

1 MILFORD PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES

2 July 21, 2020 Via Zoom, 6:30 PM

3  
4 **Members Present:**

5 Doug Knott, Chairman  
6 Tim Finan, Vice Chairman  
7 Janet Langdell, Member  
8 Paul Amato, Member  
9 Laura Dudziak, Selectmen's Rep  
10 Pete Basiliere, Member  
11 Susan Robinson, Member (arrived late)

**Staff:**

Kellie Walsh, Planner  
Darlene Bouffard, Recording Secretary

12  
13 **EXCUSED:**

14 Laura Dudziak, Selectman's Representative

15  
16  
17  
18 **1. Call to order:**

19 D. Knott called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. D. Knott read the Telephone Conference Preamble as follows:

20  
21  
22 ***MEETING PREAMBLE DURING COVID-19 EMERGENCY***

23 *Good Evening, as Chairman of the Planning Board, I am declaring that an emergency exists and I am*  
24 *invoking the provisions of RSA 91-A:2, III (b). Federal, State, and Local officials have determined that*  
25 *gatherings of 10 or more people pose a substantial risk to our community in its continuing efforts to*  
26 *combat the spear of COVID-19. In concurring with their determination, I also find that this meeting is*  
27 *imperative to the continued operation of Town government and services, which are vital to public safety*  
28 *and confidence during this emergency. As such, this meeting will be conducted without a quorum of this*  
29 *body physically present in the same location.*

30 *At this time, I also welcome members of the public accessing this meeting remotely. Even though this*  
31 *meeting is being conducted in a unique manner under unusual circumstances, the usual rules of conduct*  
32 *and decorum apply.*

33 *Public comments will be limited to three minutes per person. Any person found to be disrupting this*  
34 *meeting will be asked to cease the disruption. If the disruptive behavior continues thereafter, that*  
35 *person will be removed from this meeting.*

36 *Please note that all votes that are taken during this meeting must and will be done by Roll Call Vote.*  
37 *Let's start the meeting by taking a Roll Call attendance. When each member states their name, also*  
38 *please state whether there is anyone in the room with you during this meeting, which is required under*  
39 *the Right-to-Know Law.*

40  
41 Members and staff were polled individually: J. Langdell at her home in the room alone; P. Amato was at his  
42 home in the room alone; T. Finan was at his home in the room alone; P. Basiliere was at his home in the room  
43 alone; S. Robinson was in her home in the room alone; D. Knott was in Community Development alone; K.  
44 Walsh was in Community Development alone.

45  
46 **2. Public Hearing(s):**

- 47  
48 a. **TEG Holdings, LLC (owner) and Kenneth Lehtonen II (applicant) – Scenic Road Public Hearing**  
49 **for proposed driveway location, potential removal of stonewalls and tree cutting on Osgood Road,**  
50 **Tax Map 51, Lot 23.**

51  
52 D. Knott explained that the town was supposed to publicize two notifications for a Scenic Road Hearing  
53 in accordance with State Statute 231:8, D. Knott read from the statute. The town neglected to put the  
54 second notice in the newspaper and asked for the Planning Board thoughts on whether to move forward or  
55 not. P. Amato moved to accept the application for review. T. Finan seconded for discussion. J. Langdell

