

Town of Milford
Zoning Board of Adjustment
JUNE 16, 2022
Public Hearings

- Case #2022-06 Jerry Catanzariti, SPECIAL EXCEPTION**
- Case #2022-10 Kenneth and Hannah Wiggins, SPECIAL EXCEPTION**
- Case #2022-11 Barlo Signs and Hitchiner Manufacturing Company, Inc., VARIANCE**
- Case #2022-12 Barlo Signs and Hitchiner Manufacturing Company, Inc., VARIANCE**
- Case #2022-13 George & Jacqueline Thurrott, SPECIAL EXCEPTION**
- Case #2022-14 TM Bolduc Holdings, LLC. and Salt Creek Properties, LLC., SPECIAL EXCEPTION**

Present: Jason Plourde, Chair
 Karin Lagro, Vice Chair
 Michael Thornton, Member (via Zoom)
 Andrea Kokko Chappell, Member
 Joan Dargie, Alternate
 Lincoln Daley, Director of Community Development
 David Freel, BOS Representative

Not Present: Tracy Steel, Member
 Jane Hesketh, Recording Clerk

Meeting Agenda

1. Call to Order

2. Public Hearing(s):

- a. Case #2022-06 Jerry Catanzariti for the property located at 10 West Meadow Court, Tax Map 39, Lot 70-32 is seeking a Special Exception from the Milford Zoning Ordinance, Article V, Section 5.02.2.A.8 to construct an attached 8’ x 16’ garage bay addition to the existing residence within the 15 foot side dimensional setback within the Residence ‘A’ Zoning District.
- b. Case #2022-10 Kenneth and Hannah Wiggins for the property located at 14 Dearborn Street, Tax Map 22, Lot 66 are seeking a Special Exception from the Milford Zoning Ordinance, Article V, Section 5.02.2.A.8 and 5.02.5.A to allow the construction of a 12’ x 4’ porch 22.3’ from the front dimensional setback where 30 feet is required on the subject property located in the Residential ‘R’ District.
- c. Case #2022-11 Barlo Signs and Hitchiner Manufacturing Company, Inc. for the property located at 586 Elm Street, Tax Map 13, Lot 6 are seeking a Variance from Milford Zoning Ordinance, Article VII, Section 7.06.9.E.e.ii to allow more than one monument sign on the subject property within the Industrial Zoning District. (Request to Withdraw Application)
- d. Case #2022-12 Barlo Signs and Hitchiner Manufacturing Company, Inc. for the property located at 586 Elm Street, Tax Map 13, Lot 6 are seeking a Variance from Milford Zoning Ordinance, Article VII, Section 7.06.8.B.2.a to allow an electronic messaging sign to exceed the 50% of the total sign area and 24 square foot area design standards within the Industrial Zoning District.
- e. Case #2022-13 George & Jacqueline Thurrott for the property located at Tax Map 34, Lot 68-5 are seeking a Special Exception from the Milford Zoning Ordinance, Article V, Section 5.02.2.A.8 and 5.02.5.A to allow the construction of a single-family residence 20 feet from the front dimensional setback where 30 feet is required on the subject property located in the Residential ‘A’ District. (Request for Continuance to 7/7/22)

- 1 f. Case #2022-14 TM Bolduc Holdings, LLC. and Salt Creek Properties, LLC. for the property located at
2 Tax Map 43, Lot 69 are seeking a Special Exception from the Milford Zoning Ordinance, Article V,
3 Section 5.05.8.C and 5.07.7.C to allow the construction of six, multi-family buildings with a maximum
4 height of 56 feet where 35 feet is permitted in the Limited Commercial-Business District ‘LCB’ Zoning
5 District and 45 feet is permitted in the Commercial ‘C’ Zoning District. (Request for Continuance to
6 7/7/22)

7
8 3. Meeting Minutes: 4/7/22, 4/21/22, 5/5/22

9
10 4. Other Business: TBD

11
12 5. Next Meeting: July 7, 2022, July 21, 2022

13
14
15 **1. CALL TO ORDER**

16
17 Chair Plourde opened the meeting by welcoming everyone and introducing himself. He welcomed those
18 attending in person and electronically since this meeting is being conducted in a unique manner.

