

1 MILFORD PLANNING BOARD MEETING
2 May 22, 2018 Board of Selectmen's Meeting Room, 6:30 PM
3

4 **Members Present:**

5 Doug Knott, Chairman
6 Christopher Beer, Vice Chairman
7 Paul Amato, Member
8 Janet Langdell, Member
9 Susan Robinson, Member
10 Tim Finan, Member
11 Jacob LaFontaine, Alternate member
12

Staff:

Lincoln Daley, Comm Dev Director
Darlene Bouffard, Recording Secretary
Amy Concannon, Videographer

13 **Excused:**

14 Kevin Federico, BOS rep
15 Veeral Bharucha, Alternate member
16

17 **1. Call to order:**

18 Chairman Knott called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m. introductions were made of Board members and
19 staff. Chairman Knott indicated that tonight's meeting has three items on the agenda.
20

21 **2. Review / Approval of Meeting Minutes:**

22 a. **April 24, 2018.** J. Langdell requested an amendment to the minutes. J. Langdell moved to approve the
23 minutes of April 24, 2018 as amended. T. Finan seconded. All were in favor. Motion passed with S.
24 Robinson abstaining.
25 b. **May 1, 2018.** J. Langdell requested an amendment to the minutes. J. Langdell moved to approve the
26 minutes of May 1, 201 as amended. P. Amato seconded. J. Langdell, P. Amato and S. Robinson were in
27 favor, with D. Knott, C. Beer and T. Finan abstaining. Motion passed.
28

29 **3. Public Hearing(s):**

30 a. **Jessica Hudson for the properties located at Tax Map 43, Lots 24 and 25, Tonella Road – Major**
31 **Subdivision and Lot Line Adjustment.**
32

33 b. **Jessica Hudson for the properties located at Tax Map 32, Lots 24 and 25. Tonella Road – Major**
34 **Site Plan.**
35

36 J. Langdell indicated that J. LaFontaine is sitting in tonight as an alternate but is not voting. L. Daley
37 asked if Jacob can comment or discuss items at this meeting? D. Knott thought it might be better for Jacob to
38 not speak. J. Langdell would like to do some more research moving forward on that issue of alternate
39 members. The consensus was to hear the two Tonella Road applications together and discuss but the
40 decisions would be handled separately.
41

42 Doug MacGuire, Dubay Group, indicated when this was left off at the last meeting, there were a few
43 small outstanding items which he will now summarize. The outstanding comments on the plan have been
44 cleaned up, and 99% of the staff comments have been addressed. A few items need to be ironed out with
45 DPW. One item from the last time was the site walk, the site walk has happened and was the only change
46 from the last meeting. During one review, site contamination was brought up, so he did some research and
47 there is no open DES file on this site at all. Town staff found that the gas tanks were above ground and were
48 removed properly, the Milford Fire Department had those records. There is no known contamination on the
49 site. Contributions from a traffic standpoint were made by the LedgeWood Drive development which donated
50 \$45 per unit. Using that same method, it would be \$750 per unit for this development. Mr. MacGuire
51 indicated the applicant is substantially upgrading Tonella Road and will be adding the sidewalk tip-downs and
52 striping and those values will exceed that contribution. The developer is providing public improvements in
53 this plan. J. Langdell asked where visitors will park? D. MacGuire said we do have ample parking for the
54 sixteen units. The driveways are long. J. Langdell said most families have two cars, plus visitors. D.
55 MacGuire answered there are garages under the units as well. The driveways are 30' long which is two
56 additional cars. J. Langdell indicated that is the building on the right side, she then asked what about the

57 building on the left side? D. MacGuire responded the requirement is two parking spaces per unit. There is no
58 curbing on this street, so they could park on the street, it is public.

59
60 P. Amato asked how wide is Tonella Road? D. MacGuire said he feels there is more than enough parking
61 for visitors because of the underground parking. The driveway is 12' wide. P. Amato asked if the parking
62 spaces will be marked for specific units? Mr. MacGuire answered yes they will be marked. P. Amato asked
63 how many square feet are in each unit? D. MacGuire responded some of the units are 1296 sf and some are
64 1600 sf. J. Langdell asked how the \$45 per unit was determined for Ledgewood? L. Daley responded the
65 Nashua Street Improvement Fund literature was provided to members this evening and identifies how that
66 was calculated. In 2004 it was determined that \$8,100 would be provided from Ledgewood. The staff
67 recommendation at that time was \$100 per peak trip for 180 units. The \$45 per unit was determined from a
68 formula based on that information. Using that same method for this project, with no inflation, and using the
69 recent traffic study, it comes to \$51 per unit for a total of \$1230.

