

TOWN OF BEDFORD
March 28, 2022
PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES

A meeting of the Bedford Planning Board was held on Monday, March 28, 2022, at the Bedford Meeting Room, 10 Meeting House Road, Bedford, NH. Present were: Mac McMahan (Chairman), Town Councilor Bill Duschatko (Vice Chairman), Phil Greazzo (Town Council Alternate), Priscilla Malcolm (Secretary), Hal Newberry, Charlie Fairman, Matt Sullivan, John Quintal (Alternate), John Nelson (Alternate), Matt Nichols (Alternate), Jillian Harris (Assistant Planning Director, and Becky Hebert (Planning Director)

I. Call to Order and Roll Call:

Chairman McMahan called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Regular member Steve Clough was absent. John Quintal was appointed to vote.

II. Old Business & Continued Hearings:

III. New Business:

1. **Dartmouth-Hitchcock Clinic (Applicant & Owner)** – Request for Site Plan Approval for a 49,092 SF medical office building, located at Ridgewood Road and Kilton Road, Lot 12-8-4, Zoned PZ. *(At the request of the applicant, this application is postponed to the April 18, 2022 meeting.)*
2. **South River Road Ventures, LLC (Applicant) & River Glen Development Partner c/o Adobe Builders of NE (Owner)** – Request for Site Plan Approval for a 41,486 SF electric car maintenance facility and dealership, located at South River Road and Technology Drive, Lot 35-3-1, Zoned PZ.

IV. Concept Proposals and Other Business:

1. Housing Working Group

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

New Business:

1. **Dartmouth-Hitchcock Clinic (Applicant & Owner)** – Request for Site Plan Approval for a 49,092 SF medical office building, located at Ridgewood Road and Kilton Road,

Lot 12-8-4, Zoned PZ. *(At the request of the applicant, this application is postponed to the April 18, 2022 meeting.)*

This application for Dartmouth Hitchcock Clinic has been postponed to the April 18, 2022 Planning Board meeting.

Ms. Hebert stated, before we open Item #2, I would just like to state, again for the record, that the Dartmouth Hitchcock application, at the request of the applicant, this application is postponed to the April 18, 2022 Planning Board meeting. This announcement will serve as public notice of the change for the meeting date.

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

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

Mr. Kevan stated this is currently a vacant parcel of land and it is Map 35, Lot 3-1, at the corner of South River Road and in the southern intersection of Technology Drive. Technology Drive has a loop that runs up and there is a traffic signal at the opposite end of Technology Drive. This is at the intersection where Autumn Lane is T'd off across from that. Land Rover is diagonally south, west from this site is Sullivan Tire directly across the road from Technology Drive, the New Hampshire Sportsplex is just further southeast of this, and then Mark's Showplace is across the road. This parcel of land was part of the original River Glenn development that was developed that started around 1997-2000, and at that time they had identified this or blocked this out as a commercial parcel of land as it was tied to their development at the time. They constructed a good part of Technology Drive that was associated with all of the housing that they constructed at that time. They also did some widening of South River Road, relocation of poles and some other work as part of their overall development. The parcel is 6.19 acres. As you are looking at it on your screen, South River Road runs across the bottom of the page, Technology Drive is to the right, what was for a short time Noah's Event Center is on the left-hand side, the River Glenn housing portion is to the east, or to the top of the page. Adjacent to that property line right now they have a series of carports/garages, in between us and them they put a 13-foot landscape easement across their property and a 20-foot landscape easement on our side of that property line.

Mr. Kevan stated what is being proposed is a 41,486 square foot 1-story building that is for automobile maintenance and sales. This is for an upper-end electric automobile dealer, and as part of that, the majority of this building is preparation maintenance and parts and so forth, so out of the 41,486 square feet there is roughly 5,000 square feet of showroom and what not. They see a lot of their businesses purchasing online so that they don't have as much traffic as far as people coming onto the site. Roughly 36,000 square feet of this building is service bays and prep bays

for the cars. People will order vehicles and then the vehicles would get dropped off here and people would come pick them up. For that 41,486 square feet there is roughly 30 bays of maintenance and prep within this building. As far as parking goes, what is required 165 spaces and we are proposing 221. If you break down that parking calculation, they have 50 spaces for customer parking, new delivery or inventory is roughly 65 spaces, 53 spaces for employees, and then another 53 spaces for service spaces where people drop cars off or leaving them, which comes up to the 221.

Mr. Kevan stated for utilities, the site is serviced by EverSource electric. There is a series of poles that run along South River Road, there is a 12-inch water main, so there is a 30-foot water and grading easement across the front of this site, as well as a road widening easement that had been given to the DOT. Electric and water will come in off from South River Road, gas is Liberty Utilities where this is a connection point at the driveway that will be brought into the site, sewer actually comes through the River Mead development and they left a sewer manhole. Just on our site you can see where the cursor is there is a sewer manhole and a drain manhole there, so they had actually designed to accommodate commercial development on this site and left sewer and drainage there for it, so we will be tying into those as well.

Mr. Kevan stated there is a significant amount of grade change on the property. South River Road varies in height from 216 to roughly 206, 204 at the intersection, so there is a high point roughly in the middle of the site. As you are looking at the layout, you can see this little square kind of in the middle of our property and that was a NE Telephone equipment building, so a telephone equipment building and easement, so they have equipment there and we have to leave that easement alone as well. Technology Drive drops significantly from say 204, 205 at the intersection down to 197 at our driveway, so there is a fairly good pitch to the roadway. What we are doing with drainage on the property is we are collecting the runoff and we have three proposed StormTech systems. One will collect this front parking lot in a StormTech system in this location indicated on the screen, and have an overflow that would tie into the Technology Drive system. The majority of this parking lot back here goes into a StormTech system that daylight; there is a small wet pocket here and a culvert that crosses actually east-to-west, so it flows across South River Road in this location, so we are treating the runoff and recharging and then having an overflow that goes to that wet pocket before it discharges. Then we have done a smaller StormTech system on this side that ties to the drainage manhole in this location, and if you go back to those original calculations, they had allowed X amount of flow to leave the site at that point. We also tie our roof runoff into that drain line. The drainage calculations show that we are providing the necessary treatment and recharge that the State looks for and we are reducing or meeting the runoff rates in all directions so that we are not impacting any adjacent properties by what is being proposed.

Mr. Kevan stated for lighting we are showing 20-foot tall poles with shoebox style lights, and we have provided a photometric plan. All light is contained on site; I think we meet the regulations. The staff has asked us to take a look at the fixture to see the lighting levels directly into those poles are a little bit high and they have asked us to look at them to see if we can change out that fixture or use a different fixture that would produce a little bit lower lighting levels in those hot spots and we have agreed to do that.

