

Town of Bedford Planning Board Minutes August 14, 2023

A meeting of the Bedford Planning Board was held on Monday, August 14, 2023, at the Bedford Meeting Room, 10 Meeting House Road, Bedford, NH. Present were Charlie Fairman (Chair), Hal Newberry (Vice Chair), Chris Swiniarski (Alternate), Matt Sullivan (Member), Logan Johnson (Alternate), Phil Greazzo (Town Council), Priscilla Malcolm (Member), John Nelson (Alternate), Matt Nichols, (Secretary), Becky Hebert (Planning Director). Absent: Steve Clough (Member), Michael Strand (Town Council Alternate).

I. Call to Order and Roll Call:

Chair Charlie Fairman called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. introduced the Board members and appointed Mr. Swiniarski and Ms. Johnson to vote this evening. Ms. Hebert reviewed the agenda and stated the new application to be heard tonight has been reviewed by staff and it's our determination that the application is complete. The abutters have been notified and the application does not pose a regional impact. I would recommend that the Board accept the agenda and the new application as complete.

PUBLIC NOTICE: The following application has been postponed to the September 11 meeting:

Hakan & Medine Onan (Applicants & Owners) and Bedford Bluffs, Inc. (Owner) – Request for approval of a residential subdivision of one lot into two and a lot line adjustment and consolidation between two properties, located at 7 Hamilton Way and 57 Nashua Road, Lots 27-17-1 and 27-19, Zoned R&A.

II. Old Business & Continued Hearings: None

III. New Business:

- 1. U-Haul Company of New Hampshire (Applicant) and Amerco Real Estate Company (Owner)** – Request for site plan amendment for removal of 5 mini-storage and warehouse buildings and construction of a 17,012 sq. ft. mini-warehouse facility, located at 451 South River Road, Lot 36-6-1, Zoned PZ. *(Postponed from the July 17, 2023 meeting)*

IV. Concept Proposals and Other Business:

- 1. John & Robyn McGilvary (Owners) and Corestates Group c/o Stonefield Engineering & Design (Applicant)** – Request for review of a conceptual plan for a proposed bank (Chase Bank) with associated parking and drive-thru service, located at 67-69 South River Road, Lot 46-48 & 49, Zoned PZ.

V. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meetings (July 17, 2023 meeting)

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

II. Old Business & Continued Hearings: None

III. New Business:

Chair Fairman invited the applicant to present.

1. **U-Haul Company of New Hampshire (Applicant) and Amerco Real Estate Company (Owner)** – Request for site plan amendment for removal of 5 mini-storage and warehouse buildings and construction of a 17,012 sq. ft. mini-warehouse facility, located at 451 South River Road, Lot 36-6-1, Zoned PZ. (Postponed from the July 17, 2023 meeting).

Mr. Ian McGregor and Mr. Brian Picanco presented the application: My name is Ian McGregor. I'm a project engineer for North Point Engineering. And I am Brian Picanco. I work for you on U-Haul. I'm the U-Haul President for New Hampshire.

Mr. McGregor said members of the Board, staff, thank you for having us here tonight. I'd like to start just by a brief overview of the U-Haul ownership of the parcel. In 2017, U-Haul acquired the subject site and worked diligently with the city and the Planning Board to establish the current site plan as you see it today. And then the site plan before you tonight involves the removal of two warehouse structures, the relocation of four self-storage units from the front of the site to the rear of the site, conversion of an existing single-story warehouse structure to a two-story, climate-controlled facility that's an expansion of a current use within the existing building as well as construction of a new single-story, open plan mini warehouse storage facility as well as associated sanitary, sewer, municipal, water and storm sewer improvements to the site. The expanded climate-controlled storage facility will incorporate loading areas for customers to drop off or pick up their belongings and will incorporate exterior improvements to the facade of the building as well. The new mini warehouse facility will store U boxes. These are large containers that are delivered to or picked up by customers of U-Haul packed on location by the customers with their belongings and then delivered back to the site or picked up and delivered to the site by U-Haul. Those boxes will then be moved into the facility, the new warehouse structure, through use of the loading dock that will be constructed with the new building.

Architectural renderings for both of the proposed improvements were available with the application. Also part of this application are several waivers. The waivers pertain to stormwater and drainage calculations. We've been working with Brian Desfosses, the new city engineer, to ensure that we're meeting the existing permit and regulations to go along with the site as approved in 2010. Expansion of an existing use, that's the self-storage and the mini warehouse that's not permitted within the performance zone. Encroaching into the 60-foot setback to a front setback of only 45 feet. We're also looking for a waiver from the requirement of a stamped architectural landscape plan for the stamp from a landscape architect within the plan set. As well as relief from the landscape screening requirements for loading and receiving areas, as well as the 5 percent internal parking green space. We're looking for conditional approval tonight. We reviewed the staff comments and of the 13 conditions that staff had put on to the approval that they recommend, we have no significant comments besides comment number nine: the masonry base for the proposed new building. We were looking for just a little bit more explanation as to what you're looking for, what that would be like, but that's something that Brian has no problem working with his architecture team and U-Haul to be able to finalize and get approval from the Town as well as the Planning Board. Brian, if you want to talk about kind of the process you went through with the initial approval and day-to-day operations at U-Haul.

Mr. Picanco said so, obviously, the property on 451 South River Road is a very unique property the way everything wraps around. And when we first approached this 2017, it was a long, ongoing process. One of things we take pride in is we tried to clean up the site immediately from the lumberyard or the junkyard I like to call it the way it looked like. We spend months and months, day after day, to try to keep that property maintained consistently so it looks good for the Town and for the community. That being said, obviously, population keeps growing. People keep moving. We need to increase our services for the community and what we have now. Looking at how we are now, as a business owner, and what we do, we're at a point now where we have outgrown the facility a little bit and we're looking for the future and what's going on. And we consistently are looking at improvements and how we can we do better. And we looked at a lot of the criteria and meeting with the Town what they asked for and a lot of them were common sense, hey let's get this done. Let's look to improve and to grow.

What we do in a daily operation now, you don't see much of any craziness, right? It's a lot of inside the warehouse taking care of business, making sure customers are satisfied. Customers are telling us they need more. Community is telling us, hey, we need a little bit more here. We've outgrown this place. That being said, that's what we're looking to do today is expand our business in the property we're at now while maintaining what we have and beautifying the whole area. I look at it as kind of a gateway to the Town of Bedford. So I definitely like the way we presented it and we're looking at the building and I don't mind if you want me to go into that. But looking at the building, looking at everything, we tried to mimic the building what we had there already. So we had the metal façade: try to mimic the metal facade, try to keep it simple. Nothing too crazy. Just keep it exactly the way it is where it is on the property.

Mr. McGregor said with that, thanks, and we'll be happy to answer any questions the Planning Board has.

Chair Fairman said would you want to go through and show us?

Mr. McGregor said oh yeah, yeah. So, to orient yourself, this is 293, I believe, and then 93 or is that Everett Turnpike down there? So as we can see, we're on the south end of Bedford. The existing conditions: we have a large building that contains both a single-story warehouse structure here as well as office space in the front and a customer facing operation. The rest of the building is dedicated to climate-controlled self-storage and then several open lean-to or shed-style coverings that are anywhere from 20 to 40 feet tall. Then the smaller buildings over here are the self-storage buildings that are to be relocated to the back of the property.

In this we have the demolition. This shows the outline of the pavement that is to be removed, the two buildings that are going to be removed and not relocated on site, as well as the four existing self-storage facilities that are going to be moved to the rear of the site. And here we have the full site plan. You can see this portion of the existing open floor plan warehouse will be partitioned off. The front of the warehouse will be converted into the two-story, climate-controlled self-storage portion that will be connected into the existing self-storage use within the building. The new mini warehouse building, as well as the loading dock that's associated with that, down here. And then we are able to eliminate roughly 2,000 square feet of pavement in building this facility as well. And then in the rear of the property, you can see the four self-storage units that are going to be reconfigured a bit as well, in the back.

