

1 MILFORD PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES

2 August 18, 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

12 Laura Dudziak, Selectman's Representative

**Staff:**

Kellie Walsh, Planner

Darlene Bouffard, Recording Secretary

13  
14  
15  
16  
17 **1. Call to order:**

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

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

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

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

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

35 *Please note that all votes that are taken during this meeting must and will be done by Roll Call Vote.*

36 *Let's start the meeting by taking a Roll Call attendance. When each member states their name, also*  
37 *please state whether there is anyone in the room with you during this meeting, which is required under*  
38 *the Right-to-Know Law.*

39  
40 Members and staff were polled individually: J. Langdell at her home in the room alone; P. Amato was at his  
41 home in the room alone; T. Finan was at his home in the room alone; P. Basiliere was at his home in the room  
42 alone; S. Robinson was in her home in the room alone; D. Knott was in Community Development alone; K.  
43 Walsh was in Community Development alone.

44  
45 **2. Public Hearing(s):**

- 46  
47 a. **TEG Holdings, LLC (owner) and Kenneth Lehtonen II (applicant) – Scenic Road Public Hearing**  
48 **for proposed driveway location, potential removal of stonewalls and tree cutting on Osgood Road,**  
49 **Tax Map 51, Lot 23. Tabled from the July 21, 2020 meeting.**

50  
51 D. Knott explained this application was tabled in July due to a notification error. The applicant has  
52 submitted a withdrawal of the scenic road hearing since the stone wall is not in the Town Right of Way;  
53 the DPW Director visited the site and checked to identify that the stone wall is not in the right of way.  
54 The scenic road hearing was withdrawn by the applicant via email dated July 24, 2020. There were  
55 several letters from abutters submitted to the Planning Board regarding the stone wall and scenic road

56 hearing, which were read into the record and are filed with the original application. Letters were read by  
57 the following abutters or interested parties: Ms. Karin Cevasco, 181 Timber Ridge Drive, Milford NH;  
58 Jenni Siegrist, 687 Osgood Road, Milford NH. There were also several photos provided which are  
59 available for viewing in the original application in Community Development department on request.  
60

61 D. Knott indicated since the scenic road hearing has been withdrawn, there is no further discussion. P.  
62 Amato noted the hearing was withdrawn because there was a misunderstanding of the reasons for having  
63 a scenic road hearing; this application has no effect on a scenic road since the stone wall was found to be  
64 on private land so the scenic road hearing is not required. The withdrawal request from the applicant was  
65 submitted. Rick Riendeau, DPW Director, went out to measure and verified that the stone wall was on  
66 private property. D. Knott again stated there is no application and the letters were read into the record out  
67 of courtesy and were submitted to the town after the July 21, 2020 initial hearing.  
68

- 69 b. **Quiet Caboose Holdings, LLC (applicant/owner).** Review for acceptance and consideration of final  
70 approval for a major site plan to construct an 1,800 square foot building with garage and associated site  
71 improvements for wholesale storage and warehousing. The parcel is located at 15 Elm Street in the  
72 Commercial and Nashua Elm Street Overlay Districts. Tax Map 25, Lot 16.  
73

74 S. Robinson moved to accept the application for review. P. Amato seconded. A poll was taken: T. Finan  
75 yes; J. Langdell yes; P. Amato yes, S. Robinson yes; P. Basiliere yes; D. Knott yes. P. Amato moved no  
76 potential regional impact. J. Langdell seconded. A poll was taken: S. Robinson yes; P. Basiliere yes; J.  
77 Langdell yes; T. Finan yes; P. Amato; D. Knott yes. The motion passed.  
78

79 Spencer Tate of Meridian Land Design on behalf of the applicant indicated that 15 Elm Street is located  
80 in the Commercial District, it is a 21,000 sf lot with a large home, a former railroad car and several  
81 outbuildings. There are two apartment units in the home and an HVAC-Heating business in the other  
82 building with several outbuildings for business storage on the site. Jacques School is on one site and the  
83 residence is on the other site. This proposal is to remove two of the existing buildings and storage boxes  
84 and build a 30 x 60' garage with five bays.  
85