Mr. Kevan stated with regard to landscaping; if you look along Technology Drive what we have done is we have proposed a series of red maple, beech, pin oak, and a few spruce trees in this location. Across South River Road we are using similar tree species; we have also identified some existing trees that we are going to preserve. Initially we had gone out and identified them in this utility easement, or NE Telephone easement, staff was concerned that they may get cut down by that utility, so we have gone back out and we will show other mature trees that are adjacent to that easement but on our property and in and adjacent to this wetland at this end. We are proposing to save or utilize say eight or nine existing trees plus plan additional trees in this location as well as some shrubs. Adjacent to the Noah's property, as I mentioned, we are basically abutted against their parking lot in that location, they have about 20 feet of green on their side and we have I think 20 or 25 feet on our side as well, so we have planted some hemlock and some arborvitae around this dumpster location and we have left some areas that would be open for snow storage and so forth. On the east side along the River Glenn development, again, these are those carpools, we have proposed plantings that include some Canadian hemlock and some crabapple trees as well as a variety of shrubs of different heights and what not to just try to break the mass. Staff asked us if we could look at that area to increase our plantings or increase our buffer and our landscape architect has done that, we have agreed to add plantings. With internal islands there are some pin oaks and river birch and in addition, some shrubs in there. The way we look at this is that the delivery vehicle would come in and run the length of that east side of the building, come around the back, unload in the back of the building, store the vehicles for delivery or inventory would then be brought to this front area for this inventory area and then that truck can make that turn and then come back out of the site.

Ms. Malcolm stated I see that you have six charging stations at the north end of the building. Is that correct? Mr. Kevan replied yes. Ms. Malcolm asked is that the only place you are going to have charging stations? Mr. Kevan replied yes. The tenant has talked about just having charging stations for the vehicles on their site, there wouldn't be anything that would be there for the public to pull in and charge a car. Ms. Malcolm asked so if somebody has purchased a vehicle from this dealership, they cannot come back and charge their vehicle there? Mr. Kevan replied that would be my interpretation of what we have been told. Basically if they have a vehicle there for maintenance or what not, they might charge that, and then vehicles delivered but it was focused on people that were being serviced. If you are just coming by and want to stop for a daily charge, that wasn't what they had intended this for. Mr. Nelson stated that seems highly unusual and unlikely, and I was going to hit that point on the traffic study to understand if that was modeled in here or not. So the charging stations will not make their availability known to any vehicles of that type? Mr. Kevan responded that is what we have been told. Mr. Patoucheas stated the charging stations are there for customers that are there for service or vehicles that are there for service. If you are an owner of an electric vehicle, you can't just go and pull up and charge there. Unless you are there for service, but it is not "open to the public." Mr. Quintal asked so it won't show up on the GPS map is what you are saying? Mr. Patoucheas replied right. Mr. Nelson stated that seems exceedingly different than the model that most vehicles are following right now, that is the only reason it seems odd to me. Mr. Fairman stated I would like to know why. There is a lot of talk about charging infrastructure in this country and maybe the government paying for charging infrastructure, which doesn't seem right to me, I am very much for electric vehicles, but doesn't the company have some responsibility for providing charging stations for the public? This is at a major intersection, on a major highway, with a major

intersection to the airport and you are not planning to provide any public charging stations. I think that is wrong. I think you should have at least a dozen for the public and that should enter into the traffic study and everything else. I think the company, whichever company this is, and you are not telling us, needs to step up and recognize they have some responsibility for providing charging stations for the public and I don't understand why you are not. Mr. Sullivan stated especially when this company's closest charging stations are in Hooksett. Mr. Nelson stated it wouldn't be that company because that's not the way it works. I take my car to the service station in Dedham and there are eight bays there, those eight bays are available on the network, it tells you that they are there, anyone can use them, but that is a certain brand. Mr. Fairman stated I don't understand the position this company has taken. Mr. Newberry stated I would think it would be in their interest to provide some public access, but that is just my opinion. Mr. Nelson stated there are two concerns, I think. One is that either you provide the access and there is no access right now or that is not the model. The model works the way it works at every other service center for an electric vehicle, which is it is just part of the node and then the traffic study will be significantly skewed. It will be off by an order of magnitude because there will be people using that because it shows up on your thing and it says you can go here; it is right off a road. It is not a good or bad thing, if that is the way it functions, we need to be aware of that so that you can model it properly in there. if you are going to say nobody can use these and they are sitting there, I think that is a different kind of issue. Mr. Fairman stated that is my issue. Mr. Newberry stated I would agree that that would certainly impact the traffic, but just from a business perspective, it seems to me if you are selling and servicing electric cars and you are not providing any charging stations, it doesn't sound like a reasonable business decision, but if that is the way they want to play it, that's fine, it is not up to us. Mr. Fairman stated I disagree, Mr. Newberry, that it is a business decision. It is a public issue as well, because we need a charging infrastructure in the country, and I think the companies that are making and selling electric vehicles need to step up and provide charging stations for the public as part of the infrastructure of the country. I do think it is a public issue. I don't understand their position on that, and this is an area that can take the traffic. I don't see that there is going to be a big issue on traffic having gotten the final read on it, but it is all good roads, it is right on the highway, easy in-and-out, and they have plenty of parking spots to enlarge and go into more charging stations. Mr. Newberry stated I would agree with you, Mr. Fairman. I would rather see a few less parking spots and some space given over to some charging stations that are available to the public, but I guess that is up to the developer. Ms. Malcolm stated I agree with both of you gentlemen. I just think it is an environmental decision. If you want to sell an electric vehicle, then you should do whatever you can to provide infrastructure to support electric vehicles. Chairman McMahan asked are you set up financially with your organization that you can sell the fuel for people as they come in? Mr. Patoucheas asked sell the electric? That was not the plan. According to this potential user, these charging stations are there for their service vehicles, people that are there for service to use. They weren't necessarily open to anyone to just come in and park there and charge, like you would see in other public parking lots or in large mixed-use complexes with office or retail where you have designated areas for people that are working there or living there to charge their vehicle. I think this is a little different where this is a specific tenant use, it is mainly a service facility whereas these other areas that believe you are referring to and describing, because I have seen them myself, are publicly owned but really either, again, in municipal lots or part of larger projects where you have people that are there for the day either working or living. I think that is where I have seen many of them. I am not sure about the rest of the board.

