

TOWN OF BEDFORD
April 18, 2022
PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES

A meeting of the Bedford Planning Board was held on Monday, April 18, 2022, at the Town Meeting Room at BCTV, 10 Meeting House Road, Bedford, NH. Present were: Town Councilor Bill Duschatko (Acting Chairman), Town Councilor Alternate Phil Greazzo, Priscilla Malcolm (Secretary), Hal Newberry, Charlie Fairman, Matt Sullivan, Steve Clough, John Nelson (Alternate), Jillian Harris (Assistant Planning Director), and Becky Hebert (Planning Director)

I. Call to Order and Roll Call:

Acting Chairman Duschatko called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Chairman Mac McMahan and Alternates Matt Nichols and John Quintal were absent. Mr. Nelson was appointed to vote in place of Chairman McMahan.

II. Old Business & Continued Hearings:

III. New Business:

1. **Dartmouth-Hitchcock Clinic (Applicant & Owner)** – Request for Site Plan Approval for a 49,092 SF medical office building, located at Ridgewood Road and Kilton Road, Lot 12-8-4, Zoned PZ. *(At the request of the applicant, this application is postponed to the June 13, 2022 meeting.)*
2. **South River Road Ventures, LLC (Applicant) & River Glen Development Partner c/o Adobe Builders of NE (Owner)** – Request for Site Plan Approval for a 41,486 SF electric car maintenance facility and dealership, located at South River Road and Technology Drive, Lot 35-3-1, Zoned PZ. *(Tabled from the March 28, 2022 meeting.)*
3. **Shirley L. Beliveau Revocable Trust and Shelby and Lisa Vance Revocable Trust (Applicants & Owners)** – Request for Subdivision – Lot Line Adjustment Approval for 2 lots, located at 410 and 414 Joppa Hill Road, Lots 04-31 and 04-31-1, Zoned RA.
4. **Shane Patel (Applicant) and Akhil Hotel Group, LLC (Owner)** – Request for site plan re-approval to construct a five-story, 120 room extended stay hotel and associated improvements at 270 South River Road, Lot 24-98-8, Zoned PZ.
5. **Lyophilization Services of New England, Inc. (Applicant & Owner)** – Request for time extension approval of a site plan amendment to modify a previously approved office and warehouse building addition to expand the size of the addition from 18,881 square-feet to 32,341 square-feet and associated site changes at 7 Commerce Drive, Lot 24-99-4, Zoned PZ.

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

Ms. Harris stated the new applications have been reviewed by staff. It is Staff's recommendation that the applications are complete, the abutters have been notified, and it is the opinion of Staff that none of the applications pose a regional impact. Staff would recommend that the Board accept the agenda and the applications as complete.

MOTION by Ms. Malcolm to accept the agenda as read. Mr. Fairman duly seconded the motion. Vote taken – all in favor. Motion carried.

- 1. Dartmouth-Hitchcock Clinic (Applicant & Owner) – Request for Site Plan Approval for a 49,092 SF medical office building, located at Ridgewood Road and Kilton Road, Lot 12-8-4, Zoned PZ.** *(At the request of the applicant, this application is postponed to the June 13, 2022 meeting.)*

Acting Chairman Duschatko stated at the request of the applicant, this application is postponed to the June 13, 2022 Planning Board meeting and this announcement shall serve as public notice.

- 2. South River Road Ventures, LLC (Applicant) & River Glen Development Partner c/o Adobe Builders of NE (Owner) – Request for Site Plan Approval for a 41,486 SF electric car maintenance facility and dealership, located at South River Road and Technology Drive, Lot 35-3-1, Zoned PZ.** *(Tabled from the March 28, 2022 meeting.)*

Acting Chairman Duschatko stated I would like to express my appreciation, and I think the Board's appreciate, for the consideration of having the electric charging stations open to the public, although it is going to be restricted to owners of those particular vehicles, and they will also put them on their network. I know we spoke about that at the last meeting and I am glad everybody responded favorably. I think it makes life easier for all of us and certainly for the public, which is the important part.

Jeff Kevan of TF Moran was present to address this tabled application for site plan approval. We did the survey civil engineering on the project. Elias Patoucheas of South River Road Ventures, project developer, was also present.

