

1 MILFORD PLANNING BOARD MEETING

2 April 24, 2018 Board of Selectmen's Meeting Room, 6:30 PM

4 **Members Present:**

5 Christopher Beer, Chairman

6 Doug Knott, Vice Chair

7 Paul Amato, Member

8 Tim Finan, Member

9 Janet Langdell, Member

10 Jacob LaFontaine, Alternate member

11 Kevin Federico, BOS rep

Staff:

Lincoln Daley, Comm Dev Director

Darlene Bouffard, Recording Secretary

Amy Concannon, Videographer

13 **Excused:**

14 Veeral Bharucha, Alternate member

15 Susan Robinson, Member

17 **1. Call to order:**

18 The meeting was called to order by Chairman Beer at 6:30 p.m. introductions were made of Board members
19 and staff.

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

- 22 a. March 27, 2018 – After review, J. Langdell moved to approve the minutes of March 27, 2018 as
23 amended. K. Federico seconded. T. Finan, J. Langdell, J. LaFontaine, K. Federico were in favor with P.
24 Amato, C. Beer and D. Knott abstaining as they were not in attendance at that meeting. Motion passed.
25 b. April 3, 2018 – After review, J. Langdell moved to approve the minutes of April 3, 2018 as amended.
26 K. Federico seconded. All were in favor with T. Finan abstaining as he was not at that meeting. Motion
27 passed.

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

31 **a. Bailey Brook Revocable Trust for the properties located at Milford Tax Map 59, Lot 8 and Town of
32 Hollis Tax Map 34, Lot 19:**

33 C. Beer indicated this item has been requested to be continued to the May 1, 2018 meeting. C. Beer and
34 D. Knott stated they will not be in attendance that night. T. Finan also stated he will be unavailable. L.
35 Daley said S. Robinson might not be here either. K. Federico, J. Langdell and P. Amato will be here, J.
36 LaFontaine said he can be sure to be here to get a quorum that night. L. Daley said there was previously a
37 conceptual review of this Bailey Brook application with the Planning Board and there were not any issues
38 with the plan. There are two public hearings scheduled for May 1, the Melendy Associates LLR scenic
39 road hearing and a 6-month extension and also this hearing for Bailey Brook. L. Daley will reach out to
40 Veeral to see if he can come as well. K. Federico moved to continue this application to the May 1, 2018
41 meeting. P. Amato seconded. All were in favor.

43 **b. Jessica Hudson for the properties located at Tax Map 43, Lots 24 and 25, Tonella Road
44 (subdivision).** D. MacGuire with The Dubai Group was representing the applicant for the Site Plan and
45 subdivision on Tonella road.

47 **c. Jessica Hudson for the properties located at Tax Map 43, Lots 24 and 2, Tonella Road (site plan**
48 Mr. MacGuire indicated an overview presentation for the site plan and subdivision was provided in March
49 2018 and a site walk was done in early April. If the Board would like any items reviewed again he would
50 be happy to do so. During the previous presentation, all staff comments had not been addressed but those
51 have now been addressed. One outstanding item at that time was a site walk, the Board expressed they
52 want to see an extended side walk which has now been incorporated on the plans. Mr. MacGuire said he
53 is also looking for information on the waiver requests for the 40' right of way and the driveway coming
54 off the end of the cul-de-sac. At the last meeting there were discussions of snow storage and plowing.
55 DPW has been contacted and there were no objections to the snow plow and snow storage plans. One
56 hydrant was removed and there will be plenty of room to put the snow to the side. 99% of the comments
57 from staff have been addressed. Conservation was pleased with the proposed rain garden and overall is

pleased with the plan. During the site walk, the concern of traffic was brought up. We worked with a traffic engineer Steven Pernaw, who prepared a traffic memo that just came in today and was provided to members for tonight's meeting. The memo is an assessment of what is being added and an update to the numbers that were previously done. A traffic engineer did the previous traffic study at this intersection in 1999. Steve Pernaw concluded in his memo that with the traffic studies conducted previously and this added development, there is not the need for a traffic light at the intersection even during peak hours of traffic. For any traffic design, there needs to be certain traffic warrants met. With the 16 new town houses, there are only two vehicles entering and six vehicles exiting during peak morning and peak evening hours at the intersection. The purpose of this study is to determine if a traffic signal is needed, but it is also to show that this sized project is not of a size to impact the intersection requiring a traffic signal. Mr. MacGuire hopes this helps clear up the traffic signal issue. Typically we would not do a traffic study for this low number of trips. We wanted to make that understood. If there are any questions from the Board, he can address those.