19
20 He stated you may also attend this meeting in person at the Milford Town Hall, Board of Selectmen’s Meeting
21 Room with all Covid protocols in place.

22
23 He then went on to inform everyone about the procedures of the Board.

24
25 Chair Plourde stated all votes taken during the meeting must be done by Roll Call vote. He started the meeting
26 with a roll call attendance by asking each member to state their name; this is required under the Right-to-Know
27 Law. Roll Call Attendance (those present at Milford Town Hall): Andrea Kokko Chappell present; K. Lagro
28 present; J. Dargie present; J. Plourde present; (those present remotely): M. Thornton present. He stated since a
29 full board member could not be in attendance, he is appointing Alternate Joan Dargie as a full board member for
30 this meeting.

31
32 He stated there are 6 cases to be heard and then explained the process of the case hearings for the applicant and
33 the public. He said a full agenda may not allow all cases to be heard and that at 10:00 p.m. the meeting will end.
34 He explained how the meeting would proceed for the cases that may not be heard in that they would be
35 continued or tabled to another agreed upon meeting. He also explained the notification process for continued
36 cases.

37
38 J. Plourde then moved ahead to the cases to be heard, but before moving ahead asked if the cases can be heard
39 out of order.

40 He asked for a motion to move Cases #2022-11, #2022-13 and #2022-14 to the front since these cases are for
41 withdrawal or continuance. J. Dargie made a motion to approve this change and M. Thornton seconded. All
42 were in agreement.

43
44 **2. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

- 45
46 a. **Case #2022-11 Barlo Signs and Hitchiner Manufacturing Company, Inc. for the property located at**
47 **586 Elm Street, Tax Map 13, Lot 6** are seeking a Variance from Milford Zoning Ordinance, Article VII,
48 Section 7.06.9.E.e.ii to allow more than one monument sign on the subject property within the Industrial
49 Zoning District. (Request to Withdraw Application)

1 J. Plourde read an email to L. Daley dated June 1, 2022 requesting a withdrawal of this application without
2 prejudice. Chair Plourde asked for a motion to accept the withdrawal of this application without prejudice. M.
3 Thornton made a motion to approve this withdrawal and J. Dargie seconded. All were in favor.

4
5 **b. Case #2022-13 George & Jacqueline Thurrott for the property located at Tax Map 34, Lot 68-5** are
6 seeking a Special Exception from the Milford Zoning Ordinance, Article V, Section 5.02.2.A.8 and 5.02.5.A
7 to allow the construction of a single-family residence 20 feet from the front dimensional setback where 30
8 feet is required on the subject property located in the Residential ‘A’ District. (Request for Continuance to
9 7/7/22)

10
11 Chair Plourde read into the record an email dated June 15, 2022 to L. Daley requesting this application be
12 moved to the July 7, 2022 meeting. J. Plourde asked for a motion to accept this continuance. A. Kokko Chappell
13 made a motion and J. Dargie seconded. All were in favor.

14
15 **c. Case #2022-14 TM Bolduc Holdings, LLC. and Salt Creek Properties, LLC. for the property located**
16 **at Tax Map 43, Lot 69** are seeking a Special Exception from the Milford Zoning Ordinance, Article V,
17 Section 5.05.8.C and 5.07.7.C to allow the construction of six, multi-family buildings with a maximum
18 height of 56 feet where 35 feet is permitted in the Limited Commercial-Business District “LCB’ Zoning
19 District and 45 feet is permitted in the Commercial ‘C’ Zoning District. (Request for Continuance to 7/7/22)

20
21 Chair Plourde read into the record an email dated June 8, 2022 to L. Daley requesting this application be moved
22 to the meeting of
23 July 7, 2022. J. Plourde asked for a motion to accept this continuance. K. Lagro made a motion and J. Dargie
24 seconded. All were in favor.