86 T. Finan asked if the former ice cream shack will be removed? S. Tate said that will be taken down or be  
87 donated. The business needs storage for its vehicles and for storage. Spencer said there are some  
88 improvements to the parking in this application. There is an 18" recharge trench on the back of the  
89 garage for run off. Drainage meets the 25 year storm and will be an improvement to what is there now.  
90 The house would remain. The business is for heating and air conditioning units. P. Amato asked to look  
91 at the elevation of the building. The elevations were presented. P. Amato asked about the deck on the  
92 back of the warehouse and asked what is that for. S. Tate said that would allow for storage of pipes  
93 underneath and would be a place to sit and enjoy the property. The deck would face the abutter to the  
94 west, it does not face the school. P. Amato asked if the upstairs of the garage will be living space? S. Tate  
95 said no, it's for storing a/c units, boilers and stockroom items (things that must be stored inside).  
96

97 D. Knott indicated the applicant mentioned they might be moving to this property. S. Tate said yes, there  
98 is a four bedroom apartment in the house, the applicant currently lives in Amherst. P. Amato asked if the  
99 deck on the back of the garage it outside of the 15' setback? S. Tate responded that it is past the 15'. S.  
100 Robinson asked what materials the structure will be. S. Tate said it will be a wood frame and we have not  
101 decided on the siding yet. D. Knott said this is in the Nashua – Elm Corridor District so it needs to meet  
102 those requirements. S. Robinson asked if the Heritage Commission comments have been addressed? D.  
103 Knott does not see comments from the Heritage or Conservation Commissions. P. Amato asked if the  
104 plan elevations were sent to Heritage – K. Walsh responded that she believes they were given the  
105 elevations. S. Tate said if there are details that the Planning Board would want to see, could that be  
106 handled at the building permit phase? P. Amato said no, that is part of the zoning ordinance, not the  
107 building code. D. Knott asked if the Elm Street Corridor was taken into account with the plan? S. Tate  
108 replied this plan is what the architect came up with. P. Amato asked if the architect was aware of the  
109 overlay district?  
110

111 P. Basiliere asked if the Elm Street Overlay District requirements are available this evening for the  
112 applicants' benefit? K. Walsh responded that she does not have them available this evening. D. Knott  
113 asked if K. Walsh could review just for a reference for the architect. K. Walsh read from the ordinance,  
114 noting it is quite lengthy and is available on the Town website. D. Knott said they need to verify if that  
115 was addressed in the application. S. Tate said the specific items for the overlay district were not looked  
116 at. P. Amato said the architect needs to verify that the Elm Street Overlay District ordinance was  
117 reviewed and if so that they provide a letter stating such to the Planning Board, which would suffice. D.  
118 Knott indicated the same could be done for the landscaping requirements for this application. K. Walsh  
119 printed out the overlay district for the applicant and explained it is in addition to the development  
120 regulations.

121  
122 J. Langdell asked about the other door facing the residential abutter, is that to get equipment out of the  
123 garage? This is for the use of the mixed use apartment and the commercial use that has a residential  
124 abutter. At the conceptual discussion, the Planning Board talked about that deck and that it appears that it  
125 is looking directly at the neighboring property. S. Tate talked about the fact that both of the buildings have  
126 porches and decks that are facing each other and looking down on each other's yards. P. Amato is having  
127 a hard time visualizing, that maybe the Board needs to have a site walk. K. Walsh said this Board has not  
128 visited the property in a site walk. S. Tate said there have been multiple people visiting the site for utilities  
129 or for water. Spencer asked if there will be some initial comments from the Board this evening? P.  
130 Basiliere said the building does not align with the other buildings in the area, he feels that it is not in  
131 character with the other buildings in the area which is why the architect should be sure it aligns with the  
132 Nashua / Elm Street overlay District. D. Knott agreed.