Then Sheet 5 is just a zoomed-in display of what that would look like. If you're curious, I can open up the renderings as well if that's something that we want to look at and talk about. That's the narrative, elevations. So let's see. Let me blow these up. Here's a view from South River Road looking north. We have the existing self-storage building that's going to remain and then the south facade of the structure.

It's all metal cladding and then architectural windows as well, and then some more colorful elements to break up the large plane of some of the wider planes that are there. And this is a view from the freeway looking down on it. So if you're at an elevated view, you can see the existing view or where it's taken from. So looking down, if you're on your way to the airport from the north, this would be out your left-hand window. And then this is from South River Road looking south at the northern elevation, showing some of those windows to denote the commercial aspect of the corridor itself. This would be displaying the existing building that's going to be converted into the self-storage facility with the polar white and the forest green accents, as well as a wood paneling on the bay doors, and some details about the color choices and facade choices for the structure. Is there anything you want me to mention specifically? Mr. Picanco said no. That's pretty much it.

asked on the site plan, can you show us which border of the property where you're requesting the setback adjustment? Mr. McGregor said sure. That would be in sheet four. The required setback is 60 feet for any building that's 30 feet or taller, and we're looking to encroach 15 feet onto that. So it would only be a 45-foot setback.

Ms. Johnson asked is there a reason you couldn't go 60 feet? Mr. McGregor replied yes. For the semi-trucks that are pulling in and having movement in that loading dock area. That was as far up, with the building, that we were comfortable having semi-trucks make that turning motion.

Ms. Malcolm said you mentioned that you were eliminating some pavement behind this building. Are you going to do any landscaping where you're eliminating that pavement? Mr. McGregor said yes. The plan right now is to just expand to the mowed grass area. There's no additional trees or shrubs that we're looking to put into that area.

Vice Chair Newberry asked can you go over what's going on the east side there where you're relocating some storage units? Mr. McGregor replied so as Brian mentioned, this area or the self-storage facility is something that is constantly in demand and you're looking to just maintain those facilities on site. So it's a relocation of the existing structures just to this back area. So, in terms of what you see that's out there currently is what there would be moved. And I believe you work fairly extensively with the city to make sure that those structures were in compliance and approved through the city.

Mr. Picanco said yeah, it's still the one of the only facilities that we've built that does not have our colors for our company or anything like that, in the country. And that's one of the things we've done in this many times we've said no, we're not going to do it and we've walked away and it's literally one of the only... we purchased some that have opposing colors or whatnot that we don't use, but we're still going to keep that all the same, keeping it unified. It looks really good. It looks clean.

Vice Chair Newberry asked so is there grading going on back there and pavement or existing pavement there? Mr. McGregor said no, correct. Mr. Picanco said these sit right on the pavement.

Chair Fairman said I am a little concerned about where all your trucks going to end up. You have a lot of trucks in that back area now. Secondly, just to make a comment: last time you came to us for approval for the site we had a lot of discussion about appearance and colors and so on. I just want to compliment you. I thought that I think overall the site looks really quite nice, the appearance of it. It came out pretty well with the color schemes that we ended up with. Thank you. Good job. I'd want you to continue to keep it looking that good. It's hard without landscaping for a site to look pleasing, but this one looks pretty good. There are an awful lot of trucks there, though. So where are you going to put them?

Mr. Picanco replied so if you look at that map right here, these three buildings are no areas where we shunt our trucks. So these are unused area right now. So when you come around the bend, it's literally an open area that the only reason why we kept that open: one, we couldn't do anything on that side when we did everything with the original approval. And two, we had the loading dock there for our warehouse. So what we do is we utilize unused space right now that we'd eliminate because we built another warehouse and where we have our shunting lane is actually going to be where this box is which says shunting area. That's pretty much, we shut our trucks there and we shunt our trucks in the front unless we're moving them for snow or whatnot, like a car dealership or whatnot.

Ms. Hebert said if you open the staff report, I think there's an aerial photo that might show kind of where these are operating... bottom file. Go to the end of that. There you go. I think that shows a nice picture.

Chair Fairman asked are there any other questions, comments from the Board?

Vice Chair Newberry said the staff memo mentioned you're changing the curb cut flow and the traffic flow. Could you just review your traffic flow through the site and on and off of the side street there?

Mr. Picanco replied yes. Currently right now when you come in—Summerville Drive—you would come in. This is a two-way road right here. What we decided to do with everything going on in the warehouse going here is we're going to obviously sign up one-way area—one way in. And when we originally purchased the facility and the parcel, there was no second entrance. We added a second entrance to the parcel, which is here, originally. So what we're going to utilize is make this a one-way in. And then you go one way out. I can't control anybody's minds, but we're going to sign it up to get people to do that. There's not enough room. If we're going to move this building here and what we have designed here, there is not enough room for the two trucks to come in side by side. So one of things we decided was in order to simplify things is we're going to make this one way. And it's going to be a one-way in signing up with some do not enters and all the customers, obviously with signage, should come out the other way. It's an easy flow. That was the reason why we added that second entrance was just a way easier flow.

Vice Chair Newberry asked so your tractor trailers are going to be exiting how?

Mr. Picanco replied right now, even now they come in, there's some that come in and we put signage on the building, directory signage to tell them where they go. They pull in here. Right now because in the back corner the ones that have been here already will sometimes turn here, but most of the majority come here already and they already go out this way. And then they come to the back of the building where a loading dock is. What's going to happen now is they're going to come here. Obviously, you see them driving back into here and then they are going to be able to pull out, exit out. So we tried to literally, when we looked at every way possible, not too [inaudible] many other ways we looked at it, we tried to simplify this as much way, like the easiest way for tractor trailers to come in. Now that we've owned the property, we've been there for a couple of years, we've utilized and learned how to use the property to its max without affecting customers, without affecting people, or anything. And that's one of the reasons why that building fits right there in that corner, and we need that setback was because it literally gets the tractor trailer in and gets them right out.

Vice Chair Newberry said so it looks like they almost have to go in the north alleyway there to make the swing now? Mr. Picanco replied to come this way, yes. Vice Chair Newberry continued if they come through the parking field to the south there, are they going to be able to make the swing? Mr. Picanco said no, they're going to struggle. That's why the loading dock was designed purposely to be right there

because for any tractor trailer that tries to come in here, it's not going to work. They're going to try to pull in here and come this way, they're going to have to come away all the way around the building and realign themselves to come here. Vice Chair Newberry said so you are going to have signage there to direct them? Mr. Picanco replied oh yeah, absolutely. Vice Chair Newberry said thank you. Mr. Picanco said and I'll be honest, we try to utilize signage so we—it's a labor-saving technique. I'm not going to pay someone to sit out there and direct tractor trailers, not that we get that money out of time to come in. We're going to utilize signs to our advantage.

Mr. Kellermann said you have portable storage units there I think you said, and those are all inside the warehouse? They're not outside on the site? Mr. Picanco replied there are some that'll be outside. If a customer wants to load on site and very far and few in between does it happen. But there is a majority, if I would put a number on it, about 98 percent, it's all inside. Mr. Kellerman said OK. So if a customer is loading, but after the customer is done, is that kept outside? Mr. Picanco replied nope. That goes right inside the warehouse. It's actually a company policy to bring it in. Mr. Kellerman said OK. And you guys wouldn't be opposed to a condition that sort of says they have to be inside? I mean for loading and unloading purposes, obviously, they could be, but what I've seen is that there are some other companies that basically turn those into a bunch of non-permitted signs. Mr. Picanco replied yeah, we've been here for four years. We haven't done that. So I don't see it's a problem, but we're not looking to put it as signage. We already maximized our signage on this building. Mr. Kellerman said so are you OK with the condition, though? Mr. Picanco replied I don't understand why the condition would be needed, unless you just want to put something in writing at that point. We're not abusing the nonsense now of... I get what you're saying. I've seen them. I know what they do. They put a wall up and looks like a big wall is coming through. Mr. Kellerman explained well, the reason for the condition could be its long-range looking, and no one is saying that you guys have done anything wrong. Mr. Picanco replied well, here's my thing. I hear you and hear is my thing. Are we doing that condition so that now I have, someone comes by and says, hey, you've had two out there for 48 hours. We're going to give you a warning. What are we doing the condition for? I've worked with towns, and I've seen this happen and it's literally someone drives... You guys see the building every day. I don't mind if that's what we need to find. But I'm just saying where are we drawing the line at this point?