D. Knott said this is a general overview because at the last meeting the Board wanted to hear the site plan and subdivision plan together because they are intertwined. C. Beer said that is correct and asked for questions from the Board. T. Finan said the additional six vehicles are at the peak hours, but not per hour. D. MacGuire answered those are the morning peak hours or evening peak hours, not per hour, but all day. We are looking at 80 additional trips per day. The morning has 8 vehicle trips during peak hours. The evening will produce an additional 8 vehicles during peak hours. With these additional trips, it still does not trigger a traffic signal. P. Amato said it is an additional 80 trips per day. D. MacGuire said the reasons they look at am and pm peak hours is because that is when the intersection has an issue. The 80 trips spread out over the whole day do not impact the intersection too much. P. Amato said the Ledgewood development also produces traffic but he does not think that produces as much traffic because they are mostly retired people. J. Langdell indicated these townhouses will have younger people living in them which will produce the morning and evening peak hour trips. D. MacGuire spoke with L. Daley today about any of the outstanding comments. DPW was concerned about the drainage being maintained by the town, that was not the intent; it is to be maintained completely on the site. The plans that will be submitted will include an additional note that the property owner is responsible for the maintenance and for referring to them for inspections.

J. Langdell said this is a development of apartments that are rented and owned by a third party. D. MacGuire said yes, it will be the owner's responsibility to maintain this property. J. Langdell asked about snow removal and the hammerhead design. L. Daley discussed that today with D. MacGuire, that portions of the drainage extend into the right of way. During the discussion it was stated that the owners of the townhouses would maintain the drainage and easements on town property. This will be a public road and the town will plow the roads and store the snow on site. D. Knott wants to make sure the town is not responsible to truck snow off-site. D. MacGuire continued that the landscaping runs on both sides of the street. A note on the site plan states the snow will be trucked off site but after talking today, it was determined that the town would be responsible for plowing and maintaining it but the property owner would be responsible to carry excess snow off-site. There was also concern from Conservation about snow (meltage) running into the wetland. An additional easement area to push the snow into an existing driveway was discussed.

J. Langdell suggested a reversal of the tomahawk design which was discussed at the site walk. L. Daley asked about pushing the structure into the upland area, up the slope so that it would loop around and increase recreation opportunities and a snow storage area. D. Knott indicated the snow from the intersection will be brought all the way into the driveway. If the area is not set up to take a plow truck, they will not get in very far and there will be a big pile of snow, it is not as easy as just pushing the snow down there. C. Beer has concerns about putting a driveway down there; the driveway will get blocked (with snow). D. MacGuire would not be proposing a driveway at the end of the tomahawk right now, but Tonella Road terminates at the end of the driveway. It is a gravel area but there is no turn around. DPW currently plows that part of the road. D. Knott feels like this plan improves the road but creates a snow issue for a substantial amount of snow. D. MacGuire said the snow will be put in a large flat area. D. Knott asked how big an area it is? D. MacGuire answered it is a good size, he is not sure of the exact

measurement, he is also not sure that Conservation is aware of what else is being proposed. The snow will not be melting toward the wetland, it will be distributed into a rain garden and then slowly dissipate. D. MacGuire thought that Conservation was comfortable with this but maybe they thought it will melt into the wetland, however it will go into the rain garden. This is a substantial improvement in the roadway and turnaround ability, a fire truck can make a full turn around here.