Chairman McMahan stated before we go on, I am not familiar with the charging stations and I know very little about electric cars. The one that you go to in Durham, is it just free where you stop by, just charge your car and go? Mr. Nelson replied it is in Dedham, MA, it is part of the service center and I am sure they charge the cars that are there for service at these stations, but those stations are open to the public and anyone can use it. There is a charge that is assessed when you use it, but the availability of those things are broadcast to a network and they say someone is either using it or not using it. You can at any given time, which I am assuming any manufacturer of electric cars is building that similar functionality into their vehicles, which is to identify where in the network the openings are and that they are used. Again, if that is going to be the way it is, then you need to make sure that we assess that in the study and understand it and bring it in, and if you can increase it, the accessibility of that, that should be part of something that you may want to entertain. Mr. Fairman stated I don't know how many times I have gone to an airport and gone on a trip and come back from a trip and gotten in my car and say I have to stop at a gas station, and the same thing will happen with people that are driving electric cars. They will come back from a trip and say I need to get to a place that I can charge and this is the perfect location for it. I frankly think that this tenant or owners, or whoever it is going to be, cares about the public at all, they not only put in a dozen or 20 charging stations, but put signs on the roads and put up on the FE Everett Turnpike and coming from the airport signs that say charging stations. I think that is the type of companies that we want in Bedford that care about the public, and if you don't care about the public, then go to another town. Mr. Patoucheas stated one thing that I forgot to mention is that, again, this proposed business is for the repair, maintenance and sale of these automobiles. If it were open to the public to come in and charge whenever they need to, there are certain liability issues with people pulling into this place of business, other cars coming in and out, other customers there, new cars being dropped off, the circulation, this isn't a gas station where it is set up that way. Mr. Fairman stated you could have a section that is set up that way. You have plenty of land, plenty of parking places, you could take this corner on the right end of this building and make that set up for public charging. The way you designed it it is not but it could be. Vice Chairman Duschatko stated not to fall over Mr. Fairman's point but to follow up on it and what Ms. Malcolm said, you made reference to charging stations being on public municipally owned land. I think Mr. Fairman makes the point and I share it with him is that it is time for the private people that are getting the benefit of this type of thing is to make that investment to support their customers. This is a place that certainly has enough space to be done, it is in a good location, we don't think it is going to impact the traffic because of the flow of the roads, and maybe it is time we start looking at requiring that if people want to make investments and get the benefits of being in our community put something back into it, which would be investing in charging stations rather than waiting for the community, the state or the federal government, i.e. the taxpayers to pay for it. Mr. Kevan stated just so you know, a lot of these places are looking and as far as new developed gas stations and what not and they are either setting up where they would rent or control spaces on those gas stations so that they could put their charging stations and there are ones that are universal and there are ones that are for certain vehicles, and I know that on several of the new gas stations that are being looked at, there are these charging station locations because that is where people are used to going are to a gas station on a corridor and that is what the State is looking for to get charging stations on certain primary corridor initially and these locations where they are in place, a lot of them are putting a little bit larger space inside the service station so that someone can go

in and sit down while their car charges and so forth. I know a lot of them are looking at that. Vice Chairman Duschatko stated that is fine. The Town of Bedford has nothing to do with that; the Town of Bedford does have control over what this particular site is developed as, and if we want to put in adequate charging stations to support this business, as well as our others, then I think we can make that a requirement. That is my position.

Ms. Malcolm stated you started this presentation with a slide that showed not just this little area where you want to develop but around it. There is a lot of housing down there; I think that they are wasting an opportunity to sell electric vehicles to all of these people in those houses because you are not making this user friendly, you are not making this welcoming. This is just like a warehouse. Vice Chairman Duschatko stated this is exactly what it is.

Mr. Newberry asked can you walk us through what you anticipate the circulation to be? Will there be spaces designated for different customers, employees, inventory, and kind of detail that for us and how somebody just rolling in there is going to know where to go and how to get there? Mr. Kevan responded the grades on here are fairly interesting in that at the street or at roughly 198 here, the bulk of this site is at 211, so we have a platform at the base of the driveway but then we come up at 8 percent to get into the site, that is why we have this long island to separate so we can make some grade change and then flatten this parking area. Mr. Newberry asked is that a retaining wall there? Mr. Kevan responded no. Customer parking is up in the front area here and then the inventory and vehicles that are dropped off is located in this area as shown on the screen, here would be employee parking in this back corner, and then the service vehicles are located here.

Mr. Newberry asked can you go to the landscaping plan. In that southwest corner there were a bunch of things going on there graphically that I couldn't quite identify. Maybe just walk us through what is going on there. It looks like there is some security fixtures and things like that in that area. Mr. Kevan asked you are talking about this area right here at the corner of the intersection? Mr. Newberry replied no, the whole parking field there from midsection to the south. Mr. Kevan responded they have some bollard and chain, what they called secured parking area, and that is all that it is. A standard bollard that they chain off and I think that is just if the public is out there and they have vehicles that have been delivered, they secure this lower area here as part of their inventory. Mr. Newberry asked so the whole perimeter of that area will be some kind of blocked off area? Mr. Kevan responded yes, it is not fencing, it is actually just bollard and chain connection. Mr. Newberry stated more like what you would see on a wharf? Mr. Kevan responded probably black chain with bollards that are standard height and they would be black in color. It is not a fence barrier but it is to keep the public from going in to the vehicles that have been already sold.

Mr. Newberry stated related to that, has VHB reviewed the tractor trailer traffic. Looking at that diagram, it looked like if you are 6-inches off the line, you are not going to get in or out of there. If there is a frozen snowbank, good luck, I am just curious if VHB has reviewed that. Mr. Kevan responded we had some brief discussions and there is some roundings that we can do in here. The trucks make the circulation pattern, there are some different lines for overhang on those trucks and what have you, but the truck does make it in through here and I think the program that we use is relatively conservative, but the truck can make it. We did have some brief discussions

on if we could do a little bit of rounding on some of these curves in order to ease up some space. Mr. Newberry stated and the diagram for the fire ladder truck; has that been reviewed and agreed with the Fire Department? Mr. Kevan responded yes.

Chairman McMahan stated for the folks that are advocating, and I can understand why you would want that, is it the suggestion that the applicant would provide this charging free? All who spoke with regard to the charging stations replied no. Mr. Nelson stated just to make the stations available. Chairman McMahan stated I just wanted that clear in my own mind.

Mr. Fairman stated I would like to follow-up something that Mr. Newberry said. I don't understand on the entrance you said that is not a retaining wall and yet to the west of this island it is flat, at an upper level from the entrance as it comes up, isn't some of that a retaining wall? Mr. Kevan responded this isn't flat, so parking can be at 5 percent and the driveway is at about an 8 percent. So there is some grade difference in here but there is no retaining wall in there.

