

TOWN OF BEDFORD
April 12, 2021
PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES

A remote Zoom platform meeting of the Bedford Planning Board was held on Monday, April 12, 2021. Members who were present remotely: Jon Levenstein (Chairman), Hal Newberry (Secretary), Bill Duschatko (Town Council), Mac McMahon, Priscilla Malcolm, Steve Clough, Charlie Fairman (Alternate), Matt Sullivan (Alternate), Becky Hebert (Planning Director), and Jillian Harris (Assistant Planning Director)

Due to the Coronavirus crisis and in accordance with Governor Sununu's Emergency Order #12 pursuant to Executive Order 2020-04, the Planning Board is using the Zoom platform to conduct this meeting electronically. Please note that there is no physical location for this meeting and the BCTV building is closed to the public.

The Town of Bedford is providing public access to the meeting live on BCTV, streaming at www.Bedfordnh.org/393/BCTV, and by calling into the meeting. Please email planning@bedfordnh.org or call 603-472-5243 to receive the Zoom call-in information.

Planning staff will also be accepting questions and comments by email at planning@bedfordnh.org. Please notify staff by email if there are technological issues during the meeting.

I. Call to Order and Roll Call:

Chairman Levenstein called the remote meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Town Council Alternate Kelleigh Murphy and Alternate John Quintal were absent.

II. Old Business & Continued Hearings: None

III. New Business:

1. **Gerald P. Violette (Owner & Applicant)** – Request for a home occupation permit for a non-stocking firearms dealer and gunsmithing business at 15 Chandler Road, Lot 14-2-1, Zoned R&A.
2. **Donald Ware c/o Pennichuck Water Works (Owner & Applicant)** – Request to amend a condition of subdivision approval granted by the Planning Board on July 20, 1992, located at 85 Hawk Drive, Lot 8-16-66, Zoned R&A.
3. Public Hearing for proposed amendments to the Planning Board Rules of Procedure.

IV. Concept Proposals and Other Business:

4. Discussion of draft 2020 Master Plan edits.

Ms. Harris stated the new applications have been reviewed by staff, and it is staff's determination that the applications are complete. The abutters have been notified, and it is the opinion of staff that the applications do not pose a regional impact. Staff would recommend that the Board accept the applications as complete.

MOTION by Mr. Newberry to accept the agenda as read. Ms. Malcolm duly seconded the motion. On a unanimous roll call vote, the motion carried.

1. Gerald P. Violette (Owner & Applicant) – Request for a home occupation permit for a non-stocking firearms dealer and gunsmithing business at 15 Chandler Road, Lot 14-2-1, Zoned R&A.

Gerald Violette, 15 Chandler Road, was present to address his application for a home occupation permit.

Mr. Violette stated I have been in business for 31 years, I have had a Federal Firearms License (FFL) for 31 years and the name of the company is The Duck Stop. I am registered with the State of New Hampshire through the Secretary of State, I am an outfitter that provides a lot of hunting and fishing, and in Montana I have an affiliation with Muddy Creek Ranch in Wilsall, MT. What happens is that when I get a client that wants to travel to Montana for hunting or fishing, often we will take a firearm, and you can only ship from federal dealer to federal dealer, so with this FFL I can ship that and you don't have to worry about going through security on a plane with a firearm or driving through multiple states, so you need a federal license to do that. I also have done transfers for people. Overall in the 31 years I have transferred 119 firearms, which equates to about less than four a year. Gunsmithing is not really gunsmithing so much as it is, but basically I will purchase old firearms, I have on occasion, and just clean them up and I consign them to another dealership that has a storefront. I don't do anything like that out of the house. I have had ATF audit me several times, that is common practice for any FFL that ATF will come and do audits. I have had it happen several times, and I have never had a problem.

Mr. Violette continued the firearms portion is very small, it is more about the hunting and fishing. I do stuff for New Hampshire, I go to Wyoming, mostly Montana and a little bit of Nebraska as well.

Chairman Levenstein asked how often do you have customers at your house? Mr. Violette replied only when it is involved with a transfer of a firearm. Legally it has to happen at your business premises, so in the 31 years I have had 119 transfers. I have probably had more than that, I would double it anyway, which is nothing over 31 years. I would be exaggerating, but I would say no more than one a month because everything is really online now and I just communicate word of

mouth and through the Muddy Creek Ranch and we just do business that way. It is more of a convenience item than sales of firearms item.

