

Town of Bedford Planning Board Minutes June 26, 2023

A meeting of the Bedford Planning Board was held on Monday, June 26, 2023, at the Bedford Meeting Room, 10 Meeting House Road, Bedford, NH. Present were Charlie Fairman (Chair), Hal Newberry (Vice Chair), Matt Sullivan (Member), Michael Strand (Town Council Alternate), Steve Clough (Member), Phil Greazzo (Town Council), Priscilla Malcolm (Member), John Nelson (Alternate), Logan Johnson (Alternate), Becky Hebert (Planning Director). Absent: Chris Swiniarski (Alternate), Matt Nichols, (Secretary).

I. Call to Order and Roll Call:

Chair Charlie Fairman called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m., introduced the Board members, and appointed John Nelson to vote. Ms. Hebert reviewed the agenda and stated both of these new applications have been reviewed by staff and it's our determination that the applications are complete. The abutters have been notified and neither of the applications pose a regional impact. We'd recommend that the Board accept the agenda and the new applications as complete. I'd also like to note that under Concept Proposals and Other Business, the application by Munson and Associates, LLC, and ER Bedford, LLC, which was a request for a conceptual site plan review for a 5-story, 62-unit, independent senior living residence at 125 South River Road, at the Market & Main development, has been postponed to the July 17th meeting at the request of the applicant.

II. Election of Officers (2022 – 2023)

III. Old Business & Continued Hearings: None

IV. New Business:

1. **Dan O'Rourke (Applicant & Owner)** – Request for approval of a Conditional Use Permit for a detached accessory apartment, located at 390 Boynton Street, Lot 44-22, Zoned GR.
2. **Encore Retail, LLC (Applicant), ER Bedford, LLC (Owner)** – Request for three sign waivers to allow two freestanding signs and the approval of sign design guidelines as a substitution for the PZ Sign Standards, within the development at 'Market & Main,' located at 125 South River Road, Lot 12-33, Zoned PZ.

V. Concept Proposals and Other Business:

1. **Munson and Associates, LLC (Applicant), ER Bedford, LLC (Owner)** – Request for conceptual site plan review for a 5-story, 62-unit, multi-family independent senior living residence (55+), located at 125 South River Road, Lot 12-33, Zoned PZ. *(At the request of the applicant, this application is postponed to July 17, 2023.)*

VI. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meetings (June 12, 2023 Meeting)

MOTION by Vice Chair Newberry to accept the agenda as read. Ms. Malcolm duly seconded the motion. Vote taken – all in favor. Unanimous. Motion carried.

Chair Fairman said the first item on the agenda is the Election of Officers.

II. Election of Officers (2022 – 2023):

Ms. Hebert said tonight the Board is scheduled to elect new officers and committee assignments. The Planning Board has three officer positions, Chair, Vice Chair and a Secretary, currently held by Charlie Fairman, Hal Newberry and Matt Nichols. The Board also has two committee appointments: Conservation Commission Liaison and Historic District Commission Liaison, and both those roles are filled by Stephen Clough. So tonight, the Board should talk about those positions and take action to fill the positions for the upcoming year.

Vice Chair Newberry said so, Charlie, you're currently Chair. I don't know if you or anyone else on the Board is interested in taking that challenge on, again, for you, or a first time for someone else. Chair Fairman said I'm willing to continue for another year if the Board desires. Hal, do you want to continue as Vice Chair? Mr. Newberry said I am, but I'd certainly be willing to share the fun. Matt's not here so we can do anything to Matt. Ms. Hebert said I believe he is interested in staying on as Secretary. Chair Fairman said Steve indicated he was willing to continue as liaison, thank you, Steve. Mr. Clough said yes, I'll continue.

MOTION: Vice Chair Newberry nominates Charlie Fairman as Chair of the Planning Board for 2023-2024. Ms. Malcolm duly seconded the motion. Vote taken – all in favor. Mr. Fairman abstained from the vote. Motion carried.

MOTION: Chair Fairman nominates Hal Newberry as Vice Chair of the Planning Board for 2023-2024. Mr. Sullivan duly seconded the motion. Vote taken – all in favor. Mr. Newberry abstained from the vote. Motion carried.

MOTION: Vice Chair Newberry nominates Matt Nichols as Secretary of the Planning Board for 2023-2024. Ms. Malcolm duly seconded the motion. Vote taken – all in favor. Motion carried.

MOTION: Vice Chair Newberry nominates Steve Clough as Liaison to both the Conservation Commission and the Historic District Commission for 2023-2024. Mr. Sullivan duly seconded the motion. Vote taken – all in favor. Mr. Clough abstained from the vote. Motion carried.

III. Old Business & Continued Hearings: None

IV. New Business:

Chair Fairman invited the first applicant to present.

- 1. Dan O'Rourke (Applicant & Owner) – Request for approval of a Conditional Use Permit for a detached accessory apartment, located at 390 Boynton Street, Lot 44-22, Zoned GR.**

Mr. Dan O'Rourke presents his application: Good evening. My name is Dan O'Rourke. I'm the homeowner at 390 Boynton Street. I've been living in this house since the 1980s and it's been a family homestead since it was first built sometime in the 1930s. Tonight I'm asking the Planning Board to grant a conditional use permit to allow an accessory detached apartment at 390 Boynton Street. The building was built in the 1950s as a workshop and a business, and I would like to convert it into an accessory dwelling unit. It has running water and a pre-existing septic system, both of which I'm going to upgrade for this conditional use. A variance was granted from the Zoning Board of Adjustment June 21st, 2022 last year at the meeting for this to be allowed in the GR zone. There are no conditions of approval, but it does require a conditional use permit from the Planning Board and building permits from the Building Department.

So the criteria that I have to meet is:

A: I'm only seeking one accessory apartment that is detached on my lot.

B: The accessory detached apartment is clearly incidental to the primary use of property for a single dwelling and have a gross floor area of less than 1,000 square feet.

C: The septic design capacity has been approved by the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services on 5/12/22 and the Town of Bedford Planning Department on 5/25/22.

D: One parking space shall be provided for an accessory apartment and no new driveway curb cuts will be constructed.

E: The combination of principal single dwelling and detached accessory apartment was granted by a variance to be allowed in the GR zone.

F: The accessory detached apartment shall not be converted into a condominium or any other form of legal ownership distinct from the ownership of a single dwelling. The ADU will also not be used for short term rentals.

G: The accessory detached apartment will have two bedrooms.

H: The accessory detached apartment is located on the side yard of the lot.

I: The exterior design of the detached accessory apartment will be compatible with the existing single-family home. It will be made with similar construction materials, architectural design and scale. They both will have white vinyl siding along with green shutters, and they both have a green roof. We will see the site plan that illustrates the existing and proposed conditions, including the principal and accessory structures, driveways, parking, structural dimensions and distance to the property lines and setbacks. There are no wetlands on this property.

Included is a scaled interior floor plan and building elevations of the proposed detached accessory apartment that illustrates compliance with the criteria for granting a conditional use permit in Section 275-21J of the Zoning Ordinance.

Thank you for considering my application at this time and my request for an approval of a conditional use permit for an accessory dwelling unit. So, I can scroll back on some of the things that I have. I don't know

how familiar, if you're familiar with the property. I overheard you speaking earlier. Yes, I was there when I was a little boy with Table Talk Pies was there. There used to be a chicken coop where the shed place is now. It used to be the pool place, Playtime Pools. And my Uncle Joe, who used to use that as a carpenter shop, sold off parcels of land, little half acre, to people in the Pines. And for like \$5,000 for a lot back then and that's how he made his living, really. He was a carpenter and he used to have Denarti Statuary, concrete statuary. He sold that from Danarti. He used to make picnic tables and swings and anything out of wood he would make, and we talked about the earlier that it was like that was the outskirts of Bedford. I mean that was the outskirts of Manchester that was kind of like—it was an undeveloped type of area. So, that's the history of the property. And now I'd like to do something with the shop. It used to be a woodworking shop. Then I have done stained glass and I made it into a stained-glass shop. I got permission for signage and everything. So, I had a sign out there, Galway Glass and I could invite—for a home operated business, it was a craft business—so I could have cars come in and visit while I was there. So, it has a natural area. I'll show, when we have some of the site plans, of like parking right in the front. So, there's plenty of parking. It's got a U-shaped driveway which needs to be repaired. So, you can tell from the pictures, these aren't great pictures, but my lawn doesn't look so good either. But that's the way it is. So, those are the pictures of where we're at. It's detached because it's separated. You can see with that one car there. It's about one car length is separating the two, probably one- and one-half cars wide separates the two.