Mr. Nichols stated I think the discussion is good. I certainly would prefer to have charging infrastructure, if that is a requirement that we can place, however, I think it is important to note that the presences of this kind of facility would, in and of itself, be an addition to the community. I would prefer to have the charging, I understand all of that, but I think this kind of facility is definitely an addition to the community and will bring the right type of traffic that we want. Chairman McMahan stated I agree with that; I agree with a lot of what has been said. The concern that I have is whether or not we can make this change as a pass/fail based on his property, his business and his preference. Are we willing to turn this down? Mr. Fairman replied yes. I need to step up and not vote for it without public charging stations somewhere between 12 and 20 charging stations and therefore the traffic study, I believe, needs to be redone to include those and that is where I stand. I am not interested in companies coming into Bedford that are not interested in public service. Mr. Newberry stated Mr. Chairman, rather than approaching this as an up or down, would the applicant be willing if we were to table this to consult with their tenant on possibly addressing that issue. Chairman McMahan stated I would certainly agree with that. Any thoughts from the Board? Ms. Malcolm stated I agree with that. Chairman McMahan stated hearing no objections to that, then we can start off with that.

Attorney John Cronin, Cronin, Bisson and Zalinsky, stated I am here on behalf of the applicant. One of the other things I think that is a question mark, for this proceed, and with all of these deals I know you hear it from everyone, it is a time issue. There is the waiver piece, and if that was looked upon favorably, I think we could move forward to the next step. In terms of, I get Mr. Fairman's position and it is no surprise and he is strong on it and others, but it is the first I have heard where government is dictating what private business can do on their property. I am not going to get into that debate this evening, if you elect to condition it on the provision of that for the benefit of the public as opposed to the customers, we can deal with that condition if that is so imposed, but I want you to think for a second of all of the different businesses out there and I think it is unfair to say that we don't want people in this community, which is a subdivision of the State if they are not interested in providing electric car charging stations. There are a lot of businesses here in this community, really good ones, that care about the public that don't have stations now for charging and won't in the future and they certainly won't have them at their own costs and expense. There is also significant money, I don't think it is a money issue, I know

the State recently has come up with some direction to add more of these stations along the Route 101 corridor and Route 3, and in fact, I think there is a plan in the works that we have been working with Ms. Hebert that will come before you that has added a number of charging stations on Route 101 if that particular site is approved. I think from the businesses perspective, these folks know how to run their business, they have been doing it nationwide, they have made a decision for their business for the benefit of their customers not to have a public open section for refueling. It would be like having a gas station in your lot if you are a regular car dealer. I can't say what all of the fundamental reasons are for that decision but that is something that they generally don't do and didn't want to do at this particular location. We can still have that conversation with them but I would ask if the Board would entertain taking up the waiver. This is in the Performance Zone and taking a look at the preamble to that particular section that talks about the intent and I think this particular use hits squarely on the technological changes that it talks about when crafting in the traditional ordinance a list of uses and making a table up for uses, it is hard to envision what uses are going to come forward in time until the next revision and how to deal with them. Being an innovative land use control you have discretion under that section. When you go to the Table of Uses here, there is a section that allows motor vehicle service in this particular location but there is a footnote that is tied to 37 of the Table of Uses, which specifically excludes the sale of automobiles, so we would have to get a waiver for this to advance forward. The provisions of that waiver criteria that is stated out in the staff report, the general performance issues that are in the section in the Performance Zone, we believe this particular use meets them, certainly it is a use that is conducive with that area. You have Range Rover right across the street, you have Mini Cooper that is a recent establishment up a little bit further north on that bypass, across the street you have the Cabaret there, which I know probably for the long term that may not be the highest and best use, but that is tired and it is clearly a commercial use, won't be detrimental to surrounding properties. You see the residential in the back is sheltered with those garages and you do have an abundance of traffic there now that goes down, I see on the weekends most when my kids were younger, down to the performance fields down there. In that particular section there when you look at those other criteria, and I can address them more at length if you are wanting to take that up this evening, but that would be a help to Mr. Patoucheas that if he had some information on that he could go back and talk to the folks that are going to operate this facility and see if that is something that they would entertain. I think to even think that there might be 20 in that location, and you think about it for everyone that just happens to stop there because it is convenient from those houses, if they are looking to use those stations for their own clientele for maintenance or new vehicles to get them charged, they are not going to be available. Thank you. Chairman McMahan stated thank you; good comments. I hope I didn't misspeak when I said tabling it. We have a list of things that we want to discuss tonight so it would be just this issue that we table, and I believe you are going to have to come back anyway, are you not, because you are not ready to talk about signage. Is that right? Because there is nothing in the site plan that was submitted. Mr. Kevan responded that is correct; we would come back for signage. Chairman McMahan stated I have no intent of cutting this off. We would like to continue the discussion, there are other questions that we have, and we will see what we have at the end. Mr. Fairman stated Mr. Chairman, there is one comment on the architecture or do you want to go to the architecture next. Mr. Kevan stated we can go into the architecture if you are ready. Chairman McMahan stated please.

Mr. Patoucheas stated I brought some samples with me this evening. This building shown is mainly a precast building. We will start at the front corner, which is the main kind of entrance in the corner of the building, which is glass on the first floor and above the white and red is metal panel, similar to what is across the street at Land Rover of Bedford. Most dealerships today that are being built are built this way. You see a lot of metal panel, precast, again, very similar to what is across the street. We do have this sample here which is basically a precast concrete panel. If you look here at the four light gray sections that run along South River Road is going to be comprised of that precast panel and you see the grooves here, the grooves will be vertical. The darker gray section is the same material; the grooves will run this way. Then up top, the lighter gray section, same material but they will not be grooved, they will be a smooth finish. The spec for this tenant is actually concrete block but we did not think that that would look very good, so we went with this higher cost, higher grade material, which is precast. This is not the representative color. What you see there will be the three colors that we use. The colors of the metal panel that I have passed around those are representative colors of the white and red. Ms. Hebert asked so the light gray on the image here is white? Mr. Patoucheas responded where you see the glass and then the red, then white panel. Ms. Hebert asked one color gray for the remainder of the building? Mr. Patoucheas responded no; there will be three colors. The four vertical kind of lighter gray sections is one color, then the darker section that is in between the vertical sections is another color and the vertical grooves will go this way on those four sections, that way on the darker section and then the light section up top will be flat, there will not be any grooves. Mr. Kevan stated the main building is 22 feet tall, the lighter gray columns that kind of break it up there are 24 feet wide and they are 25.7 feet tall, and those are the texture type materials. Then as you get to the front of the building, it is just shy of 26 feet tall. Mr. Patoucheas stated our signage will go above the red band, will run across the red band up top where it is the white metal panel, there will be a logo where you see sort of the red piece in the corner there will be a logo there and then I believe another logo on the far left corner. Mr. Kevan stated we will have to come back to you with exact size and so forth and how that would look.

