

TOWN OF BEDFORD
August 12, 2019
PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES

A meeting of the Bedford Planning Board was held on Monday, August 12, 2019 at the Bedford Meeting Room, 10 Meetinghouse Road, Bedford, NH. Present were: Jon Levenstein (Chairman), Hal Newberry (Vice Chairman), Karen McGinley (Secretary), Phil Greazzo (Town Council Alternate), Rick Sawyer (Town Manager), Jeff Foote (Public Works Director), Kelleigh Murphy, Charlie Fairman (Alternate), Priscilla Malcolm (Alternate), Becky Hebert (Planning Director), and Mark Connors (Assistant Planning Director)

I. Call to Order and Roll Call:

Chairman Levenstein called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Town Councilor Chris Bandazian, regular members Randy Hawkins and Mac McMahon, and Alternate Matt Sullivan were absent. There will be no voting tonight as we only have conceptual plans.

II. Old Business & Continued Hearings: None

III. New Business:

1. **Pinhan & Muge Cakir (Owners)** – Request for site plan approval to redevelop the former Grenon Trading Post Co. warehouse into a 72-seat restaurant and bakery and 2,620 square-foot of retail space and associated access, parking, and landscaping improvements at 276 Route 101, Lot 27-29, Zoned CO. *Postponed per applicant request to 9/9/19 PB meeting.*

IV. Concept Proposals and Other Business:

2. **Paramont Partners (Applicant), RK Bedford, LLC (Owner)** – Request for conceptual review of a proposal to construct a 2,236 square-foot bank with drive-through service facilities and associated site improvements in the commercial development at 7 Kilton Road, Lot 12-23, Zoned PZ.
3. **Riley Investment Properties, LLC (Owner)** – Request for conceptual review of a proposal to construct a gasoline service station with a 4,000 square-foot convenience store and fast-food restaurant with drive-through service facilities and associated site improvements at 189 and 193 South River Road, Lots 22-87 and 22-23, Zoned PZ.
4. Development Update

Mr. Connors stated the abutters have been notified; because the Board will not be making any decisions tonight, there is no need for the board to consider if the applications are complete or if they pose a regional impact. Staff would recommend that the Board accept the agenda.

MOTION by Vice Chairman Newberry to approve the agenda as read. Ms. Murphy duly seconded the motion. Vote taken – all in favor. Motion carried.

- 1. Pinhan & Muge Cakir (Owners) – Request for site plan approval to redevelop the former Grenon Trading Post Co. warehouse into a 72-seat restaurant and bakery and 2,620 square-feet of retail space and associated access, parking, and landscaping improvements at 276 Route 101, Lot 27-29, Zoned CO. *Postponed per applicant request to 9/9/19 PB meeting.***

Chairman Levenstein stated this application for a site plan approval has been postponed to the September 9, 2019 Planning Board meeting per the request of the applicant.

- 2. Paramont Partners (Applicant), RK Bedford, LLC (Owner) – Request for conceptual review of a proposal to construct a 2,236 square-foot bank with drive-through service facilities and associated site improvements in the commercial development at 7 Kilton Road, Lot 12-23, Zoned PZ.**

Richard Pilla of Paramont Partners and Jason Hill and Dillon Cruess from TF Moran were present to address this conceptual review.

Mr. Pilla stated I am to present the proposed bank that would go at the Hannaford's plaza where the former Stop & Shop gas station was once located. As you know, the center that this Board approved changes from when Stop & Shop left and Hannaford's went in to take their place. At that particular time, or prior to that when Stop & Shop was operating the supermarket, they also had a gas station. Our proposed bank, which would be a new community bank in the Town of Bedford, would locate its branch essentially where the gas station canopy once was. We believe that this would be a good addition to the Town and to the center, it would replace what was once a gas station canopy with a very attractive traditional architecture financial institution. When we come before you on October 21st, I will be able to explain who the institution is. Up to that matter we have tried to keep it under our vest only because it is a very competitive environment there and hopefully we will eventually gain approval from this Board for us to move forward.

Mr. Pilla continued the purpose of our being here this evening is to show you what we are proposing on the site and also to get your feedback. It has been our experience that these meetings and the input we get from you, who are the Planning Board members, we usually wind up with a much better project, so we welcome your comments, your recommendations, your suggestions, and now I will turn it over to Jason Hill.

Mr. Hill stated thank you for hearing us tonight. I am going to give you a brief outline of the site development, parking conditions and such. Mr. Pilla mentioned the intention is to come before

you soon with a site plan application. They would like to start construction, obviously if things go right, winter is coming, but foundations if possible before winter, but we have a lot of work to do. This is at the Kilton Road, South River Road intersection, it is in the Hannaford plaza anchored by Hannaford supermarket, Home Goods, is a free-standing building with a Super Cuts, and also the vacant portion of that building is proposed to be occupied by a yoga fitness studio called Hot Works. We are proposing to redevelop the southeast quadrant in the location, the former gasoline station, with this 2,200+/- square-foot single-story bank with two teller drive-thru lanes. The existing site, based on the approved site plans, has 425 parking spaces, two greater than the minimum current parking requirements of the Town of Bedford. Through our process to date we have worked to refine and minimize the layout and want to keep it as green as we can; we want to keep the open space as is in terms of not increasing the amount of pavement and such. We will be coming to you with a proposal that doesn't increase the coverage, therefore the drainage facilities that are onsite we would anticipate just reusing for treatment since this is a redevelopment. Under the current regulations there are two greater spaces than the minimum requirements and we have looked into how that would affect what we are trying to do. Obviously that is the first thing that we need to resolve is how will the parking waiver situation that we are going to ask for work. With plugging in the branch bank at its minimum parking requirements per Bedford, which is similar to the shopping center, you result in a requirement of 432 spaces. The actual concept you are looking at we are making tweaks to the pavement layout and such so that you have a net loss of one parking space and a waiver is required for that parking condition. We have done a study that I recently submitted to the Board, and during the month of July during the peak hours of this plaza where we looked at the use and how much parking is being occupied, and we found that it averages roughly 56 percent of the parking on the busiest day we studied during the peak hour is parked and there is 44 percent not parked and that varies around the site where it is open and it is not open, and we know that based on what we have done to date. We have also looked at trying to grow it for the holiday period where you can anticipate more traffic in the plaza during the holiday period, so we used some of the ITE guidance for shopping centers to implement the higher demand and plus or minus 33 percent, I believe, I don't know exactly off the top of my head, but it ends up that if you apply the peak December type condition of this plaza, we anticipate that it would be 71 percent occupied, 33 percent vacant, there are 425+/- spaces so you have a couple hundred open spaces and if you build into it the fitness studio, which has a parking requirement of 12, and grow that, we are left with 100+/- . We have submitted the exact numbers but I am just talking general here, a net of 109 available for the bank where it would require nine, so we anticipate that there would still be a significant vacancy rate and there should be ample parking under that condition to accommodate both developments. We will need a waiver, which we would file for this project but this is where we are at to date and we think the parking works very well. It is typical under the multiple towns and cities that have parking rates that they may have established at a former period of time and that they are seeing with the changes in the economy and things, that those may have been larger than they actually need to be, so it is a fairly common thing to see all these parking lots for huge malls and all kinds of plazas and you have these big open areas on the periphery.

Mr. Hill continued we have two drive-thru lanes, which I believe would be an ATM and teller lane and the outer lane would be a teller lane only with three queue-in spaces and then the bypass is somewhat of a de facto bypass lane where I am not paralleling it with the driveways, I am

actually just using the existing driveway up here that is shared with the opposite building. We feel that that allows us to basically by going with this design there are a few things, there are only three cars queuing so when you are driving up to the queuing lanes, you will see the queuing in front of you and you will have an opportunity to just bypass it right from the get-go. We don't anticipate both of those queuing lanes will be fully occupied, and also it is not a long queuing lane, so with three spaces what is the real concern if you have an emergency and you are in the second space, the most you would be waiting would be something like two minutes for a long transaction. So we think that the bypass lane as we have provided is a good design and it will allow us, even though we have access parking, at least it minimizes the impact to the plaza because we want to give it plenty of parking. That is our drive-thru situation.