Mr. Swiniarski said well, I think that's a valid point. There should be a line and probably two for 48 hours is not the right line. Mr. Picanco said where can I have—because I have a four-foot overhang that I can put stuff on. So are you going to direct me to where I can put this? Or you're going to say anywhere in this 13-acre property I can't have a box outside? Because if a customer decides to store—we have some outside storage—and if a customer decides to store their RV with a box, are you going to count that as my issue or you going to count that as the customer's issue.

Ms. Hebert said you don't have any outside storage other than the trucks shown on the plan. So we don't have any storage of the U boxes shown on the plan. Mr. Picanco said we don't store them outside [unintelligible]. What I'm saying is I don't want, all of a sudden it becomes say, I have one outside or two outside, and someone's going to come in and start—I don't know if you guys fine or what you guys do—I know. I've seen it when you try to put a number of days or something like that. I just don't understand why... I don't... we can put that as a concern. What do you want to put as an amendment on there that says hey, don't keep your box outside. I'm going to lose customers if I keep customers' stored boxes outside, period. And that's basically what I'm saying. It's not our game plan. I don't try to do it at all. There's a box outside—that's probably going to get, demolished, thrown out. Yeah, that does happen, but it's not a consistent thing or anything like that. Mr. Swiniarski said well, I think if it's not part of the plan and it's not consistent, it makes sense to have a condition because, like you said, the appearance of a lot of boxes

outside can be problematic. It just doesn't look good. You're not doing it now and that's great. The approval essentially lasts forever, more or less, until someone changes it. You may not be around in 20 years and then the next person may be doing something different. You just never know. I think it's an appropriate condition for all the reasons you said. You've seen these things in other towns where they literally become sort of a... Mr. Picanco said I'll give you every company. Mr. Swiniarski continued, yeah, well it's a block of a lot of signs, basically, and it just doesn't look good. Mr. Picanco replied yeah, our boxes don't have any signage on it. No one's do. And I have no problem. Put it on there. What I'm thinking in my head is if Charlie comes and gets a box and I put his box outside, he fills it up. I now bring Charlie's box inside within 24 hours and Harold comes in and he puts his box outside, how is whoever's going to manage this? It's not my plan. Obviously, I want to put the boxes in. But I just, looking at the future, in 10 to 20 years from now, someone says, hey, you can't have any outside. Well, you didn't know the difference if it's Charlie's or Harold's outside. Mr. Swiniarski said I think it could be articulated properly. That's all. Mr. Picanco said I'm fine with [unintelligible]. Mr. Swiniarski asked what does everyone else think? It's always been a concern that I've seen when I see these things. Obviously, no one would want to inhibit your normal business activities, and it's not to say a box cannot be outside for the purposes of filling it up and then bringing it to the warehouse. It becomes a matter of if there are now X number of boxes outside sitting there, that's, in my opinion, that's not what we're looking for. I don't know. The Board may think differently. I think it's appropriate to have some sort of limitation on that so that the expectation is clear going forward years from now.

Chair Fairman said Chris, before we get to our motion, would you be prepared with a statement, a condition, to add for what you would you like? Write out what you think your condition should be. Mr. Swiniarski said yeah, definitely. I guess I'd want some input from the applicants. Like what do you need, essentially? Mr. Picanco said it's hard because come summertime it's busier for us, right? Come wintertime, I'm not looking to keep anybody's stuff or boxes outside at all. And in summertime, I'm not looking to do that either. Normally most of the time, if anything, you probably if you see any, it's someone's moving in within the 48 hours maybe I had some team member that was working that day and he was able to put that box up, to set it up for a Sunday on a Friday. At that point, that's the only time I would ever have a box outside for a customer use. And then the minute it gets filled, we have a company policy that thing needs to get in the warehouse. Mr. Swiniarski asked so what do you think the maximum is—busiest time, number of boxes sitting outside at any given moment? Mr. Picanco replied four. Mr. Swiniarski said OK, so what have we made a condition no more than five boxes sitting outside at any time? Would that work? Mr. Picanco replied yeah, that's fine. The hardest part is who's going to—and I'm not trying to be... I'm not arguing, Chris. I'm cool with that. The hardest part is who's going to manage that? Because box AA1221B, in your eyes, doesn't mean anything. In my eyes, that's one customer box. AA2230B is another customer, but from the street you're going to see one box. Mr. Swiniarski asked so they call you and they basically say bring my box outside? Mr. Picanco replied some customers will. Some customers will say, hey—they have 24 hours—hey, I'm going to be renting a U-Haul truck tomorrow. I'm going to do a load/unload on site. Does it happen all the time? No. When it does happen, it does. Could it happen four, five, six at a time? Hey, on a busy end-of-the-month Saturday, it does happen. People move. I will tell you with any type—because our boxes are very—they're five by eights. They're not that big signage that you see on—I'm not throwing any other competition out there. We're not that big a sign, but when the competition does come in, we actually give them—it's funny that we give them 24 hours to get their stuff out of here. Because we don't want that big box on our property—a big garage box, really. Chris, that's the only thing that I'm kind of, like I get what you want, and I'm OK with that. But then it's like, hey is it going to be... hey, Brian, I get a phone call and it's, you have this box up there. No, man. That's the fourth different customer this week.

Mr. Greazzo asked is that something that you track? Mr. Picanco replied no. Customer moved in. Customer moved out. Mr. Swiniarski said well, yeah, and we're not concerned with who's box it is, like you're saying. It's a matter of how many boxes are there at any given moment. So if the number is 5, let's say for discussion purposes, it doesn't matter who's 5 they are. It's just that you're allowed to have 5. If customer number 6 calls, again, those are just the numbers talking right now. It's like, hey, we can't do that until one gets put away. Because at some point they can say, yeah, all these customers have asked us. Mr. Picanco said I'll be honest with you. For me, I think of a small business owner mindset, too. Now at that point, we're denying me to make any type of income because I'm denying a customer a day or two that might go to my competition now because we want to limit how many boxes I can... And right now I don't have a problem with the order or having boxes outside. I'm saying in general, now we're getting involved in what I can make.

Ms. Hebert said I think we're just adding a condition: you may not be here in 10 years. Mr. Picanco said it's just hard to put a number. I get it. Ms. Hebert continued, if they decide to stack forty boxes in the shunting area, and that's where they're going to keep the boxes for a while, that would be an issue with the Town. Having a condition would make it more clear what's supposed to be happening out there versus, I think, the in and out of the box or two isn't going to raise any issues. Mr. Picanco replied I guess at that point, can the condition be if it's abusive? Because if we put a number on five, you're not going to be able to tell if it's five or not. Mr. Swiniarski asked what do you mean? How could we not tell? Mr. Picanco said because if it's five boxes outside and it's five different customers consistently every day—if there is... I'm only just saying 5 because you said the number 5. I guess, I don't know. I don't see a problem with it and I'm fine with it. I'm just more of like I'm not abusing it. I just don't like to put numbers on it because it's not going to be Chris coming to me and saying something. It's going to be someone else that says: Hey, on this paper in 20 years from now, this says you're only allowed to have 5. But now I'm going to go well, those are five of the same customers. Mr. Swiniarski replied it doesn't matter who the customers are. Mr. Picanco continued but if I have 5 boxes out there every day and five different customers every day... Mr. Swiniarski said whatever the number is, is the number.