56 asked what are the options? T. Finan said since it was not published two times, does that make tonight  
57 invalid? D. Knott understands that the applicant has said the area that was disturbed could be put back  
58 and another area of access that would not trigger a Scenic Road hearing might be possible and would be  
59 up to the applicant. This application could be withdrawn. P. Amato said this is a scenic road hearing, it  
60 is not an application, there is no site plan or subdivision. The scenic road hearing is only within the town  
61 right of way, not private land. The map that the applicant presented, looks like the stone walls are on his  
62 private property, therefore the town does not have jurisdiction on that. The town would only have  
63 jurisdiction if it was in the town right of way. K. Walsh explained that a complaint from a property owner  
64 was submitted, staff then followed up with the property owner (applicant) and the applicant was unaware  
65 of Osgood Road being a scenic road. During that process, portions of the stone wall were disturbed.  
66 Once staff was aware of this, K. Walsh made contact with the owner of the property and the work was  
67 stopped and until he went in for any required approvals. That is what triggered the Scenic Road  
68 application before the Board this evening; if the applicant can identify another access that does not disturb  
69 stonewalls or trees within the Town ROW, a hearing will not be necessary. No information has been  
70 presented at this time to indicate that. P. Amato asked if the stone wall is in the right of way. K. Walsh  
71 does not have the measurement, but it appears that portions could be. P. Basiliere noticed it had been  
72 disturbed but he did not take any measurements. K. Walsh spoke with the applicant today, who took  
73 measurements and it is her understanding that documentation might be provided showing that he will not  
74 affect anything in the right of way.  
75

76 D. Knott asked would the town road agent have to agree to the right of way? P. Amato said this section  
77 of Osgood Road is not a 100' right of way for the road, if they can determine the town right of way, that  
78 would determine the other side of the road. J. Langdell noted that the applicant took some measurements,  
79 can the Planning Board get those from him. K. Walsh did not have those measurements, but she believes  
80 the applicant measured about 50' from the center of the road to the property and the stone wall is well  
81 within his property. D. Knott does not want to have the applicant measure the center line from the stone  
82 wall and it measures 25' from the center. The stone bounds are 24' to the center line so it does appear  
83 that the wall is on his property but he does have an alteration that can be discussed. P. Amato said the  
84 notice did not get published two times but if the applicant has a solution that does not affect the stonewall,  
85 he can still proceed with a driveway permit from DPW. D. Knott said that is correct but the applicant  
86 would need to fix the stone wall that was disturbed (if it is within the ROW) and withdraw the scenic road  
87 hearing application.  
88

89 T. Finan clarified that there is no application for a scenic road hearing to be withdrawn. P. Basiliere said  
90 if there is an alternative access there is nothing to withdraw. J. Langdell said it is an alternative place for  
91 the driveway that does not require a scenic road hearing so that can be withdrawn now. K. Walsh said if  
92 the applicant chooses to withdraw the hearing; it will be up to town staff to confirm that the stone wall is  
93 restored if it is within the ROW. D. Knott asked if that works for the applicant. Kenny Lehtonen  
94 responded he would like to have the scenic road hearing on the next Planning Board meeting and be  
95 properly noticed (twice) for the driveway location. The alternative access that is not within the ROW is  
96 intended for logging.  
97

98 J. Langdell moved to postpone further action on the scenic road hearing until the next Planning Board  
99 meeting August 18, 2020. P. Basiliere seconded. K. Walsh stated she knows there are several abutters to  
100 this property that are on the zoom call and they will have the opportunity at the public hearing on August  
101 18, 2020 to speak. J. Langdell clarified that the Planning Board cannot proceed with the scenic road  
102 hearing tonight, because it was not noticed properly. K. Walsh said the notice was her error and this has  
103 now been postponed to August 18, 2020. D. Knott opened the meeting to the public for procedural  
104 questions only. Jennifer Siegrist, Osgood Road abutter, asked if the logging can continue? P. Amato said  
105 yes, they can get a tractor out there and they can log, they have a permit. J. Siegrist said a permit is  
106 required to cross a wetland. P. Amato responded that logging requires a different process than building a  
107 home. J. Siegrist asked what part of Town Government governs that? K. Walsh said that the Department  
108 of Environmental Services (DES) oversees wetland crossings but to log land requires a Timber Cut which  
109 goes before the Board of Selectman to approve. J. Siegrist said the applicant will clear cut 17 acres so he  
110 will need a wetland permit for that, does the town ensure that permit is received? P. Basiliere asked if  
111 that is something that can be answered by staff during the work day instead of at this meeting? P. Amato