Mr. Hill stated it is hard to see very well on the screen but the existing curb line is here for the existing driveway. To make the bank footprint to minimum requirements, we end up with this type of a building design/layout and I need to make for 1-way circulation just basically reset the curb towards the Kilton Road intersection and create this parking row where the existing parking is here. So we are going to be expanding the parking, a minor parking expansion, into the landscaped areas, however, the landscaped yard area, especially on South River Road is greater than the 30-foot requirement, so we wouldn't be violating the 30-foot requirement but we would be reducing a little bit of the landscaping in this area as well in this area shown on the screen. It doesn't show on this record plan but there are three scotch pines that will be impacted by the construction due to that pavement layout and those trees are shown in the photo on the screen. Those three scotch pines will be inside of or at or very close to the edge of the site work, so those would be proposed to be removed. We have proposed to remove those trees, we have proposed also for visibility purposes and since the site is up high a little bit and there is a lot of shrubbery that is tall and overgrown, clear this tree, clear some of these shrubbery, establish new shrubbery similar to what is around the sign, so lower grasses and shrubs. It will be attractive, it will match what is there, but they need to be visible to the traveling public and they feel that that is essential to their work to the redevelop the site is having that cleared up, and that would be something we would want some feedback on how you would like our approach. Although I haven't presented a real plan showing the species, the intent would be to carry this lower stuff that still blocks headlights and such, carry it across the full corner and then go with that so that you can see the bank facility and that image I have submitted. In the posted photo I have imported the bank, which is a somewhat actual scaled rendering of what it should look like. It looks very nice, it matches some of the other corners of that intersection where we have the Bedford Farms facility that we looked at and it has a similar open view from the intersection of the 2-story building where there are no trees in front of it, as well as the other corner of that intersection that has been redeveloped where there has been some thinning of the vegetation there to allow the public to look in and have site lines of the nice architecture. So, removal of the trees in the front of the building is what is required for some of the construction, as well as we would like to remove some additional trees and large shrubs to further open up that view.

Mr. Hill stated I will show you the architectural elevations so you can see the New England style architecture. It is visually neutral colors just like that nice flatstone work façade there, it is an attractive building, it will look very nice at that intersection, it will dress up that plaza, bring in that new construction, and I think it is very attractive detail to be provided for the future. Mr. Pilla stated the other thing that it would do is bring the building closer to the road. Right now

you just have a massive parking area and with the addition of the bank building, it will bring those improvements closer to the intersection, which would be more in keeping with other developments along South River Road. The building would be pretty much in line with those, so there will be that consistency up and down that side of South River Road. Mr. Hill stated now posted are the south and west elevations and then the east and north elevations.

Mr. Hill stated the drainage and such I have touched on. For sewer; this is a sewer lot and we would obviously propose to tie into that so that is all engineering stuff that will be in the works once we get some feedback on how we are doing so far and what your thoughts are.

Chairman Levenstein asked for any comments or questions from the Board.

Ms. Malcolm asked will additional lighting be required for this facility? Mr. Hill replied there is some perimeter parking lighting that will be relocated. The redevelopment requires a few of the poles to be relocated and probably some lighting to blend in properly, maybe some wall pack lighting, but the perimeter of the site is lit up as under the current conditions. Mr. Pilla stated we would not be adding lighting to the parking field; it would just be any lighting fixtures on the building itself.

Mr. Fairman stated the biggest problem in this parking lot is traffic flow, not necessarily parking. The traffic flow when you turn off from Kilton Road going in, which is really the main entrance to that shopping plaza, all of your traffic is then going to have to go by the entrance to the grocery store and it really is an issue today, the traffic flow in that parking lot. I would like you in your final submittal to come in and talk about the traffic flow. There isn't an entrance from that driveway halfway up off from Kilton Road, an entrance into the parking. I wonder if that entrance could be moved or an entrance into the parking lot down lower so that the traffic to the bank would run across the Kilton Road side rather than having to go past the grocery store. What I am saying is with your final submittal come in with some traffic flow.

Mr. Fairman stated one other concern I have with you cutting the shrubs down is that the headlights for all of your cars going into the ATM and drive-thru bank are going to be flowing into South River Road, into the intersection, if you cut all of those shrubs down. I want to make sure that the shrubs you do put in are high enough to obstruct the headlights as they come around that corner. Mr. Hill responded we could make it a dense opaquish screen as well. Mr. Fairman responded I don't know if I like that idea but something to make the headlights less obtrusive. Thank you.

Vice Chairman Newberry stated on the intersection corner you are proposing to change the plantings but you are not going to change the grade at all. Is that correct? Mr. Hill replied that is correct. Vice Chairman Newberry asked and then on the east side where the angled parking is proposed, is that anticipated to be primarily employee parking or for traffic that will be coming and going? Mr. Pilla replied that will be primarily employee parking. Vice Chairman Newberry asked will it be marked that way? Mr. Pilla replied if you suggest that, sure. Ms. McGinley asked wouldn't you want the few parties that need to go into the bank to have access to that? Vice Chairman Newberry replied I think the primary entrance is on the south side. Related to that, another thought was that you may want to consider some kind of a painted crosswalk on the

west side. Some of your parking may end up over in that section, just off from the sidewalk there on the south side of the building, something to facilitate people who may be coming from those parking places to the entrance of the bank. I see from your parking study that it looks like if you look at areas D and C, D specifically, it looks like you may have even taking out the spaces for the structure, you will have something like 15 spaces available worst case. Mr. Hill responded I think higher but I think I understand what you are saying that the parking lot D, which is the proposed parking lot we are impacting, has 60 spaces under the current condition on average, and if I recall, it was 50 to 54 spaces were open during the peak hour, so we would end up when you had six occupied spaces with 50 opens spaces in that parking lot and then you will put the bank and the yoga studio into that, we are still going to have 39+/- open spaces during the holiday peak is my understanding of that condition. Vice Chairman Newberry stated I am looking at the 12:00 to 12:30p.m. where in area D you are showing 49 open spaces but you have to subtract the 20+ that you are going to burn for the structure and then the 12 that the likely use of the building to the north is going to use, which when counting I came up with about 15 open spaces. Mr. Hill responded we are also going to reconfigure parking, we are going to burn some but I think that when you implement the new parking layout here, it only results in a net loss of one space being removed. So, the redevelopment of the bank and parking lot D results in a net loss of one space to the Hannaford's plaza. It is in lot D, so it would go from 60 to 59 spaces. Vice Chairman Newberry stated yes, but I would not tend to look at it as the gross parking field so much as the southeast corner there that is going to be where the activity is going to be associated with the development. Mr. Hill responded we will definitely look into that and we will provide some type of an analysis of what that affect is. Mr. Pilla stated the other thing I would like to mention is that the bank's hours are substantially less than any of the other uses in the center, and for Heart Works, their peak hours for the most part are when the bank is more likely to be closed. The bank's hours are going to be either 8:30 to 5:00 or 9:00 to 5:00 and peak hours for Heart Works is going to be more like 5:00 to 7:00 and usually the beginning of the week is busier. So, when the supermarket is not as busy or Super Cuts is not as busy, Heart Works' busiest days are the beginning of the week and they kind of drop down from that. Vice Chairman Newberry, when you were asking about the spaces closest to South River Road and you asked if those were going to be marked employee parking. More than likely that is yes, and when you asked can that be designated as such, our agreement with Hannaford is that all spaces in the center are going to be common, so if we could do it, we would, but we don't have the authority to make that decision. That is something that would have to come from our landlord, which would be Hannaford's. Chairman Levenstein stated I don't see too many Hannaford customers parking over there anyway. That is the problem with the parking lot in general that there is a lot of parking but it is not anywhere near any of the buildings.