Vice Chair Newberry said to your point, a box without signage or if your proposed condition were to include that the boxes just are not to have signs on them, then that kind of takes care of what I think your concern is; that somebody decides that they're going to stack boxes 20 high, put signs on each box and presto they have a monument sign. So maybe your condition would simply say that any boxes that are outside being managed are not to have signage on them. Mr. Swiniarski said well, that's another way to do it too, yeah. Mr. Nelson said yeah, but is that realistic? I think you said that new boxes have more heavy signage. Mr. Picanco said it's just like a truck. They have a U-Haul logo on them—the wooden ones do, which we have way more wooden ones than anything... Vice Chair Newberry said they are signs. Mr. Picanco said the new ones do. Mr. Nelson said the new ones are very well signed. Mr. Picanco said but we don't utilize—so here's the thing. In the wooden box, we put this rubber cover on. That has a U-Haul logo on it, and we use that for weather protective because they're pressure-treated wood. So that has a U-Haul logo. Now, if I'm going to have a box outside, I'm going to try to put a cover on it so that I don't get the customers goods wet. That's why I don't mind doing the number thing. We've just got to figure out what is this for? Do you know what I mean? Are we doing this because the first round I came around—and we can't talk about old girlfriends—first time I came around, we were asked to paint our trucks to white. And some of you guys may have been on the Board. Now we're asking you to put a number on. I just see a lot of—I get it, it's just a number, Brian. We just want to make sure no one abuses it, but it's just I want to make sure. And in Chris's eyes it might be this, and I get the signage thing because I've seen it. I know exactly what you're talking about. I've seen someone put 30 up. Mr. Swiniarski said that's why you have your name on it. Mr. Picanco said I'm not looking to abuse it and put 30 up.

Ms. Hebert asked do you have the U boxes there today? Or is that a new service? Mr. Picanco asked what we're presenting? Ms. Hebert asked do you have the U boxes onsite today? Mr. Picanco replied yes. Ms. Hebert said we've had no complaints about storage of U boxes, but I do think a condition would be helpful. But you move them in and out today and I've never had a complaint. Mr. Picanco said yeah, that's what I mean. Like if it was someone, and I agree with you 100 percent on that. If it was someone made a complaint, said hey, this looks like a big signage going on here. They're trying to do another one of my competitions I know stacks them up 3 high and does a big signage—a big yellow box. I haven't abused that now, so I just don't get why that—and that's probably why I'm struggling with this. Why? Mr. Greazzo said maybe that should be the condition. You can't stack your boxes in a certain fashion as to create a sign, right? Obviously, you're just doing business. Everybody knows that you're U-Haul. The more boxes you have, I think the better you're doing, and I'd love to see your yard full of boxes as long as they're moving in and out. If you're stacking them and making a giant monument sign, like Hal said, that's an issue. But the Planning Director hasn't had any complaints. You move things in and out. I think that's the appropriate way to go, in my opinion. As long as you're not stacking and creating your own sign, you're just moving stuff in and out.

Mr. Swiniarski asked do you stack them outside right now? Mr. Picanco replied the most you can go outside is 2 high. If it has to be against the building, you cannot do it 2. And honestly, I don't. I mean, there's no need to do 2 high. Mr. Swiniarski said you're not going to go against the front of your own building. So why not just have a condition that you can't stack them outside? Mr. Picanco replied that's fine.

Chair Fairman asked where would your outside units be on this site plan? There isn't much room. Mr. Picanco replied there isn't much room. If a customer needed it, depending where they're at, I'd put it probably underneath the four-foot overhang right here, just because of weather elements. Right in front of the building. Chair Fairman asked that overhang over here? Mr. Picanco replied yeah, that's it. And they're in and out in 15 minutes. Mr. Greazzo asked how many can you fit there? Mr. Picanco asked on that outside overhang? I've never measured. If I want to throw a number out there, I probably could fit, if I wanted to, 5 by 8. Mr. Greazzo asked you can judge by the parking spaces, right? Mr. Picanco said parking spaces are 10 feet wide, so 10, if that in that spot. Mr. Greazzo said and you said the most you'd see out there on a weekend might be 6, so I think I think you're all set as long as you're not going to stack them. I think no stacking takes care of it because this site is actually lower. Mr. Picanco said that makes more sense. Mr. Greazzo said it's lower than Route 3, so, again, my concern was creating signs on the boxes and if it's one high, one level, you're not doing that really. Vice Chair Newberry said the overhang is not that visible from the street. Mr. Greazzo said yes, so I think one level addresses the concern that I raised.

Chair Fairman said I was surprised by what I'll call carport storage that you have for recreational vehicles and other things. From what I've seen, it looks like it's being kept pretty well. But I am concerned that it's an opportunity for not a good-looking area. People park their vehicle there and let it go. Mr. Picanco said it becomes a junkyard, yeah. Chair Fairman said all of a sudden, the tires are flat. The thing is just being left there. Do we need any kind of—as I say, I didn't in an initial approval understand that you're going to have that. There's a good advantage of, by the lumberyard you have that overhang, why not use it? I understand that. I wonder if a condition for... Mr. Picanco said we're eliminating two of the buildings right now also. Chair Fairman said you're eliminating some of it. Mr. Picanco said yeah, there's only going to be one left. Chair Fairman said the one where you have the big... Mr. McGregor said this one will be remaining and then these two shed storages will be eliminated.

Chair Fairman said I just wonder if we should have a condition of no unregistered vehicles. Would that be a problem, I suppose? Ms. Hebert said I think we should have no storage of vehicles outside. So, the vehicles are within the canopy, but we really don't want to see a field of RV's that are being stored there. Vice Chair Newberry added without an overhang. Chair Fairman said nobody sees it a problem. They don't have a big hangover, but it's been a concern that all of a sudden you get stuff in there that's let go and becomes kind of a... Mr. Picanco said I will tell you we do keep up. I don't know if we can always [unintelligible]. We do keep up. [crosstalk] Mr. Picanco continued someone who wants to store their stuff, but one person's gold can be another one another man's trash, right. So it's kind of hard to go to a customer and say, hey, your 1979 BMW is a piece of crap, and you can't store here. Yeah, I mean that's the toughest part to do. I'm not against—I can't define a customer, what they can do what they can't store. Customers are going to store what they—now I think if they're going to have stuff everywhere, yes, I can say, hey, you got to tighten up your area and clean this up, which we are continuing to maintain that and let them know. Hey, you can't have your stuff everywhere.

Vice Chair Newberry said I think what Charlie's talking about would be a derelict vehicle. Mr. Picanco asked a dirt vehicle? Vice Chair Newberry clarified a derelict. Mr. Sullivan added an abandoned vehicle. I'm going to assume that if somebody stops paying their rent, then that gets towed out. [crosstalk] Mr. Picanco said yeah, that's a whole—I don't have anybody that's not paying. Chair Fairman said this vehicle is smashed up and I'm going to fix that up, but in the meantime, I need to have a place to store it. So, a tow truck comes in with this guy, and it's all smashed up and parks it in there. Mr. Picanco said and that's where the lien laws come in. Chair Fairman said that's site management and we don't want to get into site management, which is a comment. Mr. Picanco said but I will let with confidence that if someone's not paying, then at that point we have to do our due diligence in operations to get a paying customer in that spot. So it's not a game plan to have a vehicle sitting there not paying for X amount of time frame.

Chair Fairman asked are there any other comments? Vice Chair Newberry said on condition 9, I thought I heard you say that you weren't quite sure about that. Do you want to talk about that? Mr. Picanco said sure. So, you kind of see it right here. It's sandstone. What I've seen and experienced when these buildings are tilt wall, they get put up. We match the color sandstone with the rest of the building. On the notes, what I was looking at Number 9, it says design for new warehouse building should be modified to include masonry base and the final building elevations should be approved by the Planning Board. So, that's going to be like a sandstone color. It basically matches the rest of the property and that's how I looked at it as.

Ms. Hebert said I think staff's thoughts were that the newer metal kind of prefab buildings that have been built in the performance zone like along Harvey Road, typically sit on a mason rebase. It just dresses the building up a little bit. It anchors it to the ground a little bit more visually. And this is a big building. This is not a small addition to the site. It's a big addition to the site and it's a brand-new building. So, everything else on the site except the modular storage units was part of the lumber yard and has been retrofitted for U-Haul's use. And so it just seemed like we should be holding you all to similar standards that we are other applicants in Bedford. Another example on 101 would be the Wholistic Pet warehouse that's also kind of a prefab metal building. But they did make an effort to enhance the design a little bit and added some masonry and will work to dress up the build.

