

TOWN OF BEDFORD
June 25, 2018
PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES

A meeting of the Bedford Planning Board was held on Monday, June 25, 2018 at the Bedford Meeting Room, 10 Meetinghouse Road, Bedford, NH. Present were: Hal Newberry (Acting Chairman), Karen McGinley (Secretary), Chris Bandazian (Town Council), Mac McMahon, Charlie Fairman (Alternate), Matt Sullivan (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. Chairman Jon Levenstein, Town Council Alternate Kelleigh Murphy, regular members Rene Pincince and Randy Hawkins, Town Manager Rick Sawyer, and Alternate Monique Rice were absent. Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Fairman were appointed to vote. Mr. Connors reviewed the agenda.

II. Old Business – Continued Hearings: None

III. New Business:

1. Bedford School District (Owner) – Request for a non-binding discussion of a governmental land use pursuant to RSA 674:54 for a proposed electronic reader-board sign at Bedford High School and the Ross A. Lurgio Middle School at 47A and 47B Nashua Road, Lot 20-25, Zoned R&A.
2. Ryk-Robert Bullock Trust, Estate of Robert & Eleanor Bullock, Prem Pulami & Sangita Thapa, O'Malley Rothstein Realty Trust (Owners) - Request for approval of two lot line adjustments between four residential properties on Pinecrest Drive, Lots 21-47-12, 21-47-36, 20-10-28, and 21-47-30, Zoned R&A.
3. Bruce & Deborah Bailey (Owners) - Request to subdivide one parcel into three residential lots at 185 Pulpit Road, Lot 6-22-3, Zoned R&A.
4. West Street Keene, LLC (Owner) – Request for architectural approval of a proposed restaurant at 28 South River Road, Lot 11-12, Zoned PZ.

IV. Concept Proposals and Other Business:

5. Master Plan Update

6. Development Update

Mr. Connors stated all of the new applications have been reviewed by staff and it is our determination that the applications are complete. The abutters have been notified; it is the opinion of Planning Staff that none of these applications pose a regional impact. Staff recommends that the Board accept the applications as complete.

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

1. Bedford School District (Owner) – Request for a non-binding discussion of a governmental land use pursuant to RSA 674:54 for a proposed electronic reader-board sign at Bedford High School and the Ross A. Lurgio Middle School at 47A and 47B Nashua Road, Lot 20-25, Zoned R&A.

A staff report from Becky Hebert, Planning Director, dated June 25, 2018 as follows:

I. Project Statistics:

Owner: Bedford SAU 25
Proposal: Non-binding discussion of a proposed electronic changeable copy sign at the entrance to the Middle & High Schools
Location: 47 Nashua Road, Lot 20-25
Existing Zoning: "R&A"- Residential & Agricultural
Surrounding Uses: Residential, Commercial

The School District is presenting this proposal to the Planning Board under the guidelines of RSA 674:54, Governmental Land Uses, where the Planning Board may hold a public hearing and issue non-binding comments, however, the proposal may go forward to construction without action or approval of the Board.

II. Project Description:

The Bedford Parent Teacher Group (PTG) is donating an electronic changeable copy sign to the Bedford School District to replace the existing wooden sign at the Bedford Middle & High School campus. The sign would be located approximately 400 feet from the Nashua Road/County Road intersection at the far western corner of the lower parking lot. It is situated to convey messages to students and parents once they have turned off of Nashua Road and are driving down the main entrance drive towards the school buildings. Even though it is set back a significant distance from the road, the sign will be very visible from the County Road/Nashua Road intersection.

Bedford prohibits electronic changeable copy signs or electronic message centers in all zoning districts. It is common for communities to either prohibit or restrict the use of electronic changeable copy signs. This type of sign has been the subject of several legal disputes involving freedom of speech, community aesthetics and safety. The courts have advised communities that the best way to control electronic changeable copy signs is to ban them outright. However, some communities do allow them but place restrictions on the design of the sign and frequency and style of messages displayed, but this can be difficult to monitor and enforce. The school's sign would be the first electronic changeable copy sign in Bedford. Although, the Planning Board approved a waiver to allow one at the Market & Main development for the cinema marquee, but it has not yet been installed. This sign would advertise movie times and is located on the cinema building and does not face the public right-of-way.

In addition to being an electronic message center, the proposed sign is much larger than what would typically be permitted in Bedford. The sign is a freestanding monument sign with 73 sq. ft. of sign area and stands approximately 10 feet tall. By Bedford standards this is a large sign. In residential districts, a sign can be up to 8 sq. ft., and in commercial districts for single tenant buildings, signs can be up to 32 sq. ft. The upper portion of the proposed sign is 20 sq. ft. and reads "Bedford Middle & High School." The electronic message center is 53.39 sq. ft. and extends beyond the base of the sign. The message center has three lines of text and shows colored letters on a black background. The electronic message panel also extends beyond the base of the sign, which is not typically allowed.

If the proposed sign were to be installed on private property, it would need a conditional use permit for the electronic changeable copy, size of the sign area, and design. However, the school is a governmental land use and not required to follow the town's zoning requirements. The School District has submitted this application to allow for public comment and discussion.

Staff would prefer the School District decline the gift because we work hard to limit the use of electronic changeable copy signs in Bedford. However, we understand the electronic message center is a practical way for the school to convey information to parents and students and they are commonly used in campus settings. Staff would strongly suggest moving the sign farther into the campus, uphill from Nashua Road to the upper parking area. If it were moved to the upper parking lots, it would not be visible from Nashua Road. We feel the proposed location will have a negative impact on the residential character of Nashua Road. If the sign cannot be relocated, we would suggest reducing the size of the sign so that it only contains two lines of text.

Staff would also recommend that the SAU coordinate with Planning Staff to develop policy for the use of the sign to control the illumination levels; limit hours of use; limit graphic displays; prohibit the use of flashing; pulsating or moving symbols and text; prohibit scrolling messages so the content changes instantly and does not scroll in and out; control timing between messages; and require each message to fit on one screen. Staff would also recommend prohibiting the use of the sign for commercial advertising for school sponsors.

III. Staff Recommendations:

Planning Staff recommends that the Planning Board forward the following comments to the School District:

- 1. Coordinate with the Planning Department to develop a policy for the use of the sign to limit the illumination levels; hours of use; graphic displays; prohibit the use of flashing, pulsating or moving symbols and text; prohibit scrolling messages so the content changes instantly and does not scroll in and out; and require each message to fit on one screen.*
- 2. Prohibit the use of the sign for commercial advertising for school sponsors.*
- 3. Relocate the sign farther into the campus to upper parking area and/or orient the sign to face exiting vehicles to avoid impacting views from Nashua Road.*

Bob Jozokos, Bedford High School Associate Principal, and Bob Perry from Souza Signs were present to address this request for a non-binding discussion of a governmental land use pursuant to RSA 674:54 for a proposed electronic reader-board sign at Bedford High School and the Ross A. Lurgio Middle School.

Mr. Jozokos stated the electronic sign is something that was designed in the site plan 12 years ago actually, so if you have been on the site, there is a cement pad that has been there for quite some time with a sort of wooden sign that is on there now. The PTG has raised the money and donated the funds to buy a sign, so that is what we are looking into right now. We are working with Souza Signs. That site is about 400 feet from the street, if you know the lower parking lot as you drive in on the right, at the end of that and before there is a wooded hill, that is where the pad is. In reading your staff report under the staff recommendations with regard to Condition #1, we have had discussion about all of those recommendations, I think we are in agreement with where you are about the illumination level and hours of operation. We are thinking it comes on in the morning right when students arrive and it goes off at night no later than 8:00 p.m., so regarding all of these ideas that you are suggesting we just want you to know that we have been talking through and it is a good idea that we come up with some sort of procedure or policy for how this operates. Other than that, I am here to answer any questions you have or from people in the audience. Mr. Perry can certainly speak to the technical aspects of the sign.

Acting Chairman Newberry stated could you just walk through for the Board a little bit of the detail of the sign, how it works, and how you are planning to use it. Mr. Perry responded there is a foundation there already. The blue area would all be a box type frame internally framed with 2-inch x 2-inch aluminum tube and then glazed over with some aluminum composite panel and the top section would be either illuminated or it would just be vinyl that says Bedford High & Middle School. The electronic message center could be either text, it could be graphics, and there is a wide range of how it can be operated and it could be rotated. In some cities or towns it could be no quicker than 5 seconds and then the illumination during the day you are fighting the sunlight so the illumination is quite bright but you highly realize that and as it gets darker at night, the illumination balances out so it is not too bright. So if there is a certain regulation that you want have the illumination on that, that can certainly be toned down. It works either with a hard line or remotely and it can be changed inside the school, so if it is a school event, whether it is sports or an open house or something else, it could certainly be set up. If there is a snow emergency and the school is refuge area, that could certainly be put up on there as well and likewise voting day. So there is a wide range of community services that could be utilized. Mr. Jozokos stated we have spoken about just keeping it to school events. If you are a parent and

you get the principal's notes, at the high school at least, and at the middle school too, there is a lot that goes on and we have to inform people about so at that time it would be used for that purpose for students coming into the school, for parents coming into the school, there is just a lot going on, and there is so much I just think people miss things because we send out an email per week but it is a lot of information that we give out. There is a website but still we just need to do better with marketing to our own kids and families, so it would be used for school events and school announcements to the kids and families that need to know that.