Mr. Kevan stated I don't know if you feel we need to recap anything from before. Again, what is being proposed is an electric car dealership at the corner of South River Road and Technology Drive south. We had gone through architectural and the waivers that were requested. A couple of items that had been discussed were for us to add some additional evergreen plantings down the side, especially in these gaps between the carports, which we have done and provided a landscaping plan. In addition, we have identified some other existing trees out in some of these areas that we are not disturbing that would be preserved. With regard to the lighting, we went back, and if you recall, we had some very high lighting levels directly under the poles, we selected a new fixture, which dropped those down significantly and got them down to where it is roughly five or six foot candles under the poles and two or three in between the poles. The last

item was the charging stations. We went back and discussed that and they will be open to owners of this manufacturer's vehicles and for this facility. I believe those were the three primary items that were discussed. I can go into more detail or I will open it up to questions from the Board.

Acting Chairman Duschatko stated I think one of the questions that remains open, or two of them, signage. Mr. Kevan responded with signage we will either conform to your standards or they will have to come back with the manufacturer. There was one other item that we did address; we discussed providing a sidewalk from the facility to Technology Drive and I did provide a sketch to staff that basically the island closer to South River Road in the front are a little bit narrower than these on the other side, so I flipped them and left the landscaping pretty much the way it was but was able to put a sidewalk that came from this corner across these and then through and then through this landscaping and then up to this front corner. And, again, the reason we are going to that front corner is to get ADA access. If we go anywhere in the direction of the east side of the site, it will be too steep and won't meet ADA slopes or grades.

Acting Chairman Duschatko stated there are also some comments in here about pavement markings. Have you addressed that? Mr. Kevan responded we had agreed that we would repaint the striping and arrows and stop bars on Technology Drive. Acting Chairman Duschatko asked and internally whether there is going to be directional instructional things to the charging stations? Mr. Kevan responded yes; as much as the Town will allow us to provide directional signage on site, we can do. It is just very limited as far as directional signage on site. Acting Chairman Duschatko stated I would prefer that we work that out administratively. Mr. Kevan responded yes. Acting Chairman Duschatko stated I just wanted everybody to know that we are looking at that because obviously internal traffic flow is still a concern, in particular as you presumably have guests from out of state and out of town using that facility. Mr. Kevan responded I would say that we are going to direct them basically to come down that east side of the building, that will get them there the quickest and easiest and then they would leave the same way they came in.

Acting Chairman Duschatko asked the Board for any comments or questions for the applicant.

Mr. Newberry stated the driveway on the east side alongside the building, that is like 24 feet so you can accommodate 2-way traffic there. Mr. Kevan responded yes. Mr. Newberry asked will that be striped down the middle at all? Mr. Kevan responded we hadn't proposed it; if in between the overhead doors we feel that is just a single white stripe makes sense, we are happy to do that. Mr. Newberry stated I thought it might, but if you weren't planning to do it. It is 24 feet so traffic coming at each other might benefit from a stripe. Mr. Kevan responded we are happy to put a line down there.

Mr. Newberry asked can you just briefly review the statistics around the left-turn southbound on South River Road from the traffic study? I don't think we really got a chance to talk about that previously because there were still some open traffic study issues. Mr. Kevan responded I will see what I can do. What made the traffic study somewhat conservative is that it strictly looked at numbers at this intersection and does not take into account the signal at north Technology Drive and any other signals in the area. It doesn't allow for those gaps that kind of occur naturally

when you have the signal up just beyond it, but basically the numbers that we have is the left-hand turns do queue back towards our driveway and what you really have is occurring, so I think AM was fine, there wasn't much occurring then, but PM coming out of the sports complex, there are periods of time when you get high volumes coming out of there and at my office I discussed it with where they would have their kids over there for events, said a lot of times they will just turn right out of the facility just to go up to the signal and leave. There is queuing coming back to our driveway; the effect of our proposed project on that isn't very significant as far as how many additional cars queue back, but we felt that the numbers were conservative and when we actually looked at the cameraing of it, it didn't queue back as far as the results in the report did. My person actually sat there and looked and counted cars to see what they were looking at and how far it queued back, and it queues back just about to our driveway under normal circumstances.

Mr. Newberry stated I assume you are going to generating some hazardous waste. How is that planned to be handled? I am thinking oil and batteries and things of that nature. Mr. Kevan responded any type of normal waste from the maintenance of vehicles would be stored in containers and removed and disposed of legally offsite. Normally there is a secondary containment like a pad or what have you situated out there. Mr. Newberry asked that is intended to be kept within the building? Mr. Kevan responded yes, inside the building. Mr. Newberry asked no outside storage? Mr. Kevan responded that is correct.