Mr. Pilla stated there are a couple of other things. The busiest day for a supermarket is the day before Thanksgiving. This past Thanksgiving I sat in that parking lot for four hours, and I counted all of the cars that came in and out and tallied them by hours. At no point was there more, and we are calling it area D, was there more than six spaces that were used, maybe it was seven. Three of the reasons for why a lot of people going to Home Goods or to Hannaford's don't park in area D is because it is too far away from the front door. There is a visual barrier between area D and on the Kilton Road side a 2-foot grade change and it goes higher towards north in front of the Super Cuts building. There is a visual impact, there is a physical impact kind of delineation and the fact that it is too far to walk. If it is raining or cold or it is snowing,

people are not going to walk with a bag or two bags of groceries that distance, which is one of the reasons why you hardly see those parking spaces being used.

Chairman Levenstein asked do you have plans for any landscaping around the building? Mr. Hill replied we will do that, but we do not have them presently. That will be part of our site plan package.

Ms. Malcolm asked what will the weekend hours be for this bank? Mr. Pilla replied sometimes banks change but typically for this bank it is 9:00 to 12:00 on Saturdays and closed on Sundays. We are figuring Monday - Friday 9:00 to 5:00 with Saturday 9:00 to noon and Sunday closed.

Vice Chairman Newberry stated at some point if you could cover your thoughts on signage, but while I have the floor I would second Mr. Fairman's comment around looking at and improving the flow in that whole parking field. That avenue on the south side looks like a possibility to me. I don't know what the implications of making a cut that close to the corner are.

Chairman Levenstein stated another thing that you might bring with you when you come back is you showed us what the bank is going to look like with those shrubs cut down but what is the rest of the parking lot going to look like, how obtrusive is Hannaford's going to be and how visible. Right now it is sort of blocked by those trees. When you cut them down, what is it going to look like.

Ms. Hebert stated I just want to remind the Board that we had a yogurt shop come in and ask for a sign waiver and they wanted to cut down some of the trees and the Board was really protective of that vegetative buffer along South River Road and Kilton Road. Those trees are really healthy, they are mature, they show kind of the Performance Zone landscaping in its maturity, and I would move cautiously if you are going to have them cut down. I could see pruning them up to allow for some additional visibility, but in the past the Board has not wanted to see any impacts to that vegetated buffer. Mr. Pilla asked Mr. Cruess, do you have those pictures of before that was originally approved? We could certainly add this to the presentation. Chairman Levenstein asked are those pictures of the plantings when they were first put in? Mr. Pilla distributed photographs to the Board. Mr. Pilla stated the trees that are there now were not part of the original landscaping plan that was approved. Over a period of time they weren't managed, they weren't manicured the way vegetation should be and they have kind of overgrown. Again, what we are offering is a picture that you see there with what we think is a significant improvement. Ms. Hebert stated Hannaford's actually came in and really improved the landscaping when they took over the Stop & Shop plaza. As part of their architectural review they also did a thorough upgrade to the landscaping. They planted the landscaping around the sign that is smaller so that is only a few years old. Mr. Pilla stated my point is what was originally approved, that was subsequent to Hannaford's. Ms. Hebert responded right; they supplemented what was already there. Mr. Pilla stated what we would propose would be very attractive and obviously the very species we would be presenting to you for your approval. Visibility is a big thing for a retailer and banks are retailers. Vice Chairman Newberry stated I understand and appreciate visibility but to follow-up on Ms. Hebert's point; could you explore the viability of something between what is currently there, which is to remove all of the more mature landscape, and maybe taking some of the existing landscape but also preserving some of

the existing landscape so that it still provides your tenant with visibility but doesn't reduce it to looking like the approach to a landing strip. Mr. Pilla responded we can certainly look at that. Chairman Levenstein stated just work with Ms. Hebert and Mr. Connors. Mr. Hill stated we do know that under the current layout, which we want to proceed with, those pine trees are actually a problem. They are in the footprint of the development. Those three pine trees will be impacted by the proposed site design just based on its configuration. Mr. Connors asked could you show the existing conditions picture? The picture was posted on the screen. Mr. Hill stated they are on the edge of the relocated curb line for the redeveloped parking field. Mr. Connors stated that one tree is quite a bit closer to the intersection. You could probably keep that one.

Chairman Levenstein asked are you going to get permission to go on that sign that is in the photograph? Mr. Pilla replied we are speaking with them.

Mr. Fairman stated certainly the shrubs on the left side of this picture in front of Home Goods could certainly be left and not interfere with the visibility to the bank and would help a lot if you just left the existing shrubs on the left side of that picture. It would help overall in covering the back buildings. I frankly find shrubs and trees a lot more attractive than buildings. Mr. Hill responded what we could show is a few different scenarios and see if we could compromise. Chairman Levenstein stated that would be good.

Town Manager Sawyer stated I would just say that I echo what the Planning staff brought up about the trees. I think there are a lot more than four trees being impacted by your plan. When I went out and visited the site, there seemed to be others on the curb line or close to it that could potentially be impacted. I would be all in favor of holding the curb line and reducing parking more. I don't see the need to have those few extra angular parking spaces, I guess there are eight spaces, I would rather see the trees versus the parking, and if parking is really a problem in the future, that maybe we approve them at that point in time. Where the eight angular spaces are at least hold the curb line there and not impact anymore landscaping there. A previous Planning Board and previous Planning Director worked very hard to establish the landscaping on this site when it was formally Caldor and it was wide open to the street and this is really what the Performance Zone landscaping is meant to look like. There is a minimum number of street trees and parking lot trees that are required and I feel like when we did the TCBY signage question that was looked at heavily, and I think you have the number of trees that are required, so you would need an additional waiver, I could be wrong, but you might need an additional waiver just to remove those trees and I am not sure why we would grant that. I love what you are doing with the architecture, I love that you are trying to maximize the site, I think there is a great opportunity to maximize the site, and this is a great spot to do it. I have no issues with that, but I would propose that you find a way to hold the curb line at least along South River Road in behind the sign, tighten the radius somehow. You can work with Planning staff, it is up to you ultimately what you submit, but I just don't see why we would grant those waivers at this time. Ms. Hebert stated you appear to need waivers to the Performance Zone landscape standard especially for the landscaping around the pavement, landscaping around the building. In of those landscaping zones it doesn't look like you have enough space to satisfy all of the landscape standards. So, anything you can keep, would definitely be a benefit. Mr. Hill stated I think we should have a dialogue with you offline with regard to coming up with an appropriate landscaping design in these areas and identifying any waivers because I would like to not have to

apply for any waivers. I think we should be able to hopefully design something where we are not seeking landscaping waivers, but given the layout of everything, let's see how it plays out. We could do some type of workshop where we run some concepts through you or something. Town Manager Sawyer stated my last resort is if you had to take the three scotch pines, there is no reason to touch any of the shrubs. You were just talking about replacing them to have them grow back to the same height that they currently are at. Mr. Hill stated perhaps then we could look at some type of pruning up of what is there potentially. Chairman Levenstein stated thinning it out. Mr. Pilla stated we hear you, but without visibility, if you can't see that building from the intersection, it is not going to work for us. Vice Chairman Newberry responded I understand that but if it came to needing a waiver, I would rather see a waiver for parking than a waiver for landscaping. I would be more in support of the parking waiver than vice versa. Town Manager Sawyer stated and you could always show them as future spaces if you had to do it with Planning Board approval to cut the trees at that time or something. I would even say do three or four parallel spaces versus doing all eight angular spaces if you could hold the curb line and show the eight spaces as a future condition, again, if parking becomes a real issue. Mr. Hill stated and my own understanding at this point of the project is in that curb line itself it appears that what is existing is further off from the right-of-way than what would be required so it is usable space. We will have to figure it out for what is appropriate there. I understand.