Ms. Malcolm asked are firearms transferred to you and somebody comes and picks them up? Somebody from Montana transfers a firearm to you? Mr. Violette replied it hasn't happened, but if someone from Montana wanted to come up here for a hunting trip in New Hampshire, they can transfer from a federal dealer to myself and then they would have to sign for it here, yes. That is the way it would work or to another gun shop.

Chairman Levenstein asked how much of the house are you planning on using for the home occupation? Mr. Violette replied it is an office space. I think I wrote on my application 200 square feet, but I re-measured it and I think it is 247 square feet. Chairman Levenstein asked are there particular hours that you plan to be doing this? Mr. Violette replied with my FFL I am required to show hours, and I show from 4:00pm to 5:00pm during weekdays by appointment only, and that is just because I have to declare something with the ATF, Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms. It is minimal. It is always by appointment because I don't want cars here. I really don't want traffic here at all either, that is not my thing. I try to keep it low key. It is sort of like a pre-retirement business that I am working toward.

Mr. Fairman asked how do the weapons come back? Do they get shipped to you? Mr. Violette replied if we transfer a firearm to Montana, for example, the federal dealer where the client picks up the firearm, that same FFL would ship it back to me. That would come through UPS typically, and it can only go from federal dealer to federal dealer, so yes, I would have to sign that firearm in and the client would have to come here and sign paperwork. I would have to do a background check. Every time I transfer back and forth, legally I have to do a background check. I do that every time.

Chairman Levenstein asked for questions or comments from the Planning Board members.

Mr. Newberry asked could you explain exactly what a non-stocking dealer means in this context? Mr. Violette responded the reason I put it in this context is that non-stocking means that I don't have a showroom, I don't have any firearms here for sale, there is nothing here that is for sale. The only time is when a client transfers that I would have a firearm here. I have a safe for it and a security system and dogs, but it is just usually one or two firearms. Not to go off too far, I have sold brand new firearms as well. I can get them wholesale, but, again, it is 119 I have transferred in the past 31 years. I don't know if I answered your questions; hopefully I did. Mr. Newberry responded yes; thank you.

Mr. Newberry asked did I understand correctly that any items either outbound or inbound are either hand carried or UPS? Mr. Violette replied a client would bring a firearm to my house and I would sign it in, and then I arrange the shipping through UPS and vice versa. When it comes back, UPS, through a federal dealer, would send it back to me and the client would come back here and pick it up, but you would have to sign the paperwork and do a background check every time. It is the same at the location in Montana as well.

Mr. Sullivan asked when you say background check, is that a standard NICS background check? Mr. Violette responded if it was a handgun, which is not typical necessarily, it is the State of New Hampshire, and if it is a long gun, it is NICS or FBI. Absolutely.

Mr. Fairman stated I have a comment and questions. This one sounds okay, but in general, I don't like the idea of a firearms dealer of any kind in a residential area. With this one I understand what he is doing, I think it is okay, but let me ask a question. The first, I assume from what you said these are always hunting rifles, no automatic weapons included. I will let you answer that question, and then my second comment is that I would like to have a condition on the approval that the Police Department approve the storage of weapons onsite, do a 1-time inspection and approval of the storage. Mr. Violette responded I have never purchased automatic weapons or sold any and I have no desire to do that, but, you did make the comment or observation that they are hunting rifles. Mostly that is the case, but like I had mentioned, I have sold new through a wholesaler. Someone asked me and a guy purchased a firearm through you, I would look into it, and they can compare, but I don't get great prices because I am not a high-volume dealer. I could sell another firearm other than a hunting rifle. Even when you see on TV all the media stuff, the AR 15's, it is all semi-automatic, nothing is automatic that I sell. Mr. Fairman asked but your transfers are not automatic, they are almost all hunting? Is that right? Mr. Violette replied transfer and sale in the context of the ATF are the same thing. Every time you purchase or transfer, they are called transfers, but in fact, I haven't figured that out, but the new firearms, the full total was 119 in 31 years, including new as well and including the ones that I have fixed to sell at a storefront dealership. I have no intent on selling from the house with a showroom and all of that stuff.