Mr. Nelson stated I think at the last meeting there was some discussion around how you would model the transient traffic assuming that there was some use of the chargers by vehicles that were not being serviced. I just was curious of ultimately how you modeled that. I see that kind of the end assessment is that there won't be a significant amount of additional traffic; I just was looking for a little background on that. Mr. Kevan responded based on the discussion, we didn't go back and add in additional trips or try to consider how many cars would stop here for charging purposes, but my guess would be if you want us to coordinate or work with staff, it is just an odd number to try to calculate. Ms. Hebert stated our traffic engineer who reviewed the study concurred that the impact would be very minor and not impact the capacity of the intersection or significantly impact the queuing issue that we just discussed. Part of the striping, as Mr. Kevan said, is to add striping to Technology Drive to do not block the Sullivan Tire site driveway.

Ms. Malcolm asked do you have a timeframe for when you plan to have this operational? Mr. Patoucheas responded the goal would be sometime towards the end of next year.

Mr. Fairman stated thank you for going to the public for your vehicles only, I understand, but thank you for doing that. Unlike the Land Rover/Jaguar dealership whose charging stations are full public, I am disappointed that you didn't go fully public for all vehicles. I do think that you are also underestimating the number of charging stations that you need. With that sports complex there I can see use of charging stations there for people at the sports complex. I don't know what make this is, I make assumptions, and I see as I drive my school bus around a tremendous number of one particular brand at the schools, so we have a lot of these electric vehicles in Bedford and many of them will be at the sports complex like they are at the schools. I do think you may need in the long run to add more charging stations because I think you are

going to have a backup and queue for that and that may be a problem. Thank you for going as far as you did.

Mr. Clough stated I have a question about stormwater runoff. Would it handle like a 100-year storm even? I am assuming the land is flat. Mr. Kevan responded yes. This is a flat site, and basically we are using underground StormTech chambers, an underground system that the initial sediments or first flush is captured in this isolator row that removes the particulates and what have you, and then you infiltrate as much as possible. We have systems in three places. The first is at the front driveway that will discharge where that portion of the flow is going towards Technology Drive. There is a drain manhole that was left on this site when they originally did River Glen, so we are tying in a system on this side that will include the roof runoff and this side of the parking lot, and then there is a third system on this side that will discharge to this wetland and actually flows through a culvert and then kind of wraps back around and goes back to the river through Harvey Road and then around the Land Rover dealership. Those systems make it so that there is no increase in runoff and provide treatment that satisfies the State and Town criteria.

Acting Chairman Duschatko stated the discussion about charging stations brought up a point that we haven't discussed. This was set up as a dealership service facility, which I would assume would work during normal business hours. What happens with bringing the public in even from the network side in terms of having the charging stations there? Do they have to be manned or any lights on? Are we looking at 24-hour day service? Mr. Patoucheas responded it won't be 24-hour service. Whoever is using the station would need to remain there. They can't just leave their car. Acting Chairman Duschatko asked is there any discussion given on operating hours, Ms. Hebert? Ms. Hebert responded I believe it is one of the conditions of approval that it needs to be noted on the plan. Mr. Kevan stated normally it would probably be 7:00am to at the latest 9:00pm. My guess it would probably be earlier than that, would be the normal operation hours, and then with lighting we would have security lighting that would stay on within the property. As far as people going back and using the charging stations when the rest of the facility isn't being used, the site is not going to be gated or locked up, that is something that we would have to work out with the manufacturer or operator. Acting Chairman Duschatko stated I realize that normal petroleum based stations aren't necessarily open all of the time either. I was just curious if there was some thought given to this. Mr. Patoucheas stated it would be during service hours, so whenever the service is open.

Mr. Newberry asked this station will be visible to owners of these vehicles. Can you include in that hours of operation? Mr. Patoucheas responded yes. Mr. Newberry asked so that would include a statement of what the hours of operation are? Mr. Patoucheas responded yes. Mr. Newberry asked and that would be 7:00am to 9:00pm? Mr. Patoucheas replied whatever the tenant determines the hours of operation is for the business. Mr. Kevan stated it is a significant maintenance type facility; a good portion of the building is maintenance operation, so I can't see them opening earlier than 7:00am, so it would be 7:00am. I don't know for a fact, but my guess is the latest would be 9:00pm but it is probably more like 7:00am to 7:00pm. We will verify that and note it on the plans prior to Board signature. Mr. Newberry asked but that information would be available to anyone who had visibility to the location? Mr. Patoucheas responded yes.