Acting Chairman Newberry asked can you tell us a little bit about why the size is required? It looks like a pretty large sign. Mr. Perry responded yes, it does look large from this vantage point, but the sign is about 400 feet off from Nashua Road, so it is quite a distance away. And in perspective, from that distance it is almost like a 3 x 5 sign. If you were to put it closer to the road, the scale is much different than at 400 feet back. Mr. Fairman stated but the sign is to be read by the people going into the school not the people going down Nashua Road so it could be considerably smaller so people could read it as they go up the street. Mr. Perry stated it certainly could. Ms. Hebert stated just to clarify, our commercial districts, our commercial properties are allowed one 32 square foot sign and this sign is 73 square feet, so it is much larger than what we would typically see in a commercial area and you are in a residential district across from a park and a house. Ms. McGinley asked because of its height, wouldn't it be very noticeable from the house that is at the bottom of the road and illumination during the winter months when it is dark at night, wouldn't that be very noticeable by the several houses on that road? Mr. Perry responded again, the illumination of the sign can be toned down to whatever is agreeable and certainly whatever is legible. And as you mentioned, if you are working strictly with the school as you drive it, it could certainly be downsized and the tone can be adjusted accordingly.

Ms. McGinley stated the other question I had is would you be able to give directions to the voters of the Town on Town voting day because the school is not open during that but there are people in Town who are voting for the first time and it would be helpful to give them directions as to which way to go. It has actually changed from a couple of years ago to now. Mr. Jozokos replied I think that is a perfect use for it. Anyone that is coming onsite for the Town or the School District is doing, I just think that is an appropriate use.

Mr. Fairman stated although the law allows you to ignore us and staff as well, I hope that the School Department does not and I hope you pay attention to what we are saying and taking it into account. Mr. Jozokos responded yes.

Mr. Fairman stated I have two comments about the sign. First of all it is safety. I go to the school twice a month at 7:15 a.m. and I am leaving there about 8:00 a.m. as the traffic is at its peak and I believe a sign there is a major safety issue for both the intersection of County Road and Nashua Road but also for students that turn into that parking lot back-to-back, cars going in, inexperienced drivers going into the parking lot are now looking at a sign and you are going to have many fender benders happening because of that. I suppose you don't think that is safety because kids won't be hurt but you have a combination of inexperienced drivers on this intersection and parents who are thinking about their day ahead and dropping their kid off is a minor interference in getting on with the rest of their day, so I think it is a terrible safety issue. The second comment I have is because of the great communications the school does through

principal notes and social media and all of the other things you do and can do, you don't need the sign. This sign is totally useless. Everything that you are going to put on there is sent to the parents and students and because I am involved with the students at several levels in the school, I know how good a job you do so you don't need the sign. I just think that there are so many better things that you can do with that \$35,000 than put up a useless sign that is a safety hazard. Mr. Jozokos responded thank you.

Ms. McGinley asked why do you put it here instead of at the bottom of the parking lot that you see past the trees? Mr. Jozokos replied I think primarily because that pad has been there for almost 12 years now and it is wired with electricity. That is all just sitting there ready to go, so that is not a part of the cost for this sign. By assumption I was not on the visit with Chip or the principals but my assumption is that it is just a site that is ready to roll and that is why they are using it.

Acting Chairman Newberry stated there were a couple of other things in the staff memo. They also recommend that the sign not be used for commercial advertising. Is that a part of your plan? Mr. Jozokos replied it is not a part of the plan to use it for commercial advertising. Ms. Hebert asked like sponsors? Mr. Jozokos replied not at all.

Acting Chairman Newberry asked what do you anticipate the hours of this sign being illuminated? Mr. Jozokos replied when I spoke to the Superintendent, it hasn't been firmed up but the hours were 7:00 a.m. when students and families and staff are coming onsite until about 8:00 p.m. Acting Chairman Newberry asked that would be seven days a week or five days a week? Mr. Jozokos replied I would assume five days a week. He didn't tell me that but I would assume five days a week, which is when the people are there. Acting Chairman Newberry asked that would probably be weekdays? Mr. Jozokos replied yes. Mr. Fairman stated I will be surprised if you don't use it for the weekends because there are a lot of activities at school as well, so I suspect the School Department will want to use that seven days. Mr. Jozokos stated there are a lot of outside organizations that are out there on weekends actually, more than what we are doing. Mr. Fairman stated the other thing staff suggested in addition to the idea of putting it further up so it is not visible from County Road and Nashua Road, which I think is certainly a better idea, if you can't do that, then turn it around so that all the people that you want to reach are coming out the same exit, so turn it around so it is not facing the road. I mean you really need to think through the safety of that sign, and if you turn it around, it would help, but if you put it up at the top of the hill, it would help even more. Mr. Jozokos responded those are two good suggestions I am going to bring back to be looked into. Ms. Hebert stated that would be great. We work very hard to regulate signs in Bedford and this sign type is prohibited in all districts and this would be the first electronic changeable copy sign in Bedford and it is much larger than what we typically see for a standard sign that is just advertising a business without the changeable copy.

Acting Chairman Newberry stated looking further at the staff memo, staff also recommends prohibiting scrolling messages and I think that may also speak to Mr. Fairman's point of safety. If you have a scrolling message there, it is going to be a lot more distracting with people trying to read what is scrolling by. I would think that you would want to limit it to a fixed display. Mr. Jozokos responded I would agree with that.

Mr. McMahon stated just to go back a little bit. If Chief Bryfonski's safety board determines that there may be problems or glare or whatever, you would be willing to be able to discuss that with the Chief? Mr. Jozokos replied I am going to say yes, but I can't make that decision. I certainly will bring the request back to the Superintendent and I am sure he will take it under consideration to work with the Chief.

Mr. McMahon stated and the second thing; will there be any additional cost. I know you have had some fine people that have gathered the money to be able to have this sign, but is there going to be a cost to have it installed that is part of the School Board budget? Mr. Jozokos replied it is part of the PTG gift. They raised the money to purchase the sign and have it installed and that is all part of the PTG gift money. The only ongoing cost is really the electricity to run the sign and maintenance.

Mr. McMahon stated I know that you worked with the folks here at the center with the students at the school for audio/visual participation and instruction. Will any of the students be able to work with the school and actually help operate this thing? Mr. Jozokos replied we haven't really gotten that far down the road. We like to have students participate in all of those types of things so I am not going to say no to that, I just don't know if once it is running if there will be that much learning that can happen. Those students participate here at BCTV certainly, at the tech department, in the theater and there is just a lot to learn there, but with the sign I am sure there is a lot to learn but I don't think we are going to use it for its full usage because it does have more capabilities than your staff recommendations say we shouldn't go there, and I agree with you, so possibly students will be involved. Mr. McMahon stated it is just a curiosity that there is all sorts of learning that they could get. That is just a personal thought, not a Board recommendation. Thank you for your answer.

Councilor Bandazian stated I just would kind of echo the comments that have been made about trying to make it not visible from Nashua Road and County Road and making it visible internal to the campus. And not to sound ungrateful to the PTG as a member of the community, because they are certainly to be commended for their fund raising effort and generosity, but I do think that would be important from my perspective. Safety is another thing that is mentioned. It may mean sacrificing a concrete pad and rewiring, but if that is what needs to be done, I would encourage considering that. Mr. Jozokos responded thank you. Ms. McGinley stated I agree with you on that because if a student is looking over as they are turning in to the parking lot thinking that the person in front of them had already moved on.

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

Acting Chairman Newberry asked Ms. Hebert, do we vote on a recommendation or just make a recommendation as a Board? Ms. Hebert replied you can ask staff to share the minutes of this meeting with the School District, and if you want to specifically identify the recommendations in the staff report, we could prepare a brief letter to the School District outlining those. Acting Chairman Newberry responded I would even suggest that we provide them with the staff report because I think that does set the context of the sign and makes some good recommendations that

I think should be considered while you are deciding what and how you are going to use this sign.

Mr. Fairman stated I have one more comment. The agreement with the PTG states that only they can use it for fund raising. I would like to suggest that the School Board go back and make sure that at least other organizations directly related with the school, like Bedford Education Foundation and perhaps the library can also use that sign. It would be nice if other charitable organizations that did things for the school could use it as well but to limit it only to PTG and not have any organizations use it or at least open it up for those other educational organizations.

Acting Chairman Newberry stated I expect what we will do is we will forward to you the staff memo and the minutes from our discussion. Is there anything else from the Board's perspective? That is our feedback. Mr. Jozokos responded that is helpful. Thank you for your time.

2. Ryk-Robert Bullock Trust, Estate of Robert & Eleanor Bullock, Prem Pulami & Sangita Thapa, O'Malley Rothstein Realty Trust (Owners) - Request for approval of two lot line adjustments between four residential properties on Pinecrest Drive, Lots 21-47-12, 21-47-36, 20-10-28, and 21-47-30, Zoned R&A.