L. Daley said the plan shows overhead utility service for the units, he has had discussions with the applicant and asked if he would explain the utilities. D. Knott wants to define the snow plan so it will not need to be hauled off the site. D. MacGuire feels there is plenty of room for snow storage on site and if it needs to be hauled off by the owner, it will be. D. Knott noted DPW might want to have some gravel added for more stability at the turnaround in the snow storage area. D. Knott just does not want the town to be stuck with hauling the snow off site. D. MacGuire said Tonella Road currently has existing utility poles and it is proposed to come off those poles for the utilities in the buildings. L. Daley indicated that is not normally what is done on new developments; it is being suggested to keep the two existing utility poles to convey utilities to the new buildings underground.

C. Beer asked if it is above ground utilities going up Tonella Road. D. MacGuire said it is, it leads in with poles going up Tonella Road. P. Amato said it would not make sense to go underground for just a portion; these utilities are on their poles, as long as you go underground to the units and the power company is okay with that, it should be fine. D. MacGuire said we are not opposed to going underground to the units. C. Beer asked about the possibility of moving the existing pole to the same side of the road so the lines are not crossing over the street. D. MacGuire is not sure that is a question for the power company but there would need to be tree removal in order to move the pole. C. Beer is concerned with the height of the lines. P. Amato said power lines cross roads all over town and public service would make sure it is alright or if taller poles are required. D. MacGuire said this is an improvement on an existing situation, it improves the roadway and gains legal frontage on the property. C. Beer asked if the power company would address the issue of the height of the lines. L. Daley believes that is so. P. Amato asked how wide the road is. D. MacGuire explained the width of Tonella Road and how it narrows up to the gate, this plan would improve the width. J. Langdell asked about the road layout and the tomahawk turnaround, could you share the discussions regarding reversing the tomahawk. D. MacGuire said there is no better location than to put the tomahawk in the proposed area. If we reversed the tomahawk it would require cutting into the other area. J. Langdell said the yard is on a sloped area, if the tomahawk were reversed there might be more yard area. D. MacGuire explained the walkout basements of the four units and that the corner unit is a little tighter. On the other building there is a garage under the units and a walkout to the back area. They are working with the grade. The applicant could have done a more robust design and had more units, but they wanted to keep the family property with more land and more buffers. J. Langdell said the original concept brought to the Planning Board did not include the four units. The existing stone structure was going to be kept but it is very close to the right of way. Once the angling was determined, the roadway did not allow keeping the structure. The area for drainage is a good area and in trying to preserve the stone structure it would not work with the property and the drainage where it is proposed.

L. Daley said the goal here is to create livable communities in Milford and this location creates attractive and functional places to live. P. Amato said there will be walkout basements in the four unit structure. D. MacGuire understands the concerns raised, but respects the private property owner's desire to keep his land private. J. Langdell said they could get rid of the four-unit building. D. MacGuire said taking out the four units or redesigning the tomahawk would be a major re-design when this plan meets the site requirements and setbacks. The design works with the slope and will be an attractive development. D. MacGuire pointed out a large open space area where people can converge. P. Amato said these are apartments, the new apartments by Burger King have no yard. D. MacGuire responded there are all different types of apartments in town and they are all different. This meets all the requirements, the Conservation Commission is comfortable with the drainage and it comes down to opinions. J. Langdell said the town has an obligation to develop and promote developments of all kinds. D. Knott asked if there are any common areas. D. MacGuire answered yes, any of the green space areas are usable common areas. Each of the six units has a walkout basement that is graded away from the building. The

Ledgewood Community will be looking down on the roofs of these units. P. Amato asked how can you give these people privacy on their decks. D. MacGuire has seen some screening used between units that make good sense if that is a concern. P. Amato just feels there should be some sort of buffer for decks that are only ten feet apart, there should be some privacy provided. There were no further questions from the Board. C. Beer asked if there were questions or comments from the public.

Ms. Hemerich, President of Ledgewood Association, asked about the construction timeline when residents will be enduring construction noise right below Ledgewood. D. MacGuire said it could be phased, the road will be done first, but it will take about one construction season, the roadway first starting this summer, then finishing up the development by next spring. Ms. Hemerich said the concern is that it would go in two separate seasons. L. Daley asked if there would be any blasting associated with the development. D. MacGuire answered there could be some small blasting for one of the units. K. Federico said there was blasting done when Ledgewood was built, however, sound does not travel up, it travels down.