25
26 **d. Case #2022-06 Jerry Catanzariti for the property located at 10 West Meadow Court, Tax Map 39, Lot**
27 **70-32** is seeking a Special Exception from the Milford Zoning Ordinance, Article V, Section 5.02.2.A.8 to
28 construct an attached 8’ x 16’ garage bay addition to the existing residence within the 15 foot side
29 dimensional setback within the Residence ‘A’ Zoning District.

30
31 Jerry Catanzariti stepped forward to the microphone. J. Plourde explained to him what the board needed to hear.

32
33 J. Catanzariti displayed a drawing of the garage showing where it will be in relation to the house and the lot. He
34 stated it will be the same height/roof pitch and color as the house. He explained what it will be used for:
35 vehicles, lawn tools, etc. and it will look as though it was always part of the house. He asked his abutting
36 neighbors and both had no issues with this change. The overhang will add about 6-8 inches.

37
38 J. Plourde asked about the special exception criteria. He noted everything he has submitted is available on-line.

39
40 Special Exception criteria under 10.02.1:

41
42 **a. Criteria: proposed use is similar to those permitted in the district**

43 J. Catanzariti stated in the application that most homes in the area have an attached garage, and going
44 into the setback is allowed with special exception.

45
46 **b. Criteria: specific site is in an appropriate location for the proposed use**

47 J. Plourde asked if a shed had been considered instead. J. Catanzariti researched this option. It would be
48 costly for a 14 x 16 ft. shed that would really stand out in the yard and would not look as good as an
49 attached garage. He consulted with his neighbor on this.

50
51 **c. Criteria: the use as developed will not adversely affect the adjacent area**

52 There will be sufficient distance. Based on the lot plan it will be 9.4 ft. from the side setback. The
53 overhang will be about 6 inches. This point was discussed and agreed it will be 8 ft. from the side

1 setback. The position of the garage, at an angle, ensures it will not go any further into the setback. It was
2 confirmed the driveway will be paved to match the existing driveway. There was discussion about the
3 use and the discussions J. Catanzariti had with his neighbors. No windows will be included with the
4 addition. Further discussion continued about the appearance of the addition.
5

6 **d. Criteria: no nuisance or serious hazard to vehicles or pedestrians**

7 There will not be any trails per J. Plourde.
8

9 **e. Criteria: adequate and appropriate facilities will be provided for proper operation of the**
10 **proposed use**

11 Providing a 2 car garage will enable storage of both car and motorcycle along with lawn equipment.
12 Electricity will be available with and automatic garage door opener.
13

14 The board had no further questions. J. Plourde opened the meeting to the public.
15

16 David Freel stepped forward. He stated setbacks are there for a reason and is concerned about setting a
17 precedent for the whole neighborhood. He feels there is a way to increase size without the larger addition.
18

19 L. Daley stated that the lots are smaller due to conservation. He also said this is the first application from this
20 neighborhood, therefore, there are no comparables in the area. He went on to say small lots are a challenge but
21 owners do wish to utilize the space that is there.
22

23 J. Plourde asked the applicant if there was anything he would like to add. J. Cantarazzi stated the neighborhood
24 is primarily starter homes or homes like his that he moved to when downsizing. He feels it will add value and
25 will not be a deterrent in the neighborhood.
26

27 L. Daley asked if the offset could be increased to minimize the impact to the setback.
28

29 J. Dargie stated the house is not on the setback. L. Daley the house is 17 ft. from the setback. J. Dargie said
30 based on her calculations the addition will only be 6 ft. into the setback and does not comprehend how it will be
31 8 ft. L. Daley then explained how this figure was determined. There was more discussion on this point.
32

33 J. Plourde stated each case does not set a precedent since each case is looked at individually. There has been a
34 history of Special Exceptions granted going into the setback. He mentioned there were some bushes planted as a
35 barrier and asked the applicant if this was possible. J. Cantarazzi agreed this would be a good idea, but wants to
36 check with his neighbor. J. Plourde stated this would provide a visual border between the properties. L. Daley
37 stated his feelings regarding the application being looked at as submitted. K. Lagro agreed not much will be
38 gained with a visual border.
39