A staff report from Mark Connors, Assistant Planning Director, dated June 25, 2018 as follows:

I. Project Statistics:

Owners: Tige Tontine Realty Trust, Robert & Eleanor Bullock, Prem Pulami & Sangita Thapa, and O'Malley-Rothstein Realty Trust
Proposal: Two lot line adjustments between four lots
Location: Pinecrest Drive (Lots 21-47-12, 21-47-36, 20-10-28, & 21-47-30)
Existing Zoning: "R&A" Residential and Agricultural
Surrounding Uses: Single-family homes

II. Background Information:

All of the parcels that are subject to this application are part of the Bell Hill Estates subdivision recorded in 1970. The residence at 22 Pinecrest Drive is somewhat unique in that the footprint of the residence spans three different parcels. The home is primarily located on Lot 21-47-36, but also extends on to Lots 21-47-12 and 21-47-30. The home was built nearly 60 years ago in 1959. It is not entirely clear from the Town records how the non-conformity occurred, but according to one of the applicants, it was based on a faulty survey of the parcel. The driveway for the residence is wholly located on Lot 21-47-12, which includes a separate single-family home and driveway (at 23 Pinecrest Drive). Three of the lots in this application – 21-47-12, 21-47-36, and 20-10-28 – border Pinecrest Lane, a paper street that was never constructed. A driveway for a residence to the north, at 23 Pinecrest Drive, utilizes the Pinecrest Lane right-of-way.

The residence at 22 Pinecrest Drive does not encroach on to Lot 20-10-28, and construction of a single-family home is currently underway on that parcel. Portions of Lots 21-47-30 and 20-10-28 extend into the Bedford Historic District. On June 5, 2018, the Historic District Commission

approved the clear-cutting of a portion of Lot 20-10-28 to allow a driveway and lawn to be installed on the lot.

In April 2002, the Planning Board approved a lot line adjustment and consolidation plan that eliminated the former Lot 20-10-32 (located along the Pinecrest Lane paper street) and reapportioned the area to Lot 20-10-28 and a neighboring parcel to the west

III. Project Description:

The applicant proposes two reasonably minor lot line adjustments – the first, an equal area exchange of land between lots 21-47-36 and 20-10-28, and the second, a reapportionment of a 0.1-acre tract of land from lot 21-47-30 to lot 21-47-12. The frontages of all the lots involved in this application will not be impacted by the adjustments. The land exchanges are described further below:

Lot line adjustment #1, between Lots 21-47-36 and 20-10-28

Parcel	Existing area	"Parcel A"	"Parcel B"	Proposed area
21-47-36	44,503 SF (1.016 ac.)	-1,323 SF	+1,323 SF	44,503 SF (1.016 ac.)
20-10-28	87,510 SF (2.009 ac.)	+1,323 SF	-1,323 SF	87,510 SF (2.009 ac.)

Lot line adjustment #2, between Lots 21-47-12 and 21-47-30

Parcel	Existing area	"Parcel C"	Proposed area
21-47-12	59,276 SF (1.361 ac.)	+ 4,321 SF	63,597 SF (1.460 ac.)
21-47-30	84,737 SF (1.945 ac.)	- 4,321 SF	80,417 SF (1.846 ac.)

Both of the lot line adjustments will serve to make the parcels more conforming with Bedford’s current zoning requirements. The first equal area land exchange will have the effect of making a detached accessory structure on lot 21-47-36 that currently encroaches into the Town’s minimum 25-foot rear setback with lot 20-10-28 conforming with the setback requirement. The adjustment will increase the setback distance from 8-feet to approximately 31-feet.

The second adjustment will have the effect of correcting the encroachment of the residence on to Lot 21-47-30. Moreover, the adjustment will make the structure conforming with the Town’s minimum 25-foot rear setback with Lot 21-47-30 (the residence will be situated 26-feet from the rear lot line). Additionally, although lot 21-47-12 will still not conform with the Town’s minimum lot size requirement of 1.5 acres in the R&A Zone, the adjustment, and the addition of 0.1 acres to the parcel, will make it more conforming with the requirement. Finally, the 75-foot protective well radius on lot 21-47-36 will no longer encroach on to lot 21-47-30.

To be sure, several issues remain on lots 21-47-12 (23 Pinecrest Drive) and 21-47-36 (21 Pinecrest Drive) that staff would like the owners to address in the near-future. After the

adjustments, the residence will continue to encroach on to lot 21-47-12 and the driveway will remain wholly located on this lot (although it serves lot 21-47-36). The 75-foot protective well radius on lot 21-47-36 will continue to encroach on to the neighboring lot. However, these nonconformities already exist and they will not in any way be compounded by approval of the current application before the Board. Ultimately, these issues can only be addressed if an additional lot line adjustment is pursued between the two lots or alternatively if a substantial portion of the residence is removed, or the home is removed and replaced in a conforming location.

Mr. Ryk Bullock possesses the power of attorney for Lot 21-47-36 and is a trustee for the trust which owns Lot 21-47-12. He has explained to staff that he is not yet in a position to pursue the necessary additional changes, due to negotiation with others who enjoy shares of ownership. However, the Planning Board may wish to discuss the future corrections with the applicants to see if there is a timeline for addressing the remaining nonconformities on the lots. In addition to correcting the structural encroachment and setback issues, staff would ultimately like to see the driveway for 21 Pinecrest Drive relocated so that it no longer runs through Lot 21-47-12 and instead utilizes the Pinecrest Lane right-of-way for a shared driveway. The neighboring Lot 21-47-34 (27 Pinecrest Drive), which is the only other parcel in the subdivision that does not enjoy frontage along a public road, already utilizes the Pinecrest Drive right-of-way for its driveway access. Staff would recommend that the plan be revised to reflect the current ownership of the parcels as indicated on the current Town tax records (Condition #5)

III. Waiver Requests:

The applicant is requesting the following waivers of the Bedford Land Development Control Regulations (see letter from Robert Kilmer of Sandford Surveying & Engineering):

- 1. Section 218.1.11 requiring a topographic survey*
- 2. Section 218.1.12 requiring HISS mapping*
- 3. Section 218.1.13 requiring wetland mapping*
- 4. Section 231.2.1 requiring minimum lot size by soil type*
- 5. Section 231.2.2 requiring minimum buildable area*

The two proposed adjustments involve small areas of land, and the Board commonly waives these requirements for applications of this nature. Additionally, the proposed adjustments will have the effect of making the lots only more conforming with the Town's current requirements, and the parcels are located within a well-established residential subdivision created before adoption of most of the Town's current zoning and land use requirements. For those reasons, staff does not object to granting the waivers.

IV. Staff Recommendations:

The Planning Board will need to vote on whether or not to grant the waivers from Sections 218.1.11, 218.1.12, 218.1.13, 231.2.1, and 231.2.2 of the Bedford Land Development Control Regulations.

The Planning Staff recommends that the Planning Board grant approval of the two proposed lot line adjustments on Pinecrest Drive, between Lots 21-47-36 and 20-10-28, owned by Robert & Eleanor Bullock and Prem Pulami & Sangita Thapa and between Lots 21-47-12 and 21-47-30, owned by Tige Tontine Realty Trust and O'Malley-Rothstein Realty Trust, as shown on the plans by Sandford Surveying and Engineering, last revised June 1, 2018, with the following conditions to be fulfilled within one year and prior to plan signature or 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. In the event that the Planning Board approves the waiver requests, the waivers shall be noted on the plan along with the date of Planning Board approval.*
- 3. The applicants shall submit all recording fees to the Planning Department.*
- 4. The owners shall sign the plans.*
- 5. 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.*

Ryk-Robert Bullock, owner, and Bob Kilmer of Sandford Surveying and Engineering were present to address this request for two lot line adjustments between four lots.

Mr. Bullock stated under the applications one my companies is listed as the applicant and in all situations I am here tonight with Bob Kilmer of Sandford Surveying and Engineering. Basically the short scenario and synopsis is: Pinecrest Drive, known as Bell Hill, was originally subdivided in 1959. I'm not sure quite frankly how we got ourselves involved in the mess we are now involved in, but suffice it to say it exists, and we are here to try and resolve it.

Mr. Bullock continued Mr. Kilmer and I met with Ms. Hebert and Mr. Connors about six months ago and at that point it was decided that the best way of approaching it was to try and see what we could reach agreement with the abutters. We have got some bigger problems than others and some smaller problems than others. So the plan that is before you tonight is basically to resolve two issues that everybody is in agreement on. There are, as Mr. Connors in his memo pointed out, some significant issues that still remain, and I will address those shortly, but right now the two that we are here for are basically no-brainers. The first of which is an exchange of an equal amount of land to try and fix the contours of a lot, in the process of which that will in fact provide the right setback by Town requirements for the house located at 21 Pinecrest Drive. Not much beyond that but it will do that. The second one basically will allow what is an overlap of part of a structure at 21 Pinecrest Drive onto Lot 30, but by doing this we will in fact bring everything back into context with 23 Pinecrest Drive. We haven't resolved all of the issues but we are working our way to it. Out of four lots that were affected, we have now managed to bring them into two. Basically that is as simple as it gets.

Mr. Bullock stated Mr. Connors's memo brought forth several ideas, all of them valid, all of them viable, but anything pertaining to access on 21 Pinecrest Drive or anything else between 21 and 23 quite frankly the issue is simply not ripe yet. We are faced with a situation where we do have a beneficiary of one of the trusts that is of a different opinion than everybody else is; therefore we are sort of stuck in limbo on that. Certainly to be frank, the issue has to be

resolved. There can be no refinancing, there can be no sales, and there can be no anything of the properties at 21 and 23 until these issues are resolved. I just don't have a timeframe. There has been a good amount of discussion but without resolution and nobody has a final agreement. Therefore we are here tonight, and Mr. Kilmer is here to answer any technical questions you may have.