112 said that has nothing to do with a scenic road hearing. J. Siegrist said she will contact the town on that.  
113 A poll was taken on the motion to postpone further action on the scenic road hearing until the next  
114 Planning Board meeting August 18, 2020: P. Amato yes; P. Basiliere yes; T. Finan yes; J. Langdell yes,  
115 D. Knott yes.  
116  
117

- 118 b. **ASRT LLC (Owner) and MVC Eye Care (applicant).** Conceptual discussion for a site plan to  
119 construct a 5,654 square foot professional office along with associated site improvements for MVC Eye  
120 Care. The parcel is located in the Integrated Commercial Industrial (ICI) District, Tax Map 44, Lot 11-1.  
121

122 D. Knott explained this is for discussion only and not for any binding decisions. Doug MacGuire, Dubai  
123 Group, is representing the applicant. This application is looking for ZBA approval for setback before an  
124 application is submitted to the Planning Board. MVC Eye Care currently has a location in Milford which  
125 is located directly east of this location. MVC is looking to relocate to the lot behind the current plaza  
126 location. This location was a lot created back in 2013 and does not have frontage on Nashua Street  
127 (Route 101A); this was part of the Cumberland Farms property. There is an access easement on the  
128 Walgreens/Cumberland Farms property. We are looking at a 5,600sf building, parking that exceeds the  
129 requirements, a hammerhead turn around for larger trucks to turn around. Conceptual renderings were  
130 shown to the group. Because this property has no frontage, a zoning variance is being requested which  
131 was previously requested and approved but has expired. A Zoning Special Exception is also required for  
132 wetland crossing.  
133

134 D. MacGuire asked for comments or questions, commenting that the applicant is looking to move forward  
135 once this goes through the ZBA process August 6 and then formally be before the Planning Board. When  
136 requesting a wetland crossing, DES must look at other areas of the lot that could be used for access. P.  
137 Amato asked if this has been talked about with Walgreen's? D. MacGuire responded the way the  
138 easement was granted, it was for access of the entire parcel, and we feel this access easement is intended  
139 for access to this rear property. P. Amato was on the Planning Board at the time when one of the  
140 requirements that was made was to not land lock that lot. It is always a good idea to make sure from a  
141 legal standpoint that Walgreen's understands the easement the same as the applicant does. T. Finan asked  
142 if there are sidewalks planned on the Cumberland Farms side? D. MacGuire responded he would have to  
143 take a look at that; there are sidewalks that go fully on that side of 101A and continue into this side, we  
144 can look to maintain continuity of that. P. Basiliere asked where the lot would go through the easement,  
145 it would go right by the drive through that you should be aware of. D. MacGuire believes we will have a  
146 full two lane driveway there. D. Knott asked about the sidewalk that stops in front of Walgreens. K.  
147 Walsh said that plan shows that the Cumberland sidewalk continues to the back lot. D. MacGuire  
148 responded the applicant has been working with Cumberland Farms for signage and lights in order for  
149 customers to locate the new business; he added that the final plan will show what they would like to do.  
150 P. Basiliere is more concerned with people walking from the west and the signage. P. Amato said that  
151 light was designed to take pedestrians into the building.  
152

153 T. Finan asked if the sign ordinance allow very large signs like on the drawing? K. Walsh would have to  
154 check the ordinance. D. MacGuire said the plans are just architectural renderings but we will meet the  
155 sign requirements. P. Amato feels it is a good use of this property. D. MacGuire said there could be  
156 some additional use of the land but it would require another wetland crossing. In working on this  
157 conceptual design, we were looking at the upland area for future use. P. Amato asked when do you think  
158 you will be in front of the Planning Board again? D. MacGuire responded the application is currently on  
159 the ZBA agenda August 6 and we might try to move forward with both ZBA and Planning Board  
160 concurrently. J. Langdell asked about the southern area closest to Route 101 for building location? D.  
161 MacGuire said that is a good point, it is a little small and that would be more difficult to have the  
162 appropriate parking. If the use was right there could be a building put there but for this use it is too small.  
163 K. Walsh said once the formal applicant comes forward, the staff and legal will want to take a look at the  
164 easements to make sure they are all set, which will all be reviewed when the formal application is  
165 submitted. D. MacGuire absolutely agreed. There were no further comments or questions. D. Knott  
166 thanked the applicant. D. MacGuire thanked the Planning Board for their time.  
167