And I could show you this is the septic plan. I'm sorry I'm an amateur at this. So that's my septic plan that was done up by Steve Sarette & Sons. That was all proposed when I went to the Zoning Board last year. This kind of gives you a better idea of how the layout is. So, there's a U-shaped driveway. You can see there's like a parking area in the front even though it's not typically parking. It just has railroad ties and stone. And my pool is in the back and my septic is going to be over where it's obviously on one end of the house and on the other end of the house is the other septic. That's my old septic, which I built during the 80s that I didn't have to have a plan for but it's not OK to use now. So, I have room to have a new septic system there and the old one is going to be just filled in. I'm pretty fortunate that there's 70 feet of sand in that area of Boynton Street. There's no problem with any type of drainage.

What I could do is show you what it looks like now. You can really tell what it looks like from the pictures, but there's a conceptual drawing. Nothing is going to change on the outside. I might have a door where a window would be. There are just a few things that I'm going to have to change around.

When I went to the Zoning Board, I wanted to do the whole 16 square feet, and they limited to me to 1,000. So, what I have to do is make these back three rooms storage areas. There's the middle room, which would in the back is going to be storage. The other room, which used to be my stained-glass room, which was storage anyway, and then the other room is going to be a utility room which I have an air compressor in there. It's going to be used jointly between whoever lives there, whether it's my kids or I have it rented out. So, either one that's going to be classified as a utility room. But that's the layout the way it is right now, which I kind of have those. And that gives you the dimensions. So the front room is 844 square feet. The bathroom is like 75 square feet, and that brings us up to this right here. So, the total amount of square footage is just going to be under. It's like 993.8. So that gives you an idea. That front room is going to be carved up into two bedrooms, a kitchen and an open living room. And then the back is going to be storage because I can't use the whole building for living area. And then the back bathroom. I've pretty much covered it all, but I'll entertain any questions.

Ms. Hebert asked do you want to mention the water line upgrade? Mr. O'Rourke replied oh, thank you.

So, for the Planning Board, there was a utilities meeting that they got together, and the head of the Waterworks said that there was an issue with my water line. So, the good news is, it's been in the family since the 30s and 40s, right when they put that water line in. The bad news, it's been there since the 30s and 40s when they put the water line in. Unfortunately, I have ¾" copper right now. They want to put in 1 ½" copper line or Waterworks. I went down and talked with the Director of Waterworks, and I made an appointment to see him, and we talked about it because I wanted him to explain to me about it and to see if there were different options. Like one of the options that I was going to propose was I don't know if you could see where the water line is right here on this map that I show. I have pine trees. I have some nice trees landscaped in, a Weeping Cherry tree there. Plus, it goes right through the driveway. So, it's going to be a very invasive type of thing to replace this water line. Not only is it going to have to be involved going into the water main, which is on Boynton Street, it's also going to have to carve right through the middle of the property to go from ¾" to 1 ½" copper. I was just trying to see what the options were. If I could go down the length of that driveway that's right in front of my workshop and just put a three-quarter inch water line in right there, I wouldn't destroy my yard in the front of the house to be able to put it in and Waterworks doesn't do that. They won't do a separate water line for that. The other thing is I want to see about storage tanks. Can I—they make storage tanks to boost pressure if you've got a well. Maybe there's a way that I could boost the volume or the pressure that I get in the shops. I have plenty of storage rooms. I could put a water storage tank in there. I just wanted to see what was available and what the options were. The options are replace this take out, which is they don't want to leave any old water lines and take out the old three-quarter inch copper water line and put in a new inch and a half copper water line. I talked with Director Foote from the—Miss Hebert encouraged me to go out and seek as much knowledge as I can on the issues. I went over and talked with him, and he wasn't really happy about digging up Boynton Street. And I said, well, I'm not very happy about it either. So, we're kind of even on that part. But yeah, it's going to be something that's going to have to be addressed. So, I'm going to have to take care of the water line and the septic and incur all the costs within for that. I guess I covered it.

Chair Fairman said thank you, Dan. Are there any questions from the Board? Vice Chair Newberry said Mr. Chairman, there's currently water from the main house to the proposed ADU. Mr. O'Rourke said yes. Right. Vice Chair Newberry asked could you go back to the proposed floor plan or the floor plan as you're planning to remodel? It's pretty clear what the living space is. Could you just show to us, is any of that storage being counted as a part of the living space? I'm looking particularly at that 198 square feet that is accessible directly from the living space. Mr. O'Rourke answered no. It's a utility in the top that's not living, storage, and then storage. Vice Chair Newberry said OK, so neither storage nor utility rooms are counted as a part of the 1,000 square feet? Mr. O'Rourke said Yes. Vice Chair Newberry said OK, thank you.

Ms. Johnson asked are the storage areas—they're not going to be heated? Mr. O'Rourke replied they're not heated, no. Ms. Johnson asked and is there insulation in there now? Mr. O'Rourke replied no, not the middle room. Just the back wall. The back wall and the side walls, but not the ceiling. This one might have insulation in that ceiling, the glass one that's facing on the outside there. But the middle room does not have installation. The utility room has got like a paneling on the side, like T1-11 paneling on the side of that. So, it might have some 3 ½" insulation in it.

Mr. Clough said I have a question. What about lead paint? It's an old structure. Mr. O'Rourke said yes, so in this structure, the only part so that—when I first moved in there in the 80s, my aunt was alive, and it was a tar paper shack. So, the side walls had—and that's what they use for siding. They use rolled roofing on the side of the thing. Now we use Tyvek® or Typar®. Mr. Clough asked outside? Mr. O'Rourke said on the outside. Mr. Clough said I'm talking on the inside. Mr. O'Rourke replied on the inside there—and I

redid the wall—there isn't any remarkable woodworking in the place. It's all sheetrock. The only thing is this front picture, which, if it was going to be lead paint, was going to be on the very front of this building, which has been painted. And I actually painted it. And if it wasn't for the power lines, that's how the utility, the power goes in at the top, I would have vinyl sided it a while ago. But it's a small area to paint so I've painted over paint. So the only thing that I know that could be subject to it would be the front of the building, not the insides. It's sheetrock walls and sheetrock ceilings. Mr. Clough said so, there's the trim inside and the windows. Mr. O'Rourke replied there is no trim. I wish I had pictures, but there is when I was at Zoning. There's sheetrock and then the window. Mr. Clough asked and how about the window? Ms. Hebert said it's primarily unfinished inside. Mr. O'Rourke said it's not like an old house. Mr. Clough said right. Mr. O'Rourke said if I was doing something with my house, now that would be a different story because that's older thing. But the shop, my Uncle Joe would be making things that people—nobody really cared about what was inside of the... Mr. Clough said but you made stained glass which uses lead. Mr. Clough said I made stained glass. I have I have led from stained glass, right. Mr. Clough said right. So, is that all going to be lead free once you? Mr. O'Rourke said it's all going to be lead free. There won't be any lead. There won't be any lead around to pick up. Do you know what I mean? So, there isn't any lead dust. I mean, I used to solder with lead. I won't be doing any stained glass over there when I have it as an accessory dwelling unit. It won't be available for that. I was going to keep that room. I was going to make those back storage rooms bedrooms and then use that front room as like a big living room because the space is pretty beautiful. There are four windows on one side, four windows on the other side and I forget where I was going to go with that. I was going to keep the flooring the way it was because it's an original floor. My Uncle Joe milled that floor. It's an old pine floor. So now, because I'm going to be putting two bedrooms out there and kind of compartmentalizing that front room, then I'm going to put vinyl flooring in. So, I'm going to end up covering that floor up. It's going to be fresh paint, fresh walls, fresh flooring. There's going to be nothing that's going to really look like a workshop in that. Mr. Clough said and the windows, are they vinyl windows? Mr. O'Rourke replied I just replaced the windows. I just did vinyl replacement windows on that like a year ago. Nothing is really as old. I don't know if you can kind of see it. I don't know if I can zoom in on this. Mr. Clough said that's okay. I'm happy with the answer.

