac McMahon, Kelleigh Murphy, Charlie Fairman (Alternate), Becky Hebert (Planning Director), and Mark Connors (Assistant Planning Director)

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

Acting Chairman Newberry called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Jon Levenstein (Chairman), Karen McGinley (Secretary), Town Council alternate Phil Greazzo, Public Works Director Jeff Foote, and alternate members Matt Sullivan and Priscilla Malcolm were absent. Mr. Fairman was appointed to vote.

**II. Old Business & Continued Hearings: None**

**III. New Business:**

1. **Manchester Country Club (Applicant), Manchester Associates, Inc. (Owners) –** Request for approval of a site plan amendment to allow changes to the plan for office, maintenance and warehouse facilities along Patten Road for the Manchester Country Club, Lot 22-52, Zoned CI.

**IV. Concept Proposals and Other Business:**

**2. Bedford Master Plan Discussion**

Mr. Connors stated the application for the Manchester Country Club has been reviewed by staff, and staff would recommend that the Planning Board find the application to be complete. The abutters have been notified, and it is the opinion of staff that the application does not pose a regional impact. Staff would recommend that the Planning Board accept the agenda, and in so doing, adopt the staff recommendation that the application is complete.

**MOTION by Ms. Murphy to accept the agenda as read. Councilor Bandazian duly seconded the motion. Vote taken – all in favor. Motion carried.**

**1. Manchester Country Club (Applicant), Manchester Associates, Inc. (Owners) – Request for approval of a site plan amendment to allow changes to the plan for office, maintenance and warehouse facilities along Patten Road for the Manchester Country Club, Lot 22-52, Zoned CI.**

Nick Golon, licensed engineer with TF Moran, and Tony Nazaka of Stone River Architects were present to address this site plan amendment on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. Golon stated we were before this Board previously in regard to improvements at Manchester Country Club for their turf care facility renovation. Unfortunately, as part of the bid process, bids came back beyond the scope of the project. We had to go back to the drawing board to come up with some revisions relative to the design of the site, design of buildings, to put it more in a consistent framework for what the budgetary constraints are. As was read in the opening relative to the project as identified in the staff memo, instead of two buildings we are now proposing one, really consolidating the efforts. Mr. Nazaka can speak about the building and I will fill in the details as to the site.

Mr. Nazaka stated we are consolidating the previous two buildings into one. I don't know if there is anybody new who hasn't seen the previous design but I have that if you want to see it. Previously the shed indicated on the screen that exists was actually being demolished and we were putting a new building here. This existing cold storage in the background of our new building was getting added to, that was to be the mechanics bay, this area was going to be the office, locker rooms, and fertilizer storage and through budgetary constraints consolidating really all into one building. The aesthetics that we were using prior are roughly the same. We are using metal panel exterior, standing seam metal roof; what we really tried to do is fit within what Planning would like to see architecturally is different forms of massing, materials, things of that nature. Some of the biggest changes is that this building indicated is roughly the same size as the building that was to go here. Obviously it is positioned different on the site, that was to utilize parking as much as we could to keep away from this shed, that is to remain. I think this is actually a nicer building than we were proposing before; that is just my opinion. This building will now sort of block this existing cold storage. It will be more of a presence in the site as one passes by. That is the long and short of it; just different metal panels, we are using the same storefront style windows, rubbed bronze color, standard overhead doors, lighting above the doors, so there is not a whole heck of a lot to it. One of the biggest things is that it is actually a tad taller than before and that is mainly because we are utilizing some attic space for a mechanical room. I want to say it is 7 feet taller than the highest point of the previous building. Ms. Hebert stated the Board does have color copies of this image in your packet. Mr. Golon stated given the building was really the focal point of this effort, we thought it would be important to start with that and then we will kind of backup and to talk a little bit about some of the site aspects.

Mr. Golon stated we went from 22 parking spaces to really what they foresee as being their minimum, which is 18, and that accommodates their summer peak number of employees. We will take a look at that and then dance around the site plan so we know where all of the components are. Looking at our overall site layout, we can see how the building is orientated on the property, really parallel to the property line, with the massing of the parking located close to Patten Road. You will notice one thing that is a little bit different here than our last site plan is

that we have a 60-foot island as you enter, versus a 20-foot, and that is because of one of our utility changes. We are no longer extending municipal sewer, it will be an onsite septic, and that provides an opportune location being close to the building, while still meeting all of their required State and Town setbacks. There also will be a water well that is placed on the site versus extending the municipal service. That will be located in the back corner as shown, and, again, a lot of these changes had to do with the financial obligations and trying to provide a more cost effective product.

Mr. Golon continued again, we have our 18 parking spaces, we have our accessible space located directly in front of the office and mechanical bay, an additional five spaces as the overflow that is required during summer peak adjacent to the existing shed building. As part of the design plans that are before you, the landscape design, and I understand there is a requested edit, which we are happy to entertain if that is something that the Board would like to see. Looking at the landscape plan, we had originally proposed on this to provide a mesh screening along the existing chain link fence and provide a variety of plantings, more low growing shrub type groundcovers, behind the fence. We planned that for a couple of reasons and one reason is that we wanted to maintain the existing fence so that we don't end up with two fences. Ms. Hebert aptly pointed out or we could just remove a portion of the chain link fence and provide what she is proposing in that being a wood stockade fence and then it would also be more ideal to provide the plantings in front of the wood stockade fence versus behind the existing chain link fence. A lot of this is driven relative to the cost, trying to maintain them being that we have redesigned the project, but it is understood relative to the requirements that Bedford has for screening, and if it is desirable to go with the wood stockade fence and that is the determination of the Board, then so be it.

