

TOWN OF BEDFORD
September 13, 2021
PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES

A meeting of the Bedford Planning Board was held on Monday, July 19, 2021, at the Bedford Meeting Room, 10 Meeting House Road, Bedford, NH. Present were: Mac McMahan (Chairman), Town Councilor Bill Duschatko (Vice Chairman), Priscilla Malcolm (Secretary), Harold Newberry, Charlie Fairman, Steve Clough, Matt Sullivan, John Quintal (Alternate), John Nelson (Alternate), Matthew Nichols (Alternate), Becky Hebert (Planning Director), and Jillian Harris (Assistant Planning Director)

I. Call to Order and Roll Call:

Chairman McMahan called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Chairman McMahan stated before we get to the agenda, Tammy Penny, Bedford's Director of Finance is here, and with the concurrence of the Board, she would like to spend some time talking to us about the CIP draft for this year.

Ms. Penny stated the Town Manager is required by Charter to submit the Capital Improvement Plan after consultation with the Planning Board to the Town Council one month prior to the budget submission to Council. Town Manager Rick Sawyer was unable to attend tonight, but he did produce a staff report that I believe the Planning Board received, that really outlines what the Capital Improvement Plan is. For anybody who may not know or perhaps in the audience, the Capital Improvement Plan is a fiscal management tool used to coordinate the timing and financing of capital purchases in order to stabilize taxes.

The Planning Board is not required to take specific action as a board at this time tonight but feel free to provide any comments you have to me now and I will do my best to answer them. If you have no comments, I will just point out that there are three new items in the 2022 draft plan. Those would be the Sportsman Field turf replacement at \$800,000 in 2031, a material screener for DPW of \$180,000 in 2025, and a cablecast system for BCTV of \$31,000 in 2023. You will also see near the end of that staff report some spreadsheets and the fourth column over is the ranking and ratings. It would be particularly helpful if any of you could comment on those rating and rankings for us. Planning Board members can review and individually comment over the next month just by submitting an email to Town Manager Rick Sawyer or myself.

II. Old Business & Continued Hearings: None

III. New Business:

1. **R.J. Kelly Co., Inc. (Applicant) & Colby Court Owner, LLC (Owner)** – Request for Site Plan Approval for a change of use to convert an existing retail building (formerly Walmart) to a light industrial manufacturing facility, located at 17 Colby Court, Lot 11-

25-1, Zoned PZ.

2. **Michael McDonough (Applicant), LMJ Properties, LLC (Owner)** - Request for approval of a time extension to meet conditions of approval for a subdivision of one lot into three residential parcels at 98 Perry Road and Joppa Hill Road, Lot 18-7-6, Zoned R&A.
3. **Peter Goedecke (Applicant) & Alan Goedecke (Owner)** - Request for re-approval of a site plan amendment to add a second floor with 1,200 square-feet of office space to the Goedecke Decorating Center, 284 Route 101, Lot 27-55, Zoned CO.

IV. Concept Proposals and Other Business:

1. The Planning Board will review and offer comments on the proposed Capital Improvements Plan for 2022.

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

III. New Business:

1. **R.J. Kelly Co., Inc. (Applicant) & Colby Court Owner, LLC (Owner) – Request for Site Plan Approval for a change of use to convert an existing retail building (formerly Walmart) to a light industrial manufacturing facility, located at 17 Colby Court, Lot 11-25-1, Zoned PZ.**

Jason Lopez of Keach-Nordstrom Associates, Inc. was present to address this request for a change of use on behalf of the applicant. Also present were Brooks Goodyear of R.J. Kelly Co., Inc. and Attorney John Cronin of Cronin, Bisson and Zalinsky. Mr. Lopez stated the owner of the property is Colby Court Owner, LLC and we are talking about the former Walmart on 17 Colby Court.

Mr. Lopez stated the former Walmart building is approximately 121,000 square feet with a 16,000 square foot garden center. It has been vacant since about 2019, and R.J. Kelly is looking to market the building as a light manufacturing facility. That is an allowed use within the Performance Zone, so tonight we are requesting a change in use from retail to light industrial manufacturing.

Mr. Lopez continued we did provide a narrative for the proposal. Recently they received administrative approval for changing the color of the building and they are going to take that peaked area off from the front entrance to get rid of that Walmart feel. That has received administrative approval.