133  
134 P. Basiliere said the location of handicapped parking is surprising; putting it far away from the access  
135 seems counter-intuitive, it is usually much closer to where they might interact with the business. Spencer  
136 explained that is due to the slope at the end near the entrance, it is difficult and to have the handicapped  
137 parking further away would make it much easier for access with that slope. P. Basiliere understands that,  
138 but the regulations need to be checks for handicapped parking and the entrance, he feels the handicapped  
139 parking should be a lot closer to the door. Spencer responded if we were re-doing the entire parking lot,  
140 we could remove some of the elevation to have a more gradual slope. It is a matter of proximity versus  
141 grade. S. Robinson stated that seems logical. K. Walsh said the development regulation talks about the  
142 slope and rise for handicapped parking shall not exceed 1'. J. Langdell said there are some best practices  
143 guidelines out there. P. Amato said the handicapped parking is usually closer to the entrance. D. Knott  
144 said the State and Town ADA best practices need to be looked at to get to a desired outcome. If there is a  
145 display and it is open to the public, that triggers the other requirements, but the Planning Board needs to  
146 make sure it meets all the regulations.

147  
148 P. Amato said this is not a huge display area. S. Tate responded it is not for people to come in to buy  
149 something on the spot, the display is for sight and sound, people want to see it when it is in use. This is to  
150 help people make a decision on what they want. Most people will not be going into the display area, they  
151 will be going to look at the patio area. J. Langdell said the information on the hardscape parking needs to  
152 be given to the Planning Board members at the next meeting. P. Amato asked if the dumpster enclosure  
153 can also be shown on the plan. P. Amato drove around the Bales school and asked if there are vehicles  
154 also stored on this property, or will they be moved? S. Tate responded that those are the business vehicles  
155 and he is in process of getting rid of some of them. P. Amato said there is a formula for required parking  
156 for the business, but if there are cars being stored there, they take up some of those required spaces. P.  
157 Amato asked if the garage will be heated? S. Tate responded that it will be heated. J. Langdell asked how  
158 many parking spaces will be available for customers, employees and residents? S. Tate said there are five  
159 spots available at any given time with the business fleet there. Two spaces in the front and side are for the  
160 tenants; once the services trucks go into the garage, some of the other spaces will be available and the  
161 owner has no current parking issues. L. Daley asked if the Conservation Commission concerns have been  
162 addressed? S. Tate responded they just received those concerns last night. D. Knott read the three  
163 comments from Conservation. S. Tate said they can address all 3 of the concerns. T. Finan said one  
164 concern was the overlay requirements and asked about the existing sign. S. Tate asked if they can leave  
165 the sign the way it is. D. Knott said the overlay issue needs to be resolved. J. Langdell said the  
166 development regulations section for commercial developments versus residential development and the

167 required mitigation needs to be addressed. P. Amato asked about any landscaping. D. Knott indicated  
168 that needs to meet the overlay district requirements and the standard regulations. It was agreed that the  
169 Board would hold a site walk Tuesday August 25, 2020 at 6:30 p.m.  
170

171 D. Knott opened the meeting to the public and asked if anyone was waiting to speak. K. Walsh said there  
172 were no people in the waiting room to speak. K. Walsh took this opportunity to read the abutters list.  
173 Seeing no people waiting to speak, D. Knott closed the public meeting.  
174

175 P. Amato moved to continue this application to the September 15, 2020 Planning Board meeting. J.  
176 Langdell seconded. A poll was taken: P Basiliere yes; P. Amato yes; J. Langdell yes; S. Robinson yes; T.  
177 Finan yes; D. Knott yes. The motion passed. The application was continued to September 15, 2020,  
178 there will be no notices sent out to abutters for the continuance. The site walk will be held at 15 Elm  
179 Street at 6:30 on August 25, 2020, meet at the site; there will be no decisions made nor votes taken at the  
180 site walk meeting but it is open to the public.  
181