70
71 P. Amato asked what is done with that money? L. Daley answered the Nashua Street improvements,
72 these funds were used for improvements in front of Burger King and for the sidewalk study along Nashua
73 Street. The \$15,000 remaining in the fund will be used to connect Capron Road to the Walgreens sidewalk.
74 P. Amato asked if we are saving up for a traffic light at the end of Tonella Road? J. Langdell indicated that
75 fund does not include Tonella Road. When a plan comes up along Nashua Street, we can collect funds for a
76 traffic light. D. MacGuire indicated the tip-downs being added are off-site improvements that are being done.
77 Knott asked where did the tip-down recommendation come from? D. MacGuire responded that
78 recommendation came from DPW. D. Knott said the developer could have turned that recommendation
79 down. D. MacGuire said ultimately that lies with the Planning Board if you do not want that to be done you
80 can turn it down. We see the tip-downs as an off-site improvement.

81
82 T. Finan asked if the sidewalk goes down to Nashua Street? D. MacGuire responded that it does. P.
83 Amato asked if it is felt the tip-downs take the place of the money to be collected per unit for Nashua Street
84 improvements? D. MacGuire responded this is an off-site improvement. J. Langdell said the developer is
85 putting in a small neighborhood and as a developer is obligated to add some things to make it a safe
86 neighborhood. D. MacGuire said there are existing sidewalks there, J. Langdell said the requirements have
87 changed since Ledgewood was built. D. MacGuire indicated there are ramps in the plan, the tip-downs are an
88 improvement. L. Daley indicated Red Oak was the most recent contribution to the Nashua Street
89 Improvements Fund. P. Amato said this is a dedicated fund for projects that have a direct impact on Nashua
90 Street. L. Daley indicated in 2008 the Maple Street/Wilton Road intersection also contributed \$15,000. J.
91 Langdell indicated Pine Valley needed to contribute for a stop sign as an off-site contribution. L. Daley
92 noted there are other examples as well. J. Langdell asked if Longley Place provided any contribution? L.
93 Daley did not see any contribution from them on the list. P. Amato does not remember any contribution from
94 them.

95
96 D. MacGuire reminded the Planning Board that the comparison is 180 units versus 16 units. The trips
97 being added are insignificant. The development increases 8 trips during peak hours. P. Amato stated the
98 Board is only looking at \$1,500 for a contribution, in this case the cost is too much for a fund to improve
99 Nashua Street. D. Knott said we could use the non-inflationary formula. C. Beer said we should have them
100 do the tip-downs and striping and not a contribution. S. Robinson asked if there was a request for a
101 contribution toward a traffic light (from the Police). L. Daley said that is just a suggestion. That is based on
102 Polide experience at the intersection. S. Robinson said a lot of people say it is hard to get out of that
103 intersection. When CVS was being developed, P. Amato said we could not get anyone to say that a light was
104 needed. S. Robinson indicated the sidewalk tip-downs and striping are valuable. P. Amato agrees with
105 striping and tip-downs. T. Finan agrees with the contribution, if they can do both, that is great. J. Langdell
106 asked what it would cost to do the tip-downs and striping? D. MacGuire responded it is at least \$5,000 to do
107 it but that is just his estimate. The tip-downs and striping will cost more than the contribution. J. Langdell
108 feels like both should be done but whatever the Planning Board decides, she will go along, but she would
109 prefer both to be done. S. Robinson thinks both should be done. T. Finan would rather have the tip-downs
110 and striping. Consensus was the majority of the Board wants the off-site improvements contribution and the
111 minority wants both (including tip-downs and striping). C. Beer moved to accept the striping and curb

improvements in lieu of a contribution. P. Amato seconded. J. Langdell and S. Robinson were opposed; T. Finan, C. Beer and P. Amato were in favor. D. Knott abstained. Motion passed.