Mr. Lopez stated the existing utilities are all in place with water, sewer, underground electric, communications and natural gas. Stormwater management is a subsurface system, catch basins is in need of a little bit of maintenance, standard maintenance, as there has been nothing done for a little bit and that is notated within the plan notes of the plan posted on the screen.

Mr. Lopez stated with regard to parking, there is obviously an excess of parking out there but at this time not knowing the user, there are no proposed changes to the parking lot other than freshening up the striping, ADA spaces and signage. There are some existing loading spaces off from the back corner of the building but at this time there are no changes to the loading and there is a dumpster pad location out to the northeast corner of the building.

Mr. Lopez stated they did contract with Steve Pernaw to take a look at the traffic out there. The retail use was about 502 trips per day, and the ITE looks at the proposed use of light industrial at about 41 vehicle trips. That is quite a decrease in the amount of traffic on Colby Court.

Mr. Lopez stated the landscaping was a previously landscaped site with mature vegetation. There has been a little bit of die off where a few plants need to be replaced, possibly a few fill-ins. Again, we have notated that on the plan to be reviewed. There is also a fence that surrounds the north property line and the westerly property line. A few sections of fencing have blown down and need to be repaired. Again, before occupancy permit they will take a look at repairing those sections of fence.

Mr. Lopez stated staff did give a few recommendations. Note #15 on the plan calls out a number of items that need to be addressed before occupancy.

Mr. Lopez stated any further modifications to the site or the building would need to come back before the Board, so once they secure a tenant, you may see us back with site modifications. I can now take any questions the Board members may have.

Vice Chairman Duschatko asked is this a proposed single-tenant use or multi-tenant? Mr. Lopez replied right now it will be a single-tenant use. Vice Chairman Duschatko asked so if you want to have multi-tenants, you will have to come to revise the plan? Mr. Lopez replied I believe so.

Ms. Malcolm asked could you give me some examples of the light manufacturing that would go into this site? Mr. Lopez responded it is going to be businesses that assemble, it is not going to be heavy industrial uses. It is going to be more assembly manufacturing type businesses. We have a potential client we have been talking to. Ms. Malcolm stated I guess that is my next question. Do you have anybody in mind for this? Mr. Lopez responded there are no tenant agreements signed at this time but we are looking at a company that has shown interest and promise in the site.

Mr. Sullivan asked could you go back to the traffic numbers that you cited. I think what you stated might have been off from the report and I just want to make sure. Mr. Lopez posted the traffic report on the screen. Mr. Lopez stated for retail is 502 PM vehicle trips and anticipated for light industrial use is 41 PM vehicle trips. Mr. Sullivan asked that is per hour? Mr. Lopez responded for total peak hour.

Mr. Newberry stated I have a comment. As you work toward developing a plan with a tenant, if you can do anything to reduce some of the impervious surface there would be certainly be a win all around, I think. Mr. Lopez responded yes; and until we know the end user, we were reluctant on ripping up pavement and that kind of thing until we know what their plans and needs are. Mr. Newberry stated I understand that. As you develop your plan, if you can reduce some of that impervious surface would be good.

Mr. Fairman stated when you come to looking at finalizing the tenant, I would like the owner to look at putting solar panels to reduce the greenhouse gas emissions. There is a nice big flat roof there and it would be easy to install solar panels, so make some notes that the owner should take a look at that to save them some long term money but an upfront investment incentive. All of us need to be looking at reducing greenhouse gases.

Ms. Malcolm stated you have said hypothetically that there would be 100 employees on two shifts. Is that correct? Mr. Lopez responded correct. Ms. Malcolm asked are you sure you want to remove the bus access to this site? Mr. Lopez responded really I think that is going to be dependent upon if Manchester Transit would want to service the building. Certainly that could be brought up at a later date with them if there is a large enough demand, but right now to remove signage and so forth is the plan.

Mr. Clough asked would light industrial involve use of solvents or any hazardous materials or anything like that? Mr. Lopez responded anything would be undercover within the building and the industrial discharge permit for the sewer wastewater would have control of that, so we would have to work with Mr. Spooner with the systems inside to deal with that. Mr. Clough stated but undercover also means you might have that. Is that correct? Mr. Lopez responded we are going to have to look at who the tenant is, what they are doing and through the building permit process working with the Building Department, Sewer Department and the Fire Department. Mr. Clough responded okay.