Mr. Bullock stated as we are looking to do the two that we filed for, in fact, nothing changes anything, nothing goes against any zoning ordinance, and in fact, they tend to get better as evidenced by Mr. Connors's memo. I think that this is an excellent step to resolve something that has been in effect for perhaps close to 50 years, if not a bit longer. I can tell you quite frankly that no one was aware of it, it surfaced about a year ago, and unfortunately it is what it is. So all of us might want to wave a magic wand and make it go away, it is not going to happen. It is going to take some work, some really great engineering from Sandford, and a lot of money from somewhere. Mr. Kilmer is here to answer any technical questions you have regarding the plan, I am here to answer anything else from an historical standpoint that you might want to know, and here we are.

Acting Chairman Newberry asked so this lot line adjustment will remedy a portion of the problem there but not the entire problem? Mr. Bullock replied absolutely not. Don't get me wrong, I am not presenting this as being the end-all, as I said in the beginning of my soliloquy. When Ms. Hebert and Mr. Connors and I talked, I believe, and I am not speaking for them, that the issue was because there were so many parties involved, so many issues involved, that we would try and approach this if we could not reach a total agreement, which we are not able to, we are going to approach it and bring it to you guys as a piecemeal, not because it is the best idea, but because it is the most workable idea. Acting Chairman Newberry responded it certainly looks like a step in the right direction. Mr. Bullock stated and that is all we are presenting it to. We have been negotiating for six or seven months to get it to this point tonight.

Acting Chairman Newberry asked just for my edification, there is still a lot line that cuts right through the middle of the current structure? Mr. Bullock replied yes; but my point being, if the Board is kind enough to approve what we are presenting tonight, that takes two lots out of the four lot equation, leaving us with only two lots to deal with to come back to the Board when it is appropriate and say the parties have reached this agreement, this is the engineering that has been done, would the Board care to bless this, because ultimately it is the Board's decision, as we all know.

Ms. McGinley stated Mr. Chairman, I have a suggestion. In looking at this plan that was given to us, and I am a real estate lawyer so I am used to looking at plans, I think that anyone who is here and has an interest in this or has looked at this online because they have an interest, an explanation with the engineer showing where the lines are now and what is being changed. That would be helpful.

Mr. Kilmer stated for the initial equal area swaps, the dash line here marked 'old lot line' runs this way and we are just proposing basically to flip triangles of 1,323 square feet between lots. Again, Lot 36 will not change, it is small acreage but it will not be reduced at all. That is one. The first point being that again in the report they thought that this small rectangle in here

between the lot line and the house was a structure and in fact it was an errant rectangle that I had put in that I thought was a septic tank there, so what it is is that it doesn't bring that into conformance but it brings the one corner of the middle square addition where it is now 17 feet from the property line and not meet zoning, now with the moving of the line it is well within lot. The next parcel, which is at the north part of 23 and the vacant lot 21-47-30 that is just a parallel shift to make the back of that structure conforming from zoning and keep it off the lot 30 so there is no cloud on that lot. It is a free and clear lot with no structures and no issues.

Mr. Sullivan asked so the resulting two lots that would be affected are the only ones that still have the ongoing issues would be Lot 47-12 and Lot 47-36? Mr. Kilmer replied correct.

Ms. McGinley asked why do you want to do this piecemeal instead of having the whole solution? Mr. Bullock replied it would be great if that was a possibility, but as I said during my narrative, we do have a situation with one of the beneficiaries of 23 Pinecrest. At this point we are not able to reach an agreement. At some point, as I also said in my narrative, something has got to give because as it stands right now, neither 21 nor 23 can be sold, they can't be mortgaged or refinanced. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure out sooner or later somebody has to give here. Right now unfortunately there is no agreement and as I said, there has been discussion, but there has been no agreement, so we were faced with either bringing this before the Board as we are tonight and saying we have a major mess, we can resolve it into a smaller mess. Does the Board like seeing a smaller mess? Believe me, no more than I like seeing it, but unfortunately people die, interests change hands through estates, whatever, is it no better to approach this from the standpoint of what we are doing saying we can take a four lot situation, make it into a two lot situation and that eliminates basically half of the problem.

Ms. McGinley stated the other thing I would like to point out to anyone in the audience with interest, from the staff report these lots were built upon when zoning was non-existent or in the very early stages. Mr. Bullock responded no. The property at 21 Pinecrest was built in the latter part of 1962 to 1963, the property at 23 Pinecrest was built in 1993 to 1994, so the zoning was very much in effect. I can provide an explanation of how I think we got here. Ms. McGinley asked at what point was the lot subdivided? Mr. Bullock replied 1959. Ms. McGinley stated that is the reference that I was referring to. Mr. Bullock stated I thought you were talking about when the properties were built on. Ms. McGinley responded no because the Board and the Town doesn't really see them after they were built on as they do now. Mr. Bullock stated at the original subdivision there was not a Planning Board at that point. The original subdivision in 1959 was approved by signature of the Board of Selectmen. That is how far back we go.

Acting Chairman Newberry stated so this fixes two lots and leaves two lots still burdened. Mr. Bullock responded we still have two lots that present a challenge before we can come back to you people again. The funny part of this is, and I don't say funny in the point of being humorous, nothing can be resolved without this Board approving it. So whenever, however, the omnipotent situation of the almighty there is an agreement reached, that agreement has got to be blessed by this Board or it doesn't exist. Again, when you ask why we are coming here piecemeal, we are coming here piecemeal because as I said, and I am not trying to quote either Ms. Hebert or Mr. Connors, the idea was to get as much accomplished to resolve these issues as we could as we went. Ms. McGinley asked and you anticipate that the changes that we would

make today if we choose to approve it would not need to change again? Mr. Bullock replied absolutely. On that one I am absolutely prepared since I seem to be the one paying the bills, I will guarantee it because I am not going to go back and reinvent the wheel

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

Caitlin Demet, 13 Pinecrest Drive, asked can you just tell me the two lots that will actually be affected later? Mr. Connors replied two of the properties are not developed but the two that have homes on them are 21 Pinecrest Drive and 23 Pinecrest Drive. Mr. Bullock stated the issue the lot that will be affected that I think is of more concern to you is the one directly in back of your house, which is Lot 30. The lot directly in back of you we are doing a lot line adjustment that will in fact cut 1/10th of an acre off that lot and adhering it and combining it with the house at 21 Pinecrest Drive. Ms. Demet asked but that would be effective in the first round of what you are doing right now? Mr. Bullock replied this is what the Board will be voting on tonight, but after that is done then that is a done deal. It is not going to come back for a variation. Ms. Demet asked so I will lose a 10th of an acre potentially but then I get to be happy that I am not going to lose anymore? Mr. Connors replied you won't lose anything. Mr. Kilmer stated your lot remains the same. Ms. Demet asked so why did I get a letter? Mr. Kilmer replied because you are an abutter. Ms. Demet asked but nothing will change? Mr. Connors replied nothing on your lot will change. Ms. McGinley stated I think it is safe to say for them to deed any portion of what you have on record as your lot they would have to communicate with you and you would have to be involved in it. Ms. Hebert stated you received the certified letter just to notify you of this public hearing. You are an abutter and we are required to send you a notice so that if you had concerns about a lot line adjustment, you knew about the public hearing and you could come and request information. Ms. Demet stated that letter was not ever delivered. They only tried to deliver once and then I got an update to a letter that was just stuck in there but it was not property delivered. Ms. McGinley stated but they cannot take any of your land without your signature. Ms. Demet replied okay. Ms. Hebert stated it shifts the lot line of the parcel that is behind your house and it is going to get a little bit shorter from the rear, so from the back and the line is going to move forward just a little bit and that lot is going to get a little bit smaller, about 1/10th of an acre smaller.

Dena Monaco, 17 Pinecrest Drive, stated that is all forested behind our houses. Is that correct? Mr. Bullock replied yes. Ms. Monaco asked so it will be cleared to sell and build a house on? Mr. Bullock replied no; from where you bought is basically forested backing up to 21 Pinecrest. There are absolutely no plans to remove any trees between your property and the existing barn/house/barn at 21. There is absolutely no plan to move a tree. Ms. Monaco responded okay. How will people that potentially build on that land access those parcels? Mr. Bullock replied they would be coming in from the bottom of Pinecrest Drive, where Pinecrest Drive comes in across the street from the Mobil gas station. There is going to be no access from the upper part by your house, 21, 23, 13, there will be no entrance going in from that direction. They will all be from the lower end. Ms. Monaco responded I think that is all I have; thank you.