Mr. Newberry stated on Sheet 4A, there are three or four heavy scalloped lines around the parking spaces and it wasn't clear to me exactly what that designates. Mr. Kevan responded I think that was basically a parking designation plan that the tenant wanted where they identified customer parking, vehicle maintenance parking and so forth. Those should all be labeled or they are intending customer parking, employee parking and maintenance vehicle parking. Mr. Newberry stated that wasn't clear to me from that sheet.

Mr. Fairman stated you said it would be the end of next year before it would be opening; when do you expect to announce the name of the dealership. It is hard for me to understand why it is a secret anyway. Mr. Patoucheas responded that will be up to them.

Acting Chairman Duschatko opened the public hearing on this application.

Corrine Null, 7 Pinecrest Circle, stated I have been here for 41 years. I listened to the last meeting and the concerns that you had and I have written some comments in regard to that. It sounds like you resolved a couple of the issues, so I may repeat something but I will try to be brief. Five and a half years ago I had to go to the showroom at the Prudential Center in Boston and pay exorbitant parking fees in order to see these strange new cars. When a rock cracked my windshield, I had to go to Peabody, Mass, otherwise I have not needed any service, no oil changes, no belts, no radiators, etc., however, should I need body work or have a problem, I will have to return to our southern neighbor. Despite the inconvenience, many people have gone to the trouble and committed to this car, others are not willing to put up with the distance. If it would be easier for people to have access to the brand here in Bedford, I would help our transition to a clean transportation system. Having a showroom here in Bedford would bring a lot of new people to town, and, again, when they return to pick up their vehicles, they will likely use our retail businesses with both functions that are badly needed in New Hampshire. With the rising gas prices, interest in EV's has skyrocketed. It is an important compliment to the Town and a definite plus for our community that this manufacturer has picked Bedford. It has spearheaded the electric revolution and fits with the innovations of Dean Kamen and other inventive companies in the area. It is the clean technology business and doesn't involve much grease and oil. It fits in with the other auto dealerships along Route 3 and I also like that it is near Land Rover, another quality brand. I understand you would like this manufacturer to provide charging stations for EV cars and compliment the Board on trying to address the problem. There is certainly a need, however, the type of chargers needed are not those related to this manufacturer. It is kind of like Apple and Android or Sony versus VHS. In fact, EV's are really smartphones on wheels. They are easy to drive but learning about charging takes some effort, like learning how to use a smartphone. This manufacturer has already created the super charging infrastructure to support its product and continues to enlarge. The super chargers in Hooksett are solely for this manufacturer and are designed to be convenient along the highways. Most owners have a clothes dryer plug installed in their garage and every day have a full charge. Those that don't, have adaptors that allow them to use the off brand chargers, which I will call Brand X. Fortunately, there are many other EV vehicles but they cannot use the plugs of this manufacturer and need chargers with different types of plugs. The Brand X fast chargers that I know of are at Whole Foods and at the Mall of New Hampshire. The State is in the process of figuring out how to enlarge that infrastructure. I hope this helps the Board to learn these distinctions and

understand that the requirement for public chargers at this location is like apples and oranges, and I hope it helps you decide to invest in the future with any EV of your choice.