- 182 c. **Chappell Properties, LLC (owner/applicant).** Review for acceptance and consideration of final  
183 approval for a major site plan to construct a 6,000 square foot storage building along with associated site  
184 improvements. The parcel is located at 32 Old Brookline Road in the Integrated Commercial Industrial  
185 District. Tax Map 48, Lot 5.  
186

187 T. Finan moved to accept the application for review. P. Amato seconded. A poll was taken: T. Finan yes;  
188 P. Amato yes; J. Langdell yes; S. Robinson yes; P. Basiliere yes, D. Knott yes; The motion passed.  
189

190 K. Walsh read the abutters list. P. Amato moved no potential regional impact. P. Basiliere seconded. A  
191 poll was taken: P. Amato yes; P. Basiliere yes; S. Robinson yes; J. Langdell yes; T. Finan yes; D. Knott  
192 yes. The motion passed.  
193

194 D. Knott asked who is representing the applicant. Nate Chamberlin, Fieldstone Land Consultants,  
195 representing the applicant presented the plan. This is for Souhegan Valley Motorsports to build a storage  
196 building on the end of the lot. They worked with DPW to design a culvert for the driveway; this lot goes  
197 down to the wetland. The lot is in the ICI district, and has one house on the lot which is permitted. The  
198 existing driveway will be maintained. One overhead door will be on each end for vehicles for Souhegan  
199 Valley Motor Sports to have additional storage. There will be no vehicle repairs in this building, it will  
200 be for storage of trailers and other motor sports, there are no bathrooms or other facilities, it is just a  
201 warehouse. D. Knott asked if the boxes currently located outside will no longer be stored outside and will  
202 there be travel between the two properties? N. Chamberlin said the plan is pretty simple, the boxes will  
203 not be located outside anymore once this is built and they will unload the box on this lot, build the unit  
204 and store it inside the warehouse.  
205

206 P. Amato noted if they are unloading a truck at this location, there is a 30' setback the truck cannot go  
207 into. N. Chamberlin said the equipment will be unloaded with a forklift. D. Knott asked where will the  
208 deliveries be made? P. Amato said a crate with this equipment is a good sized crate, is there a way to get  
209 from the back of the storage building to the driveway or will a tractor trailer be coming up this driveway?  
210 This is a residential road and this will be heavy truck traffic. N. Chamberlin said there are not deliveries  
211 every week. P. Amato asked if there is any way to get to this site without going out on Old Brookline  
212 Road? N. Chamberlin will look into that. P. Amato noted that the Chappell's own all of those properties.  
213 J. Langdell said it looks like there is a connection on Lot 48-6 and 48-7. N. Chamberlin said it looks like  
214 there is something there and he will check. D. Knott said there is some kind of path between the two lots.  
215 P. Amato indicated if they want this sized building, they need to look at another way to get there without  
216 going out on Old Brookline Road. Or make the building smaller. P. Amato is concerned with the way it  
217 is designed that might have the forklift going on Old Brookline Road. This is a great use of that property  
218 but it needs to be usable. P. Amato asked if anyone has talked to the Carter's, about this size? K. Walsh  
219 has not heard from them, she has only heard from people at Ashley Commons. D. Knott asked if there  
220 are trees and shrubs out there? N. Chamberlin said there is some buffer there and there is also a lighting  
221 plan for security. P. Amato asked if the lights would be on all night. N. Chamberlin said the lighting plan  
222 will meet town regulations and the lights can be on motion sensors.

223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278

D. Knott asked if there will be adequate screening for the lights and the abutters. L. Daley pointed out the comments from Conservation and from KV Partners about stormwater. N. Chamberlin said they have responded to KV Partners comments. The Conservation comments will be difficult, since it will be difficult for small critters to get into the structure. P. Basiliere asked what are the hours of operation and for deliveries. N. Chamberlin said that is not specified on the plan yet, but we can add that. D. Knott said if they do not need to use Old Brookline Road, it would be less of an impact. J. Langdell also noted that the proper storage area should be specified on the plan to ensure no boxes are stored outside. If the type of storage changes, D. Knott asked if they must come back to the Planning Board? J. Langdell wants to make sure there is no storage on the outside of the building. P. Amato said we do not want storage especially along the abutter side of the site. J. Langdell said there should be no outside storage except in a designated area.