Chair Fairman asked is there anything else from the Board? There were no further questions. Chair Fairman asked is there anybody in the public who would like to speak to this application? Seeing no interest there, what is the pleasure of the Board?

MOTION: Ms. Malcolm moves that the Planning Board grant the Conditional Use Permit for a detached accessory apartment, located at 390 Boynton Street, in accordance with the application materials submitted by the applicant, last revised May 5, 2023, as the Planning Board finds that the applicant has shown substantial compliance with the criteria for granting the Conditional Use Permit, in accordance with the following findings of fact:

- **The plans are found to be in compliance with the purpose and intent of Section 275-21(J) of the Zoning Ordinance;**
- **The Board also includes all facts found in the meeting minutes for this application and incorporates all meeting minutes into this decision.**

This approval is granted subject to the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall submit a building permit for review and approval by the Building Department.

2. Prior to the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy for the detached accessory apartment, School and Recreation Impact fees, per Article 120 of the Land Development Control Regulations, shall be paid.
3. Prior to the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy for the detached accessory apartment, the waterline serving the house and apartment shall be upgraded to a 1 ½" water line and ¾" meter to satisfy the requirements of Manchester Waterworks.

Mr. Nelson duly seconded the motion. Vote taken – all in favor. Unanimous. Motion carries.

Mr. O'Rourke said thank you, Sir. Chair Fairman said thank you. Chairman Fairman then invited the next applicant to present their request.

2. **Encore Retail, LLC (Applicant), ER Bedford, LLC (Owner)** – Request for three sign waivers to allow two freestanding signs and the approval of sign design guidelines as a substitution for the PZ Sign Standards, within the development at 'Market & Main,' located at 125 South River Road, Lot 12-33, Zoned PZ.

Mr. Andrew Barresi of Roll Barresi & Associates, 48 Dunster Street, Cambridge, MA presents: Good to see everybody. My name is Andrew Barresi from Roll Barresi & Associates at 48 Dunster Street in Cambridge, MA. I'm a little nervous because I'm the designer guy and I don't necessarily know the formal language within the waiver itself, but what I can speak to you today is what we have done to update the design of both site signage on the site as well as the updates that we've made to the tenant signage guidelines that you had previously reviewed and approved in 2016.

So, let's start with the site signage. First, I just want to say that we have really made little to no change in terms of overall sizes and dimensions and locations to what was previously submitted in 2016. What we've done is just update the design, sort of the look and feel of these signs so that it is more consistent with the new approach to the architecture and the design of the site as well. So, in terms of site signage, this was the previous site here. It included of course, a large cinema, the parking garage and that is no longer the case. This is the new site plan and what we're talking about in terms of site signage in particular, are the two gateway pylons. So previously we had proposed a pylon sign here at the main entrance to the site. That is not changing. We're still proposing a gateway pylon at that same exact location. And here, on the east side of the garage facing 293, we were proposing six tenant sign panels there, viewable from 293 as well as the identity of the site. In place of that, at a much smaller scale than previously proposed, we're asking for a freestanding pylon, closer to 293 here on the east end of the site. So that's one change which is going from the side of the garage to a freestanding element closer to 293.

This was the original design of the gateway pylon sign. And what we are proposing is something in the same location, virtually the same exact size and approach in terms of what we're trying to do, which is eight tenant panels and an identity for the development. But we've updated the design so that it is consistent with the architecture and approach to the site that you're seeing here in these photos. Very simple building forms and shapes, the use of clapboard and ribbed or grooved metal panel, gray and neutral tones, that sort of thing. So, it's a very contemporary but very simple and elegant as well. And so, in the new pylon design, which you can see here—I'm sorry, I'm a map guy. How do I reduce the scale of this so the entire thing can be viewed? Ms. Hebert said sure. Up on the top left, there's the plus and minus—the top left corner of the screen. Mr. Barresi said OK, that's good.

The original design was 25 feet tall and about 15 feet two inches overall wide and about 3 feet deep. This design, too, is 25 feet tall. It's been reduced in width by about a foot and a half, but it is still 3 feet wide. And you can see here that the new design is very simple. It uses some of those forms that you're seeing in the architecture, neutral gray tones as well, and I have here a sample if you want to pass this around. This is the color of the proposed structure. This is the color of those tenant panels which would have white tenant logos on them. And this is the color of that red metal panel that the tenant panel sits on. So, it's like a light gray. I have some samples here.

For the tenant panels, we're asking for what's called punch through backlit acrylic on an opaque sign panel. So, the dark gray panels would be like this, painted opaque. But it's the logo that would be illuminated. Unlike this, it wouldn't be red, they would all be white. So, it would be white on the dark charcoal metallic gray sign panel. So, the only thing illuminated will be the graphic itself. The Market Street logo would be like this. It would be face illuminated individual letters and shapes. But in the case of the pylon here, instead of white it would have the coloration you're seeing there. Sorry, it's a little awkward here. But it would have sort of an illuminated blue or illuminated yellow. So, very similar approach to the original design and scale, but a different look and feel so that it sort of feels part of the new look of the architecture and the site as well.

This is a comparison of what was previously approved in the red dotted line and what we're proposing in this design. And this is kind of a rendering of the lighting condition. You can see it's just the graphics that are illuminated, not the structure itself.

And for the signage facing 293, we were originally proposing, if you recall, the Market Street identity on the garage. And six tenant panels of a similar approach kind of like this here, but lighter color. And what we're proposing is 4 tenant panels the same structure that we're proposing for the main entrance pylon as well. And so in comparing what was proposed last time and the new signage, you can see a fairly dramatic reduction in scale. But we're trying to make up for that by having the proximity of the sign a little closer to 293. And the reason we've reduced the number from six to four is so the scale of the lettering can be legible from the highway. And that's also similar lighting condition as on the main entrance.

Ms. Hebert asked and that's a single sided sign? Mr. Barresi replied it is single sided, yes. Thanks for reminding me. The other one is double sided because it's perpendicular to the roadway.

And this is just the landscape drawings prepared by the engineer showing there will be plantings around the main entrance pylon. There will also be the stone retaining wall that sort of captures that site. And they're proposing planting around the sign facing 293 as well.

So, before we go into the tenant signage guidelines, did you have any questions about what's proposed here and our request?

Chair Fairman asked are there any comments or questions from the Board? Mr. Sullivan said Mr. Chairman, I have a question. So, looking through the documents, there seems to be two signs eastward facing. Mr. Barresi replied just one. Mr. Sullivan continued the documents show that the back of the barn will have signage as well. So, is it going to be a monument sign? Or is it going to be on the back of the barn? Mr. Barresi answered it's going to be a monument sign. The back of the barn—what you're referring to are the tenant proposals which reflected that previous condition, which is no longer being considered as a place for signage. So, we were asked to include the tenant signage proposal as part of our waiver, but

they hadn't revised their approach to the pylon signage to reflect the new condition. But the intent is a freestanding sign, not on the barn.

Ms. Hebert said so, the sign waiver request, whether in the tenant design guidelines or the freestanding site signs, there's no signage on the barn. Mr. Barresi said that's right. Ms. Hebert continued but, you're right, I had the same question. It's shown on the graphics. Mr. Barresi replied yes. Sorry for the confusion.

Vice Chair Newberry said Mr. Chairman, a couple of questions on the pylon sign. How bright is that white going to be? My concern is that that's quite a contrast against the basically black field. And is that controllable or how is that handled so that you don't get a white that is so intense that it's not pleasant. Mr. Barresi answered well, the technology is LED back lighting inside the sign, which is dimmable and adjustable, so that that brightness can be adjusted. So obviously with illumination, at the height of evening darkness, it is going to be at its most prominent, but that brightness can be adjusted if necessary. It won't be any different than other backlit illuminated signs you're seeing along that roadway. It would be similar. Vice Chair Newberry said two other comments. To me, the new design has a greater visual mass than the original design, and for that reason I would really like to see it at 20 feet rather than 25 feet. Not out at the east side, but on South River Road. I think that scale of 25 there with that visual mass is just too big. I would also like to see some kind of skirting or base to tie the structure to the ground. Mr. Barresi replied well, in terms of the base condition, I think what we're trying to do is, and again, this will be anchored in a landscaped area with plantings around it. And so, there is going to be sort of massing of sorts around the base. But also in terms of the new kind of architecture, it's very deliberate kind of not to do a stone base around it because that's kind of not what's going on architecturally with the buildings now. They're more sort of lighter on their feet, so to speak. There is, I think, a sense of lightness, and so we just thought keeping how it meets the ground really simple, made a lot of sense in terms of how it relates to the new design of the architectural buildings.