Ms. Demet stated behind my house we have that rock wall goes and you can see 21, so there are a lot of trees right there and I understand that there is no access from my portion of the road, but I am I to assume that all of those trees will be removed behind my rock wall? Mr. Bullock

responded no; I have no inclination or reason to believe that that will be the case. Like anything else, whoever buys the lot they are going to position their house the way they wish it to be. So can I tell you there will never be a tree cut on the lot, of course not because the issue here is in a perfect world if we don't want to have any trees cut down, who would buy the lot, because you can't build a house on it. That much I cannot tell you. The issue is that there is no plan whatsoever to go in and cut a tree down or anything else at this point in time. If someone buys it and wants to put a house, obviously they are going to have the right, as anybody else in this town would on any other parcel in this town on anything else, to go in and say I want my house facing this way and I want to have this, so they are going to go in and cut the appropriate vegetation so they can have it and put the house there. That much I can't guarantee. What I can guarantee is we are looking for a lot line revision with absolutely no plans whatsoever under any circumstances cutting a tree until at some point when it happens, how it happens, somebody decides to buy the lot and decides they are going to put a house there. Now, I have sold property in the past and I still have lots that I sold 20 years ago that still aren't built on, so I can't give you a timeframe. But to answer your question, you don't have to worry about looking out tomorrow morning and seeing it being clear-cut. That is not going to happen; I like the deer too much. Ms. Demet responded okay, I should sell my house now. Mr. Bullock responded I am not saying that in any sense of the word. It could be 10 years, it could be 15 years, it could be 20 years, and it could be in 8 months. How can I tell? Acting Chairman Newberry stated the parcel behind you can be developed today and it can be developed tomorrow, whether this is approved or not. The only difference in the parcel behind your property is that it will be 26 feet shorter in the back. Mr. Bullock stated I am back to my usual thing, if anybody doesn't like the idea of something being built on, and then buy it. I'm sorry; I am not particularly concerned to who I sell to. I have no problems with that, but I did this once maybe about 30 years ago before we were even in this building, someone was complaining because they didn't want a house in back of them. Then buy it. This is what the price is. If you don't want to see something there, then buy it. Ms. McGinley stated I will have to tell you that I moved to Bedford in the early 1980's and there were 8,000 people here. There are a lot more people now.

Ms. Monaco asked how big are those lots? Mr. Kilmer replied the vacant lot will be 1.846 acres and this parcel here that they have cleared and are getting ready to build on is 2.009 acres. Ms. Monaco asked and it won't be subdivided further? Is there a limit in Bedford? Mr. Kilmer replied no; they lack frontage and area. Acting Chairman Newberry stated neither of those parcels are further subdividable. Ms. Monaco stated I know it has been addressed that in the future other lots will be affected and I guess I didn't completely comprehend that, but will 17 or 13 be affected in the future? Mr. Kilmer replied your lot area doesn't change at all. Mr. Bullock stated the answer is no, because the bottom line is you have a little bit better than an acre at 17, the only thing that is going to change in the next round is the fact that there will be a lot line adjustment of some sort between 21 and 23 combined. It will be done in the idea of keeping the two existing lots as close as possible to the existing acreage on them now. Assume you have the two lots; the exterior run-around of the two lots is not going to change. It is going to be what is internal in that area. Mr. Kilmer indicated the acreage on the posted plan that was being described. Mr. Bullock stated that is not going to change. That is what it is. The only thing that you are going to find changing, if the Gods smile on us, is the internal line to try and get this a little bit more conforming and do a couple of other things, but in no way is it going to affect Caitlyn, Atillo and you; it is simply what it is. The lot line when you bought the house a month

and a half ago is going to be the same lot line. That is not changing. We are trying to work with something on the internal, but, again, that could be, as I said to Caitlyn, a month, six months, a year, two years. I look at it this way, my grandson Ryan could be the one doing this by the time it is finally getting done. There is no plan for this at this point beyond that we are trying to work with communication because it is in everyone's best interest to resolve this weird issue that has been around since approximately 1967. Ms. McGinley stated this Planning Board can't grant a change that would take your land; that is just not within our power to do that. He is making changes in property lines among the lots that he owns. Ms. Hebert stated and there is no new construction proposed or that will result from the lot line adjustment. It is fixing some existing issues and non-conformities on the existing lot 21-47-36, which is that one in the center of the plan. You can stop by the Planning Department and we can go through the plans with you if you still have questions. Ms. Monaco stated I waited until Friday and I didn't see it. Mr. Bullock stated we will get one over to you.

Eric Remillard, 57 Pinecrest Drive, stated I guess I am an abutter, but I am not sure how that abuts that property. At any rate, I am just kind of curious. I don't fault you for wanting to do this but what is the intention with the property. It seems like it is abandoned now. I don't think anyone lives there. Mr. Bullock asked which property? Mr. Remillard replied the property that is in question that you want to do the repurposing. Mr. Bullock asked 21? Mr. Remillard replied yes. Mr. Bullock replied it is hardly abandoned; one of my kids' lives there and has. Mr. Remillard stated okay; the thing is there is a little patch of land there, and I know someone just bought that, and right now it is wooded. Do you know if there is any intention of that being cut down? Mr. Bullock replied I have no control over that whatsoever so I can't answer the question. Acting Chairman Newberry stated I believe you were noticed because the lot that abuts you is involved in the lot line change so you would be an abutter to a lot that is a part of this application. That is why you were notified. Mr. Remillard replied okay; thank you. Ms. McGinley stated that also includes people across the street. Mr. Bullock stated across the street, diagonally across the street, hanging from the roof rafters next door, and believe me, we got everybody covered.

Mr. Kilmer stated there are some waivers. We have put in a waiver request from Section 218.1.11, requiring a topographic survey, Section 218.1.12, requiring HISS mapping on the lots, Section 218.1.13, requiring wetland mapping, Section 231.2.1, requiring minimum lot size by soil type, and Section 231.2.2, requiring minimum buildable area. Since two of these lots are built and the other two are over the minimum acreage required by zoning today, we feel that it is a reasonable request for those waivers. Acting Chairman Newberry stated and in the staff memo it does point out that where it is a lot line adjustment involving a small area of land. The Board commonly waives these requirements for an application like this. We will see what the Board decides.

MOTION by Ms. McGinley that the Planning Board grant waivers from Sections 218.1.11, requiring a topographic survey, 218.1.12, requiring HISS mapping on the lots, 218.1.13, requiring wetland mapping, 231.2.1, requiring minimum lot size by soil type, and 231.2.2, requiring minimum buildable area, of the Bedford Land Development Control Regulations. Mr. McMahan duly seconded the motion. Vote taken - all in favor. Motion carried.

MOTION by Ms. McGinley that the Planning Board grant approval of the two proposed lot line adjustments on Pinecrest Drive, between Lots 21-47-36 and 20-10-28, owned by Robert & Eleanor Bullock and Prem Pulami & Sangita Thapa and between Lots 21-47-12 and 21-47-30, owned by Tige Tontine Realty Trust and O'Malley-Rothstein Realty Trust, as shown on the plans by Sandford Surveying and Engineering, last revised June 1, 2018, with the following conditions to be fulfilled within one year and prior to plan signature or 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. In the event that the Planning Board approves the waiver requests, the waivers shall be noted on the plan along with the date of Planning Board approval.**
- 3. The applicants shall submit all recording fees to the Planning Department.**
- 4. The owners shall sign the plans.**
- 5. 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.**

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

3. Bruce & Deborah Bailey (Owners) - Request to subdivide one parcel into three residential lots at 185 Pulpit Road, Lot 6-22-3, Zoned R&A.

A staff report from Mark Connors, Assistant Planning Director, dated June 25, 2018 as follows:

I. Project Statistics:

Owners: Bruce & Deborah Bailey
Proposal: Subdivision of Lot 6-22-3 to create three residential lots
Location: 185 Pulpit Road
Existing Zoning: "R&A" Residential and Agricultural
Surrounding Uses: Single-family homes

II. Background Information:

Lot 6-22-3 is a 18.1-acre parcel located along Pulpit Road a short distance north of New Boston Road. The lot currently includes a single-family home, detached garage, and radio tower set back at least 700-900 feet from the road. The parcel includes three small clusters of wetlands, but is mostly dry.

In October 2017, the Town obtained an easement from the property owners to access a small portion of the lot to construct, reconstruct, repair, or install and maintain drainage improvements. There are no previous Planning or Zoning applications on file for this parcel.

III. Project Description:

The applicant proposes to subdivide Lot 6-22-3 into three residential lots. The mother lot would

be reduced to 12.75 acres with two new lots created on both sides of the parcel utilizing the Pulpit Road frontage. The two new lots would measure 1.88 and 3.48 acres. All of the lots will enjoy at least 200-feet of frontage along Pulpit Road, meeting the Town's minimum 150-foot standard.

The Residential and Agricultural Zone employs soils-based lot sizing requirements for residential uses with a 1.5-acre minimum lot size enforced. The parcel is reasonably dry and lacks steep slopes. As such, both new lots exceed the minimum lot size based on the calculations submitted by a substantial margin. This calculation assumes that the residences on each parcel will not exceed four-bedrooms, and the analysis will need to be re-calculated if additional bedrooms are proposed in the future. Both lots will be served by on-site well and septic service. The well and septic locations are noted on the plan with the 75-foot protective well radii fully contained within the new lots. The applicant should revise the plan to show the topographic and soils mapping for the entire parcel (Condition #7).

The Town is currently in the process of reconstructing the portion of Pulpit Road that fronts the proposed subdivision, and the application is therefore subject to a Rational Nexus Roadway Calculation. The Town's consulting engineer calculated the assessment (see memo from Robin Bousa of VHB). Two evaluations were considered, the first accounting for estimated usage of the road generated from the subdivision and the second based on frontage. The frontage calculation returned a \$56,046 cost allocation, while the usage test, estimating a 2.05% increase in traffic to the road (which is the sole point of access for 98 lots north of New Boston Road) returned a \$9,379 per new lot cost allocation. The frontage calculation was determined to be unreasonable, so the \$9,379 per lot figure would be the required fair share roadway contribution for this application (Condition #4).

Bedford enforces a five-year moratorium on disturbing public roadways after completion of major maintenance or reconstruction projects. The Department of Public Works has requested that the applicant install driveway aprons for the two new driveways this year before final pavement coats are added to Pulpit Road to avoid disturbing the roadway after construction is complete. Staff has included this as a condition of approval (Condition #11).