40 A. Kokko Chappell asked if it needs to be added to the application that the addition conform to the aesthetics of
41 the house. J. Plourde stated what has been discussed is what the board will be voting on which is a public record.
42

43 J. Plourde determined there were no further questions and closed the public portion of the meeting.
44

45 **Deliberations:**

46
47 Special Exception criteria under 10.02.1:
48

49 **a. Criteria: proposed use is similar to those permitted in the district**

50 A. Kokko Chappell: There are no 3 car garages in this area, however, it is not a full 3 car garage; the
51 new bay will be smaller. There are other homes with attached garages. The use is similar to the area.

52 K. Lagro: agrees

53 J. Dargie: agrees

1 M. Thornton: It is similar to the general area.

2 J. Plourde: Encroachment into the setback area is permitted with a special exception. The distance along
3 with the expanded structure and the positioning will make it less intrusive. It is an expansion to the
4 house which the abutter has no issue with.

5
6 **b. Criteria: specific site is in an appropriate location for the proposed use**

7 K. Lagro: Stated that 8 ft. is very close and would like to hear what the rest of the board has to say, but
8 the location is the best place for it.

9 J. Dargie: It is an expansion to the home. A shed would look out of place; feels it is an appropriate
10 location for the use it is intended for.

11 M. Thornton: is in the best location

12 J. Plourde: feels it appropriate for the use as J. Dargie explained

13 K. Lagro: since it will look as though it belongs there, agrees

14
15 **c. Criteria: the use as developed will not adversely affect the adjacent area**

16 J. Dargie: looks like a continuation of the existing home; the alternatives would not be aesthetically
17 pleasing

18 M. Thornton: the nearest neighbor has not complained

19 A. Kokko Chappell: agrees with J. Dargie; she pointed out lots in the neighborhood are small but this lot
20 is smaller which means had the applicant's property been similar in size the addition would not go into
21 the setback; also the abutter is in agreement. Aesthetically the addition will conform to the home
22 making it look like it was built with the home, therefore, not affecting the values in the area.

23 K. Lagro: agrees

24 J. Plourde: agrees

25
26 **d. Criteria: no nuisance or serious hazard to vehicles or pedestrians**

27 M. Thornton: private property; no vehicles or pedestrians should be on the property

28 J. Plourde: there will still be ample space on the side of the garage to move lawn equipment

29 A. Kokko Chappell: no impact; agrees

30 K. Lagro: agrees

31 J. Dargie: agrees

32
33 **e. Criteria: adequate and appropriate facilities will be provided for proper operation of the**
34 **proposed use**

35 A. Kokko Chappell: agrees

36 K. Lagro: Stated that the facility will be appropriate for the use.

37 J. Dargie: agrees

38 M. Thornton: agrees

39 J. Plourde: agrees

40
41 **Voting:**

42
43 Special Exception criteria under 10.02.1:

44
45 **a. Criteria: proposed use is similar to those permitted in the district**

46 K. Lagro yes; A. Kokko Chappell yes; M. Thornton yes; J. Dargie yes; chair votes yes.

47
48 **b. Criteria: specific site is in an appropriate location for the proposed use**

49 A. Kokko Chappell yes; M. Thornton yes; J. Dargie yes; K. Lagro yes; chair votes yes.

50
51 **c. Criteria: the use as developed will not adversely affect the adjacent area**

52 M. Thornton yes; J. Dargie yes; K. Lagro yes; A. Kokko Chappell yes; chair votes yes.

1 **d. Criteria: no nuisance or serious hazard to vehicles or pedestrians**

2 J. Dargie yes; K. Lagro yes; A. Kokko Chappell yes; M. Thornton yes; chair votes yes.

3
4 **e. Criteria: adequate and appropriate facilities will be provided for proper operation of the**
5 **proposed use**

6 K. Lagro yes; A. Kokko Chappell yes; M. Thornton yes; J. Dargie yes; chair votes yes.

7
8 Is the Special Exception allowed by the Ordinance?