In terms of the overall height, again, we're trying to be identical to what was proposed previously. In terms of how the overall mass of it will look and feel, it's subjective. I think that was one reason why we're proposing the ribbed panel of a lighter color so that it has a lighter feeling to it, but I can certainly raise your concerns with Encore.

Vice Chair Newberry said the base on it, I don't think is that big a deal, one way or the other from my perspective. I do think, though, that the 25 feet is just too massive for being right out on the road. I mean one of the things noted in the staff memo is that one of the conditions, if this is approved, would be that the site be survey staked to make sure that that sign is properly located and not in the right-of-way. So that says to me that this thing is, I mean it's going to be right out on the street, and I really think the 25 feet is more than what you really need there for scale. If anything, I would think you'd be after a bigger sign out on the east end where you're working the highway crowd. Mr. Barresi answered well, you know, I think what we're trying to do is allow for the identity of the site of the Market & Main, to exist at the top of the sign and to give it sufficient space around it. So, it doesn't look like we're trying to cram something in there, you know. Vice Chair Newberry said oh, I agree, but I think you could take five feet off the height and not significantly reduce any of your signage. Mr. Barresi said well, we'll take a look at that. Vice Chair Newberry said I think that would make me more inclined to support it. Mr. Barresi said OK. Vice Chair Newberry said that's all I have, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Fairman said thank you, Hal. Let me just follow up with a couple of comments. On the height, I think your visibility from people on that street would be better if it was lower, too. Cars coming up there are going to have to look up to see it on South River Road. And from the highway, 101, I think you could

see it either way. A comment on the base—you've already built two nice stone walls in that area. You could make the base match those stone walls, one over by the M&M sign there's a stone wall, and there's one next to Carrabba's that separate that area. So, you could make that base match those stall walls pretty easily, which I think might improve it a lot. I think overall I like the signs, but I tend to agree with Hal on the height could be reduced. Both I think would be beneficial from a visibility standpoint as well as the overall mass. It'll be pretty easy to slip everything down. Cut the peak off maybe. Pretty easy to do, I think. Any other comments from the Board?

Ms. Malcolm said Mr. Chairman, the existing M&M signage that is there now, will that remain? Mr. Barresi replied yes, as far as I know. Which was always the intent from the original design, was to have the pylon with the sculptural element on the stone wall. So, that was always part of the original plan that was reviewed and approved. Ms. Malcolm said, and this may be utterly irrelevant to your discussion, but is there any need to, at any point at the entrance, to indicate that you've come this way to go to Whole Foods? Mr. Barresi replied not in the current site signage plan, no.

Chair Fairman said there are presently signs directing delivery traffic. I assume there will be something along those lines in the final plans. The internal directing traffic around that system. It's going to be needed. Mr. Barresi answered well, it's part of the original site signage, there were vehicular directional signs proposed, as you recall. In terms of the current site, there isn't a plan for extensive vehicular directional signage because of the simplified layout. But I think part of the intent is to see as the site is developed, how those traffic patterns occur and to develop signage to accommodate that. But at this moment, we're concentrating on these two important sort of gateway elements as far as site signage is concerned.

Chairman Fairman said in the overall signage guidelines, I assume you'll be putting out a new booklet with the new guidelines in it. Mr. Barresi replied as it relates to tenant identification signage? You mean the tenant signage guidelines booklet? Chair Fairman said yes. In the previous one, there's a lot of stuff that's now obsolete. One of the things about the theater, apartments. All that will be coming out. Mr. Barresi said that's correct. That's no longer part of the signage booklet.

Mr. Greazzo said I have a question. In regard to your highway facing sign, what is your plan for the rear that's facing the site? So, what sort of plan do you have for that design? Is there just going to be a blank sheet of metal? Mr. Barresi replied it would be the ribbed panel on the back. Mr. Greazzo continued just a blank façade? Mr. Barresi answered yeah. Mr. Greazzo said OK. Seems like wasted opportunity.

Vice Chair Newberry said Mr. Chairman, I think the staff memo raised the question about the aluminum channel. Could you just describe that? Is that a matte finish on it? Or what is that? Mr. Barresi replied aluminum channel? What are you referring to? Vice Chair Newberry explained the background field. Mr. Barresi replied oh, this ribbed panel here? Yeah, it's much like that sample I just passed around. If you want to take a look at that. It's just a painted finish with a satin finish to it. Vice Chair Newberry said oh, OK this represents the aluminum panel? Mr. Barresi said the light gray, yeah. Vice Chair Newberry said thank you. I didn't realize that. Does anyone else want to look at this closer?

Ms. Hebert asked what will happen when certain tenants, as the project is built out, what will happen to the blank tenant panels while tenants are being added to the site? We know REI is coming towards the end of the summer and Charles Schwab is also working on their fit up. Mr. Barresi answered well, certainly, the hope and aspiration is that they will all be occupied by a tenant sign. That there won't be blank panels, essentially. But if that is the case, sometimes what's done is to have a placeholder graphic

in place, so it doesn't look like a missing tooth. And we can certainly develop a placeholder graphic for Encore to do that. But the intent is that they're all occupied.

Ms. Malcolm asked the signage that's going to be next to 293, that is going to have just a plain back to those in the Market & Main development, is there any chance that you would put that to line up behind the barn so that nobody would see that empty panel? Mr. Barresi replied well, I think the location that Encore, and the design team have selected is considering visibility, viewing angles, that sort of thing, trying to keep it not too far down the ramp location—trying to keep it as north as is feasible. If there is objection to the blank side of that, we can certainly explore doing something differently on the back of it that would be addressing your concern about it just being blank. I think we kind of regarded it as something more architectural. So, just like on the buildings where there's large areas of ribbed or grooved architectural panels, that was the objective for that. But we can certainly explore something over that that has a visual graphic or visual appeal.

Ms. Hebert asked could you put some taller landscaping behind the sign? Mr. Barresi answered I would imagine that could be developed, yeah. Ms. Malcolm said excuse me, did you say trees? Ms. Hebert replied yes, some trees.

Mr. Nelson said Mr. Chairman, just a quick question and maybe this is a clarifying question for Becky. The feedback seems to be around taking back and getting additional feedback from Encore, yet I don't think this is a conceptual, this is an actual vote. Or how do we square the two there between getting feedback or potentially integrating changes versus just saying we approve this and then at that point, are we approving what's been presented, so. Ms. Hebert replied the Board could continue the discussion to the July meeting and ask for changes to the signs or could consider a conditional approval and attach conditions that would modify the design. Mr. Barresi replied I guess in response to that; I would say this is not conceptual that we're presenting here. Mr. Nelson said I understand. But the responses to some degree have been about taking things back and getting feedback and, to me, that indicates that there is a follow on or a feedback loop coming back to us before what were the feedback we're providing. I'm just trying to understand if that's the case or not. Mr. Barresi replied you know, in terms of the pylon at the main entrance, if the Board has concerns about the height and is not comfortable with the height that has been proposed and feels that they cannot approve as designed, then certainly we're going to have to go back and revisit that. I guess from my perspective as the designer and doing a number of signs in this kind of context, I would disagree about the height. I think the height is appropriate. It's not going to feel over scaled. And so, from a design perspective, I would push back on that. But if you can't approve it, then obviously we'll have to revisit that and address the height issue. Mr. Nelson added yeah, I guess my question is just there's a difference between rejecting something versus having a back and forth and coming to a proper agreement. So that's all my question was, Mr. Chairman.