P. Amato asked if the concept is to make this look like a barn or will it be made of metal? D. Knott said the Planning Board would like to see detail on that. Kent Chappell, applicant, said it will be a wood framed building with metal sides, the intent is to store motorcycles, jet-skis, snowmobiles in it instead of stacking them outside the building. If the crates can go inside, the parking situation will improve. P. Amato asked if it is possible to get a driveway to connect down to the building, if that works, it is a good idea. D. Knott said that seems to be the biggest concern. The hours it will be open are 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., the deliveries are all during the day. Kent Chappell has talked with the Carters and they are fine with this. P. Amato asked if there is anything across Old Brookline Road from here? K. Chappell answered no, other than the abutters and the Carters there is nothing there. K. Walsh asked to wait until the public portion to address comments provided by Ashley Commons residents. This use falls under self-storage as long as it is only one use. A self-storage fee would be collected if it were rented to multi-uses that would change the approved use, that discussion was had with Fieldstone. K. Chappell said we have self-storage on the South side of Souhegan Motor Sports, but does this piece of land allow that? K. Walsh said this site plan is for a warehouse building, a self-storage building would require a Conditional Use Permit. K. Chappell said they did talk about a 12-unit self-storage building on the north side. K. Walsh said if you want to turn it into a self-storage building, you would need to come back to the Planning Board. P. Amato said the way it is presented tonight, this will allow Souhegan Motor Sports to clean up their lot and get the crates out of the parking area.

Seeing no further comments or questions from the Board, D. Knott opened the meeting to the public at 8:45 p.m. asking for those that wish to speak to state their name and address and state if you are an abutter. K. Walsh indicated there is one person waiting to speak.

Robert Clark, 26 Ashley Commons, abutter, is directly across the street from this lot and he represents the 32 homeowners in Ashley Commons association that have concerns about this application. They would like to see how the trucks will be unloaded and asked where any dumpsters will be located. The warehouse is on the Route 13 side with a 30' setback, the vehicular traffic and dumpster location should be on this plan. The self-storage component would require a 50' setback instead of 30' and the Ashley Commons Association would like to have a condition that if they have any self-storage that the abutters be notified. D. Knott said that would be a change to the Site Plan that would come before the Planning Board. There were no other members of the public waiting to speak. D. Knott closed the public portion of the meeting.

P. Amato asked K. Chappell if uncrating would be done where it is done now and that the maximum would not be met like what is being done now. K. Chappell said that has not been discussed, it is more of just getting the equipment out of the weather. They have been hiring people to pick up the crate debris. D. Knott said it sounds like it will be more manageable and be picked up more frequently. P. Amato suggested a note be added that no crate storage is allowed outside on this lot. K. Chappell said we cannot store open crates outside now. J. Langdell said the plan already has no outside storage and that would include the crates. P. Amato said the dumpster would also not be used for the crates. J. Langdell said this will need to come back because of the driveway connection. N. Chamberlin was hoping to get a conditional approval and have staff review the plan set instead of having to come back, since that is the only sticking point. J. Langdell said that is a large point, if you cannot make that connection, we are back

279 to square one. P. Amato asked if there is any reason why you did not design a connection? K. Chappell  
280 said no, we do own that parcel as well, that is something we can look at. D. Knott asked how the  
281 deliveries will flow? P. Amato said that will make the flow much better. K. Chappell said if we can  
282 make that work, is that the only thing? P. Amato asked how K. Walsh will feel about a conditional  
283 approval with staff approval on that connection? K. Walsh said that is up to the Planning Board.  
284