Vice Chair Newberry said the structure is front and center on your site. Mr. McGregor said we were kind of looking at the masonry base. Is that mimic the stone foundation where it's just a few feet? Or is it a 10-foot-high overhead door? And is it like a first-floor kind of looking at? Ms. Hebert said I think we'd want your architect to propose something, but I imagine, something substantial enough to give the building a little bit of a mass and a grounding.

Mr. McGregor said OK. To be able to go back and bring something back and having that be a condition of approval. Mr. Picanco said and that and that's fine. We can work together on that. It's where we draw the line that matter point where we're going to put granite at the bottom of this building to beautify it to help people's eyes, or? And that's where I kind of was struggling with it because I'm like, we already did it the neutral color—the property is really sandstone—to everything to match and that's where I'm like, well at what point do we kind of—do you know what I mean? Ms. Hebert said you have a brick entrance, though. You have a brick entrance at the storefront. Mr. Picanco said on the front of that property, yeah, and I don't want to confuse with the center entrance to the building. Ms. Hebert said there are things you could do. You could have a designer look at. Mr. McGregor said something to ground it on the site. Ms. Hebert said mm-hmm, mm-hmm.

Vice Chair Newberry said I mean I think if you did something about the same height as what you're showing there and maybe just make it more earth tone and horizontal instead of vertical. Something along that line might—I mean it doesn't have to be—I don't think the intent is to require you to create a granite masterpiece base, but I think the intent is to make it look a little more like some of the other structures in that vicinity. That is a big building, and tie that a little more to the ground. And I think that the Planning Director has a good idea of what the Board would be looking for, and I don't think the point is to run your costs up because I'm sure your architect should be able to come up with an idea or two that would meet the concern that isn't going to become prohibitive in cost. While I have the mic, I would just say that I echo the Planning Director's concern around the amount of white. That if you cut that down a little bit, I think, both on this north elevation and I think the south elevation has a huge swath of white. If that was cut down a little bit, I think would be something that the Board would probably be comfortable with having the Planning Director review and approve so that it doesn't make you guys come back here again and you can still keep moving. That's my take on it.

Chairman Fairman said I agree with you, Hal, not only is this a big building, but you're asking for a waiver to get it closer to the street. One of Bedford's busiest main drags of South River Road down through that area, plus the highway. So, I think we need to do whatever we can to make it a better appearance. Mr. Picanco asked are you guys looking for... Chair Fairman said and just a question—I think I know the answer—is I just want to make sure those vertical lines are not lights. Those are just vertical lines. That's what I read on the thing, but I want to make sure they're not lights.

Mr. Picanco said so when you say too much white if—and just an idea just so I kind of get a feeling I can look for—are you looking for more of this gray to come into this area? When it comes down to it, to make it more of a narrow, because it's going to be like a pinstripe going over the building. But I'm fine with what you guys are looking at a neutral color to kind of beautify, whatnot.

Vice Chair Newberry said I don't think we want to design it for you, but I think we would like your designer to respond to the concerns as described. Mr. McGregor said to be able to break up the mass a little bit more, is what I'm hearing, if that's correct. So just kind of a visual element. I'm not an architect, but I think Brian has contacts with one so we can relay this information back and work together to come up with an appropriate solution.

Mr. Sullivan said I think this is why Point 9 is worded that way is that we're giving a lot of leeway both to you and to the Planning Director for this decision. Everyone's iterated that we're not architects and we all have subjective taste. We're not going to tell you exactly how it has to be but work with Becky and she's she has a good eye and is lenient and she'll find something, right? I was jogging my memory and I think it was the wire belt restoration of the Walmart plant on South River Road where they have some good of

that masonry detail along the frontage at least. So, that might be an example to look at. Mr. Picanco said OK.

Vice Chair Newberry said I would even suggest that if it's exposed to the interior of the property, it's probably not so much of an issue. But your elevations that are exposed to the exterior or to the rest of the world, I think the concern is to see if we can do something there to make that a little more in line with similar properties. I did have a question for Becky. In your memo, you mentioned that the Town Engineer would like to have a memo certifying the existing system is functioning as designed, but I didn't see that in the conditions. Is that something we want to add as a condition? Or is that being addressed through the technical review with the Planning Department and DPW.

Ms. Hebert said we've received a memo from the applicant. I to the memo that might still be needed and some technical comments that are still outstanding. I'm OK addressing that under the technical comments and it's something that Brian believe there are some modifications Desfosses will be requiring as part of the stormwater permit. Vice Chair Newberry said So we don't need to make that a condition. We've talked about it and the Minutes will be a part of whatever the Board ultimately does this evening. So, we've captured that as something that will need to be addressed. Ms. Hebert replied yes. Vice Chair Newberry said thank you, Becky.

Mr. Sullivan said I have a I have a question. So there's one condition in here. I believe it is Condition 4: existing landscaping on the property shall be restored to be in compliance with the landscaping plan. But there's also a request for a waiver to not have landscape architects stamp the plans. Can you explain a little bit about that request for waiver? Mr. McGregor replied yeah, so because we're trying to minimize the amount of land disturbance as possible, and Brian worked incredibly well and long to you guys in 2017 to be able to come up with an acceptable plan to be able to not have a landscape architect look at the site and go through and find where it can be changed. We worked with Becky to have a landscape architect review the site, do a site walk and ensure that everything that was approved in 2017 is alive and flourishing and where it needs to be. So doing a tree count, making sure all the shrubs are alive, and if anything is missing or not in place, it will be replanted to ensure compliance with the 2017 approval. So it would be a memo from a landscape architect that would certify compliance with the 2017 approval. Mr. Sullivan said OK. That makes sense to me. Thank you.

Ms. Hebert said I would like to say I went out to the site, and I was pleased to see how many of the trees that were planted along South River Road were alive and doing well and had gained some height. So I think U-Haul has done a really nice job with maintaining what they have. I haven't done a count out there to see if they need to replace trees. I'm sure there are some that have failed and might need to be replaced, but especially along South River Road, the added trees—they don't show up on the existing conditions plan because they look like little basketballs, but there's a nice tree buffer that as long as it's continued to be cared for and maintained, I think will eventually grow up to add to the ascetics of the site.

Chair Fairman said along that line, you might consider putting in some trees between that building and the road. Or if they're there, they're not showing up on your drawing at all in that area. In that area, you might consider adding some as part of the breakup of the building we were just talking about. Some trees in there might help.

Vice Chair Newberry said Mr. Chairman, if I read the staff memo correctly, all of the requested waivers, with the exception I guess of the landscape plan were a part of the original approval. Did I read that correctly, Becky?

Ms. Hebert replied yes, except the setback for the building. Vice Chair Newberry continued the reason I mentioned that is that in most cases when people come in asking for waivers, we like to have them go through a complete set of criteria for granting that waiver. And I think, in this case, that may not be necessary. But just for the record, I think it may not be necessary simply because these are repeats of previously granted waivers that I think is what you pointed out in your memo, Becky. Ms. Hebert said yes. Vice Chair Newberry said thank you.

Chair Fairman said we also, I think on the setback, went through the reason why it has to be back that close because the traffic turn around for the trailer trucks on the backside of it. The other option there would be make the building a little smaller. So you didn't have to do that. If he could not have that waiver. So that's the reason that I was looking at see if there's another location you could have the loading dock. Maybe on the east side? But that would perhaps you'd still have the turning radius problems, I think.

Mr. McGregor replied Brian and our principal engineer went through a pretty extensive list of site locations on the property for this facility and primarily based on the truck turning radius, this was the best location. Chair Fairman said I was looking to see if it would be better back where you're moving the other buildings to. Mr. Picanco said so we tried doing that as easements and everything in there. Chair Fairman said rather than move the buildings, I'm sure you tried that. Mr. McGregor said yeah, this is a municipal sewer that runs along the entire back portion of the property. Chair Fairman said and I think we put a restriction on truck parking had to be toward the rear of the building. Didn't we originally? Mr. Picanco replied not that I know of. You're not talking about like the rear of the building like this way? The south side? Chair Fairman said east of the building. Not out on South River Road. Mr. Picano said no. Chair Fairman said that was tied into signage again because all your trucks have signs and I think maybe we didn't end up with that condition. Mr. Picanco said so when we when we did this, we were asked to shunt here, and we decided not to do a condition because it sits in a hole and there was no way you can see the truck from the street. Because by the time you get to that part, you're seeing the top of the roof of a truck. Have I ever parked trucks there? No. So we didn't put a condition on that. And then all we asked was for the locations to be labeled. That was part of that meeting. Sorry, I was there. But yeah, that was because, at that point, when it gets to, if you don't mind me tracing this, right about when you get to about here, it starts going uphill. And everything, you don't see anything down below at this point.