9 A. Kokko Chappell yes; M. Thornton yes; J. Dargie yes; K. Lagro yes; chair votes yes.

10
11 Are all the specified conditions present under which the Special Exception may be granted?

12 A. Kokko Chappell yes; M. Thornton yes; J. Dargie yes; K. Lagro yes; chair votes yes.

13
14 Chair Plourde asked if there is a motion to approve **Case #2022-06 Jerry Catanzariti for the property located**
15 **at 10 West Meadow Court, Tax Map 39, Lot 70-32** is seeking a Special Exception from the Milford Zoning
16 Ordinance, Article V, Section 5.02.2.A.8 to construct an attached 8' x 16' garage bay addition to the existing
17 residence within the 15 foot side dimensional setback within the Residence 'A' Zoning District.

18
19 L. Daley: It will be 8.8 ft. from the side setback

20
21 J. Dargie made a motion to approve **Case #2022-06** and K. Lagro seconded.

22
23 J. Plourde: A motion has been made to approve **Case #2022-06**. Those in favor: A. Kokko Chappell yes; M.
24 Thornton yes; J. Dargie yes; K. Lagro yes; chair votes yes.

25
26 Chair Plourde stated the criteria for the Special Exception request had been satisfied and the application
27 approved. There is a 30 day appeal period that can be filed with the Zoning Board.

28
29 Chair Plourde moved to the next case.

30
31 **e. Case #2022-10 Kenneth and Hannah Wiggins for the property located at 14 Dearborn Street, Tax**
32 **Map 22, Lot 66** are seeking a Special Exception from the Milford Zoning Ordinance, Article V, Section
33 5.02.2.A.8 and 5.02.5.A to allow the construction of a 12' x 4' porch 22.3' from the front dimensional
34 setback where 30 feet is required on the subject property located in the Residential 'R' District.

35
36 Kenneth Wiggins stepped forward to the microphone. A drawing was displayed to show the location of the
37 porch addition. It will extend 4' from the house. The house already sits within the front setback which means
38 any addition to the front will require a special exception. There will be no roof over the porch.

39
40 L. Daley pointed out he had provided pictures of the neighborhood where encroachment from the front in not
41 uncommon. This point was discussed.

42
43 J. Plourde stated the application was complete and quite thorough. It outlined the project enough so it provided a
44 clear picture of what would be impacted and answered most of the questions. He then opened the meeting to the
45 public.

46
47 Pierre LaGranad 19 Dearborn Street stepped forward to make a statement. He lives directly across the street. He
48 has no objection.

49
50 J. Plourde determined there were no further questions and closed the public portion of the meeting.

1 **Deliberations:**
2

3 Special Exception criteria under 10.02.1:
4

5 **a. Criteria: proposed use is similar to those permitted in the district**

6 A. Kokko Chappell: it is similar to those permitted in that it is an older neighborhood where most homes
7 are within the 30 ft. setback

8 K. Lagro: some have porches and homes are already within the setback

9 J. Dargie: agrees

10 M. Thornton: agrees

11 J. Plourde: agrees
12

13 **b. Criteria: specific site is in an appropriate location for the proposed use**

14 K. Lagro: a porch should be on the front and only a small encroachment of 2.1 ft.

15 M. Thornton: agrees

16 J. Dargie: agrees

17 A. Kokko Chappell: agrees

18 J. Plourde: agrees
19

20 **c. Criteria: the use as developed will not adversely affect the adjacent area**

21 J. Dargie: actually makes an improvement

22 M. Thornton: brings back the front porch comradery

23 A. Kokko Chappell: will adversely affect the adjacent area

24 K. Lagro: agrees

25 J. Plourde: agrees
26

27 **d. Criteria: no nuisance or serious hazard to vehicles or pedestrians**

28 M. Thornton: private property

29 A. Kokko Chappell: agrees

30 K. Lagro: no visual impact or nuisance

31 J. Dargie: agrees

32 J. Plourde: still plenty of space left on the front
33

34 **e. Criteria: adequate and appropriate facilities will be provided for proper operation of the**
35 **proposed use**