J. Langdell asked about the stone structure, and if the President of the Heritage Commission has brought forward any suggestions for moving a plan forward; at the last discussion there was a request for a six month delay of this development in order for research to be conducted. It has been 30 days since that meeting, has anyone seen a proposal brought forward? L. Daley said nothing has been moved forward or solidified in this regard, the last request was for additional time (6 months) to find out how to take care of the stone structure. J. Langdell said there was a 30 day window since the last meeting to look at how to move the structure and to seek funding sources for a solution. The Heritage Commission is not present this evening. J. Langdell said the Planning Board should be informed of whatever is being considered at on that issue, to close the loop. D. Knott said it was felt that the Heritage Commission had ample time since January to look at it. There has been nothing brought forward to date, only reference to a document. C. Beer stated the Heritage Commission had 30 days to come up with a plan and they have not come forward with anything.

S. Robinson asked when the developer will break ground? D. MacGuire indicated late in this construction period based on financing. Groundbreaking will not be immediate. The applicant is still very happy to work with the town on solutions that have been brought up regarding the stone house. Some of the stone may be utilized at the Fletcher park; the applicant is amenable to doing that. D. Knott said it is private property and there was an e-mail exchange regarding the applicant's willingness to work with the town. The town could document the stone structure, study it and portions of it will be utilized in the back portion of the owners own property and they will also donate some stone to the town for educational preservation. J. Langdell asked how would that stone be incorporated into the back part of their property? D. MacGuire responded the family has used some pieces on their property and the intent was to state that the applicant was not interested in delaying the development for six months, if something was brought forward, the applicant would be open to that. There were other options brought up that the applicant is willing to talk about. J. Langdell said a video/audio documentary about the structure could be incorporated into the quarry business done in town, but the town does not expect the applicant to do that. She appreciates that the family is willing to continue the discussions about the stone. D. MacGuire said the structure has not been maintained and there is some overgrowth. J. Langdell hopes the town takes this opportunity to do something with the school or Historic/Heritage Commissions regarding the stone structure. C. Beer said it should be noted the stone structure is on private property and if people want to see the structure, they need the owner's permission. L. Daley said the entire property is private including the quarry.

S. Robinson asked approximately when the construction is expected to end. D. MacGuire expects August to be the earliest starting time. S. Robinson said the applicant seems comfortable with continuing the discussion to find an acceptable conclusion. D. MacGuire said the conversation will continue through Community Development and the project will go from there. L. Daley indicated the conditions should be part of any approval and dialog should continue with the town. C. Beer does not think having that as a condition of approval is necessary. P. Amato said it does not have anything to do with the site plan. There were no additional comments from the Board. The public hearing was opened for questions or comments. Seeing none, the public hearing was closed

L. Daley indicated the drainage improvements are the responsibility of the owner. D. MacGuire responded there is a note on the site plan addressing that. L. Daley indicated he is speaking of the improvements that run underneath the Tonella Road Extension, which requires easements for maintenance. Those easements need to be reviewed and approved by the town. D. MacGuire responded that they are not opposed to easements or granting those easements because of the town road. L. Daley asked about utilities and consolidating overhead lines. D. MacGuire said the grading and drainage plan shows they have existing conditions, and it is proposed to go underground from one pole to all three buildings. No additional poles will be needed, however the only request is that it not go underground for the length of the site, only the proposed lines will go underground.

The subdivision plan is for an existing lot with 40' frontage then the larger lot with no frontage and no easements. The applicant is proposing an extension of the Tonella right of way which gives frontage to the

lots without frontage. P. Amato said there are some conditions on the subdivision. P. Amato moved to approve the subdivision plan and lot line adjustment with staff recommendations. C. Beer seconded. All were in favor. Motion passed unanimously. The waivers had been approved at the last meeting.