Mr. Golon stated all of the other components that we discussed last time we were here are the same. This is a great improvement for the facility overall. If you have any questions, we would be happy to answer them. A color rendering of the proposed project was posted on the screen.

Acting Chairman Newberry stated going back to the landscaping along the street, have you seen the staff memo? Mr. Golon replied yes. Acting Chairman Newberry stated Condition #5 specifically speaks to that. Mr. Golon replied that's correct. Ms. Hebert and I had the opportunity to review it beforehand. We understood that is what is desired. The applicant just wants to make sure that that is what the Planning Board wants, and if that is in fact the case, then they are not going to take an objection if the Board thinks that is the most appropriate landscaping. Acting Chairman Newberry stated unless the motion strikes that item, I think that is what the Board wants. Mr. Golon responded we understand. Ms. Hebert stated in your packet you also have a copy of the aerial image looking at the facility as it exists today and some pictures from Google street view that show the vegetation. That vegetation would be removed to expand the parking lot and install the septic system along Patten Road, so I was concerned that although this site has been very well hidden from kind of overgrown vegetation and a natural buffer for years, it could be shocking to the neighbors or for people who run or bike or walk on Patten Road to all of a sudden have this facility 'day-lighted' and very visible. I thought having some additional plantings and a wooden stockade fence would give it that opaque barrier and be more consistent with the residential neighborhood. Mr. McMahon asked what kind of foliage are you going to plant, how high will it get, will it be able to at least cover the cars or will it go high

enough to disturb the view of the building? Mr. Golon replied the vast majority of the plantings will have top-outed heights between 8 and 12 feet.

Councilor Bandazian stated please pull up that aerial view. Acting Chairman Newberry stated in the aerial view here I see what looks like a silo type structure in the back. Is that existing? Mr. Nazaka replied yes. Acting Chairman Newberry asked what is that? Mr. Nazaka replied it is just sand, so they can wheel a cart under it to fill it with sand. Councilor Bandazian asked as we look at these various buildings on the parcel, can you say what is coming, what is going? Mr. Nazaka replied sure. Right when you enter this site, is this magnificent rusty Quonset hut to your left and that is going to be completely demolished. Indicated now is the current mechanical bay, there are locker rooms, there is a kitchen, basically all of their operations in this, and that completely goes. Really the only two things that stay, which would be the easier way to put it, this is their existing cold storage and this is their sprayer shed, which is something they drive around to spray the fairways and greens. There is an existing fertilizer shed here that is currently sort of falling down as well and that is also going. The new office will house all of their fertilizer materials. Mr. Golon stated as far as the site features, the existing slide gate located at the entrance will remain, even if we end up doing some different improvements with the additional fencing.

Councilor Bandazian asked is the well going to be a new well? Mr. Golon replied it will be. It has been sited in accordance with current requirements.

Mr. Fairman stated you are keeping the existing chemical mixing building rather than build a new one. We had a lot of discussion about chemical runoff and still more to control treatment facilities and so on. Is that changing? Mr. Nazaka replied this shed is just to house the sprayer itself. When they load that sprayer up, the new facility does have its own chemical storage with a sump containment in that area. Mr. Golon stated the full answer is that component is being replaced within the new building. It just so happens to be that shed may be where the unit itself is stored. So the chemical process is taking place within the new building. Mr. Nazaka stated correct. Mr. Fairman asked so there is no change to the controls for pollution that you proposed earlier? Mr. Golon replied correct. Mr. Nazaka stated prior we had a tank that Mr. Golon can speak to that was sort of part of the whole grand scheme of the area. That will remain kind of behind this building, that will be all poured concrete, so the sprayer actually would go where this truck is going. Behind here there are these overhead doors. This overhead door is actually the fertilizer storage, so this probably would park right in front of there. There is a sump right in front of that door and that is for any spillage that will be contained.

Mr. McMahon asked has the percentage of impervious area increased, decreased or stayed the same? Mr. Golon replied it went down a little bit. We were able to get rid of some of the pavement by shrinking up that footprint and help the project goal of trying to reduce costs, and any time you can reduce the amount of stormwater runoff and loss will be a benefit.

Town Manager Sawyer asked now that you are on septic, what is the floor drain situation? Do you have to have a holding tank in there? Mr. Golon replied there is an existing holding tank that is located behind the building, which would remain. Town Manager Sawyer asked it is really that cost effective to put in the septic system and have to pump these tanks versus the short

run of a sewer connection? Mr. Golon replied yes. There is a financial evaluation done and it showed this was a more cost effective approach. Town Manager Sawyer stated obviously a use like this getting on sewer is much more preferable than having the septic. I am sure it is a clean operation and you will do everything you can, but wash bays and things like that, trying to do those on tanks is just inefficient having to be pumped out frequently and everything. Mr. Nazaka responded that is what they do currently, and I don't believe they pump it that often. Mr. Golon stated I believe facilities went back and looked at their historical records as part of this evaluation and what they have spent in making that determination. I would really leave that up to their facilities people to speak to but we can at least provide that as a general overview.