36 A. Kokko Chappell: yes, will follow building codes and only an additional 2 ft. into the setback that will
37 enhance the property

38 K. Lagro: agrees

39 J. Dargie: agrees

40 M. Thornton: agrees

41 J. Plourde: will be built to code; agrees
42

43 **Voting:**
44

45 Special Exception criteria under 10.02.1:
46

47 **a. Criteria: proposed use is similar to those permitted in the district**

48 K. Lagro yes; A. Kokko Chappell yes; M. Thornton yes; J. Dargie yes; chair votes yes.
49

50 **b. Criteria: specific site is in an appropriate location for the proposed use**

51 A. Kokko Chappell yes; M. Thornton yes; J. Dargie yes; K. Lagro yes; chair votes yes.
52

53 **c. Criteria: the use as developed will not adversely affect the adjacent area**

1 M. Thornton yes; J. Dargie yes; K. Lagro yes; A. Kokko Chappell yes; chair votes yes.

2
3 **d. Criteria: no nuisance or serious hazard to vehicles or pedestrians**

4 J. Dargie yes; K. Lagro yes; A. Kokko Chappell yes; M. Thornton yes; chair votes yes.

5
6 **e. Criteria: adequate and appropriate facilities will be provided for proper operation of the proposed use**

7
8 K. Lagro yes; A. Kokko Chappell yes; M. Thornton yes; J. Dargie yes; chair votes yes.

9
10 Is the Special Exception allowed by the Ordinance?

11 A. Kokko Chappell yes; M. Thornton yes; J. Dargie yes; K. Lagro yes; chair votes yes.

12
13 Are all the specified conditions present under which the Special Exception may be granted?

14 M. Thornton yes; J. Dargie yes; K. Lagro yes; A. Kokko Chappell yes; chair votes yes.

15
16 Chair Plourde asked if there is a motion to approve **Case #2022-10 Kenneth and Hannah Wiggins for the property located at 14 Dearborn Street, Tax Map 22, Lot 66** are seeking a Special Exception from the
17 Milford Zoning Ordinance, Article V, Section 5.02.2.A.8 and 5.02.5.A to allow the construction of a 12' x 4'
18 porch 22.3' from the front dimensional setback where 30 feet is required on the subject property located in the
19 Residential 'A' District.

20
21
22 J. Dargie made a motion to approve **Case #2022-10** and K. Lagro seconded.

23
24 J. Plourde: A motion has been made to approve **Case #2022-10**. Those in favor: A. Kokko Chappell yes; M.
25 Thornton yes; J. Dargie yes; K. Lagro yes; chair votes yes.

26
27 Chair Plourde stated the criteria for the Special Exception request had been satisfied and the application
28 approved. There is a 30 day appeal period that can be filed with the Zoning Board.

29
30 Chair Plourde moved to the next case.

31
32
33 **f. Case #2022-12 Barlo Signs and Hitchiner Manufacturing Company, Inc. for the property located at**
34 **586 Elm Street, Tax Map 13, Lot 6** are seeking a Variance from Milford Zoning Ordinance, Article VII,
35 Section 7.06.8.B.2.a to allow an electronic messaging sign to exceed the 50% of the total sign area and 24
36 square foot area design standards within the Industrial Zoning District.

37
38 Brandon Currier representing Barlo Signs for Hitchiner Manufacturing stepped forward to make a presentation.
39 The sign will be on Elm St. and will not cause a problem to neighbors because it is an Industrial District. The
40 purpose it to provide more exposure for Hitchiner. He explained the various concerns explained on the
41 application.

42
43 J. Plourde asked why an electronic sign vs a static sign. B. Currier explained that a static sign would require an
44 employee make updates to the sign which, especially during the winter months, could prove to be a hazard.
45 Also, an electronic sign will allow Hitchiner to make changes more readily and prove to be more advantageous.
46 M. Thornton asked about the lighting. B. Currier explained the sign will take into account the ambient lighting
47 and adjust itself in order to not be a distraction to motorists.