Chair Fairman said coming back to the back side of the sign, I do think that landscaping behind that sign will go a long way. There won't be any questions about that, and I don't think we've actually seen a landscaping plan yet for the whole thing, have we, Becky? Ms. Hebert said there was a snapshot, yes, of a landscape plan in the packet. There it is. But the trees behind the highway sign are really just very small shrubs. They're 18 to 24 inches at the time of planting and mature height for an Azalea is pretty small. Chair Fairman said yes, I think you need to landscape around the backside of that sign, that's appropriate to the height of the sign. Mr. Barresi said OK. Yeah, that's a good...

Vice Chair Newberry said Mr. Chairman, I would just comment in terms of the sign structure on South River Road. I mean, there's a couple of options here, I think. We can Table it. We can reject it. We can

approve it with a constraint. And unless there is some urgent timeline that the applicant has to hit, I think that we might come up all the way around with a better solution if the applicant has an opportunity to respond to some of the Board's concerns. I don't think approving it with a condition that it be 20 feet is in anybody's best interest. Because I think the applicant may have an opportunity to consider our concern about the scale of it, reduce it to the 20 suggested feet and maybe adjust the design a little bit in the process and still give something that is going to meet the need and be attractive and at an appropriate scale. I don't know how the rest of the Board feels about that, or you as the applicant's representative. But my suggestion would be to Table this to the next scheduled meeting, assuming that we have room on the agenda for that, which Becky may be able to confirm, I don't know. And I think that would be a way of assuring that both you the applicant, and we the Board and Town of Bedford get the best possible solution here.

Mr. Sullivan said personally, I keep coming back to the idea of an additional pylon sign on 93 as completely unnecessary. You talked about this being an architectural add-on when you have that barn, and you have the backside of the barn is the perfect place to put tenant signage, and that's something that I would be for. But right now, I couldn't support a separate pylon sign on 93. That's unnecessary. It's probably something that, I'll speak for myself. I won't put words into other members mouths. But to have an additional sign when the only other pylon sign really on 93 right now is grandfathered in from the Bedford Mall. We don't want that type of signage popping up all over the place, is what I'll say for myself.

Chairman Fairman said the only comment is if they put it on the back of the barn, it's going to be a lot larger just to get the visibility from the road. And I like the reduction in size from what we saw in the back of the barn. So it could go either way, but the smaller sign is... Mr. Sullivan said I'd rather have larger signage facing 93 on the back of the barn than an empty panel half covered by trees facing the project. Chair Fairman said I could go either way on it. Ms. Johnson asked how tall is the barn? Mr. Barresi replied off the top of my head, I don't know. I'm sorry. It's taller than the pylon.

Ms. Malcolm said I do want to make this comment about the 293-ylon sign. Thank you for just putting four establishments on that sign, rather than cramming all eight on the sign. I really don't like it when everything is crammed together, and you can't see and you're driving 50 miles an hour. Mr. Barresi answered well, you know, it's really just practicality. It in order for them to be legible, they need to be of a sufficient size, and if there's eight of them, well, we can't get them up to the size needed. Ms. Malcolm reiterated I'm glad you chose four.

Mr. Strand said I have two quick questions, but I think Ms. Johnson might add something else first.

Ms. Johnson said I was going to ask the Board and maybe Becky, the previous South River Road sign was approved at that 25-foot height, correct? Ms. Hebert replied it was, yes. Ms. Johnson continued OK. Is something different about the sign that we're not willing to approve that same height that was previously approved? Ms. Hebert replied the site plan in 2016 was significantly more dense, with taller buildings and more retail space. This is more of an open, simplified layout. So, I wouldn't think you'd want to go with more signage at the gateway. And the sign was controversial then. We talked quite a bit about all the signs in 2016, but the Board did approve the design that you saw in the packet.

Mr. Nelson said the overall site is 40 percent less than it was as approved. This sign, I don't think, is 40 percent less size than what was approved, right? Mr. Barresi answered no, certainly not, no. Chair Fairman asked how large is the Bedford Mall sign? Ms. Hebert replied The Bedford Mall sign is 28 feet tall. It was the existing Bedford Mall sign when the mall was an enclosed shopping center and not the

open shopping center. In the early 2010s, I think, the mall was redeveloped to bring the store fronts to the exterior and redevelop the inside of the mall, and the sign was grandfathered. So, they were able to reface and re-panel the existing sign. Chair Fairman said that's massive. You could even compare it to this. That's quite a bit larger. Plus, the height is only 20 feet. Ms. Hebert said 28 feet. Mr. Sullivan said 3 feet higher.

Mr. Strand said quick question, going back to the blank back of the sign. How visible is it from the South River side. I mean, where would you actually see that back, whether landscaped or used for other purposes? Mr. Barresi answered well, I'm just going to go to the site plan. There we go. I'm going to try to zoom in on this here. So, the sign is off center from Main Street and based on this plan here, there'll be a large tree here and here and as well it's quite a ways. The sign is not going to be visible from South River Road and as you are walking along here. Mr. Strand said so, landscaping would definitely do the job. Mr. Barresi said yeah, I think so. Mr. Strand asked do you have the authority to accept that, should the Board approve the request with the caveat of landscaping? Mr. Barresi replied yes. Mr. Strand said that's one question. The other question would be, do you have the ability or authority to accept, if the pleasure of the Board was to grant the request with the stipulation that the front sign was 20, not 25 feet? Or would you have to go back to the drawing board? I'm asking only for the sake of expedition and trying to be friendly to the project. Mr. Barresi replied yeah, I know that Encore is very anxious to get approval for the sign because there is a timing issue. Tenants are going to be moving in the fall. It needs to be, you know, REI and Schwab, and so they want presence along South River Road and 293. And so there is a timing factor certainly. To go from 25 to 20, I don't know if I have the authority to say, oh yeah, sure, no problem. Mr. Strand said but you did say it would create a major impact on the sign and visibility as designed now? Mr. Barresi said not to get into the design minutiae here, but in terms of what does that do to the design when you go from 25 to 20? I know it doesn't sound like a lot. But just some of the things that are going through my head, to be perfectly translucent, we can't really reduce the size of the tenant panels. Those are, in my experience, about as small as you can get with those things and have them still be legible, OK. Mr. Strand asked so, you would shrink the Market & Main up top? Mr. Barresi answered so, we're going to shrink the height of this thing, not the width. And so, what happens from a design perspective, is it starts looking a little bit more squat instead of tall and slender. So, that's a different look and feel to that sign that I think would be a negative if I'm being honest. But if that is essential, certainly we can make it work. We'll make it work at 20 feet. It's a sign. It's not, you know, a life or death here. And so, if that's a requirement, we'll make it work.

Mr. Strand said my only other question is for Hal, and I'll be done in a second, sorry. I was waiting to jump in here. To your point, again, I'm not a voting member tonight, so I should make that clear. But from the perspective of the highway, I would politely disagree with you. I don't think it makes a difference. That sign is so big. It's a highway. I wouldn't want 10 more. And if there's a concern over opening the door to that, I could see that. But I don't see where any further development in this area could or would ever occur anyway, so I don't know that that's a valid concern. But my question, Hal, is I guess, and I'm new with this and this may be a naive perspective. But for me as a resident, consumer, passerby, the differential between 20 and 25 seems pretty negligible. And I could be wrong. And folks on the Board would disagree, but not to be retroactive here, but I was shocked to see that the scope of such further development was even happening in such a small space. I might have taken issue with that, although I obviously wasn't on the Board in any capacity at that point but given the 40 percent reduction in density that's already occurred, I would take little issue with a 5-foot differential of sign. But one man's opinion.

Vice Chair Newberry asked can you go back to that graphic you have of the comparing the original pylon type design and this? Mr. Barresi replied oh, the one with the red dotted lines? Vice Chair Newberry

replied yes. Mr. Barresi said this guy here, yes. Mr. Strand said it seems like more of a shape difference than height, really. Vice Chair Newberry said so, the new design in my view creates more of a block visually than the original design or the first design does. So, while they're both the same height, I still believe that the new design is going to look more massive at the same height than the old design. That's my concern. I mean, if I'm the only one that's concerned with that, then... Chair Fairman asked do we know how tall Trader Joe's is? I'm looking for a comparison between this sign and the height of Trader Joe's. Mr. Barresi replied I'm sorry. I don't know. Mr. Clough asked what if you compromised and did 22 ½ feet? Chair Fairman said I think it's going to be quite a bit shorter. Mr. Greazzo asked Ms. Hebert, what would happen if this was denied? He would just still have the original sign approval to continue? Ms. Hebert replied no, because the project has changed. They have to come back for sign waivers for their signs. It was a condition of the site plan approval when this new development is approved. Mr. Greazzo said a change in site plan approval requires a change in the site? Ms. Hebert replied yes.