Chair Fairman asked are there any comments or questions from the Board? Mr. Greazzo asked can you talk a little bit about your drainage and your water management? I notice that you're looking for a waiver but it's already existing from previous. But you have a lot of drainage pipe out in front of your building, so I'm kind of curious what your plan is to do. Are you doing new drainage? Or improving drainage? Mr. McGregor replied so initially we had done a site walk and just a visual inspection of the property and the condition of the existing drainage and everything appeared to be in good order. This was, I think it was back in April or May. So with the spring that we had had, I was expecting to see if there were capacity issues, there would have been evidence of that. I didn't see any and we were going through and because we're removing impervious area as opposed to adding additional impervious area, there didn't appear to be any drainage problems and assuming we weren't going to be causing any. Fortunately, when Brian Defosses came in, he was able to dig out of his magic hat, the alteration of terrain permit that existed on the site for 2010. So he ensured that as long as we are in compliance and the designs that were installed in 2010 are what is currently there and in good working order, then he has no problem. We have a memo that was submitted to the city that our construction inspector is going to be going out prior to final

approval, inspecting all of the catch basins, inspecting all the outlet structures. If the stormwater basin in the rear of the property needs to be dredged, Brian has no problem going out there and doing the once a decade maintenance that hasn't been performed since the construction. No record if Coastal Lumber ever did any of that. And then also working to update the maintenance and operations plan. And I believe that's Condition #7 that an updated drainage maintenance plan be registered and not necessarily with U-Haul but with the parcel itself so that the continuation of the storm drain system will be not with the owner but with the parcel.

Mr. Greazzo said so the drainage pipe that you have in the layout area out in front of the property. Mr. Picanco said that is not mine. If you want to know who that is, that is Aubrey construction. I've called... Mr. Greazzo asked on your property? Mr. Picanco said absolutely. I've called them four weeks straight. I actually spoke to the owner today. They had guys there removing half of it. I've been all over... they accidentally got a delivery and dropped it on my property. There's also No Trespass. A Board member said you should sell it. Mr. Picanco said oh, we came close on Facebook marketplace. That's why I put up no trespassing signs—Private Area. I put all those signs up myself and fixed the fence that DOT couldn't fix just so everybody knows that's a private area. Don't dump, and anytime something gets parked there, a vehicle from the highway or something, oh, there's a phone call being made. Get that off my property, please or I'm going to start charging you rent. Mr. Greazzo asked so did they put it there in connection with the Route 3 expansion? Mr. Picanco replied yes, by accident. So there's a random company that came and said I don't care and all of a sudden, I show up and I'm like, what are these big pipes doing? Everybody was like, oh, I thought it was for your new building. I'm like, no, it's not. Like we're not doing it, no. Mr. Greazzo said that's why I was asking. Mr. Picanco said yes, I went there today.

Chair Fairman asked anything else? Does anybody from the public have comments? Hearing none, we need to talk about the waivers or vote on the waivers. We've talked about them a little bit.

MOTION: Mr. Sullivan moves the Planning Board grant the waivers to Article 275-61, Table 2, Article 275-62 Table 3, Article 275-63 and 275-65, Article 275-62 E of the Bedford Zoning Ordinance and to Sections 323.3, 322.1.8 (2) and 317.1.26 of the Land Development Control Regulations as follows:

1. Article 275-61 and Table 2, Permitted Uses in the Performance Zone, to allow the expansion of the mini warehousing/self-storage use where this use is not permitted;
2. Article 275-62 and Table 3, Table of Performance Zone Dimensional Requirements, to allow a front building setback for the proposed warehouse to be 45 feet where 60 feet is required;
3. Article 275-62 E Minimum landscape performance standards and Section 317.1.20 of the Land Development Control Regulations, to not provide a Landscape Plan and the associated required landscaping;
4. Articles 275-63 and 275-65 and Section 323.3 of the Land Development Control Regulations, Screening of unsightly features, to allow loading areas and vehicles/equipment storage areas to be within view from the public right-of-way; and
5. Section 322.1.8 (2) of the Land Development Control Regulations, to not provide 5% internal greenspace (landscape islands) within the parking areas;

6. Section 317.1.26 of the Land Development Control Regulations, to not provide new drainage calculations with this application.

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

MOTION: Mr. Sullivan moves the Planning Board grant final approval for the Site Plan amendment for the U-Haul facility located at 451 South River Road, Lot 36-6-1, in accordance with the plans prepared by North Point Engineering last revised July 28, 2023, in accordance with the following findings of fact:

- **The plans are found to be in compliance with the purpose and intent of the Bedford Land Development Control Regulations.**
- **The Board also includes all facts found in the meeting minutes for this application and incorporates all meeting minutes into this decision.**

This approval is granted with the following conditions to be fulfilled within one year and prior to plan signature:

1. The Director of Public Works and the Planning Director shall determine that the Applicant has addressed all technical review comments to the Town's satisfaction.
2. In the event that the Planning Board approves the waivers, the plan shall be updated to list the waivers granted as approved.
3. The plans shall be modified to note that all of the parking spaces and pavement markings will be re-stripped.
4. The existing landscaping on the property shall be restored to be in compliance with the landscape plan approved by the Planning Board in 2017.
5. The Applicant shall submit any outstanding engineering review fees to the Planning Department.
6. A Stormwater and Land Disturbance Management Permit shall be approved by DPW and noted on the plan.
7. The Drainage Maintenance Agreement shall be recorded at the Hillsborough County Registry of Deeds.
8. Architectural elevations shall be modified to reduce the polar white and incorporate more beige, all proposed rooftop mechanicals shall be appropriately screened, and the final building elevations shall be approved by the Planning Director.
9. The design for the new warehouse building shall be modified to include a masonry base and the final building elevations shall be approved by the Planning Director.

10. Prior to the commencement of work, arrangements shall be made with the Planning Department regarding payment and coordination of third-party inspections.
11. Prior to commencement of work, a pre-construction meeting shall be held with the Planning Department, Department of Public Works, Fire Department and the Building Department.
12. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy for the building, all site improvements depicted on the plan shall be completed.
13. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy for the new building addition, the Applicant shall pay the sewer accessibility fee.
14. With no stacking of portable storage units outside of the warehouse facility.

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

Chair Fairman said you're all set. Mr. McGregor and Mr. Picanco both said thank you very much.

Chair Fairman said the next item on our agenda tonight is a request for review of a conceptual plan for proposed bank, Chase Bank, located at 67-69 South River Road.

IV. Concept Proposals and Other Business:

1. **John & Robyn McGilvary (Owners) and Corestates Group c/o Stonefield Engineering & Design (Applicant)** – Request for review of a conceptual plan for a proposed bank (Chase Bank) with associated parking and drive-thru service, located at 67-69 South River Road, Lot 46-48 & 49, Zoned PZ.

Mr. Josh Klein, partner with Stonefield Engineering and Design presents: Good evening. Thank you for having us tonight. My name is Josh Klein. I'm a partner with Stonefield Engineering and Design. We're here representing the applicant Corestates Group on behalf of Chase Bank. We're excited to be here. This project's been kind of going on for a long time. We've been kind of working closely with Becky as well. Chase is very excited at the opportunity to kind of enter the Town. So we're here tonight to kind of get some feedback before we kind of move forward with a final approval application. We're sensitive to the corridor, kind of understanding some of the development in the area. But we do think this is a great opportunity to clean up this site at this location. This is obviously, I think, where we want to see commercial uses here. I mean today we have kind of two existing single-family homes no longer permitted in this zone. Banking is a permitted use, and I think this will tie in very well with the commercial property next door.