Chairman McMahan opened this application to public comments or questions.

Dona Zajac, 212 Glenwood Avenue, stated I am an abutter and our street is a dead end street. I did take pictures but I didn't have a chance to submit them. My concern is the fencing that was put up a long time ago by Walmart. I am not sure if it actually was Walmart or they owner of the property, but the fencing that is there is a wooden fence and some of the panels are rotting. It has been repaired I believe maybe once, it could be more, but I haven't lived at that property, but I dealt with my mom who has since passed away. There are a couple of dead trees that are really of concern when it gets really, really bad weather and windy and I know the panels have blown, which I thought at some point would totally come off and hit the house. So right now there are two panels for sure that are not really connected and one of them is being supported by a dead tree. My concern is I have been reading the paperwork and it talks about fencing and repairs but I don't know if it is has gotten to the point of residential repairs of the fencing, which is my concern, and I don't know who would be responsible for that and if it could be addressed fairly quickly before winter and then throughout the years after that. That is my concern.

Chairman McMahan asked Mr. Lopez, is this the fence and the trees that you referred to earlier? Mr. Lopez responded yes. Part of the requirement for the Walmart site plan was an 8-foot wood-panel fence going around the north and west sides of the property, and there are some sections blown down on both sides, so those would need to be repaired and in Note #15 it does talk about fence panel repairs and/or replaced along the north and westerly property line. And there is also a note in there about the landscaping on the approved site plan for Walmart that would need to be replaced to that original site plan. Chairman McMahan asked that would be done by the owner? Mr. Lopez replied yes. Chairman McMahan asked Ms. Zajac, does that answer your question? Ms. Zajac asked that would include residential then? Because my other concern was the fencing

that they did put up which he has testified is 8 feet, is really not sufficient. When they did repair work, they brought the fencing up higher so it left a really big gap on the bottom to the ground and the fencing. You can see right straight through to their buildings, property and a lot of it. It is just kind of not a very good fencing where it staggers from those where they brought it up when they did the repairs and it wasn't done professionally. It was done rather quickly. I know my mom had to call them back to get the repair work done properly. I know that wood rots, so I didn't know if there is an alternative to that type of fencing. Mr. Newberry stated do you have a timeline for addressing the fence repair? Mr. Lopez responded that was going to be at occupancy, I believe. Mr. Newberry asked so the fence isn't going to be repaired until you have a tenant occupying the building? Mr. Lopez responded prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit, but I can speak to them about their schedule on that. If I might get a little clarification just so I can communicate with the owner. If you could give me your name and the property address so I can speak with the owner. I am not sure what property that section of fence that is being asked about. Chairman McMahan stated Ms. Zajac, if you could provide that information, that would be helpful. Ms. Zajac stated that is 212 Glenwood Avenue. Ms. Hebert stated that is on the westerly side of the building.

Mr. Fairman stated I think I would like to see any of the dead trees around the perimeter removed before this winter, and I would like to perhaps put that as a condition, if we could. I think I would like to have a condition that all of the fencing and trees be restored to the original Walmart site plan. In other words, if there are panels that are too far off the ground, I would like those restored to the right height and all of the fence needs to be per the initial Walmart plan. Mr. Lopez stated that was the intent, is to go back to that approved site plan. Mr. Fairman stated even one that is good and steady now that has been repaired, take that down and build it correctly. Mr. Lopez stated I will have to review that with the owner. I am not aware of any sections like that, but I will go out and look at it again and review that with the owner. Ms. Zajac stated I do have the pictures that I am going to submit to Ms. Harris. Tomorrow I am going to call her and I can forward the pictures from my phone to her so that you can see everything I am saying. I apologize for not having that visual right now, but I do have pictures. Chairman McMahan stated that is no problem. Staff will get that and forward it onto Mr. Lopez. Ms. Hebert stated we walked site and we will inspect the site again, probably several times, but I do agree with you that the fencing needs to come down to the ground, there can't be big gaps in the fencing, it can't be staggered, it needs to be a continuous stockade fence, and that is what Walmart was approved for, so we can refer back to that plan.