Mr. Strand asked Ms. Hebert, do you know a ballpark without holding you to it, how tall you would guess Trader Joe's is? I'm guessing it's pretty tall, right? Ms. Hebert replied Trader Joe's—it's fairly tall. I'd need to look that up. I'm guessing maybe 30 feet, but 30 feet is a three-story building. I don't have the plans in front of me. It's something that if you continue the discussion, we could get you some comparisons for. Mr. Barresi said I guess all I would say is from a design perspective, I think the 25 feet is a better visual look and feel. We can make 20 feet work. I can make 20 feet work. And if it's an approval on that condition, we'll make it work. But I just want to be clear with you, that what we can't make work is reducing the size of those tenant panels. That's not going to be part of the solution. It will be the other portion, the other stuff around that we're going to need to work on. But the look and feel will be the same, just proportionally it's going to be different.

Ms. Hebert asked Andrew, can you scroll back to the original design of the pylon sign? Because I remember the discussion at the time with the Board had to do with the transparency of the sign because it is close to the road and being able to see through it was important to the Board. And I did notice that you do have the same size retail tenant panels on the sign roughly as you do on the new sign. Mr. Barresi said yes, that was kind of like a criteria for updating the design was you've got to keep those panels the same. Ms. Hebert asked did they look at a sketch that kind of kept this design but changed out the materials to make it look a little more consistent with the revised architecture? Mr. Barresi said I developed a number of concepts including forms that are similar to this, but I think the consensus from the owner and from the design team was generally what you're seeing here was the preferred approach, just in terms of how it speaks very directly to the new architecture and the new design of the site. Mr. Nelson said but I think that Vice Chairman Newberry is getting at this in the sense that there's a big flat panel here, if you go back up. There's more kind of visual space. I think that's, is that Becky, kind of what you're getting at a little? Ms. Hebert said yes, there's a little more variety. So even though it was 25 feet tall, the whole mass of the sign was 25 feet tall, and you could see through the tenant panels. Mr. Strand said you can also kind of see past the sign because of the gaps up top. Chair Fairman requested go up to the proposed sign. Mr. Barresi said oh yeah, sure. Sorry. Chair Fairman said one of the easy things you could do is just cut off those two corners of that back panel. It doesn't make a big difference, but it does. We're concerned about the mass, not necessarily the height. I would like to suggest to the Board that perhaps we approve this with a condition that they reduce it. And I would suggest 22 1/2 feet rather than 20, something in between. I'm not making a motion, but I put that out there as a suggestion for the Board to consider. You have indicated you could do it to something smaller. I know you can't necessarily agree to that. That's not your position. But if we made it a condition and we could do that. And I give you. Any other comments or questions from the Board?

Ms. Johnson said I have one more question. Can you go back up to the site plan, like the overhead look? That one, yes. So, the back pylon on the 293 off ramp, where is the barn in this photo? Mr. Barresi replied it's right here. Ms. Johnson said so, it's like right there. So, to Matt's point, we're going to have a sign and a barn, and we could probably, like they're not that far off from each other. OK. I don't really have a question. That was my question.

Mr. Sullivan asked how far away is the barn? Vice Chair Newberry said I would guess it's in the 20-foot range. Just by memory. Ms. Hebert said the barn is, yes. Chair Fairman said in the back of the barn is a big stone structure. The concept had signs on that stone structure. Vice Chair Newberry said I think at least the peak of it is probably approaching a two-2 story, if I remember the scale of that. Ms. Johnson asked would that be something you would be interested in exploring on the back sign, if we could push forward some kind of resolution on the front sign? Mr. Barresi said I'm not sure what you're asking. I'm Sorry. Ms. Johnson said if we Table approving anything for the back sign until we get more information on if it's feasible to include it, do something on the barn instead of its own pylon? Mr. Barresi replied yeah, I'm not really in a position to say if that would be acceptable to Encore. I'm sorry.

Ms. Hebert asked if the Board were to Table it, you could also ask for, can you do like a photograph and simulate what the sign might look like from the site entrance? Mr. Barresi answered oh, do you mean a photographic rendering? Ms. Hebert said yes, actually take a picture and put the sign in that so we could get a better sense of what it might look and feel like? Mr. Barresi said yes. That's certainly possible to do something like that, yes.

Vice Chair Newberry said I would say an illustration like that, to scale, might at least put me at ease that 25 feet is fine. Ms. Malcolm said I'd like to see that myself. Ms. Johnson asked is the timing an issue if we wait a month? I mean I know you said it was important get it going. Mr. Barresi said yeah, they're anxious to get this in place for sure, yes. So that is an issue, yes. Mr. Nelson asked Becky, but if this is rejected is that a longer timeline to come back versus Tabling and reviewing? Or is it exactly the same? Ms. Hebert replied he would be coming back in less than a month if he came back on July 17th. Mr. Barresi said it won't be me. It'll have to be somebody else. I'm away. Mr. Strand said I feel like since you seem amenable to making it work and time is a factor, I would, again, as a nonvoting member of the Board to maybe consider the 22 ½ as an option because it provides a little bit of wiggle room for you to do what you need to do and possibly get it done. Mr. Barresi said yeah, I think it's very doable to make the 22 ½ work. Mr. Sullivan said it was at 20 a minute ago. Mr. Greazzo said I have a question about the height requirement for the barn. Is there a restriction on how tall the sign could be once it's attached to the barn? Or does it have to be barn height only? Ms. Hebert said the barn was designed to hold sign panels on what was like a chimney structure at the back end of the barn. And I don't know for certain, but I believe there may be some changes to what that barn might look like, and Market & Main would be coming back to talk to the Board about those changes. Mr. Greazzo asked does the chimney structure exceed the height of the building so that it would be larger than the estimated 20 feet? Mr. Sullivan said in the original plan, we're able to find it. It looks like the interior chimney does extend a little bit up and the entire height looks to be about 35 feet to the peak of the barn. Mr. Greazzo said so that would put their rear sign at about 35 feet. Larger than what you're looking for, and then the front sign, if it were smaller than it was more practically acceptable to the general traveling public. That would be acceptable, and it could be done. Mr. Barresi said yeah, again, I think that we can make the shorter height work. In terms of signage on the barn, I think decoupling the signage from the barn structure, I think, is an important objective of Encore. Because as the design of that structure continues to evolve, they want to move forward with signage, so decoupling those two things is important to them.

Chairman Fairman said So, we have actually three different waivers. So, we can approve, for instance, the one near the highway and not the one near South River Road. Or we can just approve the guidelines, or whatever you'd like. I'll ask the Board, what's your pleasure?

Ms. Hebert asked do you want to hear a review of the guidelines, or an explanation of the guidelines?

Mr. Barresi replied so, the other part that I haven't shown you is the tenant signage guidelines. Would you like me to just run through that? So, I think it's just right off the bat, it's very important for me to point out that we haven't changed any of the original parameters of the tenant signage guidelines that you originally reviewed and approved. So, tenants aren't allowed any more signs than previously. They're not allowed bigger signs. All the dimensional requirements, all the lighting requirements. It's all the same. The only thing we've done is to update, essentially, the storefront elevations that were present in the previous guidelines now reflect the new elevations. And we've established zones for the different types of signs that were permitted based on the new storefronts. So that's one update. We've updated some photographs of types of signs to reflect the most current sort of practices in fabrication and illumination. Things like that. Just so it's more current. But, essentially, it's the same approach from a tenant signage guideline perspective.

So, the guidelines, there's an introduction, there's a general set of guidelines, a narrative explaining everything. A description of the allowable types of tenant signs, which hasn't changed. What's prohibited in terms of signs, types and materials. That hasn't changed. The submission requirements remains the same. And we have pages that explain the different types of signs as well. And then we've been asked to include REI's proposal and Schwab's signage proposal, which to be added to this, to show you how the guidelines actually end up in application. So those two proposals are consistent with these guidelines. They don't waver from them, as an FYI.