Chairman Levenstein asked Mr. Violette, have you seen the staff report? Mr. Violette replied no. Chairman Levenstein stated the staff wanted some things clarified about some of the activities that will be excluded. I believe it is their understanding that no manufacturing or commercial reloading of ammunition is to take place. Mr. Violette stated I did see that. I don't sell ammunition at all, and I don't reload at all at this point. I don't do that. Chairman Levenstein stated no live firing of firearms. Mr. Violette responded no. I know they have to say that, but that is pretty sad, but I would never do that. Chairman Levenstein stated no sales of reloaded ammunition. You said that already. Mr. Violette responded no. Chairman Levenstein stated they wanted to clarify that no welding equipment would be used. Mr. Violette responded I don't use welding equipment here. Chairman Levenstein stated and that no Cerakote finishing or bead/sandblasting would be done on the premises. Mr. Violette responded the only time I have done that is I bring it to a place called Wicked Weaponry in Hooksett and they do it remotely. It is a coating process, like a weatherproof coating. No, I don't do that here.

Chairman Levenstein asked if there are any members of the public online or on the phone that have questions or comments on this application.

Mark Barry stated I am Mr. Violette's backyard neighbor, and I am wondering with the 119 transfers in 30 years' pre-retirement, what are your objectives post-retirement? Mr. Violette responded post-retirement would be the same, maybe even less, because if I were to make it a business for retirement, I would get a storefront. I have no desire to do this residentially, have a showroom and bring firearms here to sell. I don't want to do that. I would even sign something

stating that, with some type of limitation, if you want to do something like that. I have no intent in doing that.

Jane Barry stated you said that these transfers you make to the hunting people in Montana that that is all background checked. Mr. Violette responded everything. Ms. Barry asked when you buy something wholesale and then resell it, is there also a background check? Mr. Violette responded everything I do, every transfer I make is always background checked. That is legal, I have to by law, and I do that.

John Hartnett, 14 Chandler Road, stated I live directly across the street. Our only concern had to do with traffic, if there were going to be a lot of cars coming around. That has been answered, so that is great. Thank you. Mr. Violette stated thank you.

Chairman Levenstein asked have we received any correspondence on this application? Ms. Hebert replied we have not received any emails tonight regarding this application.

Mr. McMahon stated I just wanted to say this is a well-constructed request. It is a long-established business that he is in, and it is very well regulated by the ATF. I don't know if there is a jurisdictional conflict of something at a lower level is requested to do monitoring or inspections.

MOTION by Ms. Malcolm that the Planning Board grant final approval of the Home Occupation Permit to allow Gerald Violette to work as a gunsmith and non-stocking firearms dealer at his home at 15 Chandler Road, Map 14-2-1, in accordance with the application information provided by the Applicant, with the following conditions:

- 1. The hours of operation shall be 1 hour per day, by appointment only, as stated in the application;**
- 2. A Certificate of Compliance shall be applied for and issued by the Building Inspector prior to commencing with the home occupation;**
- 3. The Applicant shall obtain all necessary licenses and approvals from the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF) and other agencies with jurisdiction over the proposed home occupation; and**
- 4. The following activities shall be excluded from the Home Occupation:**
 - a. No manufacturing or commercial reloading of ammunition;**
 - b. No live firing of firearms;**
 - c. No sales of reloaded ammunition; and**
 - d. No welding equipment, Cerakote finishing or bead/sandblasting shall be used on the premises.**

Councilor Duschatko duly seconded the motion. On a unanimous roll call vote, the motion carried.

- 2. Donald Ware c/o Pennichuck Water Works (Owner & Applicant) – Request to amend a condition of subdivision approval granted by the Planning Board on July 20, 1992, located at 85 Hawk Drive, Lot 8-16-66, Zoned R&A.**

Trevor Yandow of Meridian Land Services was present to address this application for a subdivision request. Also present was Donald Ware of Pennichuck Water Works.

Mr. Yandow stated this lot is at 85 Hawk Drive, it is 4.3 acres with about 380 feet of frontage. The proposal seeks to remove the restrictions imposed by the approval in 1992 regarding the two wells on the lot. The approval restricted the residential use and this proposal seeks to remove that restriction so that the lot can revert back to a residential building lot. The southwestern corner of the parcel has existing water infrastructure for Pennichuck Water Works for all of the water mains that now service the development. The wells are essentially redundant at this point and they are not being utilized to provide potable water to the development. Pennichuck Water Works would like to decommission the wells and extinguish the restrictions imposed by the easements and the lot can be used for residential purposes.