Bill Plants stated my concern is that we are going to get into a place of business that is maybe going to have sustained noise options all evening and during the nighttime hours. I guess that is about the biggest concern. We still have noise and stuff like that from down below on South River Road but I just don't want to have somebody that is in there running some kind of machinery that is droning on for hours and hours. I think that is about it. Chairman McMahan asked Mr. Lopez, I guess it is going to depend on what you get in there for tenants. As far as attenuation, is that going to be taken into consideration for what kind of manufacturing takes this place? Mr. Lopez responded all I can say at this point is that until we know who the end user is going to be, it would be hard to address anything like that. But the Walmart site plan was approved with no deliveries between the hours of 11:00pm and 6:30am, so there is a restriction on the previously approved site plan of operation for some of the deliveries and stuff. Any new tenant we would have to see what their use is and the arrangement is and then be back before the Board and have that conversation. Chairman McMahan asked Mr. Plants, does that answer your

question? Mr. Plants replied I knew you didn't have any tenants slated in there yet so I knew that was going to be a question mark. I am just concerned that the noise from the building or from machinery around the building is going to drone on and on, rather than be contained within the building to isolate it from the neighborhoods. Once he finds out who is going to be in there, will be a better time to answer that question. Ms. Hebert stated there is also a condition in the staff report that any future user would need to comply with the Town's environmental Performance Zone standards, and they are quite specific with regard to noise and odor. So there are measurable standards for noise and that is something that any future tenant would have to comply with.

Ken Sevigny, 211 Salem Street, Manchester, stated I live along the north elevation. I would like to preference my remarks by saying that I was the guy 20 years ago fighting against building that building and they ended up being very good neighbors, so I am hoping that this is the same situation. Our main concern, and my neighbors who are right to my right over there, the hours of operation, exterior noise, that has already been touched upon, the deliver hours because we live right there by the receiving area, the fence has already been brought up and that has been a big problem. I have three sections of fence in my yard alone that are on the ground. With the lighting, if it isn't substantially changed, it would be good as there is already an excess of lighting there but that was in a retail situation and I am hoping that with light manufacturing and there aren't retail situations and all of that, that that could be address or at least maintained. A lot of our concern at that part of the neighborhood because we are so close and we are Manchester residents that sometimes we don't get the attention that we need. It happened eventually when the Walmart was completed, after a few years we built a good relationship with them and they were great neighbors, and then I was the first one complaining when they closed the place because then all of a sudden you had problems with vandalism, we had problems as the place was not getting maintained, so I just want to make sure that we address the Manchester residents on the north side. I know we don't have tenant yet so this is really preliminary, I just wanted to bring those things forward to you. Mr. Lopez stated I guess I pretty much touched on most of those items except for lighting. There are no proposed changes to lighting, and, again, depending on the future tenant, if removal of pavement, parking lot it would probably ultimately be a reduction in lighting. At this time there is no proposal to increase lighting.

Mr. Fairman stated I have a follow-up question. Right now you are relative hours of operation you are thinking two shifts, not three. Is that correct? Do they have to come back to the Board if they want a third shift? Ms. Hebert responded we could make that a condition but not necessarily. Mr. Fairman stated I think that would be good because of the concerns about hours of operation and that might be something we might want to discuss later on once we know what operation it is. Ms. Hebert asked do you have general hours of operation that we could propose? Mr. Lopez responded without a tenant I wouldn't, I would just be taking a shot in the dark.

Mr. Newberry stated based on what we have heard I would think that as you are developing your plans, you need to keep in mind that this is adjacent to a residential area, it is not a light industrial in an industrial park, but a light industrial proposed use that is adjacent to a residential area and I think you need to make sure that that figure into your development plans include recognizing the neighbors.

Chairman McMahan closed the public input session on this change of use application.