Chairman McMahan asked are there any comments on the architecture? Mr. Newberry stated your rendering doesn't do justice to what you are actually planning. It looks worse in the rendering than it does once you see the material. Mr. Patoucheas stated this is a high-quality material. Again, their standard spec is just kind of a painted concrete block, but we didn't want that for our building and for the Town of Bedford, especially in this location, and given the fact that the frontage spans across South River Road and has that much bright, so the building isn't deep, you have to see the massing of the building so it is important. We wanted to break it up, we wanted to use it differently with the grooves going vertical, horizontal and I think this massing really broke up what could have been just a long, plain building. We thought this was the best way to break up the massing. Mr. Kevan stated and this would be the view that you are looking at from the intersection, if you were coming south to north, you would see this corner, you can see this would be the front face facing Technology Drive, so that showroom type area is in this corner and then as you come across, the doors facing the street the overhead doors are glass doors that are not panel doors. Ms. Malcolm asked could you tell me that again? This is facing Technology Drive? This is not the Route 3 view? Mr. Kevan responded this upper elevation is Route 3, the upper one is which faces South River Road, and this lower one on the right would face Technology Drive. Mr. Fairman stated I think it is an architecturally done well and I think it blends in well with the Land Rover across the street and generally. The one thing I

wanted to bring up is something that staff mentioned. It is a good opportunity for a solar array and solar power. I am pushing very hard for reducing of greenhouse gases, and I think that this is a great opportunity to incorporate a good sized solar panel on the roof of that, reduce your power requirements and overall I think I would like you take a look at that and see if you can put solar power on that roof. It looks like it should be able to take it alright. Mr. Kevan stated we had raised the question with the tenant and at this point he wasn't willing to commit to that.

Mr. Newberry stated looking at staff notes we haven't talked about hours of operation. Mr. Kevan replied typically it would be roughly 7:00am to 7:00pm, and they would run some business hours during Saturday but we can get back to you with exact hours. Mr. Newberry asked that would be six days a week, seven days a week, eight days a week? Mr. Kevan responded Monday through Friday typically, 7:00am to 7:00pm, and then Saturday there would probably be similar hours, less maintenance, more on the showroom side on the Saturday. Mr. Newberry asked but they wouldn't be more hours on Saturday? Mr. Kevan replied no; we can get back to you with exact hours. I don't know if they would stay open later than the 7:00pm or they might go to 9:00pm.

Mr. Newberry stated I think Attorney Cronin addressed most of the criteria related to that waiver. Do you guys have anything that you want to add to making your case for addressing A – E? Attorney Cronin stated the criteria at Section 275-58 of the Zoning Ordinance:

- A. *To attract environmentally acceptable commercial, industrial, recreational, institutional, and residential uses to the District.*
- B. *To encourage diversity in the community tax base through appropriate flexibility in land use and land use development;*
- C. *To optimize financial return on public infrastructure investments and expenditures, including municipal sewer, municipal water supply, the Manchester Airport, Class I and II public highways, and the Merrimack River amenities;*
- D. *To minimize adverse traffic impacts on U.S. Route 3, the I-293/NH Route 101 interchange, surrounding local streets and roadways; and*
- E. *To preserve valuable historical, cultural, and natural features within the district and to minimize adverse environmental impacts such as water, air, light, noise pollution, flooding, clear cutting of vegetation, and the blocking of scenic views.*

Attorney Cronin stated this certainly would be a commercial use and I think it is on the cutting edge of environmentally acceptable uses to optimize the financial return on public infrastructure, investments and expenditures, including municipal sewer and municipal water supply, Manchester Airport, Class 1 and 2 public highways in the Merrimack River amenities. This particular commercial use currently has been vacant land, this proposal will be in the several millions of dollars by the time it is complete, and if you are looking at say a \$20 mil rate per thousand, probably 90 or thereabouts, ratio, you are looking at six figures, pretty close, annual tax revenue a year, with very little increased demand. It is an available corridor, easy access to fire, built to the life safety code standards by the applicable life safety code and building codes. In terms of adverse traffic impacts on Route 3, it is a relevant one here, this particular use being one of kind of a new feature in automobile sales, maybe not new for the electric industry, but where they have the JIT type of inventory planning just in time where they are not having a lot of

irons sitting on lots and floor planning, you order it, it comes in, they might have some samples there. I read recently in *Wall Street Journal* where they were talking about the auto manufacturers now not having supply for the last several years are very pleased they are selling cars at sticker and above and some of them are giving some thought not to do business the old way of warehousing cars on lots but make inventory a little bit more scarce and more acceptable to ordering, so that definitely has a bearing on traffic. The traffic engineers have taken a look at this and I think in comparison to other uses on the corridor or other uses that could go in this site, it works from a parking perspective. To preserve valuable historical, cultural and natural features within the district and to minimize adverse environmental impacts, such as water, air, light, noise pollution, flooding, clear cutting of vegetation, and the blocking of scenic views: I think at this particular location I am not aware of any significant historical features on this lot or surrounding. You are bordered by Sullivan Tire, which is a block building to the south, you have Range Rover, which are very nice buildings across the street, we have talked about the Cabaret needing probably some upgrades and attention at some time in the future, but this design when the signage goes on it, when I have seen these buildings with the signs, really makes the building pop. It looks a little bit bland in the picture, but if you have the block signs along glass front place, it is a nice looking, attractive facility, and, again, generating a significant tax base.

Attorney Cronin stated that covers those criteria for the use waiver. I would be happy to entertain any questions that you might have.

Mr. Fairman stated I would like to come back to the environmental thing. Why not solar panels; I don't understand the hesitancy. Again, to my mind on new buildings it comes back to being a good citizen of this country to put in solar panels, it also saves money, it is a win, win, a payback isn't very long on a building that you plan to be there for a long, long time, payback on solar investment is really quite quick, relatively so, and I don't understand the reluctance of the owner to not put in solar panels on this great opportunity to help. Again, being a good citizen and you don't seem to want to be that. Attorney Cronin responded I will just take exception to that comment of their desire to be a citizen, and I appreciate the policy position in terms of solar power, but I am not the person spending the millions of dollars on this facility, pretty smart people that have developed this business, they know what they are doing, I am sure they have looked at all avenues, and in this particular case, that is not something that they are interested in. Thank you.