Mr. Yandow continued we have shown a potential driveway location at the northern corner of the parcel as indicated on the plan. That is the location that logically makes the most sense because there is that larger area of jurisdictional wetland that bisects the parcel from east to west and there is more than adequate buildable area and obviously permissible for an onsite septic. The lot would be serviced by Pennichuck Water Works from the water mains in Hawk Drive, onsite septic and I believe there is underground cable and electric, which are kind of hard to see on the plan, but it is actually just north of where that potential driveway is shown on the plan as indicated.

Mr. Yandow stated obviously there will be a proposed easement around the existing water tank and the building and the paved drive that was there. We are seeking a waiver to allow two driveways for this lot because having one wouldn't make too much sense and the topography and the onsite wetlands kind of prohibit any kind of shared access. It would be cumbersome for both Pennichuck Water Works and whoever ends up building on this piece of property. That is kind of it in a nutshell. I can open it up for any questions that the Planning Board might have, and I will do my best to answer them.

Chairman Levenstein asked Mr. Yandow, when you decommission the well, what do you do? Just bury it? Mr. Yandow responded they can be filled with concrete. I think Mr. Ware can speak a little more to that, but my understanding is that they would be plugged somehow with concrete or I am assuming there are other alternatives. Mr. Ware stated first of all, the well pump gets pulled, the power gets disconnected and then it is filled with a fillable grout and sealed below ground. Chairman Levenstein asked does anything remain above ground or everything is just below? Mr. Ware replied it depends upon what you ask for. You can leave it as they are with the well casings sticking typically 2 to 3 feet out of the ground and cap that, or you can excavate down a foot or two, cut the pipe and cap it in that fashion as well.

Chairman Levenstein asked the Planning Board members for any comments or questions on this application for a subdivision.

Mr. Newberry stated it looks like there are several structures on the one piece. Are those going to be removed or maintained or abandoned or what is the intent on those? Mr. Yandow asked the structures within the easement at the southwest corner of the parcel? Mr. Newberry replied yes. I am seeing a tank and a building. Mr. Yandow replied those would remain. Mr. Newberry asked

will they be maintained? Mr. Yandow replied yes. Mr. Newberry asked not abandoned? Mr. Yandow replied not at all, no. Chairman Levenstein stated that is part of the infrastructure. Mr. Newberry asked those structures are still functional then? Mr. Yandow replied yes. They are part of the water main distribution system that is currently serving the development. Mr. Newberry asked so it is only the wells themselves that are being decommissioned? Mr. Yandow replied that is correct.

Mr. Clough asked they are decommissioning all of the wells and why are they doing this? Mr. Yandow responded the wells originally served most of the Powder Hill subdivision, or at least a portion of it, but since that time, Pennichuck Water Works has put in new water mains to service the development. They are essentially redundant and they are not being used anymore, so they want to decommission them and that is the whole purpose. Mr. Clough stated most people prefer to be on a well. Why would they decommission the whole thing? Chairman Levenstein stated I can answer that. When they built Riddle Brook school, they were going to hook it into the Powder Hill system, but when they tried to hook it into the Powder Hill system, they couldn't get enough pressure for the fire suppression stuff. What Pennichuck Water Works ended up doing was hooking us up into Manchester Water, so the water comes from Lake Massabesic that we have in Powder Hill. Mr. Ware stated just a little clarification on that actually. At the time the Riddle Brook school was built, they tried to drill individual wells and were unable to get the capacity that was required. At that time the wells serving Powder Hill and Dunlap Woods were struggling to keep up with, in particular, the summer demands. We partnered with the Bedford SAU and jointly extended water from Manchester out to that area and that became the main source of supply. The water is pumped into the tank that is onsite and then either flows out by gravity to the lower reaches of the subdivision or is pumped up to the higher reaches of the subdivision. At that time those wells were shut down, they are not a viable supply, and as they are abandoned, the DES would require them to be decommissioned at this stage. Mr. Clough replied okay; thank you.

Neeraj Agarwal, 88 Hawk Drive, stated I live right across the street. There would be one parcel that could potentially be sold to be built on? Mr. Yandow responded that is correct. Ms. Agarwal asked and then the remainder would be the wetlands in the center as well as where the current tank is would remain as it is now? Mr. Yandow responded that is correct. Ms. Agarwal stated thank you.