Town Manager Sawyer stated obviously I haven't looked at how you have designed your stormwater, so the question about not having the parking along the road and relocating that to the back, it seems like your whole stormwater system is flowing across that pavement to the pond. Is there a way to relocate that parking and not cut all the trees that are proposed to be cut? Mr. Golon replied from a spatial consideration, if we looked at the lot in aggregate and say you have a 160-acre site and is there somewhere else you could put your parking, sure. From an operational standpoint of keeping their parking close to their building, no. We have laid out the facility to provide the number of parking spaces that they need and to provide them in a location that is in proximity to the building being used. Could they have them walking from somewhere else to try and potentially access this area, I suppose the answer is yes, but would that really be of benefit. Town Manager Sawyer responded I am just talking the other side of the building not on the other side of the golf course, but like where the tank is or where the truck is parked in that green space where you are currently growing sod and landscaping materials. Mr. Golon stated we do have some setback requirements relative to our stormwater locations, as well as the holding location, as well as our well location and the septic. There are a lot of different pieces of the puzzle as to where things were sited. We have been able to open up some more green space along Patten Road, but with this revised design, but overall, we have reduced the amount of impervious from what we were before you had seen previously and we have reduced the number of parking spaces in comparison to what was provided previously. This is a good design for what we are looking at. Ms. Hebert stated between Patten Road and the existing warehouse building there is a new swath of asphalt that is 48 feet wide. How is that used by the facility? Mr. Golon replied we do have some bay doors that are along this side. Mr. Nazaka stated there is one along that side. Mr. Golon stated and the other component is accommodating the turning radius because they can have up to a WB-50 needing to make this turn up and around the building. It cuts it pretty close, but you are using the vast majority of this space just for that turning radii, and then similarly as you are making this corner to come here and then back and out again. We looked at a couple of different components as to do we site the building as shown, so we try and straighten it and parallel perpendicular to the existing building, and in order to make those turning movements work and still provide the number of spaces they are looking for for parking and accesspoints in and out of the mechanics' bay, this was the layout that had been selected. Mr. McMahon asked are there any bay doors on the east side of the remaining building? Mr. Nazaka asked of the new building? Mr. McMahon replied yes. Mr. Golon replied this whole face is actually five bay doors.

Ms. Murphy stated I have a prior working relationship with Mr. Golon and a 15-year friendship, so I am going to recuse myself from this vote. Acting Chairman Newberry stated we will still have enough votes for the motion.

Acting Chairman Newberry stated the holding tanks are existing, are they underground, and can you show us just roughly where they are. Mr. Golon replied there is a holding tank that is located almost along the entire length of this. This is the inlet to that area. Acting Chairman Newberry asked you are actually going to be driving over them? Mr. Golon replied yes. They are each 20-loaded, so they have appropriate loading classifications for the tank that is back there. They have been driving over that tank historically.

Acting Chairman Newberry stated there are four waivers. Town Manager Sawyer responded staff said they don't need action because they have been previously granted.

Acting Chairman Newberry asked for comments or questions from the audience.

Beverly Gere, 17 Patten Road, stated our property is not directly in view of this particular area. We were concerned that this would start looking like a more commercial warehouse kind of thing on Patten Road. I couldn't get whether there are plantings that are sort of going to obscure most of this and keep it residential. Is that what I am understanding? As you drive down the road, it is not going to look like you are entering a zone like Industrial Park Drive? These are little shacks now; they are not sticking up and we have lived with them for 40 years. Mr. Golon responded the existing vegetation in the southeast corner is going to remain. As we work our way to the northwest corner, this vegetation is also going to remain. There are portions between the two, which I am circling here on the screen, that are going to be removed. They will be replanted in various aspects, and with the current proposal, as recommended by staff, there would be a wood stockade fence with some additional plantings in front of it. Over time there would be the opportunity for that to grow in more. Ms. Gere asked and there is less traffic now with the new plan than there was before with the old? In other words, are you driving from Meeting House Road to that area or you coming around on County Road and turning in there? Mr. Golon replied relative to access there are no changes. However folks were entering the facility before, that will continue to be the same after this facility is rebuilt and brought up to a more current standard. Ms. Gere asked and the stockade fence you think is the most durable fence to put there? Mr. Golon responded Mr. Chairman, it may really speak to staff when it comes to the request for the stockade fence. We understand the request, and it is a fine. It is a durable, solid material that is, I believe, encircling portions of the golf course as it is currently constructed, so it would make it a good selection for what is being proposed here. Ms. Hebert stated the original proposal included these plastic slats that are woven through the chain link. I don't think it is an aesthetic treatment that people expect to see in a residential area to have the plastic privacy slats. You might see that in an industrial park, but I think that they are willing to do the wooden fence with the additional plantings. Ms. Gere asked that will be the most aesthetic? Ms. Hebert replied whatever screening is proposed would need to be maintained by the country club.