Mr. Nelson stated just one clarification on the traffic study. My sense is, and maybe a clarifying question, the charging stations that will be at this place, will they or will they not broadcast their availability status to the network of their vehicles? Attorney Cronin replied the answer to that is no. Mr. Nelson asked are there any other service centers in this company's network that operate that way or this will be completely unique here to Bedford? Attorney Cronin responded I can't speak to that. I am familiar with a few other locations; I have never inquired as to exactly how they do. I think they are consistent with this but we can ask that question and have an informed decision for you when we come back. Mr. Nelson stated I think that would be helpful because my sense is that they do broadcast their availability and that they are high capacity and that vehicles in the network see that availability and utilize those, which they should, that's a good thing. But significantly it does change the traffic that will be coming through; you can't model it solely on the service center. It would be good to understand. I don't believe there is any other

service centers that I have been to for a specific network where they don't broadcast their availability and they are not usable by anyone that owns that model vehicle. I think it would be good to understand that. If it does, that is a good thing but you just need to model that appropriately and make sure that the traffic patterns support that for that use, that additional potential use. Attorney Cronin stated I have made a note of the questions and you made a good distinction there. Are they available generally to people in the public with this brand of vehicle; I think that is a really good question and I will get you an informed decision for that versus the public at-large in general. Mr. Nelson responded there are different levels where it is not visible to anyone, if you have this maybe specific brand and I can understand that, or it is visible to entire network, so it would be good to have some clarification because that would drive some sense of the additional traffic you might see through here if it is broadcasting as I think it probably will be to the network of that specific type manufacturer. There is modeling we could probably do that says there is X amount of incremental additional. Again, I think it is probably within the confines of what you guys have designed and built, but it would be much better to have an accurate representation of that than an incorrect representation of that. Attorney Cronin stated if the answer to those questions are no or in the negative, I will try and get you some reasons why. Mr. Nelson responded yes, that would be helpful to understand.

Mr. Newberry stated I see that in looking at staff notes here that there is another waiver for the landscaping. Could you just kind of go over where that is and what that entails. Mr. Kevan responded the second waiver was a request on the exterior pavement landscape strip where it abuts the side landscape area. On these two areas indicated on the screen instead of doubling up and having a pavement strip and a perimeter landscape area, we have asked for a waiver. We are planting the necessary plantings in these areas but instead of having more land reserve we have asked for a waiver. Just on those two sides.

Chairman McMahan stated taking a look at the staff report, there are a couple of things that were addressed. The hours, pickup for the dumpsters, do you have those established yet. Mr. Kevan replied I don't think we have exact hours for pickup for the dumpsters. If there is a limitation, I am sure we could work around that, but we are directly next to what was the event center, I am not sure if you were thinking there would be some limitation on dumpster pickup hours. Ms. Harris stated more towards the apartments. Mr. Kevan responded I understand that. Is there a timeframe you just don't want it before 7:00 or something like that in the morning? Ms. Hebert responded probably avoid early morning pickups. Mr. Kevan responded we can agree to that.

Chairman McMahan stated then there is lighting. Mr. Kevan stated like I said, I think our lighting met regulation. Like I said the fixture type that we are asked to use had higher intensities directly into the poles, and staff asked us to go back to see if we could find an alternative fixture that would have lower lighting intensities in those hot spots, which is directly below the pole, and we have agreed to do that. Chairman McMahan asked did we check on the other dealers on what candle power that they had for their parking areas? Ms. Harris replied I don't have that information. Chairman McMahan stated I think it is 0.4 to the 0.6:1 candle power and yours are 20 candle power. Mr. Kevan responded like I said, we are happy to go back and look at it and try to come up with a fixture that will have lower intensities. Chairman McMahan stated and maybe take a look at if you need all of those poles. You have 20? Mr. Kevan responded if you look at the photometrics, we do need the poles. You can see the

distribution between them as far as getting an even distribution across there; we need the poles we have, we just need to adjust the fixture type. Chairman McMahan stated you can work with staff on that.

Mr. Kevan stated a couple of other things that we have talked about with staff or are in agreement with is adding a pedestrian access. Typically, if we are looking at a pedestrian access, you would want to make it ADA accessible. Because our driveway is at 8 percent, we can't run along that driveway, we have said we would be in agreement to add a sidewalk that would come across this parking lot and come to the front corner of Technology Drive. Technology Drive doesn't meet ADA, it is steeper than the requirement, but if we are going to put in a sidewalk, then we would have it meet ADA requirement and we could get to that corner we would be in agreement to do that. Chairman McMahan asked are there any thoughts from the Board on that? Mr. Fairman stated that solution sounds like a good one to me.

Mr. Kevan stated as part of our discussions on the traffic study, was that we would repaint or refresh the paint on Technology Drive just to clean up the left-turn lane through left and a right-turn lane, and then paint the Do Not Block markings on the road at the driveway location and we are in agreement to do that.

Chairman McMahan stated the question to the Board right now is are we willing to go forward with this site plan approval and the two waivers and agree that they will return for availability of pumps and signage when they come back. Mr. Fairman responded I will break that into two questions, the waivers versus site approval. Let's look at the waivers and then talk about whether we want to do site approval. Ms. Malcolm stated I need a clarification of this first waiver, to allow an automobile dealership in the Performance Zone as it is not a permitted use. Does that mean anywhere, anybody else can apply for it or is it specific to this application? Chairman McMahan replied it is not specific, a dealership needs a waiver to be able to put it in the Performance Zone. That is what that waiver is. Ms. Malcolm asked so somebody else coming along, if we approve this waiver, they are not automatically allowed to put an automobile dealership in the Performance Zone? Chairman McMahan replied no it is not. We did the same thing for two others, so there is a precedent for this. Ms. Hebert stated we do them case-by-case.

Chairman McMahan stated if we are ready for this, I would open this up for public comment. There were none.

MOTION by Mr. Newberry that the Planning Board grant the following waiver from the Bedford Zoning Ordinance:

- **Section 275-61 and Table 2, Note 37 of the Zoning Ordinance, to allow an automobile dealership in the PZ District, as it is not a permitted use, because the applicant has addressed criteria A – E that support this requested waiver.**

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

MOTION by Mr. Newberry that the Planning Board grant the following waiver from the Bedford Zoning Ordinance:

- **Section 275-63(E)(5)(b), to waive the requirement for an exterior pavement landscape strip section where it would immediately abut a side or rear landscape strip (not facing a right-of-way), as was outlined by the applicant at this meeting.**