Deborah and Peter Troy, 77 Hawk Drive, stated we just moved here last year and one of the reasons why we purchased this home was because of the covenants that protects our home and all of the other homes in the neighborhood. The covenants protect the integrity and the values of all of the homes, and another reason for our purchase was the peacefulness here. We wanted to protect the beauty of the trees, the wetlands and the habitat for all the wildlife that live on Lot 8-16-66. Clearly from the road there are many wetlands on Lot 8-16-66. On our property, which is adjacent, we have many wetlands here and we frequently see wildlife here that use those wetlands. The declarations of the covenants for this neighborhood specifically has a section on preservation of the nature environment and not to disturb the ecology. I want no amendments made to the covenants. Mr. Troy stated the developers designed these neighborhood covenants in a specific way and it was not designed for subdividing or additional buildings and that is why we did it. The covenants were made to protect all homeowners in the neighborhood from situations just like this. I would vote no to the amendment of these covenants. Chairman Levenstein responded as far as

covenants, the Town doesn't enforce the covenants, that is something between the homeowners of the homeowners' association, if it even exists over there now. Mr. Troy stated we just moved here a year ago and we had to sign the covenants and they said that they were enforced, and in there they said that they cannot subdivide any lots in this neighborhood out there. Chairman Levenstein stated the lot is an existing lot, so it is not being subdivided. Mr. Troy asked that is only one lot today? Correct? Chairman Levenstein responded it is one lot and it can only be one lot. They are just asking for the restriction as far as building something on the lot, building a house. Mr. Troy responded no, they are going to divide that into two lots because they have to maintain the water company on one lot, they are not selling the water company lot. Is that right? Chairman Levenstein responded no. They are giving the water company an easement on their lot; it will be one lot. Mr. Troy asked how many houses can they put on that lot? Chairman Levenstein replied one lot, one house. Mr. Troy asked so the people that buy that lot will be leasing the land back to the water company or how does that work? Chairman Levenstein responded there wouldn't be a lease, it would be an easement that the water company would have a right to use that property or that portion of the property.

Mr. Troy stated because I know that is assessed pretty high property tax-wise on that lot and I am wondering how they were going to divide all of that out. Chairman Levenstein responded I think that is for the Assessor to decide. It will be the person who owns the lot that will pay the taxes. Mrs. Troy asked on \$9 million? Chairman Levenstein responded I assume it will be reassessed but I don't know. That is up to the Assessor.

Mr. Troy asked do they already have a purchaser for the lot? Chairman Levenstein replied I don't know. Mr. Yandow replied no, we do not have a purchaser. As far as the assessment, the \$9 million is on all of the plant and equipment that Pennichuck Water Works has in Bedford, so all of the pipes underneath the street and Hawk Drive and Chisolm and down in Dunlap Woods and all over the place. That is not the value of what is on that lot, and we have very similar situations in other communities, and, of course, the property taxes assessed on the property, we with the easement, through agreement, pay the associated property taxes with the portion of land and the value of the building and tank and plant and equipment within the building. Mr. Troy asked so if they put it on this lot, since it is already there, would they have to abide by the covenants in that lot? Chairman Levenstein responded everybody in the subdivision who bought when the covenants were in effect have to abide by the covenants, but the Planning Board doesn't enforce those. Those are private rights that would be enforced in court by the homeowners and other members of the association and homeowners in the development.

Chairman Levenstein asked if there were any more members of the public present online, by phone or by email that would like to inquire about this application. Ms. Hebert stated there are no new communications on this application.

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

Mr. Clough stated I have a comment. I don't see how granting the waiver is going to affect the wetlands or the environment. I don't see a connection there.

MOTION by Mr. Newberry that the Planning Board grant the waiver from the Town of Bedford Land Development Control Regulations for Appendix A: Bedford Road Construction Standards – Figure 4: Typical Driveway Details – Note 6, according to the notes in the staff report dated today. Ms. Malcolm duly seconded the motion. On a unanimous roll call vote, the motion carried.

MOTION by Mr. Newberry that the Planning Board move to approve the request to remove the restriction on residential use limiting the use of lot 8-16-66 to water supply uses only, in accordance with the plan prepared by Meridian Land Services, Inc., last revised March 22, 2021, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. The Planning Director and Public Works Director shall determine that the Applicant has addressed all technical review comments to the Town's satisfaction.**
- 2. All recording fees shall be submitted to the Planning Department at the time of recording.**
- 3. If the requested waiver is approved by the Planning Board, the plan shall be revised to note the waiver and the date of approval**
- 4. A note shall be placed on the plan stating that prior to the issuance of a building permit for a residential use, the owner shall apply for and receive approval of a driveway permit from the Department of Public Works.**
- 5. The Fair Share Roadway Contribution, in an amount to be determined by the Town's consulting engineer, shall be paid to the Planning Department.**
- 6. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, school and recreation impact fees shall be paid.**
- 7. All requisite easement documents shall be executed by the Applicant and submitted to the Planning Department to be recorded simultaneously with the plan, including:**
 - a. A proposed water system easement across lot 8-16-66 to be retained by Pennichuck Water Works, Inc. for the existing water system and storage tank; and**
 - b. Release of the existing protective well radius easements on lots 8-16-68, 8-16-71, 8-16-72, 8-16-73 and 8-16-65.**