J. Langdell asked if the EMS concerns were addressed in the revised site plan? L. Daley said they were. D. Knott asked if the snow will be stored out of the wetland area? L. Daley said yes. S. Robinson asked if the house will be moved to the other side of the driveway? D. Knott noted in order for them to do that, an additional approval would be needed from zoning, so that is not part of this application. L. Daley agreed. D. Knott asked if there were any other comments or questions from the Board on the site plan. Seeing none, he opened up the public hearing. There were no further comments or questions and no further staff comments or questions. J. Langdell stated she is concerned about units 1 and 2. S. Robinson asked if the applicant has addressed comments from the Conservation Commission? L. Daley said they have. C. Beer moved to conditionally approve the site plan contingent on the staff recommendations. P. Amato seconded. All were in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

c. Hitchiner Manufacturing, Inc., 594 Elm Street, Tax Map 13, Lot 6, and 97 Old Wilton Road, Tax Map 14, Lot 6. Anthony Rodrigues and Earl Blatchford, presenting for Hitchiner Manufacturing. P. Amato moved to accept the application for review. C. Beer seconded. All were in favor. C. Beer moved no potential regional impact. P. Amato seconded. All were in favor. Abutters list was presented, those present include: Haynor Swenson, Town of Milford, Hitchiner Manufacturing. Dennis Meyers, architect, indicated this plan is very similar to the plan presented April 3, 2018, a few things have been tweaked and the design work on drainage has been addressed. The appearance is not greatly different from what was previously presented. There are two parts of the application: the proposed Plant No. 3 building with 74,000 sf footprint with 5,000 sf open space. The minor part of the application is The Barn restaurant. Currently The Barn has a gravel parking area. There are current renovations being done at this building and there has been some history of flooding. During large rain events, there has been quite a problem. A new foundation on that building is being proposed and changing the parking from gravel to pavement to make it into five parking spaces. The handicapped parking will be in the back and a handicapped access will be created. Deliveries will be in the back of the building.

D. Meyers indicated there is improvement being made to the low spot. The Plant No. 3 building will be 85,000 sf and it is between the new parking lot area. The building will be located in the grassy field area where the old Plant No. 2 was previously. Parking will be added between Plant 1 and Plant 3. There will be two overhead doors on the side, where materials get moved. The employee entrance is on the south side in the southwest corner of the building. The roof drains will be picked up in a pipe system and along the south wall using pipe into a basin. Comments were received from DES. Some comments have been received from Fred Elkind as well and those are currently being addressed. Water, gas, power and communications are getting extended from the west facilities on the site. The pump station is designed to handle the sewer for the new building. A dumpster is identified on the plan. Landscaping will keep the existing maples along the Elm Street side and they will be supplemented with Elms as discussed previously. A Special Exception was granted by the ZBA for disturbance within the wetland buffer along the swail. The Special Exception is noted on Sheet 1 of the Site Plan. The lighting will be LED with full cut off, most is wall mounted. In the service area, there are pole mounted lights. The existing parking lot area has its own lighting. Along the southern existing parking lot a little light gets lost but we increase by 4 parking spaces. Hitchiner feels the parking meets the needs for the use. The proposal is to add 85 employees over three shifts and it is felt that is sufficient.

J. Langdell read from the staff memo about the required spaces. Hitchiner has always come in to talk about the parking requirements. L. Daley shared the information about shifts in the regulations. J. Langdell just wanted to point out that in the past this has been addressed and identified that there are three different shifts. A. Rodrigues stated they did their own survey to identify parking spaces and it worked. E. Blatchford said the 85 parking spaces is for all of the additional employees over all three shifts. E. Blatchford turned the presentation over to D. Meyers. J. Langdell asked about the open space. E. Blatchford replied said the plan is contingent on a voluntary merger of M/L 13-6 and 13-7-1 which was a residential lot, and is 9/10 of an acre. Because of this voluntary merger, the open space is more than the 30% requirement. J. Langdell asked if it