Bill Gere, 17 Patten Road, stated I am curious about the building. Is it 7 feet higher than the existing building? Is that the plan for the new building? Mr. Nazaka replied I was actually

taking a stab off the top of my head. The existing building, if I recall correctly, is 18 feet tall to this point indicated on the screen. Mr. Golon stated he is pointing out the peak of the structure. Mr. Nazaka stated and the new structure is 24 feet, 6 inches, which is another 6.5 feet. Mr. Gere asked what color is that roof going to be? Is it going to blend in or is it going to be a tin colored shiny thing like you show in the rendering? Mr. Nazaka replied it is actually more of a white; the existing roof is white. Mr. Gere stated so it is definitely going to show from the street. Ms. Gere stated if I understand, the plants are eventually going to grow up and make you feel like you are on Patten Road. Mr. Nazaka replied it is a fairly low sloped roof. Obviously aerials give you a full picture of what is going on, whereas a street view is actually ironically better to show you how it looks from the street. Mr. Golon stated the roof elements aren't something that are going to be readily visible from the adjoining property or the right-of-way because of the height of the structure. Mr. Nazaka stated and we feel the structure isn't too overbearing as far as how large it is on the site, what we are taking out and how it is replacing what is there. Mr. Gere stated I was just curious about the color of the roof. Does it have to be white? Mr. Nazaka replied it does not. We were really just matching the existing. Mr. Golon stated which is consistent with the Bedford design regulations and why that was proposed as far as uniformity of color when we come to roof colors.

Mr. McMahon asked was there any consideration at all for using solar? Mr. Golon replied I did not take part in a solar evaluation for the structure. Mr. Nazaka stated just like anything else, solar comes at a premium and we are over budget as it was. It just wasn't part of the conversation really.

Acting Chairman Newberry stated I am looking at Sheet A-0, and it looks like there is a slight discrepancy. The bottom elevation appears to show 22 feet to the eaves and then the next elevation up seems to show 20 feet to the eaves. Mr. Nazaka replied you are correct. That was probably just a note oversight on my part. Acting Chairman Newberry asked which is it? Mr. Nazaka replied it is a low slope roof, so I believe the 22 is correct, and because the peak is 24.5 feet, I would think 22, but I can confirm that. Mr. Golon stated we will make sure the graphic is updated in any final submittals. Acting Chairman Newberry stated I don't think visually it is going to make a huge difference. What is the color of the roof? Mr. Nazaka replied it is currently white to match what is existing. Mr. Golon replied and the structure is set back pretty far from the road and additionally to the right-of-way.

Acting Chairman Newberry asked for any further comments or questions from the audience. There were no more at this time.

Councilor Bandazian asked Ms. Hebert, is there a height that you are contemplating for the stockade fence? Ms. Hebert replied I think 6 feet; not taller. Acting Chairman Newberry stated if it exceeds 6 feet it becomes a structure. Ms. Hebert stated that is correct.

**MOTION by Councilor Bandazian that the Planning Board grant final approval for the site plan to renovate the Turf Care Facility for the Manchester Country Club, Lot 22-52, in accordance with the engineering plans prepared by TF Moran, last revised February 27, 2020, 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. The Applicant shall address any outstanding technical review comments to the satisfaction of the Planning Director and the Public Works Director.**
- 2. In the event that the Planning Board approves the waivers, the plan shall be updated to list the waivers granted as approved.**
- 3. The applicant shall submit any outstanding engineering review fees.**
- 4. The parking lot lights shall be turned off during non-business hours.**
- 5. The applicant shall provide a wooden stockade fence and plantings along Patten Road, to screen the proposed parking area.**
- 6. Prior to construction, a performance guarantee in an amount approved by the Town for onsite maintenance of erosion and sedimentation controls shall be placed on file.**
- 7. Prior to construction, arrangements will be made with the Planning Department regarding payment and coordination of third party inspections.**
- 8. Prior to construction, the applicant will hold a preconstruction conference with the Planning Department, Public Works Department, and Building Department.**
- 9. Prior to issuance of a final Certificate of Occupancy, all site improvements indicated on the plan must be complete.**

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

## **2. Bedford Master Plan Discussion**

Acting Chairman Newberry stated I think we pretty recently got a draft copy from our consulting firm of the rewritten Master Plan. I don't know if any of you have had a chance to really look at it in detail, but I think Ms. Hebert and Mr. Connors wanted give us an overview of it based on what you have seen thus far.

Ms. Hebert stated we are excited to be sharing the draft Master Plan with the community and with all of you. We had some printing issues with the versions in your packet, so if you want to look at a very clean or crisp rendering of the Master Plan, I would recommend going online to get a sense of what the true colors are and how the graphic layout is coming together. We want to walk you through the general layout of the document tonight and describe the process moving forward for review and comment. Staff is also just looking at this freshly. We have reviewed text but this is the first time we have seen the document laid out and its color and graphics and infographics all incorporated. I would emphasize that it is a working draft, and we are looking forward to working through the comments and getting feedback from the community. Mr. Connors is going to go through a little introduction of the document and talk about our next steps moving forward.

Mr. Connors stated just a quick refresher on what the Master Plan is. The Master Plan is a very big picture, visionary document for how the Town wants to grow moving forward. We typically

update them here in Bedford every 10 years. We are required to have a Master Plan on file in order to enforce our zoning, collect impact fees and other things like that. It is a very big picture, it is very short on details, but it is a chance for the community to kind of step back from its day-to-day responsibilities and to assess how we want to grow moving forward, how we want the community to look in the future, and are we on the right track or are we on the wrong track, and consider those kinds of bigger questions.