Jeff Kerr, 71 McAllister Road, stated after watching the last Planning Board meeting I thought I should come to this meeting to show my support for the unnamed electric car dealership that is looking to build in Bedford. I was very excited to see that at last this brand would have a service presence in New Hampshire. I bought my electric car almost nine years ago, and at that time I had to go down to Watertown to pick it up, which is after I ordered the car online, selecting all of the options and colors I wanted, it was the best car buying experience I have ever had. It was nothing like haggling with the traditional dealer and is a much better way to buy a car. Since then much has changed, my brand, not to say that this is the brand, Tesla, has built a super charging network not just across the country but across the globe, Tesla are the industry leaders in the electric car revolution. It is safe to say that without Tesla, none of the other major automobile brands would be offering any EV's now. When I see comments that Tesla doesn't care about the community or environment, nothing could be further from the truth. After having an exchange on Facebook with one of your members, I realized that some education might be helpful. Ms. Null has already covered a lot of things about charging so I will just briefly touch on that. There are generally three levels of charging. Level 1 is any standard 120-volt outlet that will allow you to charge your car at about one or two miles per hour. When people talking about charging and how long does it take to charge, the most important thing to think about is how many miles per hour of charge do you get depending on the level of charging that you are doing. Level 1 is one to two miles per hour of charge, not very useful, but if you are leaving your car in a parking garage or at the airport, it is fine. Level 2 is a 240-volt outlet that is the dryer outlet that Ms. Null was talking about; that can get you between 20 and 40 miles per hour charge, which is totally adequate to parking your car in your garage overnight and charge to full for the next morning. Level 3 charging is the super charging network and there are other non-Tesla super charger standards. This is several hundred volts, big current, very big infrastructure to support this, this will get you from 10 percent of charge to 80 percent charge in about 30 – 45 minutes. This is the holy grail on these super charges and they are fantastic, but most people that have an electric car are going to have a Level 2 charger at their home or in their garage or just outside their garage and will use that for the majority of their charging. One of the best things about EV's is you get up in the morning, you go to your car that is fully charged, you drive, you come home, you plug it in and you are done. No gas stations, no waiting, no nothing, so for that reason, most people who own electric cars are not going to go to a dealership or a service center like this to charge on a daily basis. They are going to charge at home and it is only on a rare occasion that they will charge at a facility like this. I actually have a charger at my office and it has been in place for six or seven years and I have used it once because I charge at home every day and there is no need for me to charge anywhere else, except at a super charger when I have gone on a road trip. I appreciate the concern about trying to add charging facilities at a service center like this, but in my experience going to the different Tesla dealerships or service centers, they are not needed.

Mr. Kerr stated as a parting thought, while I support businesses having solar panels, if you are going to require Tesla to put solar panels on the service center, this requirement to apply to all new businesses, perhaps with a tax incentive, to use both a carrot and a stick. If you are going to go this path, even established businesses should be encouraged to have solar, but I think singling

out just this one new business is wrong. If solar is right for their business model, I am sure they will add it in the future. Thanks for your attention.

Mr. Fairman stated regarding comments from the public, those people are able to make assumptions relative to the type of dealership, we on the Board cannot do that. We have to assume that this could be any dealership from any electric car manufacturer, not necessarily just Tesla. Many of our comments, my comments at least I can speak to, are related to the fact that this could be any dealership of any electric car now and in the future, not just that. The other comment relative to charging stations; if everybody just charges at home or at work, then our government would not be looking into major costs of big charging station infrastructure that we the taxpayers have to pay for, so there are people that travel further in their electric cars than just to and from work and they are looking for a charging network throughout the country. Thank you for your comments, I appreciate them, but I just wanted to respond a little bit. Thank you.

Acting Chairman Duschatko closed the public hearing on this application.

MOTION by Ms. Malcolm that the Planning Board grant final approval for the Site Plan Application for a 41,486 square foot electric car maintenance facility and dealership, at South River Road, Lot 35-3-1, in accordance with the engineering plans prepared by TF Moran, last revised April 1, 2022, and the architectural plans prepared by BKA Architects, last revised February 7, 2022, 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 Director of Public Works and the Planning Director shall determine that the applicant has addressed all remaining technical review comments to the Town's satisfaction.**
- 2. The NHDES Sewer Discharge Permit number shall be noted on the plan, as applicable.**
- 3. The NHDES Alteration of Terrain permit approval number shall be noted on the plan.**
- 4. A Stormwater and Land Disturbance Management Permit shall be approved by DPW and noted on the plan.**
- 5. The applicant shall coordinate with DPW for discontinuance of the existing sewer easements on the property. The amended easement declaration shall be reviewed and approved by town legal counsel.**
- 6. The plans shall be updated to show a pedestrian connection to the Technology Drive sidewalk, designed to meet ADA requirements.**
- 7. The plans shall be updated to note the hours of operation for the proposed use.**
- 8. A pavement marking and signage plan shall be prepared for the intersection of Technology Drive and site / Sullivan Tire driveways for review by the Planning and DPW Director. The plan should include a review of the existing pedestrian crossing on Technology Drive to determine the best location of the crossing and ensure the pavement markings, signage, ramps, etc. meet**