MOTION by Mr. Fairman that the Planning Board grant final approval of the site plan to convert an existing retail building into a light manufacturing building in accordance with the site plan by Keach-Nordstrom Associates, last revised August 19, 2021, with the following conditions to be fulfilled within one year and prior to plan signature, and the remaining conditions of approval to be fulfilled as noted:

- 1. The Director of Public Works and the Planning Director shall determine that the applicant has addressed all remaining technical review comments to the Town's satisfaction.**
- 2. The Applicant shall submit any outstanding engineering review fees.**
- 3. The proposed future industrial use shall comply with the Environmental Performance Standards of the Bedford Zoning Ordinance, Section 275-70.**
- 4. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy for the building, the Applicant shall pay the sewer accessibility fee, as applicable.**
- 5. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy for the building, all site improvements depicted on the plan shall be completed.**
- 6. All dead trees shall be removed prior to this coming winter.**
- 7. Any future plans for the addition of a third shift will require Planning Board approval.**

Mr. Newberry asked would you accept an amendment to the motion that the fencing be addressed? Mr. Fairman responded yes. Mr. Newberry stated I am suggesting either an 8th condition or add to Condition #6 that they do at least basic repairs to the fencing before winter. Mr. Fairman stated perhaps it would be adequate that before winter, and I will ask the residents, to remove the downed panels of the fencing before winter with plans to refurbish everything in the future, or do we want to do repair and put up the new panels before winter. I certainly think that if there are some panels on some of these properties that they ought to be picked up ASAP. Chairman McMahan responded I guess what I heard was the concern by the public was that the trees may fall and cause damage and hurt somebody. Mr. Fairman stated I do want the trees addressed, but the fencing needs to be addressed soon. Mr. Newberry stated we could make it a condition just to repair the existing fence and then once they get ready to modify the site, to include doing the fencing properly. I would ask the applicant if that is something that they think they can work with. Mr. Lopez responded I think the real question is there already an agreement on the plan for the fence panels to be repaired or replaced, and also dealing with dead and dying landscaping, I think the real statement that I am hearing is whether or not that is done before winter or before occupancy. Chairman McMahan stated the view that I heard from the public was that they thought that the dead trees could be an issue and they would like that done. With that in mind, the panels you have already covered, and the other one you mentioned with the shifts. Mr. Newberry stated since you don't know if you are going to have a tenant lined up in a month or 12 months, I think we have heard that the fencing, at least in places, is not just needing repair, it is fallen over and my concern is that we address that as a part of approving the change of use so that that gets done promptly.

Mr. Fairman stated I would like to move on the condition that Mr. Newberry stated that the fencing shall all be repaired in the spring or by June 30th. Mr. Newberry stated I would say no later than spring because if you can do it this fall, that would probably be preferable. Mr. Fairman stated I know materials can be hard to get these days. Mr. Newberry stated so the friendly amendment is new proposed Condition #8 to repair the existing fencing no later than

spring. Ms. Hebert stated date specific is easier for staff to enforce. By May 30th or June 1st. Mr. Newberry stated how about May 30th. Ms. Hebert stated that is great.

- 8. The fencing on the north and westerly side of the property shall be repaired to the initial Walmart approved site plan no later than May 30, 2022.**

Ms. Malcolm duly seconded the motion as amended. Vote taken; the amended motion carried.

- 2. Michael McDonough (Applicant), LMJ Properties, LLC (Owner) - Request for approval of a time extension to meet conditions of approval for a subdivision of one lot into three residential parcels at 98 Perry Road and Joppa Hill Road, Lot 18-7-6, Zoned R&A.**

Jason Lopez of Keach-Nordstrom Associates, Inc. was present to address this request for a time extension on behalf of the applicant. Also present are Attorney John Cronin of Cronin, Bisson and Zalinsky, and the owner, Michael McDonough.

Mr. Lopez stated on August 17, 2020 we received conditional approval for a 3-lot subdivision. We have two remaining items that need to be addressed. We originally requested a 6-month extension, the staff report suggests extending one year and we are in agreement with that request, so we are just simply asking for a 1-year extension on the conditions of approval. Chairman McMahan asked there are no other changes? Mr. Lopez stated there are no other changes.

Chairman McMahan opened this application to public comments or questions. There were none. Chairman McMahan closed this application to public comments and questions.

MOTION by Ms. Malcolm that the Planning Board grant a 1-year time extension to the Planning Board subdivision approval for LMJ Properties LLC (Owner), to create two new residential lots at 98 Perry Road and Joppa Hill Road, Lot 18-7-6, in accordance with the plan prepared by Keach-Nordstrom Associates, last revised July 30, 2020, with the following conditions to be fulfilled within one year and prior to plan signature, and the remaining conditions of approval to be fulfilled as noted:

- 1. All conditions of the August 17, 2020 subdivision approval shall remain in effect.**

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

- 2. Peter Goedecke (Applicant) & Alan Goedecke (Owner) - Request for re-approval of a site plan amendment to add a second floor with 1,200 square-feet of office space to the Goedecke Decorating Center, 284 Route 101, Lot 27-55, Zoned CO.**

Peter Goedecke was present to address this request for re-approval of a site plan amendment.