Mr. Connors reviewed the 12-page Executive Summary, which is from the cover page to the brief introduction to what Bedford looks like today, with lots of facts and figures relating to the community, introduction of the process behind the Master Plan, the public engagement process, the Planapalooza process, when we first introduced this to the community, and very, very briefly discusses some items, like where Bedford was when we started this process. We updated the Master Plan during this period where we are seeing a lot of major development proposals, so probably the most dominant public sentiment that we heard was concern about development and its impacts on the character of the community. Then it goes on to explain the structure of the document and how we have these six guiding principles that framed the document, and then there are these 17 big ideas that are converging under these six guiding principles. Traditionally in a Master Plan you sort of have a natural resources chapter and a transportation chapter and a land use chapter, and the goal is when we started this process is to have a more holistic document that is a little bit less soloed. Then we go into the conservation and development map, which is how do we want the community to grow moving forward. Really we are not introducing any major changes that deviate from our existing zoning, so the plan recommends sort of capitalizing on existing commercially developed areas and maximizing the tax revenues that we can out of those areas but we are really taking a hands-off approach to the residential areas of town and limiting growth in the vast majority of the town. That is the Executive Summary in a nutshell.

Mr. Connors continued the Master Plan itself is much longer, it is 240 pages. I think we recognize that we would be in a better place where we are cutting rather than adding at this point.

Mr. Hawkins stated I didn't get through all 240 pages of the Master Plan, but one thing I was thinking is that especially when you look at Page 2 and you have some stats about where we are today. I have seen master plans that are done in 10 years, I have seen some that are done in 20 years, and when they are done in 10 years, it seems to be like the master plan should developed within the context of the previous master plan because it is close enough to that to say how did we do. How did the original, or 10-year ago, Master Plan promote a vision that we either succeeded or fell short of over the subsequent 10 years and based upon how we did, how is this new Master Plan shaped or molded? Is any of that is taken into consideration with the consultants in formulating this Master Plan, because if stats changed, that may impact what we decide to do over the next 10 years? I am just wondering if those are considerations or are these in isolation every 10 years starting fresh, starting anew? Mr. Connors replied I would definitely say it is not an isolation; sort of building off from that Master Plan that was done in 2010. Mr. Hawkins stated you have this Master Plan and how we did with the 10-year vision of the last Master Plan at first blush. Ms. Hebert responded they are very different documents, a very different style. Mr. Connors stated the last Master Plan was 2010 and we were kind of in the midst of the recession, so I would say the outlook was a little bit different at that point. Mr. Hawkins asked less ambitious? Mr. Connors stated Town Manager Sawyer could probably

speak to this better than I can, but the feeling I get from that document is the Town was more looking to promote development as much as possible. Not as much as possible but during a period where we didn't have much development to attract development to Bedford. Ms. Hebert stated hedging off from a recession, I think it was more of a pro-growth document. I think this document tries to capture what it is that everybody loves about Bedford and how do we maintain that and move forward and make it better.

Mr. Fairman stated I have gone through almost the whole document at this point and I find a tremendous number of things that I think need to be corrected. What is the process going forward for us and for the public, and how are you going to distribute this to the public? I am not sure it is ready for the public, but how are you going to distribute it to the public and how are we going to get feedback from all of them? Mr. Connors replied we just got this a week ago, and we felt like even though we have the same thoughts that there were some errors, the Town has waited so long for this that we really wanted to get this out as soon as possible and to stick to the timeline the Think Tank sort of decided upon. We decided to release it recognizing that there are errors in the document and now we are in the midst of this public comment period where we have a chance to hear from the public. Certainly those little errors and typos and things like that, but more the big picture what are peoples' feelings about the message. Mr. Fairman stated one of the problems is just looking at the timeline and there are some big issues. They go from 1990 to 2007 and the only thing they have in there is the high school being built, and part of it is organized differently than any other part and there are errors on those pages. But the biggest problem I have is that I don't think the consultants understand our form of government. Throughout the document they talk about the Planning Board promoting or encouraging and that is not our charter, I don't think. I may be wrong, but I don't think we promote business to come into the community and that document is full of that type of stuff. If you go to the implementation phase, almost every item is the Planning Staff and the Planning Board. We are not the ones that are going to be doing all of the implementation, not all of it is us, but I bet 80 percent of it is, between the Planning Staff and the Planning Board. I just don't know that they understand our government and that seems to me a major problem with the document. Ms. Hebert responded we really wanted to have these types of conversations because the way the process was laid out there was this heavy public input early on in the project, and then the consultant went away and prepared a document, and I feel like the editing process now needs to be done with the public input and through a public review. Mr. Fairman stated the danger is the public is going to think it is not a very good document with the errors that are in it. The numbers are inconsistent, where one place talks about one number of people that live in Bedford that work, either in town or out of town, and in another place you have another number and the numbers differ by 700 people. That kind of inconsistency in the number, I think, is dangerous to send out to the public. I think they are going to think the document is not very good. When they look at the timeline alone, you have one page very nicely organized and then you have another page that starts on the top with the latest date and then it goes down in the middle with other dates and the bottom is the earliest date. Then the final section goes 17 years where the population grew from 12,000 to 18,000 and there is nothing said. It makes a big deal of the bridge to the airport and I don't think that has had any real effect on Bedford. So there is nothing about New Boston Road being built or rebuilt by the federal government and that had a major effect on Bedford. It says that I-93 is completed through Bedford, but I-93 never went through

Bedford. I have flags on many pages. Ms. Hebert stated perhaps we can sit down and go over some of your comments.