Mr. Pilla asked what is the likelihood of the bank having its own monument sign? Nowhere near as big as the other one. Mr. Connors responded not good. Town Manager Sawyer stated especially if you are cutting all of that landscaping, your building will be quite visible and that is the way others have been treated too. If the building is there and can be seen from the road is the same as having a monument sign. Mr. Pilla responded that is fine. I just needed to ask the question.

Vice Chairman Newberry asked is the white square on your north elevation a likely sign? Mr. Pilla replied yes. We just blocked off the logo for the bank. When we come back in October, you will see exactly what we will be proposing.

Mr. Foote asked can you ensure that the plans you return with clearly show sewer easements, road widening easements, any sort of easement that any of this may influence? Mr. Hill replied we are going to provide an updated boundary survey and we will have those components as part of that work. Mr. Foote stated that would be great.

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

3. Riley Investment Properties, LLC (Owner) – Request for conceptual review of a proposal to construct a gasoline service station with a 4,000 square-foot convenience store and fast-food restaurant with drive-through service facilities and associated site improvements at 189 and 193 South River Road, Lots 22-87 and 22-23, Zoned PZ.

Chairman Levenstein recused himself for this conceptual review for Riley Investment Properties, LLC. Vice Chairman Newberry was appointed Acting Chairman.

Chris Riley representing Riley Investment Properties, LLC and Brian Pratt of Fuss & O'Neill were present to review this conceptual plan on behalf of the applicant. Elie El Chalfoun of MegaX was also present.

Mr. Riley stated we are going to be brief on our presentation but give you hopefully enough information that you can give us some positive feedback on things you would like to see on the site, ideas that you have for the site, general comments for us that could help us in our full engineering of the site to construct a roughly 4,000 square-foot convenience store and gas station located at 193 South River Road. We did a redevelopment of this site starting back in 2009 when we converted the old Fox house into the White Willow Day Spa and Salon, as well as a second renovation to the parcel abutting 189 at 193 with an expansion of an existing property into the River Road Tavern. I am sure many of you are familiar with the location; maybe you have visited the location.

Mr. Riley stated our concept that we are bringing to you tonight is to expand upon that redevelopment of the site and introduce a gas station/convenience store that fits within the site in the location. We have listened to the residents of Town in numerous locations and I continuously heard that we have a need for another service and gas station along the South River Road corridor. We felt that this site would fit that need well seeing that it is in between the only other two service stations that are in close proximity, one being on the northerly side at the Manchester/Bedford line at Second Street and the other being over the bridge past Lowes/Target to the Irving station that services the southern portion of town.

Mr. Riley stated that is a brief history of the site. We, as owners of the site and residents of Bedford, are extremely concerned with the architectural component and how this fits in with the existing users on the site. Mr. El Chalfoun is still in the works with his architect to design the layout and look, so we are going to have limited architectural for you to look at tonight, we are open to hearing what you would like to see, it is your town, so we would like to know what you would like to see from this type of use in this type of location. Acting Chairman Newberry stated so when we get to that part, I think that staff has a couple of examples that we can refer to. Mr. Riley stated Ms. Hebert provided a few examples to you I believe. We have a brief sketch also that we could show you in the direction we are going with it. I think though speaking just on behalf of the ownership, myself and my father, it is one of our top priorities that this site fit in with what is there. We have created a look to what the River Road Tavern is, as well as what White Willow Day Spa is, and we want to really make it fit, so I don't want to see something that pops out in a negative way for the site and we want it to fit into the character and feel of what we are trying to represent here in Bedford given its location to the country club, Village Green, and other residential components, so we would look for a lot of input from the Board on that. I will now turn it over to Mr. Pratt and he can talk a little more about the engineering and the technical aspects of the project.

Mr. Pratt stated as Mr. Riley mentioned, we are planning to develop the land behind the River Road Tavern. If you look at the concept plan posted now, this is the River Road Tavern, this is the White Willow Spa, and this is the fourth leg of the Back River Road intersection that was built a couple of years ago. Posted now is what the site looks like today showing the fourth leg and then it accesses from the intersection over to the River Road Tavern. The plan would be to

just basically pick up right at that spur where we left off and we would end up redeveloping the parking lot. The existing parking lot for the tavern kind of comes out at a different angle than the parking lot at the salon. We would line that up so that the two parking lots are combined so you end up having one parking lot that is kind of shared between the tavern and the salon and then the gas station itself would kind of have like a pad site, you would have some kind of delineation to try to separate the uses a little bit even though the parking could be shared between so somebody could park at the gas station and walk over to the tavern if they wanted. Access from the signalized intersection, you come in, this would be a 4,000 square foot gas station/convenience store and it would have a drive-thru coffee shop as well. We have provided full circulation from the signalized intersection and you can loop around and get back out to a redesigned drive aisle that gets you over to the tavern, 1-way circulation around the rear, which would leave you with at least ten stacking spaces before you get to the parking spaces here. We have a couple of electric vehicle spaces planned, those are up and coming, we have some air pump spaces and then we have 16 fueling stations. We have plenty of space between the parking spaces and the landscape aisles to allow for stacking so if they are all full, there is plenty of room for somebody to sit behind and not block circulation. We have some dumpsters planned in the back and then on this plan we do also show a potential future connection to access the land behind the tavern. There is some buildable land in the back that is kind of behind, as shown on the screen, and there is Executive Park Drive. At this time, we don't know what is going back there, it is a different entity that owns that land, so all we are asking for is feedback on this layout with the potential for a future connection.

Mr. Pratt stated we will need a wetlands permit for this. There is a small wetland pocket at the tow of the slope, we will also need an Alteration of Terrain permit from the Department of Environmental Services because this disturbs over 100,000 square feet, so we will have to do stormwater treatment mitigation and peak flow mitigation. For trucking we have designed the site to allow the truck to make it all the way around so delivery trucks can park in the back, there is loading next to the bypass lane, that truck can make it all the way around and it can park in the front without obstructing the gas pumps for unloading the fuel into the underground storage tanks.

Mr. Pratt continued the tanks will be state-of-the-art double-wall, alarmed, at least 75 feet away from any surface water. We have Patten Brook over on the side here as shown on the screen. No parking was discussed so the existing parking has about 67 parking spaces now, and as you are aware if you have been to the River Road Tavern, that it does fill up, that parking lot gets pretty busy, so part of this application is to provide some additional parking for them. The plan right now shows 129 spaces, so we have about 100 that are kind of in the tavern and the salon's parking area and then about 30-31 on the gas station side. One of the comments in the staff report was to consider potentially eliminating some of that parking but we really think that the parking level here is appropriate. According to the ordinance I think we only need 86 spaces but just knowing how the businesses here function, we think that having this amount of parking is the appropriate amount.

Mr. Pratt stated with regard to distances to other stations: We will need a Conditional Use Permit as part of this application. We have prepared a sketch showing the distances to other gas stations. In the middle is where our proposed station is, it is 1.6 miles north to the Circle K

Mobil and then it is 1.2 miles as the crow flies south to the Irving, but it really almost 1.5 miles along the road. It is a good location; it is not directly across the street from another gas station. There was potentially some concerns with traffic related to the coffee shop because there is a Dunkin Donuts diagonally across the street. We think this might actually help the situation because we know that Dunkin Donuts gets very busy, traffic backs up, you get a lot of cars taking left turns whereas if they have another option here, it might keep the people going the same direction to avoid them cutting across. We are going to do a full traffic study, we know the Conditional Use Permit and the site plan requires that so we are working on that now, we are doing some counts soon, after school opens, and we will have a full traffic study that talks about any impacts to the signal, any potential retimings, but this signal was designed for a larger retail development here plus also some spaces in the back. I don't think there are going to be any physical changes besides maybe some signal timing adjustments needed as part of this. Acting Chairman Newberry asked on the traffic study will you also take a look at what traffic going northbound out of the north curb cut is likely to look like? Mr. Pratt replied yes.