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

Chairman McMahan asked when is a good time for you to come back to take a look at the use of the pumps and the signage? When do you feel you can be ready? Mr. Patoucheas asked could I clarify something on the chargers? Chairman McMahan responded yes. Mr. Patoucheas stated if the tenant were to allow the use of these chargers for the specific brand that they are selling and not limit it to the customers that are there for service, would that be acceptable. Just so I understand what the ask is. I have made the ask once and the answer was no, but rather than going back and forth, I would rather just understand what the ask is. Would the Board approve the use of these chargers by not only the customers that are there for service but also owners of this brand of vehicle who are not there for service to use them. Chairman McMahan responded I think you might get a feeling of the Board and which way it wants to go, but obviously we can't take a vote and give you that information, so I will ask the Board what their thoughts are on that. Ms. Malcolm stated I would like that a lot better. Mr. Nelson stated I would think that that would be more consistent with the other service centers that the manufacturer may have, that would be my personal sense of it, is clarifying that that isn't already part of it. That was kind of what my point is. I didn't know you could segregate that out from being visible to the network, maybe it can, but I would confirm if it is or isn't, and if it is visible, then by its very nature, it will be used by people other than people that are there just for service and that will change the traffic utilization levels. I think it would just be clarification of that, and then in a much smaller service center than what you are proposing, I have seen eight or ten stalls of high-capacity charging that seems to be the averages, at least eight. I would just look and see across other service centers of something similar, maybe of the northeast or something, what is either are they accessible to that manufacturer's brand, publicly and visible on their network of availability, and then second, what is the number that a similar sized service center might employ. It seems slightly small for that size. It would just be interesting to get that feedback from a region. Mr. Newberry stated from my perspective I think what I heard the Board asking is to discuss with the potential tenant what they could do based on the comments and concerns expressed in the meeting this evening. Ideally I think that would be a publicly accessible set of chargers, but I think the Board is just looking for you and the tenant to take another look at what is possible there. Maybe the answer is nothing, maybe the answer is we can do a full public access or something in between. That is kind of what my interpretation of what I have heard this evening is, that is not me speaking for the Board. Mr. Patoucheas responded okay.

Mr. Newberry stated I think there were several other questions that came up; I think there is still some work to be done clarifying the traffic study. I didn't make a specific note of them but I think there were several other questions that the applicant was going to clarify and come back to the Board if we were to table this. Mr. Kevan responded there some minor things. We have

resubmitted traffic, but if we are going to consider charging stations that are open, the question would be that will be an interesting one trying to figure out how to come up with a traffic number that is associated with that because that is pretty unique. We could work with staff to try to address that. Mr. Newberry asked would you be able to address signage also if you were to come back? Ms. Hebert stated the applicant may come back with a separate waiver application, they just would not be able to put any signs on the building that did not meet Town standards. Under the current application it is assumed that all of their signage would need to meet the Town dimensional standards and location requirements. If they need relief from that moving forward, the tenant has the option to come back to the Board with a separate request. Chairman McMahan stated Mr. Kevan, you have been here before, it is a rather restrictive in the zoning area. Mr. Kevan stated I am not sure as far as the actual tenant; my guess is that that may be a little while out before we would be able to come back. Our intention right now was that whatever signage we would propose would conform, and in the Performance Zone you are allowed a monument sign that is 32 square feet and my guess is we would place that probably up at the corner closer to the intersection of the road, and then you are actually allowed signage on sides that side streets and parking areas, so the signage that had been described to you where there would be signage on this wall as shown and on the end, we would just have to look at the location to see if it fits within your ordinance. But the idea right now was signage would conform to your standards and we wouldn't come back unless we had the specific tenant who knew exactly what they wanted. Chairman McMahan responded I can understand that, and you can work with staff. Mr. Kevan stated my guess is that we wouldn't come back with signage immediately, we would come back with answers to a couple of these questions. Mr. Newberry stated ignore my question on signage. Chairman McMahan stated with the understanding that if you are going to go outside, then you would come back and the Board would like to see the signs that you are going to put up and where they are going to be placed. Just like we would with anybody else. Mr. Kevan responded yes. Chairman McMahan stated so the signage will be taken care of in the future. When you come back it is just going to be the concern of what is going to be done with the charging stations, and that would be a condition of passing or voting on the site plan approval. Ms. Hebert responded that is correct. Chairman McMahan stated so whoever makes that motion, that needs to be included, and the signage couldn't go up without them coming back anyway, so it would be very much like Mr. Kevan has seen before. Mr. Kevan stated my guess is that the crux of the question is these charging stations, so we can go back to the tenant and discuss whether we can have them, that can be accomplished in relatively short time, but then adjusting the traffic study and having it reviewed may take a little bit more. Mr. Patoucheas asked do we need to address the traffic study or just review it? Mr. Kevan replied if we are going to add charging stations, we are going to have to change the traffic study because the trip generation will be different. Mr. Patoucheas asked when is the earliest point that we can come back? Ms. Hebert replied the April 18, 2022 Planning Board meeting, and then the next one is May 9, 2022. Mr. Kevan asked when would you need information? Ms. Hebert replied I don't have a sense of what the order of magnitude the charging stations would result in for the traffic study. I don't think it is going to be a lot of additional trips, and my sense it is not going to change the mitigation package significantly. If it did, we could require an additional review. Mr. Kevan stated why don't we do that and if we need more time, then we could ask to be continued off from that to the 18th and then we will see if we can accomplish it by then. Ms. Hebert responded okay. Mr. Newberry stated speaking for myself, I would say based on staff's expert opinion, the traffic impact is probably not going to be so great that the detail couldn't be worked out with

staff and VHB. Mr. Kevan asked so if we just come back with an answer? Mr. Newberry stated speaking for myself, not the Board. Chairman McMahan stated that might change the traffic pattern, Mr. Newberry, if it is opened up to all public. We will look at what they have when they come back.

MOTION by Mr. Fairman that the Planning Board table the application of South River Road Ventures, LLC (Applicant) & River Glen Development Partner c/o Adobe Builders of NE (Owner) requesting Site Plan Approval for a 41,486 square foot electric car maintenance facility and dealership, located at South River Road and Technology Drive, to the April 18, 2022 Planning Board meeting, and this motion will serve as public notice. Vice Chairman Duschatko duly seconded the motion. Vote taken – all in favor. Motion carried.

Concept Proposals and Other Business:

1. Housing Working Group

Ms. Hebert stated for some background: At the Planning Board's September 2021 Workshop meeting the Board discussed appointing a working group to review Bedford's zoning for workforce housing and really opportunities for housing in Bedford in general. At the workshop we talked about establishing a committee or a working group that would take a deeper look at housing and kind of do an audit of what we have in our regulations and make recommendations for the Board's fall 2022 workshop. The establishment of the working group is supported by our newly adopted Master Plan, which includes the goal to provide opportunities for housing choice and more specifically states that the Town should continue to provide realistic opportunities for workforce housing development consistent with State law and to regularly assess the effectiveness of Bedford's workforce housing ordinance. Additionally, State law requires municipalities to make reasonable and realistic accommodations for workforce housing and those opportunities need to include multi-family housing.

Ms. Hebert stated Bedford zoning for workforce housing was initially adopted in 2009 and about three years ago Bedford residents approved a petition zoning amendment to that zoning, which moved the housing as a permitted use from the Route 101 corridor to the Performance Zone, and by establishing the working group we are not suggesting that there be changes made immediately to the zoning, I don't have anything off the top of my head that I would change right now. I think that the Town should take a close look at it and have a group of people take a look at housing in general. It is a hot topic right now and has been a hot topic within the community and it is a topic that is of discussion statewide. We thought that it would be a good time to establish this working group and really take a look at what we have on our books for housing opportunities.