Ms. Hebert stated moving through the public process we are asking people to be very specific with their comments, to cite pages, to email all their comments to the Planning Department at [planning@bedford.nh.org](mailto:planning@bedford.nh.org) and we will do our best with the resources we have to incorporate all of these comments and have them addressed. Moving forward there is a public informational session scheduled for March 26<sup>th</sup> at 7:00pm at Lurgio Middle School cafeteria and the consultant will be there to present the plan and answer some of these questions and talk about the project.

Mr. Connors stated with regard to the timeline; we are in the midst of this public comment period, which is about 5.5 weeks long, so it extends until April 16<sup>th</sup>, which is the last day to get your comments in. Next week on Wednesday and Thursday Ms. Hebert and I will be at the library just to answer questions for people that don't want to go to a big event. We will be there from 1:00pm to 4:00pm on Wednesday, March 18<sup>th</sup>, and 9:00am to Noon on Thursday, March 19<sup>th</sup>. Thursday, March 26<sup>th</sup> at 7:00pm is the date of the public information session at the Lurgio Middle School cafeteria where the consultants will be present to introduce the document to the community and to respond to any public comments that we receive then. It will be more of a presentation style and then more of an open house style, so if you don't want to speak in front of a big crowd, there will be stations you can go to to offer your comments. The schedule we have now has the consultant updating the plan through May to respond all of the comments that we receive and we would like to hopefully have a final Master Plan to be considered for adoption by the Planning Board in June.

Acting Chairman Newberry stated I have not had a chance to really read the document yet, but it almost sounds to me like the consultants should be alerted to the fact that we suspect there may be some significant rewrites required and whether they need to change their plan a little bit and whether they have from experience ways of responding to some of the concerns that I think Mr. Fairman has had a chance to dig out of the current version. Just flipping casually through the pages, I like the graphics, I think they help, if they are accurate, they important dimensions of the whole thing. A comment building off from Mr. Hawkins' question, I think a lot of these documents, the emphasis put on drawing comments from the community and not so much in my observation, that the community looks back at the previous Master Plan so much as what is on everybody's mind today and today where do we think we want to be 2, 4, 6, 10 years down the road. That is an interesting dimension that when we do this again, it might be interesting to make sure that that factor gets included also. I do think that because there is, in my observation, so much emphasis on trying to draw input from the community, maybe it would benefit from a little more ability to look back at, out of what we thought we were going to do 10 years ago, how much of it did we really do, how much of it did we want to do, and how much of it did we wish we hadn't done. Mr. Hawkins stated I think it is helpful in that regard because there are two groups. There were people who were here and those that weren't and it helps both groups of people to understand what that vision was 10 years ago. For the people who were here, they are able to say how well did we do, let's compare and contrast, where we were and where do we want to go. For people who weren't here, they could say this is what the Master Plan process is like, this is what we are trying to do, let's see how it goes the next time. I think it is something

that we can give context to any iteration of the Master Plan by reflecting on the other one. Maybe side-by-side comparisons of what we thought then and what we are thinking of now.

Ms. Murphy stated I agree completely with Mr. Hawkins. I have submitted some comments and I will send some more. I just want to go through this from a graphic design perspective from just a couple of the pages that are jumping out at me. The primary motivator for creating this document, or at least one them, was so that we could use it to promote economic development. That is why we wanted flashy graphics when we created it and it is why we put this kind of effort into selecting a company to put it together so that it would stand out and we could use it to attract businesses, which is why I was surprised to see just one photo on the economy page. We have dead space on the bottom of that page where you could fit three photos in that space of what is going on locally business-wise. We have a lot of local businesses in Bedford, and it would be nice to feature two more diversified industries that are performing well in town, on that page in particular, Page 61. On Page 65 is the same thing, and this particular section deals with commercial real estate investment, and there is dead space below the paragraph where you could put another graphic in. That target graphic looks like it is stretched to me and probably could be condensed a little bit. Page 79, this is a little bit more difficult because you don't necessarily want to post photos of PFAs contamination, but there is significant dead space where the paragraph for water and sewer infrastructure ends. We can certainly post an infrastructure photo there or there could be additional verbiage. Page 100, trails and outdoor recreation, and this comes on the heels of a discussion about conservation land, so I am not sure if the aerial photo of a cluster subdivision really belongs in that section. I question the appropriateness of it. What I would much rather see is a bigger, glossier photo of an outdoor recreation area and we do have a couple of really good ones. I didn't see one of the Benedictine Park, so it would be nice to see a photo like that. That would seem to be an appropriate photo. Page 105, stormwater management, where there is a lot of dead space below that second column that you could use for graphics. Page 106, I would either blow up that map and make it full page or I would put another graphic or more verbiage below it so that it doesn't look like we ran out of things to say and we just have dead space in our own Master Plan. Page 107, I question the statistic that over one third of residents depend on tap water. Don't we all depend on tap water? Ms. Hebert replied 100 percent; it should say well water. There are a lot of mistakes like this in the document. Ms. Murphy asked why is there a graphic of tap water in the Master Plan document? It just seems like a poor use of space. Page 109, it is really cool what the Energy Commission is doing. It is not an Energy Committee, it is the Energy Commission, and they have done amazing things with solar and they have done amazing things with conservation and PSAs and things at the Town dump and there is a picture of a solar cooperative in the United Kingdom. I feel like this thing just doesn't belong. A former Chairman of the Energy Commission has an absolutely gorgeous house in a neighborhood that I happen to live in that is covered with solar panels and would make a great photo for the Master Plan. I love that we do a green business award. I think that in that dead space below that photo we feature a prior winner of the green business award in town. I would definitely make it less generic and more specific. Those are my preliminary thoughts on the layout.