David Palance, Heritage Commission, asked if the Planning Board already granted waivers on the road. J. Langdell responded that nothing has been granted on this application yet. D. Palance asked if a waiver was given. J. Langdell responded that this applicant went to the ZBA and was granted a variance. J. Langdell asked D. MacGuire to explain the reason why the applicant will not utilize the variance that was granted by the ZBA. D. MacGuire explained that the ZBA granted a variance on the frontage for the stone structure, but once the engineering was done on drainage, it was not as natural and we would have had to cut more; this area is logical to do the drainage to minimize encroachment, the applicant reviewed everything and then decided to remove the stone structure. The owner does plan to utilize the granite on their own site. There have been a lot of ideas for that structure, but we are not going to knock it down and bury it. A lot of ideas have been floated, there is an opportunity to photo log the disassembly of the stone house. It would be preserved and used but not in the state that it is.

D. Palance said the owner has a historical quarry on his land and preserved the quarry; he is into preserving history. Why would a plan be presented with the structure not intact and then make it seem like it is too difficult. C. Beer stated the owner chose this plan. D. Palance said this is two different entities, the owner is saying he wants to preserve the history. And we have this other entity tonight saying it's not really efficient he can't really design around it or have the ability to make a good plan out of this, it doesn't seem that they are cooperating with the original intent of the owner which is to preserve a historical structure. There are also some issues because of the slopes, when kids are living in these units, it is going to be a hazard. As far as snow storage, a good third of that snow is going to end up at the bottom of that hill. The Heritage Commission would love to see the stone structure kept and not allow the engineer to plan it this way. We wouldn't remove a historic rock, or wouldn't remove the old man of the mountain, oh that's already gone and we can bring it back, oh the volume is going down, interesting. I think we should give this some thought and shouldn't be limited to the engineer's ability to design a decent plan. C. Beer said the engineer explained that the issues were presented to the owner who is the one that decided to go with this plan, the owner has the final say, not the engineer. The engineer has spoken at length about snow storage and that has been addressed. D. Palance asked about the safety issue, and is concerned about those that may have children growing up in these developments with tempting places to play where there would be risk. D. Knott said parents can make a judgement on where they would like to live. D. MacGuire said if there were an abrupt ridge we would put a barrier of some sort, if there are concerns about safety we can put some type of pedestrian barrier, but this is an existing vegetative area. There were no further public comments. C. Beer asked for comments from staff.

L. Daley asked if Mr. Palance or the Heritage Commission members have discussed alternatives for the stone structure. D. Palance said yes, the structure is what gives it the historical value, the Heritage Commission would be interested in moving the structure to other land but the beauty is in the structure. The heritage value is in the structure, not the rocks. The structure talks about what the people of Milford did, the construction of the building is rough cut rock. It talks about the thriftiness of New England, the structure was created by immigrants in the town and their hard work cutting stone talks about the granite of the town. The structure is in really good shape, you see how they cut the stones and shape the stones.

J. Langdell said it sounds like the whole QR tour is ready from what you say; she asked if the Heritage Commission looked at how much it would cost to move the stone structure? D. Palance responded that they have not, they have only talked about the Heritage value of the building. J. Langdell said the stone house has been there for over 100 years, but the Heritage Commission has not taken any steps to implement any plan of moving it. She wishes Justin Demontigny was here tonight; she would love to know how many times the town, the Heritage Commission, the Historical Society, the school department or the public has contacted the Demontigny family about visiting the building over the years, to see it visually or to collect architectural data. D. MacGuire understands from Justin that has never happened. D. MacGuire explained that Justin would be here tonight but has contracted the flu. He is home watching tonight. D. Palance said that doesn't mean moving it cannot happen. J. Langdell indicated this is just another example of Milford being reactive and not proactive when it comes to historic preservation.