Ms. Hebert stated another reason to kick off this working group right now is that Southern NH Regional Planning Commission is also beginning the process to update what we call the Regional Housing Needs Assessment, and this is something that is done periodically. Vice Chairman Duschatko might know how every how many years they are supposed to do it. I feel like it is every seven years that they are supposed to update the Regional Housing Needs

Assessment, and it hasn't been done since the 2009 initial writing of our workforce housing zoning. Southern NH Regional Planning Commission is taking on this significant effort to update the Regional Housing Needs Assessment and all of the regional planning commissions in New Hampshire are undergoing that process right now with a due date for that analysis by the end of the year. So our hope is that we will have a working group established looking at housing and we will have this Regional Housing Needs Assessment hopefully coming out by the end of the year to help inform their work.

Ms. Hebert stated the housing needs assessment will identify challenges and opportunities within each of the communities to help inform community recommendations and it will also help compare communities to see what different towns are doing, and I think that will be an interesting analysis. Southern NH Regional Planning Commission has a website, there is a link included in our staff report to their website for this particular project and there is also a housing needs assessment public survey and would encourage all of you to log into that survey and answer the questions in the survey because that is how we are going to get Bedford's voice incorporated into this study. If you know of friends or have family who would be interested in filling out that survey as well, I would encourage you all to share that link with your friends and family because that will help to include Bedford's voice in this Regional Housing Needs Assessment. There is also a survey for employers, so if you are Bedford employer, consider taking both the public survey and the employer survey.

Ms. Hebert stated that is really in a nutshell what we are looking to do. We are looking to establish a group of volunteers, we are looking for two to three volunteers from the Planning Board and then those Board members would meet with staff and we need to do some outreach into the community. We would like to bring a slate of volunteers back to the Board for official appointment to the housing working group. I think we would like two to three Planning Board members and we would like another three or four community members to advise the group and then that group would bring their thoughts and ideas and recommendations back to the Planning Board at your workshop in September. Staff would provide staff support to the group and we would coordinate hopefully monthly meetings would be the commitment, with the first meeting beginning if we can as soon as April, if not we would look at May for our first meeting date. At this point it would probably be best to email staff if you have an interest in serving on the housing working group. I would be happy to answer any questions about the working group, and I would love to hear your thoughts on this.

Mr. Fairman stated I would like to comment on the survey. I would encourage people to do it. At the Southern NH Regional Planning Commission this last week Vice Chairman Duschatko and I saw a chart that showed the communities that had responded to the survey. Bedford was one that I think had the most number of respondents and some communities had none. I don't know that we have been asked before to do the survey, probably we haven't, I am a little concerned that the people that have responded at this point may be slanted in one direction. The word might have gotten out in that group of people that have one particular slant on the survey. Whatever your slant is, I think it is important that the Board step in and do the survey at any rate. Mr. Newberry stated word of warning though, if you just go there to look at the survey, it won't let you back in again. Apparently they have it set up so that people cannot multiple on the same location, at least, of the IP address. If you open it, go there planning to fill it out because if you

don't, you probably will not get back in. I looked to get a sense of how they were approaching it, and one thing I did do that may have made the difference is they give you some little okay buttons and I hit one of those thinking that I couldn't get to the next page, but I figured out later than you can get to all of the pages without hitting the okay button. That may prevent you from getting locked out if you just want to look at the survey. The survey was interesting. Ms. Hebert stated I will send an email with a fresh link to the survey and you can forward it onto your friends. We are going to send it to all of our boards and commissions and ask everybody to respond to the survey. The Regional Housing Needs Assessment is a statewide effort and there are significant resources being put into it at the State level with consultants working on the demographic analysis. It will be interesting to see the results of it and I think it is important to have Bedford's opinions and voices included. Is there any way BCC could help spread the word on this? Ms. Hebert responded we could do a quick-link or a PSA on that. You can use either link that is being supplied to you. Vice Chairman Duschatko stated you have to be a little bit cautious, I believe, of having a huge response from Bedford. It is disproportional and the other towns would be thrown out or readjusted for proper statistic because they don't want to have one group influencing a region. Ms. Hebert asked have they had a wide response from other communities? Vice Chairman Duschatko replied no, but you can see as Mr. Fairman points out, probably 3-to-1 over everybody else. Mr. Fairman stated yes, but the numbers that we had was very small. Vice Chairman Duschatko stated but if that proportion stays the same, then we will be brought down to where it is proportionally. Mr. Newberry stated I would think the final analysis should take into account not only the volume but also the general spread of that volume. Vice Chairman Duschatko responded that is basically what I am saying. They will adjust it to try to make it equal in terms of proportions, so if Bedford came in at two times the response of Derry, for example, something is going to be wrong. Derry is not going to be raised up but Bedford will be dropped down. Mr. Newberry stated I would think part of the analysis would also look at the distribution of that volume, are they distributed similarly, not just volume. Vice Chairman Duschatko stated here is the other problem with the survey, it is Internet based. If you don't have Internet capability, for the most part you are not going to get it unless somebody walks you into a library or other facility. They are trying to find ways to get a broader outreach. Ms. Hebert stated it is an information survey, I don't think it will be statistically recorded. Vice Chairman Duschatko stated whatever comes out of it, it is going to require some analysis, and the entire state is the same feeling. I just bring it out because that is going to happen.

V. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meetings:

MOTION by Ms. Malcolm to approve the minutes of the February 14, 2022 Planning Board meeting as written. Mr. Sullivan duly seconded the motion. Vote taken; motion carried, with Mr. Nelson abstained.

VI. Communications to the Board:

The next Planning Board meeting is scheduled for April 18, 2022.

Ms. Harris stated I sent out some information about the New Hampshire Municipal Association which has several webinars and workshops coming up. Specifically, they have some local officials' workshops on April 5th and May 17th, which everyone can consider registering for those. Ms. Hebert stated the workshops are free and they are both virtual. If you are interested, please register. You don't need to contact staff if you are going to register for the workshops, and I would encourage you to consider attending at least one of them. They are great opportunities for board member training. If you attend the NHMA workshop, you will get a free resource guidebook called Knowing the Territory, which is a great resource for volunteer board members.

Ms. Hebert stated you also have printed copies of the Master Plan and the Executive Summary. We are excited to be distributing those out to the community. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Ms. Harris stated we also provided some information on the update to the Planning Board Handbook. That comes from the Office of Planning and Development. We have provided a summary of those changes, and I would encourage you to look at that summary and we have also provided a full copy of the new handbook as it has been updated.

VII. Reports of Committees: None

VIII. Adjournment:

MOTION by Mr. Quintal to adjourn at 8:40 p.m. Ms. Malcolm duly seconded the motion. Vote taken – all in favor. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted by
Valerie J. Emmons