I have up on the screen, just to kind of talk through a little bit. We can actually start with the site plan. So the site is two lots. It's two single-family homes. You can kind of see in light gray, the property line that splits the property. There are kind of two access points along South River Road and then one access point along Park Drive. I was there today, and I've been there before. I think they kind of park their cars wherever, so it's probably, we'll call it one big driveway. What we're looking to do is kind of consolidate access to Park Drive. So there'd be no access along South River Road. Our hope is to kind of seek that cross access with the neighbor commercial development. It was a condition of their approval at one point

in time. There's no recorded easement, but I know the developer that we're working with is kind of seeking that as well and our hope would be to kind of maintain that cross access.

Chase is looking to incorporate kind of their new building shape at this location with the kind of the parking in front, the ATM behind. The ATM would be kind of attached to the back of the building, so there's not a window or a live teller. It's just an ATM and that's really what we're seeing—not only for Chase, but just in terms of modern-day banking kind of moving to those ATM layouts.

We're here tonight kind of I think two main objectives, I think, is to get some feedback on the layout and get some input from the Board. Our goal is to kind of make the application process as smooth as possible and kind of understand some of the waivers that we need and kind of get the Board's feedback on the ability for us to get those waivers in order to kind of provide the kind of the parking and the operational footprint that Chase needs. And I did bring an architectural plan. But I do think we've already heard the feedback and our architecture team is kind of working on a new layout, but we wanted to see if we could get some feedback on what we should look to or expect from an architectural perspective. I think we kind of are sensitive to what the Board is looking for.

I'm happy to walk the Board through, but it seemed like based maybe on the last application, it's a Board that would be open to making make this more conversational. So, totally happy to take your lead, Chairman, and proceed accordingly.

Chair Fairman said OK. Why don't you go ahead. You said you had some architectural... Mr. Klein said yes, I brought this with me. I don't think this, in terms of the architecture, is probably what the Board is looking for. I probably more brought it for a color pallet to see if maybe from a material standpoint, some of the materials or mix of colors and mix of glass is something the Board would be looking at. Again, our architect is taking in some of the feedback from the staff report and a kind of our pre filing meeting in terms of I think, clap board and pitch roofs and things of that nature. But I think this is definitely probably on the color scheme that Chase would be looking for. And I was just kind of curious to see if this is kind of understanding some of the examples we received if there's any kind of feedback on this initial kind of color or orientation.

Chair Fairman said OK. Mr. Greazzo asked is there a national branding or is it completely up to each of the local branches to have that? I'm just trying to understand how much leeway there could be and in what you're proposing there. Mr. Klein replied it is nationally. Chase has their own design team and their own kind of national group that reviews and approves every project. So it's not based on like, there's not an individual branch owner. It is kind of looked at a corporate level. Mr. Greazzo asked but there is some ability to make changes? Mr. Klein replied I think there is some level which is I think why we came with the concept review first. Mr. Greazzo replied got it. Thank you.

Ms. Hebert asked are you looking for a neutral palette? Is that kind of the feedback you're hoping to get? Mr. Klein replied exactly. That's kind of what the branding has kind of moved towards is a more neutral palette. We haven't seen them kind of go with like a red brick and things of that. It's more of these kind of neutral colors. And I know I think it was helpful in the staff report. We've had a few examples and we met with you, and you gave us some examples as well.

Vice Chair Newberry said my feedback would be that that might be nicer with a little bit of color to it of some sort. Five shades of gray just kind of looks pretty industrial. I don't think it needs to look colonial, in my opinion. I think it's good to see new architectural ideas develop through the Town. If what have there is simply the color and not the architectural style, I think the style looks more like a [unintelligible] shop,

but that's up to you guys. I mean, I personally wouldn't shoot it down just if you use those colors and come back with something that looks like that, but I would also encourage you to explore ideas that can enhance the corridor and be an attraction to your operation.

Mr. Sullivan said yeah, I was in downtown Manchester this past week where they do have a Chase branch. I know, historically, that a certain shade of blue has been one of the primary brand standards of Chase. So if that could be incorporated to add a little bit more color as opposed to the five shades of gray as I'll put it. And while the renderings that you supplied; you state that these aren't exactly what you're bringing forth after conversations with staff. Through the corridor, it's like we like to have the pitched roofs and more of the New England style architecture. I think of Trader Joe's. There's a number of other banks on the corridor that have that type of style. So, I think this—I'm not an architectural student by any means, but this monolithic, boxy thing just would be a little bit out of place within the area.

Mr. Swiniarski said I'd agree with that, too. Pitched roofs sort of fit with the area a lot more, and that's as easy as driving up and down the road, seeing what's there. So I'm sure your designers would probably do that anyway, but I think most people on the Board would be looking for something like that, less box.

Chair Fairman said as Becky pointed out, there are several new bank buildings along that line, they've built in the last several years: Citizens, Bank of New Hampshire, Bar Harbor, are three that come to mind right away. I think the architecture of those, while not obviously don't want to be duplicated, they're more examples of what we'd like to see. You only have one lane, I believe, for both ATM and drive up. Is that correct? Mr. Klein replied correct. So someone would enter the site and they would go right and then they'd work their way to the front of the building, kind of loop around and then they could make a left into an ATM lane. Or they could make a left into a bypass lane to get to Park Drive. Or they could make the right and get to the shopping center that's adjacent.

Chair Fairman said I am concerned about that entrance to the shopping center, that this will become an exit. You'll have a lot of traffic going through your parking lot. If you're at Tuckers, for instance, finishing up breakfast, when I want to go north on South River Road, why would I want to buckle back around the Citizen's building to get north when I can come right through here and go out. So I really think it will be used as an exit for that shopping center, particularly for Staples, the Pet Store and Tuckers. I'm not sure it would be for Kohl's and some of the bigger places, but there's a lot of traffic generated by Tuckers. So I think you need to think about that and consider whether that really is a good thing or not. I understand you'd like to have it for good reasons but think it through before you make that final decision relative to people using that as a shortcut.

Vice Chair Newberry said well, in addition to that, does the basic layout work if you do not succeed in getting an access there? Mr. Klein replied the layout would work if the access wasn't there. You would still kind of circulate the site in the same motion. Where the traffic engineer, myself for the project as well, cross access can always be a touchy subject. There are benefits to it, but then it does raise concerns, I think. It relieves pressure on signals. It relieves pressure at driveways. I think one of the keys here is trying to keep that exit traffic to the back of the Chase so that people wouldn't be cutting around the front of the Chase to leave. But we'll definitely kind of relay that to the team.

Ms. Johnson asked from Park Drive, can you take a left out of that? Or is that can you only go north?

Mr. Klein said there's no restrictions on the movement at Park Drive. Ms. Johnson continued, there's no light there either? Mr. Klein said correct.

Ms. Malcolm asked what are you going to do for landscaping of this building? Mr. Klein replied so let me pull up the plan. I can zoom in. We would be seeking waivers from the landscape requirement. We are providing 30 feet along the frontage, and we're providing 15 feet along Park Drive. And it ranges from about 8 to 5 feet to the shopping center and then approximately, I believe it's 15 to 20 feet at the rear, except for the trash enclosure. We'd be seeking waivers for some of the dimensional requirements, but we are providing the same amount of plantings and landscaping in accordance with the standards in those areas. So we're treated a little bit differently because we're a corner lot, but we have kind of that streetscape along both Park Drive as well as along South River Road. And then doing more kind of buffering to the rear to the neighbor. We would look, I don't think this plan currently shows it, but the intention would be also like a six-foot-high board on board fence along the rear to that resident as well.