P. Amato would like to see the structure maintained as a structure, but he does not own it. The Heritage Commission, or the Historic Society or the Town of Milford does not own it. If there were a plan to move it under a grant or something like that so people could see it and visit it, that would be the way to deal with it. J. Langdell said yes, something should be brought forward since this has been on the table for a few months now and bringing something forward to talk about could be done. There is a time limit to move the structure in order for the developer to move forward. C. Beer said there is also the issue of delaying the applicant. J. Langdell said someone needs to look into it and get some information or figure out a way. D. MacGuire indicated he would be happy to keep the dialog open, it is not in the budget to move it, but we are open to that so if it is something that is wanted, we can talk about it.

K. Federico talked to Justin during the site walk and about the cost to move the stone house and then re-assemble it. Nobody offered to do it but Justin did say he would re-allocate the stone to provide information about donating stone for different purposes. J. Langdell also had that conversation with Justin. K. Federico said it is an exorbitant cost to move the structure and then reassemble it. J. Langdell asked how much it would be. K. Federico responded he has no idea but no less than \$50,000 to \$100,000. D. Palance suggested this be tabled for six months for the Heritage Commission, the Historic Society and any other people interested, to research moving the structure and put a decent proposal together. J. Langdell said this plan has been around for a long time, it has been before the Planning Board since last year, six months is too long. P. Amato asked if they phase this so they could work on the other side of the parcel first, but it might not be six months. C. Beer indicated the road has to be done first and the structure is in the right of way. D. MacGuire cannot wait six months to start the plan, and noted this is the private property of the owner and he can take all that granite and do whatever with it. There are things like financing that can be done in the meantime. J. Langdell said there is time before construction begins to document the structure. Justin can take the structure apart and store the granite if he so chooses. If nothing else, the Heritage Commission should get the documentation.

D. Knott said the Board would like to move forward on this and things need to be taken care of. The developer wants to start and waiting six months is too long. J. Langdell said there are things that can be done prior to starting construction. Justin could take the structure down and store it on his property but for now the Heritage Commission could collect documentation relative to the structure (photographs, video) to document how it is put together in order for it to be re-assembled. That would allow the town to try to get funding through a grant or fundraiser to re-assemble it at a later time. D. MacGuire said this structure is not pristine, Quick-Crete has been used over the years to preserve it, it is not all authentic. Justin's father has been tinkering with this stone house for decades. C. Beer indicated there is consensus that the Planning Board is not going to delay this plan six months as requested.

D. Palance asked if there is any plan to remove any oil residue from the years of leaking gas trucks that were parked here, as identified on the staff memo. J. Langdell asked if evidence of that was found at DES. D. Palance said it is in the memo. J. Langdell indicated reference to that is different than the related material that is referenced. D. Knott concurred that he saw a reference but no documentation. L. Daley has not verified that information. D. Palance asked what date is on the plan. L. Daley said there are two plans. January 2018, C. Beer said the plan is dated January 29, 2018. D. Palance indicated this

has only been available for a few months. L. Daley said if the Board decides to approve waivers today, there is a 30 day appeal window to consider opportunities for the structure.

C. Beer said there are other obstacles that allow time as well. P. Amato said it would be nice if they could start the construction this season but it might go until the beginning of the next season, they still have a lot to do. D. MacGuire hopes that the Planning Board is comfortable with the plan with conditions. He is not putting a shovel in the soil tomorrow. We can start to obtain financing if waiver approval is granted. We would like to move it forward with a conditional approval. It is the owner's prerogative of what to do with the stone structure, it is generous of the owner. We recognize the concerns being raised. P. Amato asked what the list looks like for conditions. L. Daley listed: 1) resolution on the easement language; 2) interest of the town to protect the stone structure; 3) protect the interest of future residents of the site (safety). C. Beer said we have enough information to act on the waivers.

D. Palance does not see any mitigation on the site for contamination. C. Beer indicated that will be addressed in the conditions. D. MacGuire said this is not a superfund site, there is a possibility of pollution, but if during construction something is found, it will be stopped and dealt with. This was a storage area for truck and tanks. It was looked at, but D. MacGuire does not consider this a contaminated site, if something is found it will go through DES. The bank is going to require that the appropriate items get done, it's not something at the planning board level.