- current standards. The plan should note faded pavement markings along the Technology Drive at the site / Sullivan Tire driveways should be replaced.
9. A driveway permit shall be approved by the Dept. of Public Works.
 10. All requisite easement documents shall be executed by the Applicant and submitted to the Planning Department to be recorded simultaneously with the plan, including:
 - a. First Amendment to Declaration of Easements
 11. The Applicant shall submit any outstanding engineering review fees, if any, to the Planning Department.
 12. The Fair Share Roadway Contribution, determined by the Town's consulting engineer, shall be paid to the Dept. of Public Works, as applicable.
 13. A letter from Manchester Water Works stating that they will be able to serve this project shall be submitted to the Planning Department.
 14. The applicant shall obtain excavation permits for proposed utilities from NHDOT for trenching in the ROW, as applicable.
 15. Prior to work within the Right-of-Way, the applicant shall obtain a street opening permit from DPW.
 16. Proposed signage will be required to meet town standards. A Sign Permit should be submitted for review and approval by the Planning Dept. and DPW.
 17. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Building Dept. shall review and approve building plans.
 18. Prior to the commencement of work, arrangements shall be made with the Planning Department regarding payment and coordination of third party inspections.
 19. Prior to commencement of work, a pre-construction meeting shall be held with the Planning Department, Department of Public Works, Fire Department and the Building Department.
 20. Prior to commencement of work, a performance guarantee in an amount approved by the Town for onsite maintenance of erosion and sedimentation controls shall be placed on file.
 21. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy, a building sewer permit is required from the Dept. of Public Works and the sewer accessibility fee shall be paid.
 22. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy, all site improvements depicted on the plan shall be completed.

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

3. **Shirley L. Beliveau Revocable Trust and Shelby and Lisa Vance Revocable Trust (Applicants & Owners) – Request for Subdivision – Lot Line Adjustment Approval for 2 lots, located at 410 and 414 Joppa Hill Road, Lots 04-31 and 04-31-1, Zoned RA.**

Richard Maynard of Maynard & Paquette Engineering Associates, LLC was present to address this applicant on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. Maynard stated it is the centerline of the property, and roughly what they are exchanging is 53,000 square feet of land making each of the lots approximately 174,000 square foot in size. No physical changes other than the lot line are being made to the property, no construction, nothing else. It is as simple a project as you could probably get.

Acting Chairman Duschatko asked the Board for any comments or questions for the presenter.

Ms. Malcolm asked are there any septic systems that will be affected by this lot line? Are there any septic systems near this lot line? Mr. Maynard replied the septic systems are shown on the plan and none of the septic systems will be affected by this lot line relocation. They are clear of the line.

Acting Chairman Duschatko opened the public hearing on this application. There were none. The public hearing was closed.

Ms. Hebert stated there are two waivers. Mr. Maynard stated the waivers being requested are shown on the staff memo, and they are essentially having to do with the soils HISS mapping and with wetlands. Both of those, HISS mapping and wetlands, have been mapped several times by previous plans for these two particular lots. Getting them remapped to show you the same thing serves no purpose, we are not doing any construction or any changes to the actual lots properties themselves, so we are requesting waivers from HISS mapping and wetlands.

MOTION by Mr. Fairman that the Planning Board grant two waivers from the Bedford Land Development Control Regulations as follows:

- 1. Section 231.2 – provide HISS Mapping and Lot Area by Soil Type Calculation stamped by a certified soil scientist.**
- 2. Section 218.1.13 – wetlands delineated and sealed by a Certified Wetland Scientist.**

Ms. Malcolm duly seconded the motion. Vote taken - all in favor. Motion carried.

MOTION by Mr. Sullivan that the Planning Board grant final approval of the lot line adjustment between 410 and 414 Joppa Hill Road, Lots 4-31 and 4-31-1, as shown on plans by Maynard and Paquette Engineering Associates, LLC last revised April 4, 2022, with the following conditions to be fulfilled within one year and prior to plan signature:

- 1. The Planning Director and Public Works Director shall determine that the Applicant has addressed all technical review comments to the Town's satisfaction.**
- 2. If the requested waivers are approved by the Planning Board, the plan shall be revised to note the waivers and the date of approval.**
- 3. All recording fees shall be submitted to the Planning Department at the time of recording.**

4. **A letter shall be submitted to the Planning Department by a Licensed Land Surveyor certifying that all boundary monumentation has been set as noted on the approved plan, or the boundary monumentation may be set and shown on the plan.**
5. **Prior to plan signatures the plans shall be certified and stamped by the Licensed Land Surveyor, Soil Scientist and Wetland Scientist, as applicable. Plans shall also be signed by the property owners per the Bedford Land Development Control Regulations.**

Ms. Malcolm duly seconded the motion. Vote taken - all in favor. Motion carried.

4. Shane Patel (Applicant) and Akhil Hotel Group, LLC (Owner) – Request for site plan re-approval to construct a five-story, 120 room extended stay hotel and associated improvements at 270 South River Road, Lot 24-98-8, Zoned PZ.