Mr. Goedecke stated the site plan expired, which I did not realize, so when I went to get a building permit I did not realize that it expired. I would like to get that renewed if I could so that we can get the building permit. As far as changes, there are no changes. Originally there were some things that I had to do, like add some extra trees, which I did, so aside from that, everything is basically 100 percent the same. The DOT driveway permit needed to be renewed and the DES permit but that is on the way. That could be a condition, as I am sure you would like to have on there.

Mr. Newberry stated I have a question to staff. Are the two waiver requests just a renewal of existing ones or are these new waivers? Ms. Harris responded those are the same waivers that were granted last time, they were part of the last approval, so they should be a part of a new approval. Ms. Hebert stated the entire package site plan conditions of approval are identical to what was approved by the Board originally, and then for this renewal you have the updating of the two state permits that had expired.

Chairman McMahan stated there are no members of the public present for comments or questions. Did we receive any emails on this application? Ms. Harris replied we did not.

MOTION by Mr. Newberry that the Planning Board approve the following two waivers to the Bedford Land Development Control Regulations:

- **Section 317.1.11, to provide HISS mapping**
- **Section 327.2.1, requiring a dumpster setback of 30 feet from the lot line**

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

MOTION by Mr. Newberry that the Planning Board grant re-approval of the site plan amendment to Alan and Nancy Goedecke, to permit a 1,260 square-foot addition to the Goedecke Decorating Center at 284 NH Route 101, as shown on the plans by Meridian Land Services, Inc., last revised on January 7, 2020 and the architectural plans by Eskin Associates Architects, with the following conditions to be fulfilled prior to plan signature and the other conditions to be addressed as noted:

- 1. If the waivers are granted by the Planning Board, the plan shall be revised to note the waivers as granted by the Board and date of approval.**
- 2. The applicant shall provide a copy of the updated NHDOT Driveway Permit to the Planning Department and note the permit number on the plan.**
- 3. The applicant shall provide a copy of the updated NHDES septic permit to the Planning Department and note the approval number on the plan or provide documentation to staff that such a permit is not necessary.**
- 4. Prior to a certificate of occupancy being issued for the addition, all improvements depicted on the plan shall be complete.**

Ms. Malcolm duly seconded the motion.

Mr. Fairman asked this doesn't include a date that this approval would expire? Ms. Hebert replied it is a complete renewing of the approval, so it would be valid for one year, which is one year from plan signature to get a building permit.

Chairman McMahan called for a vote on the motion; all in favor. Motion carried.

IV. Concept Proposals and Other Business:

1. The Planning Board will review and offer comments on the proposed Capital Improvements Plan for 2022.

Mr. Newberry stated I found the notation to be pretty good in terms of explaining the context of the items. I think it was probably a little more detailed than we have seen in the past, and I thought it was very helpful and a nice job. I can send a note to you to pass on; the only other comment I had was, and I am not 100 percent sure that it applies, but at some point I think, as Mr. Fairman often points out, that we might want to try to encourage some kind of a plan addressing alternative energy sources and/or solar as a part of some of the Town facilities.

Mr. Fairman stated I have hand time to review it. I don't know whether we should try to have another discussion at the next meeting or just send comments to Town Manager Sawyer. Three or four days is not enough for me to do it justice to review. Ms. Hebert responded it is early in the budget process. I do know that the Town Manager is needing to move the CIP onto the Town Council for their review, so I would suggest that you email comments directly to Town Manager Sawyer or you can email them to me or Ms. Harris and we will forward them on. There will be review and discussion at the Town Council level of the CIP, and they can take those comments into consideration as they begin that process. Chairman McMahan asked did I hear Ms. Penny correctly that they would like them within 30 days? Ms. Hebert responded yes; you have 30 days. Chairman McMahan stated that is a lot to digest. Mr. Fairman stated the only reason to have the Board discuss this so all members could hear comments, but I don't want to take up more Board time than is necessary either. I expect the next meeting might be a big one. Ms. Hebert stated your next meeting is your fall workshop and we have kind of a full agenda of long-range planning topics, zoning amendments to discuss. We can add the CIP on that agenda at your next meeting but I think really the Finance Director and the Town Manager are looking for your thoughts and your comments, they are not looking for a motion or recommendation from the Planning Board as a whole, so because you are so involved in the development process, the idea is that the Planning Board has an opportunity to review the CIP early and provide any comments or feedback.