Mr. McMahon asked is part of the Master Plan not only an introduction but some reference to how we are governed? My experience is dated. My experience was that at one of the Old Town Days we had no more than a few people that even knew that this town was governed by a Town

Council, and the most common thing that I got was, what is it and what do you do. Mr. Fairman talked about how the Planning Board does X percentage of it, but certainly the people that do the management of the Town itself; I don't know whether or not that would be good as an instructional issue to be able to give a little bit of verbiage on that so people do read it. It is really sort of embarrassing. Mr. Connors stated that's not a bad idea. Councilor Bandazian stated I think a lot of people still believe we have selectmen. Ms. Murphy stated I would bet you that over 60 percent of the Town has absolutely no idea that we vote for Town officials tomorrow, but we come back and vote for the Town budget on Wednesday. Town Manager Sawyer stated and that the Town Council doesn't vote on the budget and manage the budget like a city council does. Ms. Hebert stated or approve zoning amendments.

Mr. Fairman stated there is a section that talks about the recreation and how much area we have set aside for recreation in the Town. It points out that we are a couple of percentage points below what we should be at according to our peers. Included in what they list for recreation are none of our hiking trails or none of the ski trails at Legacy Park. They talk about Legacy Park with a couple of things but they don't even mention the 5 kilometers of cross country ski trails. I suspect that if we added in our hiking and walking trails in town, we would be above the percentage. There is another section on trails and hiking but it is not in the recreation section and certainly should be a major part of the recreation.

Mr. Fairman stated the other things that I find is that the book talks a lot about economic development and growth and the need for that, even suggesting we should hire an economic development manager in town, and yet admits that we have no room to grow. I find the whole thing schizophrenic. Almost all of it talks about the growth and why we ought to be growing and how much we ought to be pushing for growth and looking for growth and all of this stuff, but as we all know, we have already grown. It doesn't play together that way. Let's be realistic about where we are as a community today with very limited growth opportunity and recognize that we are not going out to sell the community as a place to come to. People are coming here because they want to but we don't have a lot of opportunity. Ms. Hebert stated I would love to know where we are promoting growth in the document because I feel like it is very 'preserve what you have.' I don't see it that way, but I would love to see where you feel the document is promoting growth because the guiding principles don't lend in that direction. If you can be as specific as you can with your comments and cite pages and let us know where you want to see changes.

Ms. Hebert stated we are also looking at this from a graphic design standpoint for the first time, so Mr. Connors and I have a ton of comments. The timeline for this project didn't allow for us to do a staff review. Mr. Fairman stated our biggest goal is to make the document realistic. Address the real problems that we have, which are somewhat stated in the beginning. I haven't read the whole appendix in the back, but some of the problems that are upfront I haven't found implementation plans for. I look forward to sending my comments to you. Ms. Hebert stated all of your comments will help shape the plan. Mr. Fairman stated I am not trying to throw darts at the Planning Department. You have done tremendous work on this and I appreciate that. Ms. Hebert responded we have gotten to a point where we really need feedback, we need public feedback, and we have a tight timeline for this to be completed and the process didn't lay out for snippets of public participation throughout. We really need to have a conversation about the document.

Mr. Fairman asked how are you going to distribute the document to the public? Ms. Hebert replied right now the document is available on the Town's website, it is on the Blueprint Bedford website, it is going to get pushed out on social media, we email all of the Bedford committees and organizations, community organizations, and we are going to distribute this the same way we advocated for the kickoff meeting when the process started. We had a great turnout for that kickoff meeting, so I am really hoping that we get a lot of people reading the document and we get a lot of feedback and a lot of really good constructive criticism. Ms. Murphy asked can you send to the members of the Planning Board an email with the deadlines and the upcoming meetings with a link to the document? I can post it out on several groups, all of the other town and community boards that I am a part of, and I can disseminate it to the sports leagues. Ms. Hebert stated the Planning Board's adoption and final acceptance of this document can follow its own path. Ideally we would like to wrap this up by June, but if we need more time, we need more time, and we want the document to be something the community is proud of and feels like it accurately reflects what we heard during the public engagement process.

Acting Chairman Newberry stated I would rather see us end up with a quality document than hit a time milestone. Also, it might be worth putting a pointer to the Bedford Blueprint URL as a news item because I think a lot of people may have difficulty finding the draft document. So if we could get something in the news that is kind of a little promotional reminder and a pointer to exactly where people can see the document online. Mr. Connors stated I think this week will kind of be a big push to get this out with a press release, get it in the paper, all the Town organizations' websites, etc. That is what we will be focusing on this week.