will be on the final plan? A. Rodrigues said it will. P Amato asked what the open space will be used for? A. Rodrigues said it is just open and green and has been reclaimed and seeded. E. Blatchford said the expansion of the stormwater area will be added on the plan. D. Meyers said an architect in Manchester described the details of the building. The height of the structure is based on the crane needed in Building 3. The third floor mechanical mezzanine is for units that might normally be on the roof. The roof is 39', the GTO office building is only 25' high and there will be some equipment outside. The voluntary merger was just recorded last week. There were monuments out there. With that merger it just qualified and it was subject to that lot line. L. Daley asked if that was recorded? E. Blatchford said yes last week. D. Meyers asked if there were questions from the Board. P. Amato asked if there are any Fire Department questions about the air conditioning units being inside the building. A. Rodrigues said they will have air ducts inside and have been used in many places and are much easier to maintain. P. Amato commented that it makes sense to put them inside, it is a lot easier and there is room available. J. Langdell thanked the presenter for supplying the information tonight, specifically about the rain garden. The Conservation Commission looked at solar possibilities. A. Rodrigues said the structure has been designed to use solar in the future. J. Langdell was appreciative of the green snow removal process on the site. D. Knott thinks it is great that Hitchiner is doing that and getting behind green initiatives. A. Rodrigues related the information to the snow contractor who is reaching out to UNH for that. J. Langdell said additional signage could be considered on the Elm Street side. A. Rodrigues understood it is for the new entrance down the service roads but it is not a through way.

L. Daley thinks along the Elm Street side of the building, some shrubs could be added. He asked if the existing Elm trees will remain. L. Daley indicated the regulations on landscaping require trees every 5 feet. D. Knott feels the trees will block the building better than shrubs. J. Langdell asked if there has been an analysis of what is proper for the region? L. Daley stated without the trees, they would not meet the regulations. He asked if additional plantings could be planted next to the building. A. Rodrigues said they can look at adding some additional plantings. L. Daley said the building is big. P. Amato wants the regulations to be met for an industrial zone or shopping center. L. Daley said having landscaping further away from the building is not very effective. A. Rodrigues responded he can look at that further to break up the size of the building a little bit. L. Daley said in the drainage area, east of the building, that area could use some landscaping to provide additional screening. A. Rodrigues responded there are existing deciduous trees on the bank of the swail which will not be disturbed. L. Daley asked if a pedestrian walkway could be put along the easterly side. A. Rodrigues said with the service area, it might be difficult. E. Blatchford said the Conservation Commission comment was similar to the Planning Board comment in that there could be an area for employees to move around the site. The area around the swail is a difficult area for a walkway.

L. Daley said the plan revisions were the only other comments from him. A. Rodrigues has responded to all of Lincoln's other comments on the plan. J. Langdell would like everyone to think about the possibility of public transit in this area someday. P. Amato said there is plenty of room that we could add public transit at some point. E. Blatchford said he understands the comments but without any specific proposal, we acknowledge there is that possibility in the future. The meeting was opened for public comments. Seeing none, D. Knott closed the public hearing. There were no further staff comments. P. Amato asked if the Planning Board comments have all been addressed? L. Daley said they have been and the memo was received from the applicant to address his comments as well. P. Amato asked if there is anything else that would require the applicant to come back before the Planning Board? L. Daley responded there is nothing else. P. Amato said for them to get the AOT is the biggest challenge. P. Amato moved to grant conditional approval with the five recommendations from staff, without number 3. J. Langdell seconded. All were in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

4. Public Meeting(s):

a. **Town of Milford, Fire Department, 39 School Street, Tax Map 26, Lot 168.** D. Knott explained this item is a town project and is not subject to local land controls and does not require ZBA special exception. L. Daley indicated this follows the same process the ambulance facility followed, it is a public hearing, but is not subject to local requirements.

C. Branon, Fieldstone, Fire Captain Flaherty and Fire Chief Kelly were all in attendance to present the plans and answer any questions. The presentation included the proposed expense and site improvements for the Milford

Fire Station which was built in 1974 and is situated on Map 26, Lot 168 at 39 School Street on .56 acres. It is zoned both Commercial and the Oval Subdistrict. The area behind the fire station is lawn and it utilized for outdoor storage. There is not a lot of extra space on the site. Improvements consist of maintaining the existing garage area and demolishing the rear portion of the building to construct a new portion and add one apparatus bay on the north side. This is designed to solve issues that exist today. The second floor of the addition is for future growth and expansion of the fire station. The additional apparatus bay is for storage of additional equipment. A sprinkler system and fire alarm system will be installed. Exterior improvements include drainage, lighting and parking needs. There will be a new entrance on the south side of the building. The parking on the side of the building will be more conforming. The entire parking area will be re-paved. Natural gas will be coming in from School Street and no utilities will be on the back side of the building. An oil/water separator is not included in this plan which does not currently exist. Stormwater management consists of improvements along School Street and around the perimeter of the building. There is a current catch basin; through review of drainage, DPW came up with a closed drainage system because there is currently an 8" ACP pipe. Rick Riendeau, DPW, agreed with two catch basins which will improve the drainage on School Street. The roof run off will be collected in these catch basins.