J. Langdell said the Planning Board can address the two waivers tonight and continue this plan to the next Planning Board meeting to allow any DES information to be identified and allow time for the Heritage Commission to work up a plan relative to the stone structure (within 30 days or to the next meeting) with the applicant relative to this building, this abandoned structure; allow staff to work out easement language concerns and then re-evaluate at the next meeting. J. Langdell asked if that covered everything. All concurred. L. Daley said there are also additional questions on the site plan. P. Amato asked if we have concerns on the subdivision. L. Daley would rather clean up the site plan and subdivision plan one at a time. D. MacGuire said these plans had to be done separately but they are a package deal. C. Beer indicated the waivers will be taken up one at a time by the Planning Board so the applicant at least has those addressed.

C. Beer asked if both applications have been presented satisfactorily. L. Daley believes that is correct for this evening. D. MacGuire asked about the traffic study and if the memo is sufficient. Do we need to have further discussion on the traffic impact at the intersection of Tonella Road and Nashua Street. J. Langdell appreciates the information in the memo from Mr. Parnaw but some of the traffic reports go back to 2007, the addition of 80 trips per day at this intersection may not get it to the level to get a traffic light or justify a light but she does not think the concerns of that intersection and road are going away. It is her hope that the town, through the Oval Area Improvements funding that's available and study that should get resurrected before that money is gone, could incorporate this particular area of town to look at. J. Langdell does not think this development has direct impact at this time. K. Federico, T. Finan and D. Knott agreed. J. Langdell asked that her statements be documented verbatim. P. Amato indicated 80 additional trips will not make the intersection any better. C. Beer asked if P. Amato requires additional information in terms of studying that intersection or potential improvements. P. Amato said he does not. C. Beer stated the Board is not requiring any additional information on traffic for this development.

P. Amato asked if there were any reserve funds collected from Ledgewood for a light. J. Langdell believes there was some funding provided from CVS and County Stores but that was specifically for the Clinton Street intersection. L. Daley explained that \$175,000 was part of the approved site plan for CVS for a signalized light plan at the Clinton/Nashua Street intersection. L. Daley's understanding is that there have been contributions for the Nashua Street/Tonella Road improvements but they have been utilized for the sidewalk study for Nashua Street. P. Amato questions if this development should contribute as other developments have done, how big the development was, how much they contributed, and what the contribution was used for, we should at least look into it and state that there may have to be some sort of contribution to this. J. Langdell said that type of contribution would be more effective than an impact fee as brought up by Captain Frye. D. MacGuire indicated that CVS causes exponentially more traffic than

this development. P. Amato agreed and stated the contribution would not be \$175,000 but it is 80 more trips and if Ledgewood contributed something and if we did not ask this developer to contribute something we would be remiss. J. Langdell also noted that Longley Place is also part of this area, we should see if there was any contribution from them as well. J. Langdell also stated in tonight's packet there was a DPW memo stating that the applicant will be responsible for upgrading the ADA access for the sidewalks that go to Ledgewood. D. MacGuire said that is an added cost and is off-site from the development. J. Langdell said it is necessary with the development; when this comes back to the Planning Board she would expect that the applicant and staff have had some significant discussions on this. There were no other questions or comments on traffic.

Waiver Request from the development regulations for relief from the minimum roadway width for the Tonella Road extension and right of way. Staff has no issues with this request. Planning Board has no issues. The discussion was opened to the public just for this waiver request. There were no public questions or comments. The public hearing was closed. P. Amato moved to grant this waiver. J. Langdell seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Waiver Request from the infrastructure design and construction requirements, tomahawk turnaround to allow a driveway at the end of the turnaround. L. Daley said DPW and Fire do not have an issue with this, his only concern is if every alternative was looked at for the driveway location. P. Amato said in looking at the plan he only sees the one option for the driveway. D. MacGuire said there is a significant grade difference there; the only alternative would be to bend around, we are meeting perfectly at grade with the existing driveway, in order to change that there would need to be some very abrupt activity, possibly blasting to make that happen. A big part of this request has to do with snow storage, and we have met that requirement. There were no other comments or questions from the Board. C. Beer opened the discussion of the waiver to the public. There were no comments or questions from the public. The public hearing was closed. D. Knott moved to grant this waiver. J. Langdell seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