The plan shows the proposed driveway locations, which meet the Town's requirements for all season sight distance. The plan shows 12" hydro polyethylene culverts serving the driveways within the Town's right-of-way. The Department of Public Works has requested that the culverts be made of reinforced concrete (RCP) at a minimum 12" diameter and staff has included this amendment to the plan as a condition of approval (Condition #5). Construction of the southernmost driveway will require disturbing a part of a stonewall traversing the property. Staff would recommend that the plan be revised to show the part of the stonewall disturbed for the driveway construction rebuilt within the proposed lot 6-22-4 (Condition #6).

The applicant assumes approximately 16,000 square-feet of additional impervious surfaces generated from the development and proposes three stormwater retention basins to collect and treat drainage generated from the development. Two basins would be located on proposed lot 6-22-3, one located near the home site and one along the driveway, while one basin would be located near the home site for lot 6-22-4. The applicant has submitted a stormwater report

showing the drainage improvements will result in a slight decrease in peak stormwater flows generated from the site. The Town's consulting engineer reviewed the subdivision plans and stormwater report and the applicant will need to address a few minor outstanding issues highlighted in that review (see attached memo from Mark Verostick of VHB).

III. Waiver Request:

The applicant is requesting a waiver from Section 237.1 of the Land Development Control Regulations (see attached letter from Robert Kilmer of Sandford Engineering) requiring underground utilities, to permit two new utility poles along the right-of-way for ease in extending underground service to the two new lots. Pulpit Road includes overhead utility lines on the opposite side of the road. The applicant will need to note the approximate location of the poles on the plan (Condition #9). However, staff does not object to the waiver in this case, in order to avoid disturbance to the reconstruction Pulpit Road.

IV. Staff Recommendations:

The Planning Board will need to vote on whether or not to grant the waiver from the Bedford Land Development Control Regulations, Section 237.1 to allow two additional utility poles to serve the new lots.

The Planning Staff recommends that the Planning Board grant approval of the three-lot residential subdivision of Lot 6-22-3 at 185 Pulpit Road, owned by David and Deborah Bailey, as shown on the plans by Sandford Surveying and Engineering, dated April 20, 2018, with the following conditions to be fulfilled within one year and prior to plan signature or 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 Applicant shall submit any outstanding engineering review fees, if any, to the Planning Department.*
- 3. In the event that the Planning Board approves the waiver from Section 237.1 of the LDCR, the waiver shall be noted on the plan along with the date of Planning Board approval.*
- 4. The applicant shall submit the Rational Nexus Roadway Contribution of \$18,758 to the Planning Department.*
- 5. The applicant shall revise the plan to show the proposed driveway culverts constructed of reinforced concrete pipes with a minimum 12" diameter.*
- 6. The applicant shall revise the plan to show the portion of the stonewall disturbed for the driveway construction on Lot 6-22-4 relocated within the parcel.*
- 7. The applicant shall revise the Topographic & HISS Soils Plan to show the entire parcel.*
- 8. The applicant shall submit all recording fees for the subdivision to the Planning Department at the time of recording.*
- 9. The applicant shall revise the plan to show the approximate locations of the two new utility poles.*
- 10. NHDES subdivision approval shall be obtained and the approval number noted on the plan.*

11. *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.*
12. *The applicant shall coordinate with the Department of Public Works and construct the two new driveway aprons prior to the application of final pavement coats as part of the Pulpit Road reconstruction project.*
13. *Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, school and recreation impact fees shall be paid to the Town.*

Bob Kilmer of Sandford Surveying and Engineering and owner Bruce Bailey were present to address this application for a subdivision.

Mr. Kilmer stated posted is the subdivision plan. Bruce and Deborah Bailey at 185 Pulpit Road purchased two lots of a 4-lot subdivision in 1983, of which they were a 12.3-acre parcel and a 5.7-acre parcel. He built the property around 1985 and 1986 as you can see on the screen. In 1999 they merged the lots creating the new 6-22-3 containing 18.1 acres. What we are here today to do is propose to create two frontage lots off from Pulpit Road. The first lot will be Map 6, Lot 22-4 and it contains 3.481 acres, it will have 212.61 feet of frontage on Pulpit Road and meets all of the Town requirements for area, frontage, etc., and the suitable buildable area is approximately 24,450 square feet. It consists predominantly of shallow depth to ledge soils and a wetland, as shown, making it such a large lot from the minimum. The driveway is off to the left side near the existing one only to stay away from any impact from the wetland. The next lot will be on this side, which is Map 6, Lot 22-5 and that will contain 1.877 acres, it will contain 203.91 feet of frontage on Pulpit Road, and meets all of the Town zoning requirements for the area. This suitable buildable area is approximately 45,000 square feet. The proposed drive for this lot is basically to the left of the center of the lot and it is a fairly gradual grade to meet that.

Mr. Kilmer stated posted now is the lot topography with the soils. We have a 4k area up here for State subdivision, proposed well all on the lot meeting the wetland setback and everything. Lot 22-5 we have a 4k area as shown, approximately midway through the lot, with the well to the back basically for the State subdivision approval to meet their standards. The remainder lot 22-3 will end up being 12.75 acres and will have 213.02 feet of frontage.

Acting Chairman Newberry stated the staff memo pointed out a couple of conditions. Condition #7 revising the topographic and HISS soil plan. I assume you have seen that memo. Mr. Kilmer stated I don't seem to have that one. Acting Chairman Newberry stated there are a couple of concerns that staff pointed out that are listed as conditions for an approval. That is one of them and there was a request that the driveway aprons be installed in advance so that when the roads are finished before final paving, which is Condition #11. Mr. Kilmer replied yes. Acting Chairman Newberry stated and then there is Condition #5, which is to use 12-inch diameter culvert under the driveways instead of whatever was proposed originally. It is referenced in the paragraph as #6 of the staff memo but it is Condition #5 on the conditions list. I just wanted to touch on those and make sure that you were aware of and good with those. Mr. Kilmer responded yes, no problem; they seem reasonable.

Acting Chairman Newberry asked for further comments or questions from the Board. There

were none.

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

Earl Sandford stated I am actually the engineer who did the work here. I just wanted to commend DPW; when we ran some of the drainage calcs, we saw that the road culvert was drastically undersized. I hopped on my motorcycle and zoomed up there and they had just been put in, so I called Jeff Foote and said you do what you want but he took the information and replaced it with the proper size culvert. I commend the DPW for their actions.

Acting Chairman Newberry stated there is one waiver request for Section 237.1 of the Bedford Land Development Control Regulations and is addressed in Condition #9 that the plan be revised to show the approximate location of the two new utility poles. Mr. Kilmer stated and again, the proposed poles we will try to keep them at the driveway entrance, so along with the driveways being built the underground can be done along the same area. And, again, we are asking for that waiver only because the utilities are on the opposite side of the road and since they have base-coated and redid the culverts, regraded and put their base coat down, we don't want to have to do anything like that. And, again, it is a reasonable thought since it is overhead basically all the way up and down the road until you get to the end to the newer subdivision at the end of the road. Acting Chairman Newberry stated I think given the circumstances, staff agrees with the waiver. I think the condition is just that they want to see on the plan exactly where you end up locating it. Mr. Kilmer stated approximately there, again, it will be public service's say as far as which side or whatever, but that is where we want to put it.

MOTION by Councilor Bandazian that the Planning Board grant the request for a waiver from Section 237.1 of the Bedford Land Development Control Regulations to allow two additional utility poles to serve the new lots. Ms. McGinley duly seconded the motion. Vote taken - all in favor. Motion carried.

MOTION by Councilor Bandazian that the Planning Board grant approval of the three-lot residential subdivision of Lot 6-22-3 at 185 Pulpit Road, owned by David and Deborah Bailey, as shown on the plans by Sandford Surveying and Engineering, dated April 20, 2018, with the following conditions to be fulfilled within one year and prior to plan signature or 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 Applicant shall submit any outstanding engineering review fees, if any, to the Planning Department.**
- 3. In the event that the Planning Board approves the waiver from Section 237.1 of the LDCR, the waiver shall be noted on the plan along with the date of Planning Board approval.**
- 4. The applicant shall submit the Rational Nexus Roadway Contribution of \$18,758 to the Planning Department.**
- 5. The applicant shall revise the plan to show the proposed driveway culverts constructed of reinforced concrete pipes with a minimum 12" diameter.**

6. The applicant shall revise the plan to show the portion of the stonewall disturbed for the driveway construction on Lot 6-22-4 relocated within the parcel.
 7. The applicant shall revise the Topographic & HISS Soils Plan to show the entire parcel.
 8. The applicant shall submit all recording fees for the subdivision to the Planning Department at the time of recording.
 9. The applicant shall revise the plan to show the approximate locations of the two new utility poles.
 10. NHDES subdivision approval shall be obtained and the approval number noted on the plan.
 11. 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.
 12. The applicant shall coordinate with the Department of Public Works and construct the two new driveway aprons prior to the application of final pavement coats as part of the Pulpit Road reconstruction project.
 13. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, school and recreation impact fees shall be paid to the Town.
- Mr. McMahan duly seconded the motion. Vote taken - all in favor. Motion carried.

4. West Street Keene, LLC (Owner) – Request for architectural approval of a proposed restaurant at 28 South River Road, Lot 11-12, Zoned PZ.