C. Branon met with F. Elkind who is fine with what is being proposed. There is not a lot of room on the site for other stormwater improvements. This project will result in a reduction of stormwater flow. The proposal includes installation of a chain link fence along the retaining wall and a portion of the guard rail will be removed during construction along the retaining wall. Lighting will be through the building ground line, a lighting plan was provided and additional details on fixtures will be provided. There is a verbal agreement with the abutter to use their lot for staging equipment during construction. J. Langdell asked if there is a cost for a temporary easement during construction? C. Branon said it would be about \$450/month. J. Langdell asked if there were elevations to look at? C. Branon provided elevations. P. Amato asked how wide is the building? C. Branon said 24' wide. Captain Flaherty said the new second story is 4'7" higher than the existing building. P. Amato asked about screening for the rear of the building. C. Branon said there is no screening proposed out back, the stockade fence will be replaced on the back side of this building. The vegetation is on the abutting property. T. Finan said there is a steep drop off on that side. C. Branon agreed and we are cutting off part of that hill and using the back of the building as a retaining wall. It will look higher than 24' in the back. J. Langdell asked about some kind of architectural features for the exterior of the building. C. Branon explained there is a type of crows moulding around the top of the building which cuts the edge a little.

P. Amato feels like we are squeezing too big a building on too small a lot and not following our own rules. J. Langdell agrees and noted we can choose to follow the rules or not. You would think the town would follow its own rules. C. Branon said we are not showing any landscaping on the plan. P. Amato asked if there could be some landscaping by the walkway? C. Branon responded that there is so much going on with a small site, including natural gas, drainage, utilities, that they really can't put any landscaping.

J. Langdell asked if there are two areas of green space on the corners? C. Branon responded that when responding to a call, the firefighters need to park so that is the reason why we cannot put shrubs or trees in those areas, since the cars use that area. We have to look at the practicality and leaving the area paved for parking. J. Langdell thinks when this first was talked about years ago, there was greenery on the site. P. Amato pointed out that some landscaping could be put against the buildings on the Bridge Street side. The Planning Board just asked Hitchiner to add landscaping on their site. J. Langdell said the size of Hitchiner cannot be compared to the size of this building; this site is different. L. Daley asked about the lighting and the spill over to the neighborhood below. C. Branon responded that he will look at the lighting that might impact the neighbors. L. Daley said the fence along the back could be removed and have trees or bushes instead. J. Langdell asked who owns the fence? Captain Flaherty said the fence is not the Fire Department's, we do not maintain it. This year the neighbor has maintained it. C. Branon indicated adding vegetation in the back area limits the ability to maintain it, which is why the fence would be replaced. He understands the Board's concern with landscaping, there is not a lot of space between the lots, but he will look at it. L. Daley asked if the roof could be looked at as a green roof. C. Branon responded he has not seen those being successful over time. J. Langdell said we already have a warrant article approved by the voters and we are limited to that funding. C. Branon said the result of this project is an improvement of stormwater management. J. Langdell said this project is subject to local requirements but stormwater is a federal regulation. J. Langdell noted the Fire Department has done a great job on bringing

everything together and presenting it to the public and it was approved the first time around, thank you for all those efforts.

5. Other Business:

a. Planning Board Rules and Procedures – this will be discussed at the June 5 work session.

b. Community Development Updates - more to follow

c. Commission / Committee Updates – NRPC meet and greet and discussion coming up in Merrimack; June 1 the Vietnam Memorial Survey closes. L. Daley will provide a copy of the draft Rules of Procedure to members regarding how PB Alternates will be handled.

6. Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 9:25 p.m. on a motion made by C. Beer and seconded by T. Finan. All were in favor. Motion passed.

Signature of the Chairperson/Vice-Chairman: Date: _____

MINUTES OF 5/22/18 MEETING WERE APPROVED ON 6/26/18