We start with a description of the types of signs that are allowed. So, the first type here is a wall sign. This is the primary sign for a tenant—one of the primary signs. We generally show a typical condition here, and the types of applications that are acceptable, namely individual letters like this. It can either be externally illuminated or internally illuminated. That hasn't changed. This is an example of a box or logo that has the graphics cut out to push through and then backlit. So, all these kinds of treatments were part of the guidelines and continue to be.

Another type of sign if folks have a canopy and they'd rather not do a wall sign, but they want to put something on the canopy they're still allowed to do that. These are some examples of that and the allowable sizes and locations, that sort of thing. Some folks prefer just doing awnings with the principal identification being on the awning. That is still permissible as well. Or a primary like blade sign like this. Although, architecturally, there are a few locations where this applies, but it's still an allowable sign. And then they are still allowed certain types of supplemental signs. Things like colored awnings on a second tier, decorative graphics on the windows, abstract or decorative graphics on a wall surface or like a tag line on a canopy, that sort of thing. Those are still part of the guidelines. And these are just different photographic examples, as I've said, that we've included to further describe those signs. Tenants are encouraged to have a small perpendicular blade sign for pedestrians as you're walking along, so you can kind of see the stores as they occur down the sidewalk. That's still part of the program, as are small identifications on windows as well, and an address.

And then as I said, what we did was to update the plan and also the storefront elevations. So, these are elevations of each storefront, and where we identify the different zones for those types of signs and where they're allowed. Much as we did before, and there's options for different locations they can use for a wall

sign on some storefronts. Or they could do a canopy sign and we show where those would go. These aren't saying that you can put a sign on all these surfaces, it's just if you choose to have a wall sign, it can go here or here. If you choose to have a canopy sign, it can go here or here. A tag line sign on the canopy here or here. And of course, window graphics or designs on the wall surface, that sort of thing. So, we're just kind of demarcating those areas that these different types of signs that they're allowed goes. That's what these do. And they've been updated to reflect obviously, the new storefront designs.

And then we summarize those guidelines at the end much as we did before. And in the appendix here, we have what REI is proposing. And here they're proposing a primary wall sign on the west side and a supplemental tag line sign here on the west side as well, a supplemental tag line sign on the south side, and a primary wall sign on the east side. So, a three-sided tenant like this is permitted a sign on each one of those frontages. The max they're allowed is three primary signs. So, they're using two of the three that they're allowed. In terms of the designs, dimensionally, location wise, they're consistent with these guidelines. They're within those parameters that have been established. And they're proposing letters, a logo, that will look like this, internally illuminated, fabricated, painted, metal sides. That sort of thing. And they do want to be on the pylon facing this is the... This is what was confusing. They do want to be on the pylon that will be facing 293 as well as on the pylon at the main entrance as well.

As far as Schwab is concerned, they're a free-floating building, so they have four sides available to them. But again, the maximum number of primary signs they can have is three. And what they're proposing is a primary sign here. Let me zoom in, I'm sorry. So, they're proposing lettering here on the north side and on the south, and they're proposing a smaller square logo sign on the west. They're not proposing any primary sign on the east and they're not permitted a fourth sign. So, they're only permitted four primary signs. They're also proposing a single tenant blade sign. One of those small blade signs here, so that if you parked in the parking lot, it sort of identifies it along the pedestrian way here. And then at each of the entrances and at glass, they're proposing small vinyl graphics on the glass. So, as I said this approach is consistent. They're in the wall sign zone that have been established for this building here and here. Their sizes are within the multiplication factor of 1 ½ times the linear frontage of the building. And this guy right here is also within that area allotment for that side. These are just details of those. There is going to be like a halo around that square and the letters will be illuminated much like that photograph I showed you before. And then this is that blade sign right here. And that's internally illuminated. Just a very simple square panel with push through acrylics like this. And then they're proposing some minor graphics on the glass entries and side lights as well. And they do want to be on the two pylons. That was the previous design, but they would be here on both of them. So, as I said, pretty much everything about the guidelines is the same. It's just updating the elevations, updating some of the imagery so that it's more current. I'm happy to answer any questions you have about these as well.

Chair Fairman asked are there any comments or questions on the sign guidelines? Vice Chair Newberry said I think that the guideline is very well done. I think it will give the tenants maximum flexibility but assure that doesn't get out of control. I think the vast majority of these signs will only be visible, at best, partially off site, but primarily within the site. I think it's a good plan to make consistent, attractive signage within the development. I think that's an important dimension of this, to keep in mind that, because of the nature of this development, I think it makes sense to have a sign guideline and requirements that may differ from what normally would be required within the Town. I think it's very well done. Chair Fairman said thank you, Hal. Any other comments, questions? I'll just concur with Hal. I like the fact when you see the actual signs for REI and Schwab. That the sizing of them against the panel is appropriate. They're not overwhelming and large, so I like the guidelines very much. There's nobody here from the public, so I don't

think I need to ask for comments there. Any other comments on the tenant signage guidelines? I'll entertain a motion on a waiver for the design guidelines and tenant signage.

MOTION: Vice Chair Newberry moves the Planning Board approve a waiver from Bedford Zoning Ordinance, Sections 275-68, 275-74 H(4) & Table 6 of the Performance Zone Sign Standards, to approve the proposed design guidelines for tenant storefront and building signage as presented by the Applicant, for Market & Main, located at 125 South River Road, Lot 12-33, as the Planning Board finds that the applicant has shown substantial compliance with the purpose statements of the Performance Zone, in accordance with the following findings of fact:

- **The plans are found to be in compliance with the purpose and intent of the Performance Zone;**
- **The Board also includes all facts found in the meeting minutes for this application and incorporates all meeting minutes into this decision.**

Ms. Malcolm duly seconded the motion. Vote taken – all in favor. Unanimous. Motion carries.

Chair Fairman said that is approved. Mr. Barresi said I guess I should have started there. Chairman Fairman said the second waiver is for the freestanding sign facing South River Road.

MOTION: Mr. Greazzo moves the Planning Board Table to the next meeting, a waiver from Bedford Zoning Ordinance, Sections 275-68, 275-74 H(4) & Table 6 of the Performance Zone Sign Standards, to allow the proposed 149.25 sq. ft. freestanding sign (25 feet tall) at the site entrance off of South River Road, as presented by the Applicant, for Market & Main, located at 125 South River Road, Lot 12-33e. Mr. Sullivan seconded the motion.

Discussion: Mr. Nelson said Mr. Chairman, the only thing I would add is if there's any additional documentation examples, I think those are very helpful for the Board to get closure on this. I understand the need and desire to get this closed out, but I think that could help at the next meeting, finalize the matter.

Mr. Barresi asked can you clarify a little bit what you mean by additional documentation? Mr. Nelson replied I think we've talked about some photorealistic examples of the different sizes, things of that nature. Mr. Barresi replied oh, I see. Chair Fairman said I'd like some visuals, a barn picture. Show us that compared to the new pylon sign. So, some comparisons like that, artist's conceptions. Mr. Barresi said OK, I would like to reiterate the decoupling of the signage from the barn is kind of, you know, essential. So, showing signs on the barn... Mr. Greazzo replied no, I think what they're looking for is a visual reference. A conceptual design of what it would look like as compared to standing next to the barn, as well as the one on South River Road compared to the size of the buildings there, of what it would look like at a 30-foot height or 20-foot height. Mr. Barresi said oh, I see. Got it. Mr. Nelson said right now, we're discussing the South River Road, Item Number 2, specifically, correct? Mr. Greazzo said yes. Mr. Nelson said there is a motion to Table that. So, in terms of that, I think it would be the ability to have some way to visualize what the scale might look like in context, both the 25 of the new design and maybe a potential alternative, slight modification of that. Mr. Barresi replied OK.

Mr. Sullivan said in the past, a lot of the plans that have been presented to us were very photo realistic of what the entire scale looks like. And so, to have that sense of what the entranceway will look like with the sign there. So, it's not just on a piece of paper with a mock person next to it. Mr. Barresi said got it. OK.