Mr. Hawkins stated as Ms. Murphy was saying, limit the dead space, more photos, and if we run out of photos, shorten the document. Dead space in a document like this just doesn't go well, and businesses want to say that there are businesses like me, families want to say there are families like us. You can show it better than you can describe it. Dead space is our enemy here. Acting Chairman Newberry stated based off some of the other comments, some of the infrastructure sections may not make sense to have a photograph but it may make a lot of sense to see if there isn't some graphic representation of data on stormwater, on those kinds of infrastructure things. I think there may be some data associated with some of those more infrastructure mundane areas that would both convey the significance of it and also be something that you could at a glance go, oh wow. Ms. Murphy stated or something informational like a 3-bullet point box or some major legislation that has passed in the last 5 years that is going to affect the Town. Mr. Fairman stated it would be nice to have a picture of Route 101 how it is going to be. It talks about Route 101 being rebuilt, but by the time this comes out, it will be built and we need to correct that throughout the document. Ms. Murphy stated it might be nice to have an overlay of Bedford like 100 years ago and then overlay it with a graphic 50 years ago and 25 years ago, so you can see the progression of how it has evolved. Ms. Hebert stated I was hoping we would have conversations like these. We recognize the document is not perfect and we really want to see it improve and we want to bring it to a point where we are going to cross the finish line and adopt it but we really need everyone's feedback and we really need your ideas. Ms. Murphy stated if you have a 2-page graphic, divide it into six to eight slices and each slice is almost the same picture, which we have in the Town archives, but it is the same picture in different decades, so you can kind of see how an area of town has evolved over time. Councilor

Bandazian stated it would be nice to show the backed up traffic on Route 101 when the project was pushed through, and then show what it is like now and renderings of what it will look like. Ms. Hebert stated if you have personal photos that you think illustrate aspects of Bedford that aren't shown in the plan, send them to us by email. Having photos from community members will really help fill in those blanks. Ms. Murphy stated if you own a business in town and you have photographs of people inside your business working or photos that are indicative of the type of business that you own and what you are doing in the community, please consider sending those photos to the Planning Department because that is the number one category I think we are lacking.

Mr. Fairman stated one of the things in the timeline that might be added is to show the population jumping by big numbers. You could tie that into areas of the town that got opened up into development, to show how Bedford spread out. It was all farmland where people were all spread out in the beginning, but at some point we started developing big chunks. After I came here it really started growing. Ms. Hebert stated Mr. Connors and I can't stand that you start with Bedford today and then you immediately flip to the history of Bedford. We need to talk to the consultant about needing to add a couple of pages on the history of Bedford leading up to the timeline because the timeline needs some work. We had worked with the Historical Society to come up with some of the bullet points on the timeline but we also had a lot of great photos and we wanted to incorporate some of those photos into the document and we are disappointed to see that they didn't make it. Mr. Fairman stated I think the history side up through 1955 is pretty good, well organized, it might have another picture or two in there, but it is well done. Then all of sudden you skip over to the other side and it is jumbled. 1962, 1980, 1990, 1965-1967, and 1960, which is the order of the dates from top to bottom and the other side is very nicely chronologically ordered. Then it goes from 1990 to 2007 without anything at all. That was a big growth period in Bedford. Town Manager Sawyer stated that is when the Charter was adopted as well and that should be in there. Ms. Murphy stated I think the art contest was really great but there are 4.5 pages devoted to bullet points, graphics or discussion of the art contest.

Acting Chairman Newberry asked for comments or questions from the audience. There were none.

Town Manager Sawyer stated I just want to thank the staff for all of the time they have put into it as well as the Think Tank members and all the energy the members of the public put into it. I know they have been working hard to get us to this point. It is a big effort and a lot of work to pull together something like this and all of those public meetings that were held earlier on have formed a lot of these pages. I haven't been able to read the whole document myself either but I am looking forward to it. I do think those comments were heard very strongly and were incorporated into what is becoming the final document. Ms. Murphy stated I think the biggest misconception that I have heard in this process is that the delays were internal to the Town of Bedford, and I can't emphasize enough that they weren't. Ms. Hebert and Mr. Connors have done a fantastic job with putting this together and editing it. Unfortunately, there was a personnel change, which I think resulted in a rushed product that was far more generic cut-and-paste than it was specific to the Town of Bedford. You guys have done a fantastic job pulling together something that we can at least start to talk about. I understand that the lack of information that is necessarily germane to what we are discussing in town and how it impacts our

residents has no bearing on you guys. It is entirely a lack of understanding, I think, from an organization out of Tennessee, so there is work to be done, but it is not the fault of the Planning Board or the Planning Department or anyone else internal to the Town that this process has dragged.

Ms. Hebert stated we knew what we were getting into when we put this out to the public. We really want your comments. We could be sitting in an office editing it and I think it is more productive and we want to involve the community and need to be doing this with all of your help and your expertise. Acting Chairman Newberry stated this is really not as easy a document to create as it would seem at first blush, and I think particularly with this one where it is attempting to be a little more innovative in how it presents information, I think adds a whole other level of challenge to making it what we want it to be.

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

**MOTION by Town Manager Sawyer to approve the minutes of the February 24, 2020 Planning Board meeting as written. Ms. Murphy duly seconded the motion. Vote taken; motion carried, with Acting Chairman Newberry and Mr. Hawkins abstained.**

**VI. Communications to the Board: None**

**VII. Reports of Committees: None**

**VIII. Adjournment:**

**MOTION by Ms. Murphy to adjourn at 8:17pm. Town Manager Sawyer duly seconded the motion. Vote taken – all in favor. Motion carried.**

Respectfully submitted by  
Valerie J. Emmons