- 168 c. **Controlled Forestry Investments LLC (owner) and 61 N. River LLC (applicant).** Review for  
169 acceptance and consideration of final approval for a site plan to construct a 384 sf building addition to be  
170 utilized as a waiting room area for the existing auto repair shop. The parcel is located at 61 North River  
171 Road in the Residence R District. Tax Map 8, Lot 50.

172  
173 T. Finan moved to accept the application for review. P. Basiliere seconded. A poll was taken: P.  
174 Basiliere yes; J. Langdell yes, P. Amato yes; S. Robinson yes; T. Finan yes; D. Knott yes.

175  
176 P. Amato moved no potential regional impact. T. Finan seconded. A poll was taken: S. Robinson yes; P.  
177 Basiliere yes; J. Langdell yes, P. Amato yes; T. Finan yes; D. Knott yes.

178  
179 Attorney Paul English, representing the applicant, was present with the applicant and the owner. Attorney  
180 English explained this proposed use has gone before the ZBA and received approval for the property to  
181 revert back to an auto garage. The applicant would like to convert one existing garage to a waiting room.  
182 This will set it back farther from the road. This is a small addition to the existing building, it will be a  
183 waiting room with a bathroom. K. Walsh read the abutters into the record. Attorney English said the  
184 existing sign will be utilized. D. Knott stated as long as it meets the sign regulation. P. English said they  
185 have done a conceptual . D. Knott asked if all the department comments have been reviewed. P. English  
186 said most of the departments did not have comments. D. Knott feels the Heritage Commission comment  
187 is a concern since they are not in the position to have a plan rejected, he is concerned that the comments  
188 are not applicable. J. Langdell agrees but they make a statement on the disparate property lines. D. Knott  
189 agrees that should have an answer but he wants to be careful about encouraging input from different  
190 advisory commissions. K. Walsh is unaware of any disputes on property lines; the applicant did provide a  
191 survey stamped by Meridian.

192  
193 P. Amato asked who hired Meridian to do this site plan? P. English said the applicant hired them, it is not  
194 a full site plan because it does not show all the utilities, it is a design that is to scale for the building but it  
195 is not a full site plan. The main reason is because a full site survey is very expensive to get a full site  
196 plan. P. English knows of no property line dispute. P. Amato said there is a “hashed” area that says it is  
197 not deeded. P. English said that is not the piece of the property being discussed tonight. P. Basiliere said  
198 on the plan it is called “proposed addition plot plan.” On this plan, P. Amato said there is no delineation  
199 of the site for in and out on the site, there should be markings on the plan for an entrance and exist. P.  
200 English said until they are out there and have the parking sorted out, then they can have a flow of traffic  
201 and strip it. P. Basiliere said on the ZBA decision the applicant has to put a buffer between the two lots.  
202 P. English said that has been taken care of already. The hours will be 8 am – 6 pm Monday-Friday with  
203 no weekends; the number of vehicles are anticipated to be 5-8 per day. This is a mechanic that has a few  
204 customers per day.