Ms. Hebert asked would the board like to see an alternative design at 20 or 22 ½ feet just to compare? Mr. Nelson replied I think anything of that nature that could help us get closure in the next meeting and not perpetually keep moving this down the road would be helpful. Vice Chair Newberry said I think that's a good point, yes. Chair Fairman asked are there any other comments or discussion? So, the motion on the floor is to Table sign waiver Number 2 related to the freestanding sign facing South River Road.

Vote taken – all in favor. Unanimous. Motion carries. Waiver request Number 2 is Tabled.

Chair Fairman said the third sign waiver requested is for the freestanding sign facing Interstate 293. We've had considerable discussion on this sign as well. Is there a motion?

MOTION: Mr. Sullivan moves the Planning Board Table to the next meeting, a waiver from Bedford Zoning Ordinance, Sections 275-68, 275-74 H(4) & Table 6 of the Performance Zone Sign Standards, to allow the proposed 123.25 sq. ft. freestanding sign (single-sided) (25 feet tall) facing Interstate 293, as presented by the Applicant, for Market & Main, located at 125 South River Road, Lot 12-33. Mr. Greazzo seconded the motion.

Discussion: Mr. Sullivan said I'd like to see similar renderings of signage from both the 293 perspective and potentially the Main Street perspective. Chair Fairman said I'd just like to add to that one that we haven't really suggested any changes. So, I'm not sure what we expect the applicant to come back with, maybe some visuals but we're not really suggesting or have any concern about the size or where it's located or anything about that. I haven't heard anything. Mr. Greazzo said Mr. Chairman, I think one of the things we discussed were the blank side on the back facing the property, as well as the fact that some members of the Board wanted it attached as opposed to detached. So, a rendering of what they would be voting on rather than, I think, what the motion alludes to is that just somebody standing next to a sign doesn't really cut it. Vice Chair Newberry said I would also comment that I think by Tabling this, if they make any changes to the South River Road sign, they have the opportunity to keep them consistent with each other rather than approving this one and then locking them into that. Mr. Strand said that's a good point. I would just comment that it seems like if for the applicant being detached is an imperative or, you know reevaluating being attached to the barn is a nonstarter, then to the Board, it seems that that will be the decision, at the next meeting, will be simply to what whether to approve as detached to that proposal or not? Mr. Greazzo said I believe the reason for the detached was that they wanted it as quickly as possible, whereas the barn won't be built as quickly as possible. That's the impetus for that.

Mr. Barresi said so, I'm just looking for a little clarity in terms of what we're doing for the east side, because I didn't hear any objections to the scale of that. I only heard concerns about the view to the backside, which I think could be addressed with landscaping. So, I'm not sure what further development is required on that for you. Mr. Nelson said well, I believe that I heard that there was a question of if it could or could not be attached to the barn versus standalone, correct? And then I think you indicated that that was maybe more of a business decision that we're not in a position right now tonight to make that decision. Mr. Barresi replied I think I'm comfortable in saying it's not going to be attached to the barn. The desires for it to be a freestanding sign. Mr. Strand said I think that a question to defer to the applicant would be, if the only option is detached, then there's no room to consider attachment to the barn, which it seems multiple members of the Board would be interested in and that would be a decision for you guys to make before coming back, knowing it will be a simple yes or no. Chair Fairman said that's my point exactly. We're not asking them to do anything different than what they've already proposed. So why are we Tabling it? Yeah, we can bring in some visuals. We can see an artist's conception of the sign, but the attachment to the barn is not an option. So why are we even doing that?

Mr. Greazzo said maybe the maker of the motion would withdraw the motion and move to... Mr. Sullivan said that was going to be my next move. Mr. Sullivan said Mr. Chairman, I have it either way, I guess. Chair Fairman asked to do what? To disapprove? Mr. Greazzo replied to disapprove. Either give them the option to have the discussion to come with something that they would be amenable to, or not have one at all, I guess, is the interest of the maker of the motion. I won't speak for him, but I'll leave that to him. Mr. Sullivan said no, if the Board doesn't feel that Tabling is a good move because there's no real substantial discussion or request, then I'll withdraw my motion and instead motion to disapprove. Mr. Barresi asked so, on what basis? Mr. Sullivan said I feel that we don't need another pylon sign, and it opens up a can of worms along both 293 and Route 3 that, we already have one that's grandfathered in. I don't want to open up the opportunity for more businesses to add pylon signs of this size. Chair Fairman said we have several businesses—we already do—have signs both front and back on 293 and South River Road. Vice Chair Newberry said well, to your point, Matt, I think it can also be looked at as this is unique enough of a development that it may justify providing that waiver that we might otherwise be reluctant to provide. Mr. Sullivan said I mean; I'll go back to the idea that the original signage as presented on the back of the barn seemed adequate and in line with both what the applicant was trying to do in terms of provide signage to the 293 corridor and tie into the architectural feel and look of the development. But if they stuck with that, I'd be fine with it. But an additional pylon sign in addition to the barn, it just seems unnecessary to me. Ms. Hebert said it seems like the Tabling would allow the applicant to bring back more information on what the plans are for the barn and to talk about the pylon sign. Mr. Barresi replied I think so. Ms. Malcolm asked you're not proposing to have the pylon sign and the signage on the back of the barn both? Mr. Barresi replied oh, no, no, certainly not. If, at this stage, the only acceptable alternative to the Board is on the barn, then I would need to go back to the applicant to have that discussion with them. Mr. Sullivan said it looks like all the design work had already gone into that direction initially, so if it was just a business decision of how fast to get the signage up, if they're willing to wait and stick to that original plan, I think I'll speak for myself to say that I'd be more amenable to that and perhaps the rest of the Board would be as well. Mr. Strand said if there are mixed opinions on this on the Board, there could still be value on that vote because it would put the applicant in the same position regardless. Mr. Nelson asked Becky, if the vote is held and it fails, is that then I guess, back to my initial question, does that put you further back in the process or in your mind it doesn't? Ms. Hebert replied so, if the motion to disapprove passes, the applicant has to come back with a substantially different application. Mr. Greazzo said point of order, we're still working on the Tabling motion. Ms. Hebert said oh. Mr. Greazzo said the applicant has indicated that he'd rather Table than disapprove, so I'd call the question, Mr. Chairman.

Chair Fairman said OK. All those in favor of Tabling the third sign waiver for the freestanding sign facing Interstate 293. All those in favor opposed.

Vote taken – all in favor. Unanimous. Motion carries. Waiver request Number 3 is Tabled.

Chair Fairman said we're done, Sir. Mr. Barresi said thank you very much.

Public Notice:

Ms. Hebert said I'd like to announce for members of the public watching this meeting, that the applications have been Tabled to July 17th and this announcement will serve as notice to the public.

V. Concept Proposals and Other Business:

- 1. Munson and Associates, LLC (Applicant), ER Bedford, LLC (Owner)** – Request for conceptual site plan review for a 5-story, 62-unit, multi-family independent senior living residence (55+), located at 125 South River Road, Lot 12-33, Zoned PZ. *(At the request of the applicant, this application is postponed to July 17, 2023.)*

VI. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meetings (June 12, 2023 Meeting)

Chair Fairman asked are there any corrections, changes to the minutes for June 12th? There were none.

MOTION: Vice Chair Newberry moves the Planning Board approve the meeting minutes for June 12, 2023 as written. Mr. Nelson seconded the motion. Vote taken – all in favor. Chair Fairman, Ms. Malcolm, and Mr. Clough abstained from the vote. Motion carried.

VII. Communications to the Board: None.

VIII. Reports of Committees: Ms. Hebert said I can report that we have finalized the contract for the housing project and we're in the process of scheduling a meeting with the Housing Working Group for July. The first phase of this project involves a lot of data gathering, studying of Bedford's existing conditions. So, we would likely be having our first large public engagement session in late September, early October. We're excited to be kicking this off and the consultant team seems excited to be working on it.

IX. Adjournment:

MOTION by Vice Chair Newberry to adjourn at 8:53 pm. Ms. Malcolm duly seconded the motion. Vote taken – all in favor. Motion carried.

The next meeting of the Planning Board is scheduled for July 17, 2023.

Respectfully submitted by
Sue Forcier