Chairman Levenstein stated I have a question about the fair share contribution. Wouldn't they have had to pay that when it was originally subdivided? Ms. Hebert responded no they did not, and we looked at it as a change of use.

Ms. Malcolm duly seconded the motion. On a unanimous roll call vote, the motion carried.

3. Public Hearing for proposed amendments to the Planning Board Rules of Procedure.

Ms. Harris stated this public hearing was scheduled at the last Planning Board meeting to consider some amendments to the Rules of Procedure, and this was in response to some recent changes on

the Planning Board with the removal of the Town Manager and Public Works Director. Updates are proposed to Section 3.1 – Membership; Term of Office and Sections 6.5 and 6.4 (C) – Quorum. Amendments are also proposed to Section 5.2 (C) – Employees and Section 7.6 – Public Notice removing the requirement to advertise in the newspaper. Noticing will continue in two public places and on the Town website and the final notice on the Town website. We have proposed that we will send a final notice to the newspaper just to advertise the change to those noticing procedures. Lastly, amendments proposed to Section 6.1 – Regular Meeting Schedule, and this would be to include a virtual meeting option. Staff recommends adopting the proposed amendments as presented and listed below.

- Section 3.1 - Membership; Term of Office
- Section 5.2 (C) – Employees
- Section 6.1 -Regular Meeting Schedule
- Section 6.4 (C, D) - Change of Meeting Schedule
- Section 6.5 – Quorum
- Section 7.6 - Public Notice
- Page 14 - BEDFORD PLANNING BOARD ADOPTON OF RULES OF PROCEDURE

MOTION by Mr. Newberry to open the public hearing for the proposed amendments to the Planning Board Rules of Procedure. Councilor Duschatko duly seconded the motion. On a unanimous roll call vote, the motion carried.

Chairman Levenstein asked for any comments or questions from members of the public online, by phone or by email. There were none.

MOTION by Mr. Newberry to close the public hearing for proposed amendments to the Planning Board Rules of Procedure. Councilor Duschatko duly seconded the motion. On a unanimous roll call vote, the motion carried.

MOTION by Ms. Malcolm that the Planning Board adopt the proposed amendments to Sections 3.1, 5.2(C), 6.1, 6.4 (C & D), 6.5, 7.6, and Page 14 of the Rules of Procedure as presented. Councilor Duschatko duly seconded the motion. On a unanimous roll call vote, the motion carried.

4. Discussion of draft 2020 Master Plan edits.

Ms. Hebert stated in your Planning Board packet this month I shared with you a collection of edits that the Master Plan’s working group is recommending be made to the Master Plan. The working group met several times between the months of October and March to review the text, talk about the document and make final recommendations for edits to the Master Plan. These were primarily based on the discussion that the Board had at the September Workshop when you asked and discussed the Master Plan more broadly. This is really the last chance the Planning Board has to make significant edits to the plan working with the consultant, it is part of our contract to have this last round of edits made to the plan, not that we couldn’t make smaller, more minor, tweaks moving forward, this is the last significant round of edits. I wanted to just highlight some of the major

changes that have been discussed, and I hope you have all had a chance to glance at the plan. It is lengthy, so I am not going to go page by page right now on Zoom, but I do want to highlight some of the major changes.

Ms. Hebert continued the document had a section entitled ‘Big Ideas for Bedford.’ This was a lengthy section in the Master Plan that had big ideas and with those big ideas there were objective statements and text associated with each of the objective statements and then a list of action items followed by the objective statements, and these big ideas were a lot of ideas that Bedford has been following for years, there weren’t a lot of groundbreaking ideas that came out of the Master Plan, there were a lot of wonderful steps and policies to think about and to push forward as we work through the implementation of the action items. At the Planning Board Workshop there was some discussion about the title ‘Big Ideas’ being not suited for the document, and the working group is suggesting that this section be renamed ‘Next Steps for Tomorrow’s Bedford,’ and that a new section be added ahead of the Bedford historical section entitled ‘Bedford Yesterday.’ The document’s existing conditions section was already titled ‘Bedford Today,’ so the working group is suggesting kind of a rebranding of these sections so that it would be ‘Bedford Yesterday,’ ‘Bedford Today’ and ‘Next Steps for Tomorrow’s Bedford.’ That is one of the biggest changes in the plan, kind of rebranding the flow between those three major sections.