205  
206 P. Amato said that larger repairs sometimes require the car to wait on parts and the cards would have to  
207 sit there. P. English responded the ZBA addressed that, the larger repairs things like require 7-8 hours of  
208 work. S. Robinson noted that the Heritage Commission comments need clarification. J. Langdell said the  
209 points brought up by heritage have been discussed, we covered most of those. P. Basiliere asked about  
210 the dumpster and where does it goes when it is moved for snow plow? P. English responded it would be  
211 put to the right side of the building where snow could be pushed. J. Langdell said the comments made by  
212 the ZBA include the split wood will be stored on the site? P. English said yes, there will be a pallet out  
213 front for sale. J. Langdell you might want to make that larger so that it is easy to identify on the plan.  
214 The ZBA decision includes the number of cars on the property and hours of operation, which should be  
215 on this plan as well. The ZBA decision should also be called out on this plan. K. Walsh said if it is a  
216 conditional approval tonight, we should add those conditions to this plan. D. Knott asked of there were  
217 any questions or comments. Seeing none, D. Knott opened the meeting to the public and to please state  
218 your name and address if you speak. K. Walsh said there is not anybody waiting to speak. D. Knott  
219 closed the public meeting.

220  
221 K. Walsh read the conditions she has written down: 1-adding planters or barriers; 2-label wood pallets for  
222 sale on the front so that it shows wood sales; 3-ZBA decision date and any notes on the decision; 4-  
223 entrance and exit arrows to the business. P. Amato asked if there should be a note about the potential

224 boundary dispute? K. Walsh if there is a property line dispute, it would be a civil matter and it would be  
225 between the two owners. D. Knott asked if there is a dispute? J. Langdell said it is referenced on this  
226 plan from 1992. It is noted in the record, that is as far as we need to take it. K. Walsh said Community  
227 Development is not aware of any dispute at this time.

228  
229 P. Basiliere moved to approve the plan conditionally with the four conditions cited by K. Walsh. J.  
230 Langdell seconded. A poll was taken: S. Robinson yes; T. Finan yes; P. Amato yes; J. Langdell yes; P.  
231 Basiliere yes, D. Knott yes.

232  
233 D. Knott thanked the applicant for the presentation. The applicant thanked the Board for their time.

234  
235 d. **Odhner Holographics Inc. (owner) and Jefferson Odhner (applicant).** P. Amato moved to accept the  
236 plan for review. P. Basiliere seconded. A poll was taken: P. Amato yes; P. Basiliere yes; T. Finan yes; J.  
237 Langdell yes, S. Robinson yes, D. Knott yes. Motion passed. K. Walsh read the abutters list. P. Amato  
238 moved no potential regional impact. T. Finan seconded. A poll was taken: P. Amato yes, T. Finan yes, J.  
239 Langdell yes, S. Robinson yes; P. Basiliere yes; D. Knott yes. Motion passed.

240  
241 Jeff Odhner, applicant, would like to add a few more food trucks to the site, one is currently on the site  
242 (Island Bowls); he would like to add a BBQ truck and possibly a donut truck. J. Odhner would like to get  
243 the approval before he gets additional electrical lines trenched and that is the extent of the presentation.  
244 There are currently no other tenants in the building other than his business. These food trucks should not  
245 cause any problems with parking. The baseball field out back is being leased out to an organization. A  
246 new tenant would like to put additional fields out there to expand. K. Walsh indicated the baseball field  
247 request (expansion) was submitted after the deadline and is not a part of this application and staff has not  
248 had time to look at the recreational use of the site, so that will not be addressed tonight. D. Knott said the  
249 only comments staff has made on this application is the hours of operation. J. Odhner explained there are  
250 two people on each food truck, occasionally there is a third person for Island Bowls, they are open six  
251 days a week. The BBQ truck would be similar with two employees. The donut truck has one person and  
252 is only open on weekends.

253  
254 P. Amato said if the Planning Board approves the site plan, he believes Jeff would like to see some  
255 tenants in the building, if there is baseball out there maybe the foot trucks could be open during games. If  
256 a couple of food trucks are very successful it changes the dynamic of the site. J. Langdell was amazed  
257 last weekend when the parking lot was full with people getting foot. If there are 3 ball fields, there needs  
258 to be additional information. J. Odhner said the parking for baseball is not in the lot, they park in the next  
259 lot. J. Langdell said she saw the parking lot was full. K. Walsh said the baseball portion cannot be  
260 discussed tonight, the notice did not include that use so we should not discuss it at this time. S. Robinson  
261 asked if this should be postponed? D. Knott said we can discuss the application that is before us, the ball  
262 field is not part of this. K. Walsh said tonight's discussion is the food trucks but staff will need to look at  
263 the use on the site. P. Amato asked if the current ball field is grandfathered? K. Walsh said it is existing.