285 P. Amato moved that this can be worked out administratively. J. Langdell said she would rather see it  
286 come back to the Board. T. Finan is okay with that suggestion, since they own all of the lots. L. Dudziak  
287 agreed the connection can be handled administratively. P. Basiliere is not sure why it should not come  
288 back to the Planning Board. K. Chappell said it would be helpful to get it built. J. Langdell said if this  
289 was any other plan, we would ask them to come back. P. Amato said either they can make it work to the  
290 satisfaction of Lincoln Daley and Kellie Walsh or they cannot and then they will have to come back. P.  
291 Basiliere is okay with that. S. Robinson asked if the connection difficult because of the slope? N.  
292 Chamberlin is sure he can make it work. K. Walsh noted the access in that area could affect the  
293 stormwater. P. Amato agreed. N. Chamberlain said they could just put in another culvert. S. Robinson  
294 said this connection would address the concern of the abutter and the debris. D. Knott said the connection  
295 would address the traffic and it could affect the debris as well. If the connection does not work, it will  
296 come back to the Planning Board. A poll was taken: P. Amato yes; J. Langdell no; T. Finan yes; P.  
297 Basiliere yes; S. Robinson yes; D. Knott yes.  
298

299 P. Amato moved to conditionally approve the application based on the conditions noted:  
300 1-no outside storage;  
301 2-dumpster location (no crates);  
302 3-feasible access for delivery vehicles between Lot 48-5 and 48-7, to be reviewed administratively, if  
303 not acceptable to staff, the plan comes back before the Planning Board;  
304 4-lighting is subject to dimmer;  
305 5-hours of operation must be on the plan, including deliveries only 8 am – 5 pm M-F  
306 P. Basiliere seconded. A poll was taken: S. Robinson yes, T. Finan yes; P. Amato yes; P. Basiliere yes; J.  
307 Langdell no, D. Knott yes. Motion passed 5-1. K. Chappell thanked the Board for their time.  
308

309 d. **Louis Andronaco (owner/applicant)** - Conceptual discussion for a potential site plan to construct a  
310 multifamily residential complex along with associated site improvements. The parcel is located at 86  
311 West Street in the Residential A Zoning District. Tax Map 24, Lot 26.  
312

313 D. Knott indicated this is a conceptual discussion only, for a potential multi-family structure at 86 West  
314 Street in the Residential A Zone. P. Amato indicated that his daughter is a direct abutter, therefore if  
315 anyone has any issues with him participating in discussion, they should please speak up. P. Amato said  
316 this is a discussion only, but he may recuse himself if it comes in as an application.  
317

318 Louis and Lindsey Andronaco were here to talk about a multi-family building. The lot is in Residential A  
319 zone. This will be a townhouse style building with single floor residences for older residents. Typically  
320 the residents would have a caregiver living in the home with them. S. Robinson asked if this is will be  
321 handicap accessible? If the units are for older people, why would they be two stories? J. Langdell  
322 indicated we do not have a senior housing ordinance in Milford. D. Knott pointed out the staff comments  
323 identify the density. This is a lower density zone. T. Finan said Milford requires a half acre for five  
324 units. Lindsey Andronaco said that is what she read and we are looking at four units and we have a full  
325 acre. K. Walsh said five units per acre is allowed in Res B but the Planning Board has density  
326 jurisdiction, this is Res A. T. Finan said this is not large enough for five units. D. Knott said this is in  
327 Res A which is low density. J. Langdell added there might have been things approved in the 70's and  
328 80's that were high density, but the Master Plan is different today than it was back then. L. Andronaco  
329 said if it is a matter of density, would three units be acceptable?  
330

331 P. Amato said if you get past the allowed use of a Single Family Residence and then ask if the Board  
332 wants an apartment building in this zone, but that is not how zoning works. L. Andronaco said there is an  
333 apartment building across from the lot we are talking about. Even though this is Res A, there is already  
334 an apartment building there. D. Knott said this concept would be adding to the multi-families if this went