Ms. Hebert stated the other significant change is that ‘Next Steps for Tomorrow’s Bedford,’ which was formally the ‘Big Ideas for Bedford,’ has been significantly consolidated so that there is one narrative section for each major guiding principle and the objective statements are listed in that section with the action items following. Rather than having all the narrative sections associated with the objective statements, there is just one major text section associated with each guiding principle.

Ms. Hebert stated the group is also recommending that the implementation matrix, because it simply summarizes the action items, be incorporated into an appendix to shorten the document. That was one of the things we heard at the September meeting that the Board would like to see the document shortened, so some of the edits are being suggested to do that to make the document more concise and reader friendly.

Ms. Hebert stated the demographic and statistical data will be updated throughout the document. There are references to the Corona Virus pandemic that have been incorporated into the plan, and the working group has reread the plan and incorporated numerous wordsmithing revisions to final language and approved the tone of the text. Extraneous pages and information have been eliminated to reduce the overall length of the document and to further consolidate information. The working group is making some minor changes to the graphic layout, photographs and info graphics to improve the appearance and layout of the document. They are also suggesting that any maps be formatted to be 11” x 17” rather than split down the middle. Right now the maps that are full spread covering two pages have a seam down the middle, so having those be formatted to be 11” x 17” without a seam down the middle to improve readability, and all the info graphics and photographs have been reviewed and sources have been updated or included as needed.

Ms. Hebert stated that is a summary of what I see are the most significant changes. Councilor Duschatko, Mr. McMahan and Councilor Murphy were the work group members and I don’t know

if they want to add anything to the proposed edits. Councilor Duschatko asked which part? Ms. Hebert responded did I miss anything. Councilor Duschatko stated no; I think you covered the entire background very well. I have noticed a few edits we agreed on that I think got overlooked, but I am not sure we want to spend the time of the Board on that tonight. They are not significant. Ms. Hebert stated you can send me an email with those. If there was one I missed or something that didn't get captured, we can talk about it later. Councilor Duschatko stated it was nothing significant, it was, just in my mind, reducing some of the verbiage in a couple of places.

Chairman Levenstein asked are there any comments or questions from the Board.

Mr. McMahon stated I think she did a great job reviewing exactly what happened, and I would like to thank Ms. Hebert and Mark Connors for all of the work they went through and for their infinite patience with us. Councilor Duschatko stated I certainly second that. Ms. Hebert stated I have to thank Mr. McMahon, Councilor Duschatko and Councilor Murphy though. They have met 11 times since October. It has been a significant job and we have had some great discussion about the plan and really gone through everything with careful consideration and discussion.

Chairman Levenstein asked what is the next step? Ms. Hebert responded we will get these changes made. I would like to ask for some flexibility from the Board. I have reached out to TPUDC and our consultant, Bryant Wright, and we still have work that they need to do to finalize the plan based on our scope of work. They are also up to their ears because it has been some time since we have last worked with them with other plans and documents. If their scheduling doesn't line up with our scheduling, I am suggesting that we reach out to a local graphic designer to see about having these final changes implemented if it is comparable cost to our contract with TPUDC. I have reviewed this with TPUDC and they are fine with sharing the final documents and finals with another consultant if we find that we can have these changes implemented on a faster timeline using a local graphic designer. If the Board doesn't object to that, I think that may be an option for us to implement the changes and bring this project to conclusion on a faster timeline than we may have if we stick with TPUDC because their graphic design resources are limited and they are sharing that resource with other plans that they are working on. Ms. Malcolm stated it sounds like a good idea to me. Chairman Levenstein asked the Planning Board for their input on this request. There were no other comments. Chairman Levenstein stated it sounds like you have the okay from the Board.