Ms. Hebert asked Vice Chairman Duschatko, do any of you have any thoughts on the budget process as the Town Council rep? Vice Chairman Duschatko indicated no.

Mr. Clough stated there was some chatter about building another safety complex. Is that in the works or in the planning? Ms. Hebert replied there is money in the current CIP and in this proposed CIP for facilities planning but for the early stages of facilities planning. Site selection, engineering, review, concept development, those types of items are included, and site acquisition. Chairman McMahan stated one of the things I wanted to look at is how soon that fire truck with the extended ladder and what the priority was and when it will be funded because

that was one of the concerns. Ms. Hebert stated I have an update on that. We have an existing ladder truck that has been repaired and is functioning and the Fire Department had mentioned during our past year site plan review discussions that a new ladder truck was needed. The ladder truck was ordered; it takes 18 months from the date you order it for it to arrive. It is due in July, so we are still out quite a few months, about a year. Vice Chairman Duschatko stated that's a year but it is almost two years as originally projected. Ms. Hebert stated that item moved up in last year's CIP as a need, and the Fire Department was able to make that purchase and put that order in, so they build them to order basically. Chairman McMahan stated I would think that the Planning Board has interest in this type of thing, as we consider apartment buildings, and has had some influence on it. Vice Chairman Duschatko stated there is influence because the other one was down more than it was up and it is hideously expensive and apparently did not last very long. Work is still being done on that particular vehicle. Ms. Hebert stated fire items do increase the period in which engines are replaced, so they are looking at 7-year cycle now for replacement of engines.

Mr. Clough stated they also had a 10-year life span for Sportsman Field, and I used to consult in this area and the life span for an artificial turf field is typically 12 to 14 years, at least the ones that we used to install. Is there any way that we can push that out? Ms. Hebert responded it is such a new amenity for the Town, I think they were looking at a 10-year cycle for resurfacing the turf. Mr. Clough asked how long did the one at the high school last? Ms. Hebert responded 12 years. Vice Chairman Duschatko stated and that was old technology. Mr. Clough stated you would think that the new technology would last a little longer because I do know they have better polymers now in the turf. Vice Chairman Duschatko stated it is a matter of basically selecting an effective life at the time it was done and discuss that was what we had. Any input we can receive on information that would indicate an extended life, would be more than welcome to receive by the Town Council. I appreciate that. Chairman McMahan stated especially since you have expertise.

V. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meetings:

MOTION by Ms. Malcolm to approve the minutes of the July 19, 2021 Planning Board minutes as written. Vice Chairman Duschatko duly seconded the motion. Vote taken; motion carried, with Mr. Clough abstaining.

MOTION by Ms. Malcolm to approve the minutes of the August 16, 2021 Planning Board minutes as written. Vice Chairman Duschatko duly seconded the motion. Vote taken; motion carried, with Mr. Clough, Mr. Fairman and Mr. Sullivan abstaining.

VI. Communications to the Board:

Ms. Hebert stated the next Planning Board meeting is your annual fall workshop meeting where we talk about long-range planning items, zoning amendments and topics that affect the Planning Board. I will also be circulating a copy of the Master Plan and we will start the review of the final draft version of the Master Plan at that meeting. I will try to get that out to you as early as possible so that you have plenty of time to look through all of the material. The packet will have information about the various planning topics, and we want to make sure you have enough time

to review it and read through it. Please bring your ideas to the meeting, it is going to be a free-flow discussion between the Board and staff as we plan for our long-range planning for the year.

VII. Reports of Committees: None

VIII. Adjournment:

MOTION by Mr. Fairman to adjourn at 7:55 p.m. Mr. Newberry duly seconded the motion. Vote taken – all in favor. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted by
Valerie J. Emmons