264  
265 P. Amato asked how many food trucks are being asked for? J. Odhner said he is asking for an additional  
266 two food trucks (adding to the current one that is on site). P. Basiliere asked about the donut truck? K.  
267 Walsh said that should not have been operating there, that is why we are here tonight. How do we get on  
268 a path to be compliant. J. Odhner said originally he was asked by Rick to serve donuts on the grounds. P.  
269 Basiliere asked is Phil's BBQ gone? K. Walsh said they are gone. P. Basiliere asked how many parking  
270 spaces are required for foot trucks? K. Walsh indicated we utilize the restaurant parking allocation. That  
271 is a discussion that she wants to have with the Planning Board since there is no parking requirement for  
272 food trucks. J. Langdell said this started with the Taco truck at the old bowling alley, was there any  
273 decision at that time on parking? K. Walsh believes it was to define on a case by case basis, for this  
274 property there is one tenant in the building. K. Walsh feels there is sufficient parking as it exists today.  
275 That is part of why it will need to come back for additional tenants or the baseball fields. P. Amato is  
276 sure the applicant would much rather have tenants than more food trucks. J. Odhner said absolutely, there  
277 is 6000 sf of space waiting to be leased, it is beautiful space but it has not been rented out. A tenant in the  
278 building would take priority over a food truck. P. Basiliere is concerned about the parking spaces right  
279 next to the two food trucks.

280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335

D. Knott asked what kind of traffic flow does this food truck activity generate? P. Amato said with Phil's BBQ at lunchtime, it generated about 7-8 cars at a time. J. Odhner said some days Island Bowls has 10 cars and some days there are fewer. When there was a ballgame, J. Langdell said it was congested and people were trying to get food. P. Basiliere feels the parking spaces are considered because some people park too close lot to get to the food truck. J. Odhner said the parking spaces on the plan are laid out for the tenants but he has never had any issues with the parking at his lot. D. Knott said one issue is that during the week, there is adequate parking and then when there was a ball game on the weekend the lot was full and parking under the awning and at Island Bowls was busy. On the weekend it was a potential problem. J. Langdell said there was a lot going on, the Planning Board can look at this as a conditional approval for three food trucks and any change or additions will need to come back to the Planning Board. J. Odhner asked if a tenant wants to sign a lease, he does not want to wait for a Planning Board meeting to sign a lease, that is his main objective to rent out the units, not have more food trucks. J. Odhner shared photos of the weekend event during the ball game and the activity in the parking lot. Seeing no further comments or questions from the Planning Board, D. Knott opened the meeting to the public. K. Walsh said there were no members of the public waiting to speak. D. Knott closed the public hearing and asked for a motion.

P. Amato is concerned about the truck on the west side of the lot; he has no problem with the food trucks on the east side. P. Amato indicated the Planning Board should not tie Jeff's hands up about how he will rent his building out. J. Langdell said while it might not be great, adding the food trucks adds intensity of the property and we get into problems with cards and traffic. D. Knott said the intensity of the building is close to zero, the donuts on the west side is only on weekends, if the west side of the building gets rented out, that food truck would go away. J. Odhner said if he rented that side of the building, he would get rid of that food truck. D. Knott if it is written in the decision then it comes together.