Ms. Hebert stated the next step for the Planning Board moving forward is that once these changes are incorporated into a final document, to review the plan one more time, discuss it and then set it for a public hearing. The public hearing would be to adopt the Master Plan, but also to take additional public comment and public feedback and we would be able to obviously make minor changes as a result of any comments the Board may receive. Ms. Malcolm asked do you have a rough idea of when this final public approval would be given? Ms. Hebert responded ideally in June would be my timeline. We will probably have the plan back to the Board in June; it really depends on how quickly the consultants can make the changes to the document. If they can do it in a couple of weeks, I will get it back to the Board as soon as possible.

Mr. Newberry stated I think that this document, with the modifications that have been made, is a good, slightly different approach. I think that has been part of the challenge along with Covid and

a few other things that have kind of made this a longer process than anybody expected or anticipated, but I do think that the work that the working group and that the staff has put into creating this document, taking out some of the material that I saw in the material that the staff circulated in preparation for this review, discussion, while a lot of it was interesting context, I think removing it has helped to bring the document down in size so that it is a little more approachable to the real meat of it.

V. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meetings:

MOTION by Mr. McMahon that the March 8, 2021 Planning Board minutes be approved as presented. Ms. Malcolm duly seconded the motion. On a roll call vote, the motion carried.

MOTION by Ms. Malcolm that the March 22, 2021 Planning Board minutes be approved as presented. Mr. Clough duly seconded the motion. On a roll call vote, the motion carried.

VI. Communications to the Board:

Ms. Hebert stated there are no new applications for your April, 26th meeting so that meeting will be cancelled. Your next meeting will be May 10, 2021. The second meeting in May will be a Planning Board Workshop. It will not be an opportunity for application review, it will be a workshop, and Ms. Harris and I will be working on some discussion items for the workshop. We decided this year to add a workshop in the spring in addition to your fall workshop so that we could get ahead of some of the zoning amendments and kind of Board member training/discussion items that we might want to cover.

Ms. Hebert stated because the April 26th meeting is cancelled, the May meeting is when the Board will have new board appointees from the Town Council attending, and it is also the meeting where the Planning Board talks about reorganizing and selecting Chairman, Vice Chairman and Secretary positions along with appointments to the Historic District Commission and Conservation Commission.

Ms. Hebert stated sadly this is Jon Levenstein's final Planning Board meeting. I want to thank Jon for all of his time and service to the Town of Bedford. He has been a Board member for 18 years, serving on the Planning Board since 2003, and serving as either Chairman or Vice Chairman since 2007. Thank you so much. Ms. Malcolm stated we are going to miss you. Mr. Fairman stated I would like the Board members to watch for an invite to go out and have a drink with Jon in late April or early May when the weather gets a little better, where perhaps we could go to some place and sit outside. I also want to thank Jon for his long time on the Board and his leadership, for me particularly, as in watching him I have learned a lot over that time. Thank you, Jon.

Chairman Levenstein stated now I can tell my story about how I got to do this for all of this time. I was living in Los Angeles, CA and my wife and I, we are both from New York, decided that we didn't want to raise our kids out there and we really wanted to get out of the rat race, so we decided

we would move to a small town. Being a type A person that I am, I went to Barnes and Noble and found a book and the book title was pretty much so you want to move to a small town, and it was written by somebody, who after fires and earthquakes and everything else, moved to a place in Oregon, like a large number of people did at that point from LA, and it has all sorts of suggestions about moving to a small town. The only thing I remember about it is one of the suggestions was if you live in a small town, you have the opportunity to become involved and that you really should get involved because it is not like living in a place like Los Angeles or New York, wherever else I had lived, where you were just a number. I was here and in the Bedford Bulletin that used to actually get delivered in the mail instead of thrown on your lawn, they had the ads, and there was an ad, I had been there maybe three months, and it said that the Town was looking for people to serve on a Town board, and they had a bunch of them. I put my name in and got a call back a couple of weeks later that they wanted to know if I wanted to serve on the Conservation Commission and the Historic District Commission. So I started six months after I moved here and we have been here for 26 years and I have been on boards continuously since then, and they are right, it is rewarding. I know I will miss it, but it is time for new people. I am sure I will see all of you and we are all going to have a drink. Mr. Newberry stated I am glad you chose Bedford and all that you have contributed to the Town. Chairman Levenstein stated Hal is the only one on the Board that has been on longer than I have been. Mr. Clough stated thank you, Jon.

VII. Reports of Committees: None

VIII. Adjournment:

MOTION by Mr. Newberry to adjourn at 8:07pm. Mr. McMahon duly seconded the motion. On a unanimous roll call vote, the motion carried.

Respectfully submitted by
Valerie J. Emmons