Mr. Pratt stated I will talk about signage a little bit. This parcel is unique in its shape that there is a weird right-of-way leftover strip. The yellow strip indicated on the screen is part of the DOT's right-of-way and this is where the old culvert used to come out for Patten Brook. The property lines are a little off, this is from the Town's GIS, but technically that is the frontage, that is our right-of-way. If we are going to do a sign, we can't put it in the DOT right-of-way, so the plan is to put a sign next to it that will require a waiver from this Board because you need a 10-foot side setback, so realistically it's not really an abutter, it is to the right-of-way, so we will be coming in with a waiver request for that. There is also an existing sign already for the River Road Tavern as shown on the screen. This will be on the same parcel, so we wanted to get some feedback from this Board to see if there is a possibility to request a waiver or variance or if you had any thoughts to keep that sign and to add this as a second sign on the same lot. I just kind of wanted to see how this Board felt about that. This one would obviously be closer to the intersection and this one is quite far away. There is a sight distance easement and it is a good looking sign. Ms. McGinley asked wouldn't that be solved by a redo of all the land so that you don't have the land owned by the same entity or does it cause more problems? Mr. Riley responded we haven't finalized yet on how we want to set up the ownership entity for the sites. I spoke very briefly with Bill in the tax department just to make it as easy as possible from the Town taxing perspective. I think we are going to end up condoing this out, similar to like we did with Caldwell and Convenient MD or they did at Bedford Highlands or they did at the Copper Door. We are still working on the legal aspect on how to do that, but I still don't think that allows for multiple signs. I think we would still require the waiver on the additional sign. With that being said, River Road Tavern never took advantage of the allowable signage that they have on the building, there is no signage on the building, so maybe we can look at total allocation allowed in the zone for building signage and pylon signage to look at what our total amount of signage is overall for the site, and work with the Board and staff to come up with something that is reasonable and that fits. Mr. Fairman asked what about putting the tavern sign on the building? Mr. Riley replied we could, Mr. Fairman. I think they like their old rustic looking sign but it is an option absolutely and it would be just as visible because they would be allowed two signs. It is an option absolutely.

Mr. Pratt stated with regard to retaining walls: There are some grades, there is an existing retaining wall where that culvert was relocated in order to put in the fourth leg of that intersection. The existing retaining wall is about 10-11 feet in height, so in order to develop and continue this road, we will have to extend that retaining wall. We will have a 10-foot retaining wall that is within the wetland buffer and that will require a variance as well, but the plan is to lower it, start lowering this road to try to get those walls as short as possible because walls are expensive so we want to try to minimize those, but we will need some retaining walls because of the steep drop-off and potentially we will do two retaining walls. One will be closer to the gas station and then one on the other side just so that that road can kind of drop down faster and get back to the existing grade in the back. Acting Chairman Newberry asked so part of this development will include that retaining wall on the south side? Mr. Pratt stated yes; this one here and this one probably won't be put in until we come in with another site plan. Acting Chairman Newberry asked that is not intended to be a part of this development? Mr. Riley responded no. We don't know what we want to do with it yet. There is a lot of land back there, there are other investors involved with that parcel. I noticed in one of the comments talking about the Club Acre tie-in; we do have a percentage control at the end of Club Acre at this point, but as far as this, this is just going to stand on its own because it could be 5 years, 10 years, 2 years, I don't know when we are going to really look at developing that piece. Acting Chairman Newberry asked that is really only there now for concept? Mr. Riley replied correct. Mr. Pratt stated to make sure that it can fit, just kind of planning ahead. We will have to build at least the sort section of it up here because that is going to be required for the road but we will probably end up petering it off down in this area and then picking it up on that side. Ms. Malcolm asked the other retaining wall that you are going to build, about how high is that going to be? Mr. Pratt asked the one in the back indicated on the screen? Ms. Malcolm replied yes. Mr. Pratt replied that is going to vary. Up in this corner it is going to be nothing, there is kind of a slope that drops down there. It could be as tall as 10-11 feet or we could do a slope there, like kind of a steep slope instead of a wall. We haven't really started the grading too much yet, we are kind of getting the concept out here, getting some feedback before we really move forward with the final design. So it will be about 10-12 feet most likely depending on the final grading and everything.

Acting Chairman Newberry stated while we are talking about retaining walls back in that area; I think staff pointed out that there has been conversation in the past about an eventual connection through to Club Acre Lane. Any comments, thoughts or plans around how that could be done, when it might be done, if it would be done. Mr. Riley replied all I can tell you right now is that we have no discussions, no concepts, no tenants, we haven't discussed it. We did want to act and purchase the properties at the end of Club Acre when they became available, so we did do that. This accesspoint at some date in the future, should we ever come to agreements with the owners of Bedford Executive Park or if we decide to do something on that land piece in the back, this would definitely be the intersection that could handle that, as well as accessing through Club Acre and the existing Executive Park Drive, but there is just nothing at this point on that. I wish I could tell you more. For those of you who know my family's development in the town, we do things generationally, so this could be the next generation coming before the Bedford Planning Board to do something on that site or the right thing could come along in a few years. I just don't have that answer at this time. Mr. Pratt stated this doesn't preclude any connection. The grade of Club Acre Lane is down at the lower elevation, so if there were a connection, it would come in as you can see Club Acre Lane kind of faded off to the side, it would come in over in

that area. Ms. McGinley asked for anyone who is here today, can you describe the fact that the Club Acre Lane is below grade to this? Mr. Pratt replied yes; it sits probably 10-12 feet lower, so there would be a retaining wall and then you would have to tie in somewhere into the road up this area as shown or further into the site. Ms. McGinley asked you would provide for an access when you are doing this development so that there can be a connection? Mr. Pratt replied no, because they are not going to build this road back here, this future connection, but we are trying to be good planners and make sure that we don't preclude it from happening, but we are not proposing it as part of this. Like Mr. Riley said, we may come back in a couple of years, it may come back in 10 years, who knows.

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

Mr. Riley stated we can talk about architecture so you can kind of get a feel. We don't have our concepts yet. Mr. Pratt stated posted is a picture of one of the other stations that Mr. El Chalfoun has done and you can see the gas station is on that side and then this is the drive-thru coffee shop. We don't have a tenant right now, so this is just a generic. We have looked at the architectural regulations and we talked to Planning staff and Town staff and this is a potential alternative, which is basically keep that whole left-hand side, kind of how we have it shown here, and then potentially do something kind of like this. This kind of lines up a little bit with some of the samples that Ms. Hebert handed out. Ms. Hebert stated I did pass out a copy of your architectural design checklist just for a reminder because gas stations really present kind of a unique architectural challenge with the canopy and the gas station. It is a smaller building but it is very visible from usually three sides at least. In your packet handed out tonight there are some examples we can walk through of different gas station designs just to give you an idea of shapes and forms for the canopy and the gas station itself and we could talk about what the applicant has here. Your design guidelines do typically recommend a peaked roof and more of a colonial style. The Board has varied from that looking at the Mini Cooper site just down the street where you can see an example of more modern architecture that was approved.