335 through, but this is just a conceptual discussion. P. Amato said this town allows apartments, but they  
336 would have to go for a zoning variance here, it is a very small lot, it is a big lot for West Street but it is  
337 small. It is not designed to be an apartment lot. L. Andronaco said they are looking into the feasibility of  
338 apartments on this lot; the plan would possibly be to sell the units, we have been landlords in the past and  
339 we would be open to either rent or sell. J. Langdell said if you get approved for four handicapped  
340 accessible units for seniors, you should sell them, then they can sell them to whomever they want. Land  
341 use is not just an in the moment thing, it is planned for the first owner and for subsequent owners.  
342

343 P. Basiliere said these units would be desirable for many people, but is there enough frontage on West  
344 Street? Lindsey Andronaco responded there is 85' of frontage. P. Basiliere indicated based on the  
345 drawings presented, he is not sure there is enough space for this type of building; anyone could buy these,  
346 not only those individuals requiring a caretaker. L. Andronaco initially thought these would not appeal to  
347 people with children because of the mobility items in each unit, she would be happy to go through that  
348 with the architect and modify the plan to allow the parking required for three units instead. S. Robinson  
349 asked if the Town House design was used because it would fit on the lot? D. Knott said it sounds like the  
350 feedback from the Board is that this is not the best use for this area for 4 bedroom units in this size  
351 dwelling. D. Knott does not see that this would work with most of the abutters being single family  
352 homes.  
353

354 Lindsey Andronaco asked if this was something they could try, but do a different layout or is the feedback  
355 because they are town houses (multi-family) in a Res A neighborhood? D. Knott said this plan does not  
356 make sense to him. J. Langdell said it is the location, the intention is great, but it is the intensity of use;  
357 there is also a lot of water in this area off the high school. D. Knott indicated if the applicant wants to  
358 move ahead, you would need ZBA approval for density. L. Daley agreed with D. Knott and J. Langdell,  
359 and he does not feel a multi-family should be in this area of single family residences. T. Finan asked if  
360 any abutters have been talked to about this. Lindsey Andronaco stated they have talked with one abutter  
361 that is selling their lot which would provide just under two acres. D. Knott said you still would need to go  
362 before the ZBA for multi-family use in a Res A zone. Approval would be needed from the ZBA since it  
363 would change the character of the neighborhood. L. Andronaco asked if a lot were available in Milford  
364 for this type of building, in what zone should it be located in, so that they know what type properties they  
365 should focus on? K. Walsh indicated when an applicant applies for a variance, one of the criteria is  
366 hardship, that is something to consider, asking for a multi-family building in a Res A zone requires a  
367 variance. D. Knott indicated that the hardship to the neighborhood must also be considered by the Zoning  
368 Board. The applicants thanked the Planning Board for their time and feedback.  
369

370 3. **Minutes -**

371 P. Basiliere moved to approve the minutes of July 21, 2020. T. Finan seconded. D. Knott took a poll: T.  
372 Finan, yes; P. Amato, yes; J. Langdell, yes, P. Basiliere yes; S. Robinson yes; D. Knott yes. Motion  
373 passed unanimously.  
374

375 4. **Discussion / possible action regarding other items of concern-** K. Walsh indicated there was a Regional  
376 Impact Notice sent to Milford from Hooksett for a cell tower; Kellie will file it away, as the Board felt there  
377 was no action needed. Another notice was sent from Amherst for the Subaru dealership Regional Impact, no  
378 action is necessary.  
379

380 5. **Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned at 9:53 p.m. on a motion made by P. Amato and  
381 seconded by P. Basiliere. A poll was taken: T. Finan, yes; P. Amato, yes; J. Langdell, yes; P. Basiliere  
382 yes; S. Robinson yes; D. Knott yes. Motion passed unanimously.  
383

384  
385 \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
386 Signature of the Chairperson/Vice-Chairperson:

387  
388  
389 **MINUTES OF THE 8/18/2020 MEETING WERE APPROVED \_\_\_\_\_, 2020**