48
49 L. Daley asked about the correlation between the size of the sign in relation to the size of the land it will sit on.
50 B. Currier explained why the location was picked and why the sign needs to be so large. He stated due to the
51 grassy area and the positioning they wanted to make sure motorists could see it clearly without it being a hazard.
52 There was further discussion about this point.

1 J. Plourde stated the designated location could represent a hardship.

2
3 Mr. Rodriguez from Hitchiner stepped forward to explain the rationale for the designated location. There was
4 more discussion about this topic. It was brought up there is no signage for Hitchiner on Elm St.

5
6 J. Plourde explained research was done in regards to the criteria variance and the only issue is the size. He then
7 opened the meeting to the public and then asked the representative to go over the criteria points.

8
9 Variance Criteria:

10
11 **1. This will not be contrary to the public interest.**

12 The sign will be to scale for the environment and its location (behind the railroad track).

13
14 **2. The spirit of the Ordinance is observed.**

15 Will provide essential communication.

16
17 **3. Substantial Justice is done.**

18 It will be clearly seen and be aesthetically pleasing. It will not restrict sight lines. It will show where the
19 entrance is which improves safety and benefit the public.

20
21 **4. The Values of Surrounding Properties will not be diminished.**

22 No properties in the area.

23
24 **5. Literal Enforcement of the provisions of the Ordinance would result in an unnecessary hardship.**

25 The location makes it a hardship because the sign has to be large enough to be seen without causing a
26 hazard. It will not be close to the road.

27
28 Chair Plourde asked if there were any more comments from the public. He asked the applicants if they had
29 anything more to add. There were no further comments from the public and the applicants had nothing more to
30 add.

31
32 The public portion of the meeting was closed.

33
34 **Deliberations:**

35
36 **1. This will not be contrary to the public interest.**

37 A. Kokko Chappell: advertising will be a benefit

38 K. Lagro: it will help designate the entrance

39 J. Dargie: agrees

40 M. Thornton: it will direct and inform the public without decreasing public safety

41 J. Plourde: does not impact public involvement in the area

42
43 **2. The spirit of the Ordinance is observed.**

44 K. Lagro: in this case a larger sign is needed making it within the spirit of the ordinance; visible and
45 safer

46 J. Dargie: in the spirit of the ordinance, there will be minimal impact to that area because there are very
47 few signs in the area

48 M. Thornton: benefits the public

49 A. Kokko Chappell: agrees

50 J. Plourde: agrees

51
52 **3. Substantial Justice is done.**

53 J. Dargie: there is no benefit to the public by denying the variance

1 M. Thornton: agrees
2 A. Kokko Chappell: agrees; a new updated sign does substantial justice
3 K. Lagro: it will be a benefit; the designated location is the best place
4 J. Plourde: agrees; nothing to add
5

6 **4. The Values of Surrounding Properties will not be diminished.**

7 M. Thornton: industrial area; other electronic signs in the area; agrees
8 A. Kokko Chappell: benefits the Elm St. corridor with a sign to improve business; definitely does not
9 diminish
10 K. Lagro: that area is primarily Hitchiner and will improve the stretch of Elm St.
11 J. Dargie: agrees
12 J. Plourde: agrees; nothing to add
13

14 **5. Literal Enforcement of the provisions of the Ordinance would result in an unnecessary hardship.**

15 K. Lagro: the unique location, wide setback because of the railroad, the sign needs to be large which
16 presents the hardship
17 J. Dargie: the designated location is the hardship which is the best location
18 M. Thornton: agrees
19 A. Kokko Chappell: agrees; best location for the sign
20 J. Plourde: proposed use is reasonable, location is reasonable; agrees with others
21

22 J. Plourde asked the board if they were ready to vote, and all were in agreement.
23

24 **Voting:**

25
26 **1. This will not be contrary to the public interest.**

27 K. Lagro yes; A. Kokko Chappell yes; M. Thornton yes; J. Dargie yes; chair votes yes.
28

29 **2. The spirit of the Ordinance is observed by creating affordable housing in keeping with the area.**