Mr. Riley stated I have spent a lot of time looking at canopies over the last few months and I haven't found one that I love yet, but I have seen some that I like. I found if we go full pitched roof, and Mr. El Chalfoun has been fantastic, there were multiple users looking when we decided we would go potentially with this type of use; we had multiple people come to us that wanted the site. Mr. El Chalfoun is a resident of town and this is going to be a showpiece station and his other stations as well, but he was very willing to work with us on the design characteristics and that is probably one of the most important things from my perspective. When you go with a full pitched canopy roof like you would see over at the Irving off from Route 114 and White Avenue, or even if you look down at the one up the road a little further about 1.5 miles up the road, I feel like you see a lot of shingles, I feel like when you drive into the facility, what you see is the pitch and shingles. This site will sit just above South River Road's grade, about 2 feet above grade, so you will have a fairly direct eye approach as you come into the station and the convenience store. It does sit a little further back than tenants of this use typically want, they want to be right on the street, but given the radius turn of South River Road I still feel it is a very visible location. So the design challenge is really to get as much input from you as to what you would like to see in a canopy, not necessarily saying we want to go with a flat canopy, but maybe something that is a

combination of both, and I think Ms. Hebert had provided a couple pictures that show that. I think Cumberland Farms right now is doing a hybrid canopy. Ms. Hebert stated we can walk through those if the Board would like.

Acting Chairman Newberry stated I would think that the canopy, in order to minimize how much it screens the structure, would want to be designed to be visually minimal. Mr. Fairman stated I concur with that. Acting Chairman Newberry stated because otherwise all you are going to see is the canopy, you are not going to see the structure. And just a comment on that pencil sketch, I thought the right side of that was kind of interesting in that it strikes me at least as reminiscent of a barn and that might be a theme that would work back there and be something that would be complimentary to the structures in the front. I think one of the keys there is coming up with a design for that canopy that minimizes it visually so that it doesn't take out the building behind it.

Mr. Pratt stated posted on the screen is a photo of his typical station, which is a pretty thin canopy. Mr. Riley stated they do make them thinner. I have seen concepts where it is a much thinner profile. Ms. McGinley asked but as you come into the site, wouldn't that be what you see first and you wouldn't see the shop behind it because of where the roads are? Town Manager Sawyer stated canopies basically start at the roofline height so that you see the building underneath the canopies. Mr. Pratt stated like Mr. Riley said, the grades are all pretty close, it is all pretty flat, so as you come in, you will be driving heading straight towards the canopy with the building behind it. Mr. Riley stated there will be a landscape island before the canopy. We have tried to do a large landscape island there and then the canopy is behind it, which you would see through. Yes, the store itself sits back a little bit. Ms. McGinley stated but the people who go here will know what is there. If you are going to get gas, you will see the store; if you see the store, you will see the gas. Mr. Riley stated we are fairly confident that should the Board see this to be a fit site for this use, then it is going to do very well here.

Ms. McGinley asked how does that do well for you but not for the traffic? We will need to know what happens with the traffic. Mr. Pratt responded yes; we had a scoping meeting with staff and they reviewed it with VHB, so we have provided a full traffic study. We have already done a traffic study on this site before with the unknown uses, so this one will be brand new. It is going to take into account the traffic from the new developments that weren't there when we came in the last time. Ms. McGinley stated and then anyone who wants to go north, would be going out only north. Is that correct? You wouldn't have a north and south exit there? Mr. Riley asked any traffic heading north to get onto the highway? The reality is that you are coming from the south to north to get on the highway, that is where the traffic comes from. So where we are creating traffic issues right now having owned this site for a while, is you have a high intensity use across the intersection in the morning that is coming in from Back River Road, backing up onto Back River Road, and then you have the left-hand turn movement at this intersection going into that high-use coffee site. In theory, this site would be the on/off site, so you are going to get your gas or your coffee in the morning, you are coming in, you are going out, and you are heading back north, so you can make that north movement through the lighted intersection, you can make that north movement through the north driveway as well. There are two points to make that northbound movement, so it should keep traffic moving in that direction, and the morning is the peak for that use. Whereas the tavern works well on the site with this use because the tavern's peak hours are really 3:30 to 9:00. They are alternating high-use times. Ms.

Malcolm asked will left turns be prohibited from that north access? Mr. Riley replied currently it is an unrestricted accesspoint. Mr. Pratt stated we think most of the people will use the signal if they are trying to take a left out. I would. Ms. McGinley stated especially at peak hours.

Ms. Malcolm asked where are you going to put snow? Mr. Pratt replied there is plenty of green space around the perimeter. We always have standard notes on the plan that if the snow starts to obstruct parking or sight distances, it has to be trucked off. There should be plenty of space to put it in on the perimeter. Mr. Riley stated we could show the areas on the final plan.

Mr. Fairman stated from an architectural standpoint, I suspect this does not work from a retail visibility, but from an overall architectural aspect I think that if you could put the canopy behind the building, the whole structure would look a lot nicer. As I said, I don't think the retailer would like that. Mr. Riley stated that would be a challenge with the canopy but I don't think a gas station will ever do it that way. Mr. Fairman stated or it might be better to turn it sideways. Mr. Riley stated we haven't looked at that. Mr. Fairman stated look at turning the building and canopy sideways so that you have a lot less visibility of the canopy. Looking at the piece of land, it looks like it could go any way, any of those directions. Mr. Riley stated I think once we come back to the Board with a better plan and some architectural renderings like you saw with the bank previous to us, I think you are going to find visually coming in from the north and south, as well as from the Back River Road intersection, that you are greeted by a fairly large green space, which is the State area that Mr. Pratt was explaining, followed by more landscaping before you get back. I guess the only challenge that the users who wanted this site had was we would like it to be closer to the street and initially we didn't even bring it to this Board but we had some concept designs pulling those pumps way up, almost level with the tavern, and it just was a no go for us as owners. It is not what we are looking to do. Like I said, we drive by it every day and we live here, so we are very concerned with the aesthetic of this. Mr. Fairman stated I like having it back. It is much better. Ms. McGinley stated and given the traffic on that road, it is not going to have a problem with traffic. Mr. Riley responded right, as long as the signage is looked at and considered by the Board so people can see that there is a station with some pricing there.

Town Manager Sawyer stated I will just say on your pencil sketch I think it is the arch form that doesn't fit with anything around it at this point in time. Mr. Riley asked the arch in the middle? You like the peaks, the barn kind of feel that was mentioned? Town Manager Sawyer responded there is a lot going on on a small building there on that elevation. I just think that three different forms, three different roof angles, on a fairly small building. Ms. McGinley stated it somewhat reminds every one of the stations, etc. on the highway going north where the liquor stores are, and they have multiple uses. Ms. Murphy stated I like the arch. Town Manager Sawyer stated it is a preference but whatever works best for White Willow and the tavern. Mr. Riley stated I feel like we have to have some type of clapboard component because the other two buildings have that. One has shakes; maybe some use of some faux stonework on bases or even maybe consider it on the posts to the canopy. There are different things that we can look at, but we definitely want it to blend. I want it to look like it has been there right along. I don't want it to look like we stuck something to a more traditional use on the site. Ms. McGinley stated what you are showing now on the screen it looks like there are more uses in the building. Mr. Pratt stated this one is a little bigger than ours. This one may have had a sandwich shop in there or something

too. Ms. McGinley stated but if you go for gas, you are there for gas. If you go to get something at the building behind, what is available? Mr. Pratt responded it is a drive-thru coffee shop and convenience store.

Mr. Riley stated Mr. El Chalfoun is also considering having a sit-down area, small patio area, with maybe umbrellas or a canopy where you could grab a sandwich and eat it or have your coffee and drink it, but that is all dependent on putting things together with the final user for who the coffee use will be. We are in discussions but nothing is finalized so we can't say who we are talking to yet.