A staff report from Becky Hebert, Planning Director, dated June 25, 2018 as follows:

I. Project Statistics:

Owners: West Street Keene, LLC
Applicant: West Street Keene, LLC
Proposal: Architectural review for a proposed commercial building
Location: 28 South River Road (Lot 11-12)
Existing Zoning: "PZ" – Performance Zone
Surrounding Uses: Residential & commercial

II. Background Information:

There is an existing single family home on the property which was constructed in 1930's. The house is uninhabited and in a state of disrepair. In 2017, the Town Council received a petition signed by Bedford residents requesting that the structure be torn down.

In April 2018, the Planning Board approved a site plan for the redevelopment of the site, including the demolition of the existing building and the construction of a 3,024 sq. ft. restaurant, small parking lot and associated site improvements. However, the building and site could easily accommodate an office or small retailer if the use were to change in the future. At the time the site plan was approved, the final design for the building was not finished and the

plan was approved with the condition that the applicant return to the Planning Board for review and approval of the proposed architecture.

III. Project Description:

The property is on the west side of South River Road, situated between the Hull Road and Colby Court intersections. The parcel contains 0.532 acres and is generally flat with an existing driveway off of South River Road. There are three existing residential properties and a hair salon to the south and the Bellemore Septic Service is located immediately to the north. The site and surrounding properties are in the Performance Zone.

The proposed restaurant is a single level with a peaked roof and “modern colonial” style. The building is 36 feet wide by 84 feet long with the gable end facing South River Road. The front portion of the building has a traditional 10:12 roof pitch and the rear portion of the building has a lower pitched roof and three shed dormers. The siding is a mix of vinyl cedar shake shingles in white and gray board and batten. The roof material is a black architectural shingle and the base of the building is a gray stone veneer. The design includes extensive glass on the east and south facing facades. The storefront windows are finished with an oil rubbed bronze colored frame with white PVC trim and white PVC panels. The north elevation has fewer windows in order to meet building code requirements and is finished with the gray board and batten siding. Staff feels the building is nicely designed to fit within the narrow shaped lot. The design is also an attractive blend of modern and colonial styles, which will complement the surrounding commercial and residential buildings.

There are no additional waivers associated with the architectural review. The Planning Board approved several waivers as part the original site plan, including a waiver to allow the building to be located as close as four feet to the northerly side lot line. The original site plan showed the building footprint four feet from the side lot line and the proposed building is setback five feet.

IV. Staff Recommendations:

The Planning Staff recommends that the Planning Board grant final approval of the architecture for the proposed restaurant for West Street Keene, LLC at 28 South River Road (Lot 11-12), as shown on plans prepared by Stone River Architects, last revised June 6, 2018, with the following condition:

- 1. All conditions of the April 9, 2018 approval shall remain in full effect.*

Chris Riley was present on behalf of the applicant and architect Tony Mazaka from Stone River Architects was also present. Mr. Riley stated Mr. Mazaka can answer any questions you might have pertaining to the architecture of the property or materials being used. Earl Sandford is also present if you have any questions for him.

Mr. Riley stated the purpose for our visit this evening is to fulfill one of the conditions of approval that the Board granted back in April. Those of you that were present for that meeting, there was a list of conditions that had to be satisfied within a certain timeframe so that we can move forward with the demolition of the existing structure and proceed with the construction of the new structure.

Mr. Riley stated I know you are familiar with the site as we were here before, and like I said, our purpose tonight is to simply have you review the architecture, see if you have any comments, questions, modifications or changes you would like to see, and then we can move that off the list and fulfill the other conditions that are still outstanding.

Mr. Mazaka stated the proposal is for a 3,000 square foot commercial building, wood frames, wood truss, the exterior is going to be a variety of a Certainteed vinyl siding, high end by all siding, the front end being cedar shake and the rear being vertical board and batten 6 – 8 inches. All the trim is going to be PVC, the roof is just your standard black architectural shingle and then we have a base of veneer stone, Eldorado stone. All of the windows are oil rubbed bronze storefront, as well as the entrance in the back is storefront all glass, and then a little canopy to match the oil rubbed bronze columns. It is fairly straightforward. The building is 36 feet wide by 84 feet long, the highest peak is on the street front on South River Road and it is about 28.5 feet, the rear is obviously the front and is just your standard gable-end structure with gabled dormers.

Mr. Riley stated the Board did grant a waiver during the initial approval in April that we could be 4 feet from the property line given the constraints of the site. This building as proposed actually yields 5 feet so we are a foot in from what the Board had granted via waiver on the last approval. Mr. Mazaka stated and 5 feet is so we can per code get openings along this north elevation if we were within 5 feet. Mr. Riley stated after investigation we thought it would have been an 80 foot building without windows on a side probably wouldn't have been the best looking building, so by moving it a foot we were allowed to put some windows on that side of the property. Acting Chairman Newberry asked those will be functional windows? Mr. Riley replied they are commercial; they are not going to operate as far as opening, but they will be glass. Acting Chairman Newberry stated you will be able to see through them. Mr. Riley replied correct. Mr. Mazaka stated for these transom windows on the north elevation are actually going to be spandrel glass to achieve the same uniform look around the building. One of these might end up being spandrel as well if we do in fact put a door here for egress requirements, depending on the building use. Mr. Riley stated a lot will have to do with what type of use that is in there. If they need a long wall without windows, it depends on the business use, but the intent is to have real windows and in other areas other than what Mr. Mazaka had just mentioned. Ms. McGinley asked what you are describing is that given the use that eventually goes in this space, the windows may not really be see-through windows, they would just architecturally on the outside look like windows. For instance, if it is a restaurant, you are going to have to have a kitchen. Mr. Mazaka responded correct, but I would assume from an owner's standpoint, not to put words in your mouth, Mr. Riley, but the first two lower ones on the north elevation will remain as real windows, real storefront.

Acting Chairman Newberry asked can you describe the glazing just a little bit. Is it tinted? Mr. Mazaka replied no, it is not tinted, just your standard storefront glass. I don't know if it reads tinted but just your standard glass. Ms. McGinley stated I think it is because it is blue, so it is hard to tell whether or not those were windows or if it is an architectural feature. Mr. Riley stated it is clear glass. There is some glazing effect on any glass, but it is not a tinted color like green or blue or gold or any other color. Acting Chairman Newberry asked so at night the

interior will be wholly visible? Mr. Riley replied correct, which most retailers want you to see what is going on.

Mr. Sullivan asked at this point there is still no confirmed tenant? Mr. Riley replied no. The intent is still the same. It is to get all of these conditions satisfied so what is there can be removed.

Mr. McMahan asked will that be the only sign? Mr. Riley replied I believe as part of the initial approval we were going to talk about a pylon location should the tenant request one. Mr. McMahan stated we discussed that but I don't know if we came to a conclusion. Mr. Riley stated yes, I think we left it open a little bit. It is really going to be tenant driven. I am happy with the signage on the building, that is allowable in the zone, but if we have a tenant who has a heavy need for additional signage, that is something we can discuss with staff or come back to the Board if that is what the Board wishes, but we don't have any proposed location at this time, I believe, on the plan, for any pylon. Ms. McGinley stated except for the wall sign. Mr. Riley responded right. Mr. McMahan stated as memory serves wasn't there some discussion on which way that monument sign would face. Ms. Hebert responded there was some discussion about whether it would be located in front of the building below the proposed wall sign or on the very corner. The property is very narrow so there is not a lot of real estate left between the driveway entrance and the adjacent lot to the south, so I think that when a tenant is known, we can work on that. Mr. Riley stated if there is a need for it, if that is a real pushing point for the tenant, we will visit it then, but I think given the size of the lot, the location of it, the proximity from South River Road, if you can't see the signage on the front of that building, you probably shouldn't be driving. Again, we will look at it on a tenant-by-tenant basis on what their need is. Brick and mortar stores are having a harder and harder time competing and signage becomes a bigger and bigger factor, as this Board knows, so we could probably revisit the need for it later. Ms. Hebert stated they would have to come back if there were any size or height requirements or setback requirements, they would have to come back for a waiver. Mr. Riley stated right now there is no pylon. Acting Chairman Newberry asked what you are showing there is purely conceptual? Mr. Riley replied yes. Mr. Mazaka replied conceptual to show the size. Acting Chairman Newberry asked it is conceptual but is it conforming? Mr. Riley replied I don't know if we drew the box around that word signage. Mr. Mazaka responded as I understood the new ordinance that the square footage is the actual rectangle or the letters themselves. Ms. Hebert replied the rectangle. Mr. Mazaka stated maybe I just heard through the grapevine that you could measure the actual letters and the grand total of the letters was the allowable area. What is the allowable rectangle? Ms. Hebert stated if you had a logo such that there was something that projected outside of that box around the letters, we wouldn't be penalizing you for that extra area, but where your sign or proposed sign is kind of cursive, we would draw a box around the letters. Mr. McMahan stated right now your plan shows that it is 10 square feet. Mr. Mazaka stated that is with what I had mentioned. Mr. Riley stated that is without the box. Mr. Mazaka asked what is allowed? Mr. Riley replied you are allowed two building signs in the Performance Zone of 32 square feet each, so you would have a total of 64 square feet. Given the nature of this building I wouldn't be surprised if a tenant wanted a little more in the front and then something much smaller at the entry point in the back. We would work within that 64 square foot allocation. Again, if it needs to be more than that, that is something we have to come back and revisit. As of right now, we have no intent for that. Ms. Hebert stated you are allowed to split that square

footage of your allowable sign area between different walls on the structure. Acting Chairman Newberry stated I was just curious if what you portrayed there was close to what it might end up looking like. Mr. Riley stated if you look at what is on the front and what is on the back, and I apologize that we don't have an actual square footage calculation based on the rectangle, but if you look at the front sign, which is a little larger than the sign on the back, which is a little smaller, I wouldn't be shocked if it is not right around the allowable number.