30 A. Kokko Chappell yes; M. Thornton yes; J. Dargie yes; K. Lagro yes; chair votes yes.
31

32 **3. Substantial Justice is done.**

33 M. Thornton yes; J. Dargie yes; K. Lagro yes; A. Kokko Chappell yes; chair votes yes.
34

35 **4. The Values of Surrounding Properties will not be diminished.**

36 J. Dargie yes; K. Lagro yes; A. Kokko Chappell yes; M. Thornton yes; chair votes yes.
37

38 **5. Literal Enforcement of the provisions of the Ordinance would result in an unnecessary hardship.**

39 K. Lagro yes; A. Kokko Chappell yes; M. Thornton yes; J. Dargie yes; chair votes yes.
40

41 Chair Plourde asked if there is a motion to approve **Case #2022-12** Barlo Signs and Hitchiner Manufacturing
42 Company, Inc. for the property located at 586 Elm Street, Tax Map 13, Lot 6 are seeking a Variance from
43 Milford Zoning Ordinance, Article VII, Section 7.06.8.B.2.a to allow an electronic messaging sign to exceed the
44 50% of the total sign area and 24 square foot area design standards within the Industrial Zoning
45 District.
46

47 K. Lagro made a motion to approve **Case #2022-12** and J. Dargie seconded.

48 J. Plourde: A motion has been made to approve **Case #2022-12**. Those in favor: K. Lagro yes; A. Kokko
49 Chappell yes; M. Thornton yes; J. Dargie yes; chair votes yes.
50

51 Chair Plourde stated the criteria for the Variance request had been satisfied and the application approved. There
52 is a 30 day appeal period that can be filed with the Zoning Board.
53

1 **MEETING MINUTES**

2
3 4/7/2022:

4 In Attendance: J. Dargie, A. Kokko Chappell, J. Plourde
5 J. Plourde asked for a motion to approve minutes of April 7, 2022 as amended.
6 A. Kokko Chappell made a motion to approve and J. Dargie seconded.
7 All were in agreement.

8
9 4/21/22:

10 In Attendance: K. Lagro, M. Thornton, T. Steele, A. Kokko Chappell, J. Plourde
11 J. Plourde asked for a motion to approve minutes of April 21, 2022 as amended.
12 M. Thornton made a motion to approve and K. Lagro seconded.
13 All were in agreement.

14
15 5/5/22:

16 In Attendance: K. Lagro, M. Thornton, T. Steele, J. Dargie, A. Kokko Chappell
17 J. Plourde asked for a motion to approve minutes of May 5, 2022 as amended.
18 J. Dargie made a motion to approve and K. Lagro seconded.
19 All were in agreement.

20
21 **4. OTHER BUSINESS**

22
23 J. Plourde, K. Lagro and L. Daley met with the Town Council. The ambiguity in regards to voting was discussed
24 when a ZBA member should vote NO on a specific criteria. The recommendation from Town Council was to
25 continue the individual voting on each criteria. The board continued to discuss this and what was done in the
26 past was brought up in that there were discussions but no voting on each individual criteria. This point was
27 debated amongst the Board members and the benefits of how the voting is done now was weighed against how it
28 was previously done.

29
30 Discussions continued about the bylaws and what should be included such as how the voting is done being an
31 item to include. It was also pointed out the length of the meeting should be put into the bylaws as well as how
32 many cases can be heard at each meeting.

33
34 More discussion ensued in regards to voting for each criteria individually. Other procedures were also discussed
35 and the role of Town Council involvement with the ZBA.

36
37
38 **Motion to Adjourn**

39
40 Chair Plourde asked if there was anything else. J. Dargie made a motion to adjourn and M. Thornton seconded.
41 All Board Members were in agreement. Meeting adjourned.

1 **Motion to Approve:** _____
2
3 **Seconded:** _____
4
5 **Signed:** _____
6
7 **Date:** _____
8