Acting Chairman Newberry asked will your other islands have some landscape also? Mr. Pratt replied everything green on the plan we are intending to have some landscaping. Mr. Riley stated bushes, shrubs, small trees. Mr. Pratt stated there will be this large green space that is already existing, that is the DOT area, it will probably be a little flat, stormwater, that is how it exists today. You can see it is kind of a little stormwater area, that will probably remain exactly how it is and this drive connection will bring you over to the tavern and the salon parking area, so it kind of keeps the uses separated a little bit, and then the gas station and the people coming in for the convenience store and the drive-thru coffee will either come in get to the pumps or park in front of the station, park on the side, or drive around and you do have full bypass all the way around. So if somebody decides they don't want to order, the line is too long, they can loop around. They either get out this way into the big parking lot or they can move back around to the front of the gas station.

Town Manager Sawyer asked can you speak to why you have those shown as 1-way on either side of the pumps? It is 22-foot wide aisle; people have plenty of room to go two ways. Mr. Pratt stated we could change it to 2-way. The reason mostly is because this is a 1-way coming around the back here, so I just felt like it was a little too busy if people would be coming in. People are going to do what they want; people are going to drive two ways around that. Town Manager Sawyer stated it is 22 feet plus the 12 feet to the pumps. Staff brought it up in the report; I don't see any way you would police it and it is not typical. Mr. Pratt responded I think it is more just a suggestion. I know people are going to do whatever they want, but with people coming out of the drive-thru, especially in the morning, you are going to get a steady stream of people coming out. I would rather try to avoid that conflict and encourage people to come into the station this way. You can come in this way and you can get into your pumps. I would rather encourage people to leave this way so that they have the ability to stack so that they are not coming out and having this awkward kind of movement here. Like I said, people are going to do whatever they want. At 2:00p.m. when there is only one car, or two cars at the pump, it is not going to be an issue, but in the morning I would rather try to keep the flow circulating around. Ms. Hebert stated people are going to have to drive by the pumps after they go through the drive-thru. Mr. Pratt responded exactly, so they are going to come out here and then they are going to end up down to here. Ideally they come out, they hit this drive aisle and then they loop out, and that way there is plenty of stacking, and they are not blocking the entrance or anything. I was looking at some other gas stations and a lot of them have this kind of spacing, this kind of circulation and encourage the 1-ways around either side. Ms. McGinley stated but they physically could go north and go across the developments that are already there. Is that correct? Mr. Pratt replied correct; they could take a right. Mr. Riley stated it would be a longer path. Ms.

McGinley stated not if they are going north. Mr. Pratt stated right; if they wanted to come straight here and take a right and go up through here, they are welcome to. There are no restrictions. They could take a hard right and loop around. Town Manager Sawyer stated I just think if you want them to 1-way, they have to be less than 22 feet wide. It is just too much pavement to restrict 1-way access. That is up to you guys and staff to talk about some more. Mr. Riley stated we could widen up the island a little bit and make it more green, or we could just take that arrow out and let them go both ways. Mr. Pratt stated we would also do paint to narrow them up a little bit. We will play with some ideas on that.

Town Manager Sawyer stated my other comment is the number one complaint I received as Planning Director was on the last two drive-thrus that we did, which are the Dunkin Donuts by Copper Door and Starbucks, and that the access to those drive-thrus are through parking spaces and the conflicts that occur between the parking spaces at both sites is terrible and I basically said I would never do it again. Even though you are meeting our minimum requirement for ten, so are those other two sites. Is there any way to reduce the number of spaces you have? I know you are way over-parked or separate that entrance to the drive-thru. I would strongly encourage that. It is by far the number one complaint that we receive. Mr. Riley stated you are 100 percent correct; I sat in that chair when we did the Starbucks and I remember we discussed it at length and it has become an issue there, it has become an issue at Copper Door, it has become an issue at Back River Road. We tried to make it so that this would move in an area that isn't heavily trafficked. So even if we stacked four more cars there, the likelihood at the peak hours and morning commute, peak hours for coffee is when people get their coffee, the likelihood of those spots being taken by others, even other than an employee, is probably pretty small, but we could probably pull it back. We have more than enough parking, so we could probably pull it back to stack a few more, show a few more stacking, but even if they were to stack out past those ten spots, which is highly unlikely, because now you are talking almost 20 cars there, 15 at least, you are still not in an area that would restrict movement throughout the rest of the site. Town Manager Sawyer responded which is exactly what we said on the other two site plans, that it wouldn't be impacting the public right-of-way so it is the owners' problem but it is reflective on the Planning Board and the Town that we approved them and we have emails that tell us that we shouldn't have approved them in those ways. Mr. Riley stated okay, we will look at it. Mr. Pratt stated that is why I put the electrical vehicle spaces there because those are likely to get less use and if they do get used, the people will park there for half an hour, they sit and have their coffee or whatever. Town Manager Sawyer stated they said Starbucks' peak hours were in the morning before the other businesses opened. It doesn't matter and it hasn't mattered. Ms. Hebert state those EV spaces may get more use than you think. The ones at Whole Foods are always full. Mr. Pratt stated but they stay there longer, I think. They are not just parked for five minutes. Town Manager Sawyer stated but if they can't get out, that is when the calls are going to come in. Mr. Riley stated we can look at that and make some adjustments. Town Manager Sawyer stated and again, you may be heard with the earlier site plan if there had to be future spaces if you needed them and not constructed initially, I would be great with that too. Mr. Riley stated the nice thing is that we have plenty of room, so I am sure we can reconfigure things to try to avoid that situation.

Town Manager Sawyer stated I think the last comment from me is I think it would be appropriate to supply at least to staff, or staff and VHB, with the concept design for the access road to show

that it works, not necessarily take it to full engineering, but at least show the preliminary grading for how that would work. Mr. Pratt responded sure. Mr. Riley asked where do you want it to access to? Town Manager Sawyer replied just conceptually that you get to Club Acre Lane and Executive Park Drive, just like the Route 3 corridor plan calls for and all the previous conversations with you and your family have been about. Mr. Riley stated I think it is the smart long-term play for the Town. We don't have control over when those owners would like to contribute toward building that infrastructure. Town Manager Sawyer stated something that shows that the grades can work between those two retaining walls that you are showing especially. Mr. Pratt stated we did show some preliminary grades on this because obviously I don't want to show something here and then realize we can't build it and ruin it. We can definitely show like a conceptual roadway something or other.

Acting Chairman Newberry stated I think staff emphasized the criteria around conditional use. Do you anticipate any issues or problems meeting those criteria? Mr. Pratt replied I don't think so. It is distance to other stations, so we will provide formal copies of the plan that we created. Posted shows like a 2-mile radius, these kind of numbers are other gas stations but really the main route on South River Road there is 1.6 miles north and there is 1.2 miles south as the crow flies but it is really probably 1.4 miles along the road. Also, shown is what the CUP asks for is 5-mile radius and that is tough because you get into Manchester. You can see there are a lot of stations in Manchester but we have that big gap that our blowup shows. Mr. El Chalfoun can supply some market data, but he wouldn't pick this site if it wasn't sufficient. With environmental safeguards there is a requirement for 75 feet to surface waters, which we meet. We are over 90 and we have an underground UST designer that knows all of the rules and they are going to provide details for the double-walled tanks and the concrete groves around the perimeter of the pad and stormwater where you are not supposed to sheet the stormwater from one side of the site over the pad, you are supposed to kind of make it go around so that the stormwater doesn't come and flush it across. Traffic and access is one of the other CUP items. We are doing a full traffic study for that. I think that is the bulk of the CUP items.