Jeff Kevan of TF Moran was present to address this site plan re-approval on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. Kevan stated we had originally gotten an approval in May of 2019 for a 120-room extended stay hotel, which was Home2 Suites, which is a Hilton line. Shane Patel is the proposed builder/owner. The Covid issue hit and the hotel business just went flat. He is basically saying that business has picked up and he is looking to start construction as soon as possible.

Mr. Kevan stated we did one amendment later in October 31, 2019, they came in and added a shed next to the dumpster area, and I think we had some architectural stuff that we did at the same time. The plan had a number of waivers. We asked to build 142 parking spaces where 160 were required, and as part of that condition, we have shown where those additional spaces would go on the site. The dumpster was 22.5 feet off the side property line where 25 was required and we provided some landscaping to mitigate that. We also asked for a waiver to allow a reduction of the side landscape strip along that side, basically from 28 feet to 22.6 feet. Then there happens to be a billboard in the back of the property that is for Pat's Peak and runs with the land forever, so we asked for the ability to have a second monument sign on the property. Those waivers have been granted. We came in and we got one extension in May of 2020 and that lapsed May of last year, so he's coming in and we are in the process. The Alteration of Terrain permit stands, we have asked for the New Hampshire DOT permit to be updated, which he is processing, and then we should be ready for construction.

Mr. Fairman asked could you show the architectural renderings because we have some new members on the Board since then. The renderings were posted. Mr. Kevan stated with this we had gone back and forth a little bit with the Board at the time. You will see we have gotten a stone base across the lower level of the building and then we took that same stone base up across the middle of the building and off one of the wings where there was an indentation. At the time we had gone through materials and architecture, and I know that this isn't the same Board. Mr. Fairman stated I thought somebody might like to take a quick look at it.

Mr. Fairman asked what hotel chain is it? Mr. Kevan replied Home2 Suites by Hilton. Mr. Fairman stated I thought Hilton's extended stay was the Tru. Mr. Kevan stated I think they have a couple of different lines. Mr. Fairman stated I am glad it is not True, because that is not a particularly attractive building. This one is.

Mr. Nelson stated I have a clarifying question. There is nothing that has changed either in the proposal or in since that time the applicable rules and regulations that would have any impact? Is that correct from what I read in the memo? Ms. Hebert responded nothing has changed within the Town's regulations that impact the approval, and the plan itself hasn't changed since the original approval and the amendment that Mr. Kevan explained to allow the additional signage and a shed on the property. Mr. Kevan stated it is a shed that they put back in the dumpster area. Mr. Nelson asked those were the mitigations that were approved? Mr. Kevan replied yes. Ms. Hebert stated they were approved as a site plan amendment.

Ms. Hebert stated when we have a re-approval like this, we work with the applicant to go back to the date that the plans were when the Board approved them, and we do another full technical review to double check to make sure everything is in order, make sure there are no overlooked changes. It is always hard when this amount of time lapses, but we do this frequently and we jump back on the plans and do a complete review. Mr. Kevan stated the only thing from the site's perspective was that at the time we were going to bring sewer across South River Road because we felt at the time we were going to be first. The Town had a plan to bring it across and what not, we had an agreement and participated in a portion of that, so the sewer is already across, we do have to cross the road for the waterline and we have been told we are not open trenching that excavation, that we will have to do a directional bore.

Mr. Fairman stated as I recall I believe we addressed the widening of FE Everett Turnpike, which is now going to happen next year, so that this doesn't have any impact. Those two projects don't have any impact on each other. I am pretty sure we addressed that before. Mr. Kevan stated not that I am aware of. Ms. Hebert stated that's correct, and there is an existing road widening easement along the frontage here to help facilitate that roadwork and this project was designed with that roadwork in mind and under consideration. Mr. Fairman stated actually both sides are being enlarged because next year the FE Everett Turnpike is going to be widened on the back side. I think we addressed that two years ago as well. Ms. Hebert stated yes. Mr. Fairman stated so both roads will be widened in the next few years, with the FE Everett Turnpike happening first, with a lot of blasting.

Acting Chairman Duschatko stated I have noticed there is a sign on that property indicating that it is for lease. Is the property going to be built on or are we just trying to hold this up? Mr. Kevan replied I am not sure why there would be a sign for lease, unless there is a remaining parcel in the front, but the hotel itself is being built by the owner and would be maintained by him. There is the open parcel in the front that could be developed further in the future. Ms. Hebert stated the Board did condition the approval on the demolition of those existing buildings out front.