D. MacGuire indicated he understands what he needs to address and bring forward at the next meeting. L. Daley responded that he will work with the applicant to have him address the issues including bringing back the revised easements, address the DES contamination concerns raised by Mr. Palance, examine the issue of a contribution history of Ledgewood and the Heritage Commission look at any kind of planning relative to moving the stone structure. K. Federico moved to table this application to the May 22, 2018 Planning Board meeting. J. Langdell seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

d. Ronald and Loreen Racicot, 21 Old Wilton Road, Tax Map 14, Lot 10. C. Branon, Fieldstone Engineering, representing the owner and applicant for this property on Old Wilton Road. A preliminary plan was before the Planning Board February 27, 2018 at which time a formal presentation was done with some design details. At that time, no elevation rendering was available. Some feedback regarding the style of the (warehouse) building was provided to the applicant including the cupola on the building. C. Branon has responded to the input and provided that in tonight's plan. More landscaping has also been included. C. Branon is continuing to work with F. Elkind on the storm water permits. The building is 42' x 68' therefore 2856 sf as depicted on the plan. This will be occupied by Son's Chimney, which is housed on the oval, and this warehouse will be strictly for stock and will take the truck traffic away from the oval. Currently they are using a barn on this site for storage but it is not adequate. J. Langdell asked if the barn will remain after the new building is built. C. Branon said the plan is to leave the barn up at this time. D. Knott would love to see Elm trees along the Elm Street side of the building. C. Branon will review that with the owner.

P. Amato asked about the residential use and industrial use on the same road. J. Langdell said that was brought up at the last meeting. The owners do not live there and are adding another use. If the use of the warehouse changes, J. Langdell would like the application to come back to the Planning Board. P. Amato said it is not a very big warehouse. C. Branon said the owner just wanted to build a garage and after a meeting with town staff, it was determined that because it is a commercial use, it required a site plan because it is more than just what the owner wants, it must meet the site plan regulations. It is not

uncommon to have a mixed use such as this. They are not adding any intensity to the property. C. Branon said they will not be bringing retail business to this site, it is only to allow for better storage. J. Langdell wants to have parameters on this so that it comes back to Planning if the tenant changes. C. Branon said initially they were proposing a building that connects to the parking lot in order to isolate the residential portion from the commercial.

If a third apartment is put in the residence, J. Langdell asked what is required. L. Daley indicated a variance would be needed. C. Branon said a change of use is put forward to the zoning board, who has the ability to grant it or not. L. Daley asked if a condition should be on the plan or reference the ordinance about tenant or ownership change needing to come before the Planning Board. P. Amato cannot think of any residential and industrial on the same parcel in Milford. There were no further questions from the Board. L. Daley agrees with D. Knott's comment on the Elm trees. He asked if there was any opportunity to turn that into a rain garden. C. Branon said the design before you tonight meets the requirements, and the owner would prefer an infiltration system not a rain garden. J. Langdell asked about the pine trees that were requested to be removed. C. Branon indicated the two parties will work together on that. L. Daley said he had no concerns with the landscape plan with minor details. There were no further comments or questions from the Board. C. Beer opened the discussion to the public. There were no comments or questions from the public. C. Beer closed the public hearing.

K. Federico moved to approve with the conditions as discussed. D. Knott seconded. All were in favor.

4. Other Business:

- a. Planning Board election of officers: J. Langdell nominated D. Knott to be Chairman of the Planning Board. K. Federico seconded. All were in favor. J. Langdell nominated C. Beer to be Vice Chair of the Planning Board. K. Federico seconded. All were in favor.

5. Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 9:07 p.m. on a motion made by K. Federico and seconded by T. Finan. All were in favor.

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

MINUTES OF THE 4/24/18 MEETING WERE APPROVED ON 5/22/18