Acting Chairman Newberry asked so the only real waiver you anticipate at this point would be that sign that we mentioned? I didn't hear any spontaneous concern but how it looks will probably have a lot to do with how much support it gets. Mr. Riley responded I think at the next meeting you will see what the sign will look like on the site, some designs for the sign so we can get your input on that as well. Mr. Pratt stated retaining wall height, I think this Board can grant the variance for that because it is in the Performance Zone. Ms. Hebert replied that goes to the Zoning Board. Everything but wetlands. Mr. Pratt stated we have to go for the wetland fill anyway, so we have to go to the Zoning Board anyway. I think is reasonable. They already granted us the variance to do the previous fill, so we have that height already there that we have to tie into and we are going to try to reduce that. Acting Chairman Newberry stated I think the staff memo indicated that the Conservation Commission would get a look also. Mr. Pratt responded yes.

Mr. Foote stated I see the canopy is 120-130 feet long by 35 feet, and I see you have included EV spaces. Are there any opportunities that you have seen in this site to have solar on top of the canopy or anything? Mr. Riley responded that is a fabulous point. We treat the site once we get through the planning process as a ground lease with the tenant. Like I mentioned before, Mr. El

Chalfoun has been great to work with and I am sure those are all things he would like to consider. Have you considered solar on any of your canopy sites? Mr. El Chalfoun replied I will have somebody look at that. Mr. Riley stated it is worth taking a look at. It is a perfect use for it. Mr. Foote stated what made me think of it is that Mr. Fairman mentioned rotating the site, I would say counterclockwise, and if you did that, you would probably have a pretty good location for an array. Mr. Riley responded as long as it looks good. It has to look good too. Functionality, green initiative I support, but, again, it has to blend with that site. I don't want it to look like a thumb that doesn't belong.

Acting Chairman Newberry asked for further comments or questions from the Planning Board. There were none.

Acting Chairman Newberry asked is there anything you are looking for feedback from us that we haven't touched on? Mr. Pratt responded just general feelings. I don't think I saw any opposition; anybody that absolutely hates it. There were definitely some good suggestions that we will take a look at. It seems the general consensus with the canopy is that you would prefer a thinner canopy to not block the visibility of the building. It sounded like there were a couple of people that liked the arch but it seemed like most people didn't care for the arch. Turning it sideways we will take a look at that. We will see if it is possible. Maybe with the drive-thru it might be kind of awkward. With the stacking we were asked to see if we could increase the stacking to avoid blocking spaces. Mr. Riley stated we will look at the overall parking count. We have a decent amount of years of data just from the tavern and during its peak hours it is busy. Right now they are parking in unauthorized parking areas, as many of you probably know, so we are trying to eliminate that so no one is parking on grass or dirt. We want everybody to have a spot and we find that most of their clientele come one to a vehicle, so there is not a lot of multiple patrons coming in one car, it is usually everyone has their own car. We are trying to provide enough parking so that we have more than we need, but if we can cut it back to make more green space, we will do it. Mr. Pratt stated you would like to see a master plan kind of roadway connection to prove that that can make it to the back and potentially connect to other adjacent properties. Ms. Murphy stated I think the number of parking spaces is really critical. I know by way of personal anecdote, my soccer leagues that play at GPS come to River Road Tavern after their games and they all travel in different cars. Thursday nights and Tuesday nights tend to be the nights we go there. Mr. Riley stated if there are 50 people in the tavern, there are probably 40 cars in the parking lot. Mr. Pratt stated it is definitely a place that people meet after work and they are all coming from a different direction. Mr. Riley stated which is great; we are glad that it provides that for the Town. Ms. Murphy stated and that falls within the peak hours because they stop playing between 7:00 and 9:00 and then head over there. Mr. Riley responded and those are the lighter hours for the gas station. So it works; the combination of uses works.

Chairman Levenstein returned to the meeting.

4. Development Update

Mr. Connors reviewed the progress of several development sites in town, which included photographs of the sites.

- Camp Foster redevelopment
- 35 Constitution Drive office building expansion
- LSE office building, Harvey Road
- Haigh-Farr expansion
- Wayfarer apartment site work
- Bedford Mall new retail facilities
- South River Road Citizens Bank redevelopment

V. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meetings:

MOTION by Town Manager Sawyer to approve the minutes of the June 24, 2019 Planning Board meeting as written. Ms. Malcolm duly seconded the motion. Vote taken; motion carried, with Chairman Levenstein, Vice Chairman Newberry, Ms. McGinley, Councilor Greazzo, and Mr. Foote abstained.

V. Communications to the Board:

Ms. Hebert stated there is a communication in your packet for the development of regional impact that the Board was notified of by Goffstown's Planning Board for the Gentle Slopes solar array in Goffstown. Abutter Tim Ross sent a communication by email to the Planning Board clarifying some points that were made at the Planning Board meeting on May 20th. I wanted you to all have a chance to read his comments. He has some concerns around the stormwater design for the solar array development, which is significant in size. He has been talking with the Goffstown Planning Board and the Goffstown engineer and I have been in touch with the Planning Director, and I guess at this point I recommend that we officially forward his comments to the Goffstown Planning Board. The Planning Board's role in this not regulatory. RSA 436:54 when a project is determined to be of regional impact by an abutting town, it gives the Bedford Planning Board the status of the abutter, so the Bedford Planning Board can then review the project and submit comments to the neighboring municipality's Planning Board as though we are an abutter. You can testify, you don't have rights to appeal or rights to attach any condition, it is really advisory. I would recommend sending these comments from the abutter to the Goffstown Planning Board with a letter from the Planning Board Chair or the Planning Director letting them know these issues were brought to our attention. Are there any questions or comments?

Ms. McGinley asked do you need a vote from the Planning Board? Ms. Hebert replied I do think so.

MOTION by Vice Chairman Newberry that the Planning Board forward the comments submitted to us from Tim Ross, who is an abutter, to the Goffstown Planning Board with our recommendation that they make sure they entertain the

points made by Mr. Ross. Town Manager Sawyer duly seconded the motion. Vote taken - all in favor. Motion carried.

Chairman Levenstein stated I have a letter from Normandeau talking about replacing the culverts on Route 101 over Pulpit Brook down by Twin Brook Lane. They are asking if we have any concerns relative to the project's potential impacts on environmental, social economic and cultural resources such as conservation land and invasive plant species. If anyone on the Board has any concerns, let me know and we will get it to the Normandeau's. Town Manager Sawyer stated those are stock letters that basically go out to all public officials on any State project, especially ones that have any wetland impacts. They are just trying to collect any public information that they can get. Ms. McGinley asked is there a loss of further right to on our behalf or anyone in our town by not commenting? Town Manager Sawyer replied no. There will be a public hearing this fall on the right-of-way acquisition to lay out the project to prove that there is enough need to do it. I believe you are actually on that commission, along with Councilor Greazzo, so I look forward to seeing that. I think they are planning an October hearing, and possibly a September hearing. It is a project that this Planning Board has voted on a number of times as a need for the community. It has been supported in the State's 10-year plan for quite a while now, and we are especially thankful to the State because they are including a left-turn lane into Twin Brook Road as part of that project, which was highly sought after by the residents of Twin Brook Road. Vice Chairman Newberry asked does this request for input get posted on the Town website? Town Manager Sawyer replied no. The State has the public notice requirement on that. Ms. Hebert stated they did have a public meeting this past spring that I attended and abutters were there, folks within the vicinity, but we will take a look at the area and see if there is any information that we need to forward to them. I think the Town does hold a conservation easement on some land along the brook just to the east of Twin Brook Road.

Mr. Connors stated you should have the revisions to the zoning ordinance in your packets to be swapped out with the old sections based on the amendments that were passed at the Town Meeting this past March.

VII. Reports of Committees: None

VIII. Adjournment:

MOTION by Vice Chairman Newberry to adjourn at 8:43 p.m. Town Manager Sawyer duly seconded the motion. Vote taken – all in favor. Motion carried.