MOTION by Ms. Malcolm that the Planning Board re-approve the Site Plan for an extended stay hotel at 270 South River Road, Lot 24-98-8, Zoned PZ, in accordance

with the site plans prepared by TF Moran, last revised April 4, 2019 and September 19, 2019, and the architectural plans by ZHA Architects, last revised April 16, 2019, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. All conditions of the April 22, 2019 site plan approval and the October 7, 2019 site plan amendment approval shall remain in effect.**
- 2. The applicant shall obtain approval of a Stormwater Management and Land Disturbance Permit for the subdivision from the Department of Public Works.**

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

- 5. Lyophilization Services of New England, Inc. (Applicant & Owner) – Request for time extension approval of a site plan amendment to modify a previously approved office and warehouse building addition to expand the size of the addition from 18,881 square-feet to 32,341 square-feet and associated site changes at 7 Commerce Drive, Lot 24-99-4, Zoned PZ.**

Jeff Kevan of TF Moran was present to address this time extension approval of a site plan amendment on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. Kevan stated this was the third phase of a 3-phase building. The first two phases were built out and had been there for a while. We got this plan approved April 6, 2020 and the plan was signed by the Board at the end of March in 2021.

Mr. Kevan stated this is 23,070 square foot of light industrial with a 9,271 office that is on the second floor. The architectural are on the screen in front of you. Basically what they did was they got this plan approved, they had purchased the building at the end of Commercial Drive, which is 29 Commerce Drive, where Suresk was located, and in the meantime they went forward with a building at the end, a building behind the Suresk. The equipment that they utilize takes about a year to get or have delivered, so they basically used the equipment in that structure. At this point they are ready to move forward with this facility; they are looking to get under construction this summer. I think our approval would have lapsed at the end of March right before we filed for this request for an extension, so we are asking for one year more to get under construction.

Acting Chairman Duschatko stated it seems reasonable. Does the Board have any questions or comments? There were none.

MOTION by Ms. Malcolm that the Planning Board grant a one-year time extension to provide an additional year for Lyophilization Services of New England, Inc. (LSNE) to apply for a Building Permit for the proposed addition a 7 Commerce Drive, Lot 24-99-4, Zoned PZ, with the following conditions:

- 1. All conditions of the April 6, 2020 Planning Board approval shall remain in full effect.**
- 2. The Applicant shall obtain a building permit for the project by March 30, 2023.**

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

V. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meetings:

MOTION by Mr. Fairman that the Planning Board table the approval of the March 28, 2022 Planning Board minutes. Ms. Malcolm duly seconded the motion. Vote taken - all in favor. Motion carried.

VI. Communications to the Board:

Ms. Hebert stated the next Planning Board meeting was scheduled for May 9, 2022 but will be cancelled because we did not receive any new applications. Your next meeting is on May 23, 2022 and that is a workshop meeting. It will be open to the public but not televised and Ms. Harris and I will be bringing a workshop agenda for the Board to discuss long-range planning, training, procedural questions, and we will have a nice informal discussion about planning in Bedford. Your next regular meeting where you will see site plan and subdivision applications will be on June 13, 2022.

Acting Chairman Duschatko asked where do we stand with the housing item? Ms. Hebert responded we have a few members who have raised their hand to volunteer to help with the housing discussion, and that is Mr. Nichols, Mr. Newberry and Vice Chairman Duschatko. We want to bring thoughts to the Planning Board at the workshop meeting to talk about how we might formalize that group and who else should be involved in the discussion.

Acting Chairman Duschatko asked is everyone attending the virtual meeting next week being put on by Southern NH Regional Planning Commission? Ms. Hebert responded the virtual meeting next week is a stakeholders meeting on housing that I believe went out to the Bedford Reps from Southern NH Regional Planning Commission and our Planning Board Chair and Vice-Chair. If other Board members are interested in listening to that stakeholder discussion that is being hosted by Southern NH Regional Planning Commission, I can forward that information out to the rest of the group. Acting Chairman Duschatko stated I thought everyone was supposed to get that. Ms. Hebert stated I think anyone and everyone who is interested can join. We can forward that on. That is scheduled Tuesday afternoon at 4:30pm.

VII. Reports of Committees: None

VIII. Adjournment:

MOTION by Mr. Fairman to adjourn at 8:00 p.m. Ms. Malcolm duly seconded the motion. Vote taken – all in favor. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted by
Valerie J Emmons