Acting Chairman Newberry asked those are all functional windows down the driveway side also or are some of those just architectural? Mr. Riley replied those are all functional.

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

MOTION by Ms. McGinley that the Planning Board grant final approval of the architecture for the proposed restaurant for West Street Keene, LLC at 28 South River Road (Lot 11-12), as shown on plans prepared by Stone River Architects, last revised June 6, 2018, with the following condition:

- 1. All conditions of the April 9, 2018 approval shall remain in full effect.**

Councilor Bandazian duly seconded the motion.

Mr. Sullivan asked should we change the language to reflect the possibility of other uses instead of just purely a restaurant within the motion? Ms. Hebert replied the site plan was designed around the restaurant use, so if a different user were to come, we would bring the plan back to the Planning Board. Acting Chairman Newberry stated as I recall too in the discussion, the idea of it being a proposed restaurant is that that would be the most demanding use for the site, so if it is not a restaurant, it would be less demanding in terms of things like parking spaces. Mr. Riley stated right; we wanted to present with what we thought would be the highest intensity, that way if it becomes an insurance office or real estate office or something along those lines, that is a much less intense use and then we can determine what the best way is to change that use would be, whether it was through staff or coming back to the Board. Acting Chairman Newberry asked I don't think referencing a proposed restaurant presents a problem does it? Ms. Hebert replied no it doesn't. It is consistent with the April approval. Acting Chairman Newberry stated related to that, their setback is 5 feet instead of 4 feet, so their plan will be revised to reflect that. Ms. Hebert replied yes. Acting Chairman Newberry asked do we need to address that specifically here? Ms. Hebert replied we already have a revised plan that shifts the building and where it is becoming more conforming we didn't feel an additional waiver was required.

Acting Chairman Newberry called for a vote on the motion. With all members voting in the affirmative, the motion carried.

Mr. McMahan asked do you have any idea when the tear-down is going to start? Mr. Riley replied we are getting closer; there are only a few conditions left. Mr. McMahan stated people are asking. Acting Chairman Newberry stated I think we were dreaming of August. Mr. Riley replied I think so, and I don't think that is unrealistic. There is still an easement to be addressed with the abutter, but they are on good terms. It is nothing that is adversarial in any way.

5. Master Plan Update:

Ms. Hebert stated we have the contract approved with the Master Plan consultants and we are looking forward to starting work next week. Ms. McGinley asked did we advise the Board about who the consultant is? Ms. Hebert stated Town Planning and Urban Design Collaborative (TPUDC) and we updated the Board at the last meeting with the details of the contract. The Town Council approved awarding the contract to TPUDC at their last meeting and we are under contract at this point and are looking forward to starting on July 2nd.

Ms. McGinley asked when will they begin their work and what is being done about the Master Plan Committee members? Ms. Hebert replied we have a draft list of potential Master Plan Committee members. We are still trying to fill a few gaps and we wanted to get under contract and talk with the consultants about the Master Plan Steering Committee. They advise a committee they call a think tank and they have some thoughts on that think tank, so before we set that committee in stone, we wanted to make sure that we had them under contract and that we were working with their model for the steering committee engagement. I hope to have a list of Master Plan Steering Committee members for the next meeting. Ms. McGinley stated one of the things, and I was on the committee that chose the consultants that have been retained, is that we do it a little bit differently than the last time just because of the nature of the times. It has been 10 years from then, paper intensive and not very visual for the Town public, and I think one of the draws that we had for this consultant is it is a lot more visual and a lot more hands-on and that doesn't mean little hands, but a lot of variety of engagement with Town residents that we didn't have before. Ms. Hebert responded yes, we are hoping for a very robust public engagement that has different levels of engagement. The contract includes a website called Engagement HQ and it is an online platform for getting information out to the public. We also plan to have a community kick-off meeting and several public forums leading up to a 4-day planning event that would be soliciting kind of an intensive public outreach in November, and then the contract also includes meeting with this think tank or steering committee about on a monthly basis throughout the 18 month Master Plan update process. I think that we will see lots of opportunities for public engagement, lots of opportunities for people to get involved. The think tank and steering committee is just one possibility or opportunity for that. TPUDC are urban designers and planners and they are collaborating with other disciplines and will be producing a plan that is highly graphical and hopefully interesting to read. Their examples of other work they have done are very engaging and interesting to read and the contract includes an executive summary, which is something that the Town would be able to use for economic development and marketing purposes, and I think it is going to be a really fun and interesting process. We are excited to start. Acting Chairman Newberry asked do we have enough potential volunteers or do we need to put it out on the airwaves? Ms. Hebert replied at this point I think we have enough volunteers. Initially when we talked about the steering committee we had some citizen representatives to represent different age groups and we are still looking for someone to represent the millennial age group, so if you know of anyone who would be a good fit for that or might be interested, if you could have them email me or Mark, that would be great. We will be recommending a slate of volunteers and the Board can review and discuss it and make a recommendation. Ms. McGinley asked they don't need to be a voter if they are not old enough? Ms. Hebert replied they don't need to be a voter; that is certainly not a requirement, but

they do need to reside in town.

6. Development Update:

Mr. Connors stated there is only one new development that started construction since the last time the Board met. That is the Haigh-Farr facility on Harvey Road, which is a 40,000 square foot research and development facility for Haigh-Farr. It was approved by the Board March 26th. They have wrapped up their conditions pretty quickly and started construction about two weeks ago. We are excited to see them start. That is the only new project that has started in the last two weeks, but as you know, there are a bunch of active projects in town and we will be sending updates once those projects are open to the public. There are a couple of projects I think that are getting very close to opening to the public.

V. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meetings:

MOTION by Councilor Bandazian to approve the minutes of the June 11, 2018 Planning Board meeting as written. Mr. Fairman duly seconded the motion. Vote taken; motion carried, with Ms. McGinley abstained.

VI. Communications to the Board:

Ms. Hebert stated we have an update on the age-friendly project that the Town is collaborating with Southern NH Planning Commission on, and Mr. Connors can give an update on the age-friendly survey. Mr. Connors stated in January the Southern NH Planning Commission was here to talk to you about the second phase of this project. They got a grant through AARP and other organizations and the Planning Board recommended that the Town move forward on applying for the second round, the Town Council approved that, and Bedford was selected along with the towns of Chester and Goffstown to participate in the second phase. Because we are doing the Master Plan we wanted a project that would kind of be useful towards that Master Plan project, so this is a survey that looks at issues specific to millennials, younger folks, younger families, and seniors and folks that are approaching retirement. The input we got from the Board was that we wanted as much participation as possible so we designed a survey that is pretty brief, it is 25 questions, and we are trying to get as many people to do that as possible. We are trying a multi-pronged effort. I was down at Harvest Market last week, the Southern NH Planning Commission folks will be there tomorrow for Senior Day, which is when they give discounts to seniors on Tuesdays, so that might be a good time to go. We will be advertising on BCTV and the radio station. I have been sending emails out to organizations today, and I will be sending you all emails and we are hoping that you can forward it to your friends in town to help us get the word out. It is not just limited to millennials and seniors, it is for anyone that lives or even works in Bedford. Ms. Hebert stated it is an interesting survey and it really is focused on livability and livability for all ages. We are hoping to use the results of the survey to help inform the Master Plan, and Southern NH Planning Commission is also hosting a public forum on Wednesday night at 5:30 p.m. at the Town Library. This is a Southern NH Planning Commission event, it is not

Bedford specific, to give their members and anyone who is interested an update on their age-friendly grant and the projects they have done in the towns of Goffstown, Chester and Bedford and the work they did as part of the Phase I grant, which involved a broader age-friendly assessment for the communities within their membership. They also did some interesting outreach to businesses, so they looked at how local businesses could become more age-friendly and they developed a checklist to outline how business owners could be a little more thoughtful in addressing needs of seniors as well as needs of younger folks.

Mr. Fairman asked Ms. Hebert, have we seen anything on the facilities survey? When is that coming out? Ms. Hebert replied I don't know if the Planning Board will see recommendations from the facilities survey. There are some alternative scenarios that have been developed by the consultant and they have yet to be reviewed and vetted by the Town Council, so I think after the Town Council has their discussion and review of the various scenarios for the facilities, we can bring an update to the Planning Board. Mr. Fairman asked they will be made public at that point? Ms. Hebert replied yes. Mr. Fairman stated I think the facility study does tie into the age-friendly and that is the reason I brought it up and what we do for the senior citizens in town can come out of that facility study. Ms. Hebert responded absolutely. One more thing about the facilities study is that it will also work to inform the Master Plan as there is a facilities section to the Master Plan.

VII. Reports of Committees: None

VIII. Adjournment:

MOTION by Mr. McMahan to adjourn at 8:35 p.m. Councilor Bandazian duly seconded the motion. Vote taken – all in favor. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted by
Valerie J. Emmons