Chair Fairman said I think you could improve your landscaping if you reduced your parking. If you look at any of the banks down through there, none of the parking lots are full—ever. Citizens is probably the busiest of the banks and there's always room to park—plenty room in there. So I think, and you're almost twice the number of spaces required, so I think you should look at reducing the number of parking spaces to improve landscaping and green space. Mr. Klein replied got it. We can do that, and I think it was, I don't know if it was officially submitted: we will include, too, in our report. We can also give some support for the parking as well. I think that would help the Board. We see that this Chase has a financial component, so it's Chase, but it's also JP Morgan. So we do see that they tend to have a little bit more of a demand and a little bit more of a customer base. We even, in a lot of branches now, Chase will keep 288 parking spaces even when they have less than 25 parking spaces for the site, just because they do have more of a presence of people coming in. So we can give a little bit more info, but message received. We'll look at that with the team as well to see if there's opportunities.

Chair Fairman said I think Citizens has financial in there too. I just don't see that many cars at the banks, and they're busy banks, some of them.

Mr. Nelson asked are there any other known variances that you would look for other than landscaping at this time? I know it's early, but I just didn't know if there was any other. Mr. Klein replied that's a great question. Let me just double check.

Ms. Hebert said I think your dumpster location is one we were chatting about. Mr. Klein replied correct. The dumpster location would be a waiver. Thirty feet is required from all boundaries. We're showing currently it's 2.2 feet. It's a masonry enclosure, kind of the same finish as the building. So, in these cases it would match this finish, but in the case of whatever our finish is, it'll kind of match that and it's typically 8 feet high with a solid gate on it as well. Mr. Nelson replied OK. Mr. Klein continued there's a waiver request for the drive aisle. Eighteen feet is noted in the code. We have 15 feet for one way, the right-hand side. So that would be another waiver. And then, in terms of the landscaping, it's really; the two waivers we currently know would be: there's an exterior pavement strip for both the west frontage and the north frontage and we're not providing those, but we are meeting the required 15 feet for the street tree as well as the 15 foot for the front landscaping. So the waiver is again for not meeting a dimensional criteria, but we're providing the plantings that's required in that strip. It's basically the same amount of plantings, we've just put them in a smaller area.

Chairman Fairman asked are there any other comments or questions? Seeing none, is there anybody in the public? Ma'am, do you have any comments? I guess not. Seeing no public comments coming, there are no other questions or comments. We got what you need from us, Sir. Mr. Klein replied I think so. Would there typically be a peer review if we were to go forward?

Ms. Hebert replied sure, there is an internal staff review, and we do a third-party engineering review before your public hearing with your final plan. Mr. Klein asked I guess would we be able to, I think, get feedback if we reached out to the internal staff? I mean I think the big one would be Fire. Ms. Hebert replied yes. Mr. Klein asked OK, so is that something I could coordinate with you this week? Ms. Hebert replied you could coordinate with me, and we can set up a meeting. Mr. Klein said that would be great. Ms. Hebert said I believe Fire was a little concerned about the turning radius around the back corner. Mr. Klein said yeah, perfect. OK. I'll reach out. Thank you again. I appreciate the time.

Vice Chair Newberry said one moment, another comment. One thing that just occurred to me. We didn't talk about it all, is traffic. I assume you'll be doing a traffic study associated with this. Mr. Klein replied we prepared a traffic assessment report to this bank. A new bank of this size only generates about 86 trips in the peak hour. Twenty five percent of those are passed by, so it even kind of lowers that number. So from an industry standpoint, this site wouldn't trigger or necessitate a traffic impact study. We look at kind of 100 trips in a peak hour as being that threshold. And this site kind of stays below that. So we will submit a traffic assessment report that's signed and sealed, but the generation of a building this size and this type of use really won't have a significant or diverse impact on the roadway network.

Chair Fairman said just make sure that traffic assessment considers what through traffic's going to do to Park Drive—people coming out of the restaurant coming in that direction or anyplace else there. Mr. Klein replied yeah, we can definitely make sure, when we formally file and present, that we'll kind of talk about that. Chair Fairman said thank you.

Ms. Hebert said typically, a project like this would have a traffic study or a trip generation memo, and your traffic assessment. We can talk about it, but I think that you may need to be doing a little bit more with traffic than what you presented with your concept review. Mr. Klein said OK, yeah, we're happy to talk it through. I mean, ultimately, we work with a lot of different users, a lot of small and large projects. This definitely concerns are always important, but it's not a—luckily, this isn't a high trip-generating use. It's a good fit for a corner like this.

Vice Chair Newberry said if you don't get the through connect to the south, I'd be interested in what you think your southbound traffic coming out of Park Drive is going to look like. Because I think a lot of your clientele will likely be coming from the south. But you guys would know that better than we would. Mr. Klein replied that's great. Yeah, we'll definitely take a look. Vice Chair Newberry said you have a lot of people to the South who might be interested in utilizing your service.

Ms. Hebert said another thing to note is that right-of-way for Park Drive is substandard. It's only a 40-foot right-of-way. We noted that in the staff report, but the Board may want to see that right-of-way expanded 5 feet, so you're contributing half of what might be needed to bring it to full compliance. Chair Fairman said the reason I have concern about traffic wanting to come this way is that down at the internal intersection in the mall area, we've got Starbucks traffic and Citizens Bank traffic all coming in there at intersection, Tucker's traffic, all coming in that section in the morning. It gets pretty crazy. So those people going north are going to, once they have some experience, are going to say let's go this way. I don't know how much that is but take a look at it. Mr. Klein said thank you. Appreciate it. Chair Fairman said alright, Sir, thank you very much.

V. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meetings July 17, 2023 meeting.

Chair Fairman asked are there any comments, questions, corrections. There were none.

MOTION: Vice Chair Newberry moves the Planning Board approve the minutes from the July 17, 2023 meeting as written. Ms. Malcolm seconded the motion. Vote taken – all in favor. Motion carried.

VII. Communications to the Board and VIII. Reports of Committees: Ms. Hebert said I'm going to combine communications and reports from committees. We have a couple of announcements. The Housing Working Group kicked off the Invest New Hampshire Housing Study and named the Project: Bedford - a Place to Live. So you'll see more about that project as work continues, and information unfolds. The Housing Working Group, with the consultant, also set two meeting dates. In September on September 20th, we're going to have a joint meeting with all the Boards and Commissions to introduce the project and get feedback from the Commissions on what their thoughts might be with regards to housing in Bedford. That's going to take place at the Bedford Library in the evening. I'll be sending an announcement out. You'll get a more formal invitation via e-mail very soon, but I wanted to let that that's on the horizon. And the group also set the date tentatively for November 14th for the first Public Engagement Session. This would be one of three large Public Engagement Sessions, and it would be hosted at the Bedford High School cafeteria. Things are moving forward, and the Housing Working Group will be meeting this Friday morning. Did I forget anything? Folks who are participating?

Vice Chair Newberry said I think you covered it well, Becky.

Ms. Hebert said your next Planning Board meeting is on September 11th. And your second Planning Board meeting in September is your Planning Board workshop where we talk about possible zoning amendments for the upcoming zoning amendment season and discussion process. So if you have any ideas for zoning amendments or things that you want me to consider as part of that workshop, just shoot me an e-mail and I can dig into that a little bit ahead of the workshop meeting and include it in the staff memo.

Mr. Nelson asked is there a date set for that? Ms. Hebert replied that date, I believe it's the 26th, but let me double check. We have the 25th. Mr. Nelson said thank you. Ms. Malcolm asked the 25th, you said? Ms. Hebert confirmed, the 25th, yes. Ms. Malcolm said that Yom Kippur. Ms. Hebert asked is it? Ms. Malcolm replied yes, it is. Ms. Hebert said OK. Then we can maybe look at moving that. Hang on a second. Let me see. Priscilla, we may have already done that. It is the 18th. September 18th. Normally we're every other week, but in September, you're going to have meetings back-to-back. So you'll go September 11th and September 18th. Chair Fairman asked and the 18th is the workshop? Ms. Hebert confirmed, the 18th is the workshop. Ms. Malcolm said thank you.

Chair Fairman asked is there anything else to discuss? There was no further discussion.

IX. Adjournment:

MOTION by Vice Chair Newberry to adjourn at 8:31 pm. Ms. Malcolm duly seconded the motion. Vote taken – all in favor. Motion carried.

The next meeting of the Planning Board is scheduled for September 11, 2023.

Respectfully submitted by
Sue Forcier