P. Amato moved to grant conditional approval for 3 food trucks to be allowed and if a tenant for the former DMV is found, then the west side food truck lease will not be renewed. P. Basiliere seconded for discussion. K. Walsh indicated a note will be on the plan to indicate food truck lease renewal. P. Amato said if any space is rented with only two employees, the food truck is fine. J. Odhner said renting the building is his number one priority. T. Finan asked what is the restaurant parking requirement? K. Walsh said it is based on the number of seats. T. Finan asked is there any parking requirement right now? K. Walsh answered yes, and suggested a condition that the approval needs to come to staff if they intend to lease out the space. If another business goes in, staff does not know unless we are approached. P. Amato said if a business rents out the space and has 100 employees, that should come to the Planning Board for review. A poll was taken: P. Amato yes; P. Basiliere yes; S. Robinson yes; T. Finan yes; J. Langdell yes; D. Knott yes. Motion passed.

- e. **Tamsab Realty, LLC (owner) and Commonwealth Automotive Center (applicant).** T. Finan moved to accept the plan for review. P. Amato. A poll was taken: T. Finan yes; P. Amato yes; J. Langdell yes; S. Robinson yes; P. Basiliere yes; D. Knott yes. P. Amato indicated he is not sure of the impact of this type of business. T. Finan asked if we can hear the application before addressing regional impact? J. Langdell explained the Planning Board needs to do regional impact first because if the Board feels it will impact the region, it stops right here until we notify surrounding regions. P. Amato moved no potential regional impact. S. Robinson seconded. A poll was taken: J. Langdell yes; P. Amato yes; T. Finan yes, P. Basiliere yes; S. Robinson yes; D. Knott yes. Motion passed.

Nate Chamberlin, Fieldstone Land Services, representing the applicant presented the plan for an auto facility between the Drive-in and a vacant lot on Elm Street. This is to move the dispatch center from Nashua to Milford for Amazon. The current dispatch center is at 10 State Street in Nashua. Darius (applicant) sent the current dispatch center information (located across from the Community College) to the Board members. N. Chamberlin explained the traffic is on the plan. D. Knott asked where the school busses will go? N. Chamberlin explained this is not where the busses are stored, this is a lot that has been vacant for many years. D. Knott said the Heritage Commission comments have nothing to do with the scope of the Heritage Commission. We appreciate their work, but that has nothing to do with their mission. N. Chamberlin indicated the fleet is released in off-peak times. P. Amato asked if we could

336 limit the number to 70 cars instead of 100? Darius responded from the fleet, sent to Massachusetts, right  
337 now the number is 58 vans in each release. Since Covid began, the home deliveries have increased. P.  
338 Basiliere noted that the release of vans starts at 11 am and is done every half hour, ten vehicles leave the  
339 property and it takes 3 hours to get them on the road. Darius explained it would be 10 vans an hour  
340 released. P. Amato asked if any deliveries are in Milford? N. Chamberlin said there is a 60 miles radius  
341 from the warehouse in which they deliver.  
342

343 D. Knott said that Milford Conservation provided a letter response to this plan, N. Chamberlin said that  
344 the conservation request will be added to the plan. D. Knott said there are five Community Development  
345 comments on traffic impact. K. Walsh responded those have been addressed by Fieldstone. K. Walsh  
346 concern is how the general public will interact with the vans coming and going. Darius responded there  
347 will be signage to indicate where the fleet goes and where the public goes on the site, for entering and  
348 exiting. Commonwealth auto motors handles the repairs for the fleet (for Amazon) and Amazon will park  
349 the vans in the parking lot. D. Knott asked how will the Fleet be separated from the public? K. Walsh  
350 suggested that to be a note on the plan to reference in the future. P. Basiliere does not understand the  
351 number of spaces for the Fleet, and employees and the people waiting for work to be done to their cars.  
352 D. Knott said there are 109 spaces on the site, that is noted on the plan, N. Chamberlin said that  
353 employee parking will be in a section of the parking lot, separate from the Fleet parking. K. Walsh said  
354 that the ADA component is for the general public, that requirement is for 2 handicapped spaces per 25  
355 spaces. They have executed the requirement. K. Walsh said a light plan needs to be reviewed for this  
356 site. Darius had the bulbs replaced for the existing floodlights. He would like to have more lighting on  
357 the site for safety. P. Basiliere noted the downcast lighting has to be used so that it does not impact the  
358 neighboring properties. D. Knott asked if Elm Trees could be added for the landscaping component. J.  
359 Langdell asked why the rocks are painted red? Darius said the rocks are red for snow plowing to  
360 distinguish the edge of the property. P. Amato asked if the stormwater management out there currently  
361 works? K. Walsh has not heard any complaints or concerns of storm water drainage on the site. Milford  
362 Conservation did not bring that up either. K. Walsh said there is no proposed paving or changes that  
363 would affect the drainage. They are not adding to the building, nothing would trigger drainage. K. Walsh  
364 said if there were drainage issues from the site, there would have been comments from DPW.  
365

366 Seeing no further questions or comments from the Board, D. Knott opened the meeting to the public.  
367 K. Walsh said there were no public people waiting to speak. D. Knott closed the public meeting.  
368

369 P. Amato moved to grant a conditional approval with the conditions cited: 1-Adding Conservation  
370 comments to the plan; 2- signage note on the plan; 3-light plan (administrative review); 4-auto repairs will  
371 be performed inside the garage. T. Finan seconded for discussion. P. Basiliere asked if any cars will be  
372 on the property for sale. K. Walsh responded that a different approval would be required for car sales and  
373 would be a violation of this site plan. A poll was taken: T. Finan yes; P. Basiliere yes; P. Amato yes; S.  
374 Robinson yes; J. Langdell yes; D. Knott yes. Motion passed.  
375

376 D. Knott thanked the applicant and representative; Darius thanked the Board and looks forward to being  
377 an asset to the Town and will adhere to the regulations.  
378

### 379 3. Minutes -

380 P. Basiliere moved to approve the minutes of June 16, 2020 as amended. T. Finan seconded. D. Knott  
381 took a poll: T. Finan, aye; P. Amato, aye; J. Langdell, aye, P. Basiliere aye; S. Robinson aye; D. Knott  
382 aye. Motion passed unanimously.  
383

384 4. Discussion / possible action regarding other items of concern- K. Walsh asked if it would be helpful to the  
385 Board if she forwarded information about Regional Impact? J. Langdell said that would be helpful as well as  
386 the statute. P. Amato agreed there are some cases where it is questionable.  
387

388 There is a joint meeting with the ZBA August 4 about the proposed dispatch communications tower. P.  
389 Basiliere asked if food trucks could be discussed at a future work session, see what other towns are doing. K.  
390 Walsh has been working on that and will bring forward what she has found. D. Knott is very concerned about  
391 comments being made by the Heritage Commission that are not in the purview of the HC. J. Langdell asked

392 if those meetings are being recorded and asked where minutes are stored? K. Walsh said the heritage  
393 commission is handling meetings via email. D. Knott said the comments from Heritage need to be limited to  
394 the Heritage Commission mission. If the Heritage Commission is holding meetings via email, J. Langdell  
395 feels that is an issue and does not comply with Right To Know law and should be brought to the attention of  
396 the Town Administrator. K. Walsh said she will bring this to the TA. P. Basiliere is sure the meetings are  
397 being done with members using what is known, they are probably not familiar with the Zoom program.  
398

399 **5. Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned at 9:50 p.m. on a motion made by P. Amato and  
400 seconded by J. Langdell. A poll was taken: T. Finan, aye; P. Amato, aye; J. Langdell, aye; P. Basiliere  
401 aye; S. Robinson aye; D. Knott aye. Motion passed unanimously.  
402

403  
404  
405 \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
406 Signature of the Chairperson/Vice-Chairperson:  
407

408 **MINUTES OF THE 7/21/2020 MEETING WERE APPROVED \_\_\_\_\_, 2020**  
409