

1 MILFORD PLANNING BOARD WORK SESSION MINUTES ~DRAFT

2 APRIL 2, 2024 Board of Selectmen Meeting Room, 6:30 PM

3  
4 **Members Present:**

5 Doug Knott, Chairman  
6 Janet Langdell, Vice Chairman  
7 Paul Amato, Member (via Zoom)  
8 Susan Robinson, Member  
9 Susan Smith, Alternate  
10 Pete Basiliere, Member

**Staff:**

Terrey Dolan, Town Planner  
Andrew Kouropoulos, Videographer

11  
12 **Excused:**

13 Andrew Ciardelli, Member (arrived 7:05)  
14 Dave Freel, Selectman's Representative  
15 Darlene Bouffard, Recording Secretary

- 16  
17  
18 **1. Call to order:** Chairman Knott called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. indicating that tonight is  
19 a work session and that S. Smith, Alternate, will be sitting in for A. Ciardelli until he arrives.  
20 Planning Board members and staff were introduced by D. Knott. P. Amato is joining the Board  
21 via Zoom tonight, therefore a role call vote is required.

22  
23 D. Knott expressed that it seems this Board has sometimes gotten a little too far in the weeds,  
24 resulting in longer meetings. D. Knott would like to try utilizing ELMO (Enough Let's Move On),  
25 which can be fun and everyone will know what that clue means. The Chair can always point out  
26 that things are dragging on and things can be reined in, D. Knott agreed and stated that we do not  
27 want to ever cut a discussion short.

- 28  
29 **2. Meeting Minutes Approval:** 3/5/24; it was pointed out by S. Smith that in the minutes, line 33  
30 there is no reference to who "he" is. It was suggested by J. Langdell that in the introductory  
31 sentence it be captured that "T. Dolan introduced the performance bonding update called out in  
32 the Town Development Regulations and has recently been updated in the law." By identifying it  
33 was T. Dolan, that would cover "he" in the following paragraph. All agreed. J. Langdell moved  
34 to approve the amended minutes of 3/5/24. S. Smith seconded. Role call vote: P. Amato yes; S.  
35 Smith yes; J. Langdell yes; S. Robinson yes; D. Knott yes and P. Basiliere abstained. Motion  
36 passed.

37  
38 P. Basiliere asked about Page 2 of the minutes, which referenced T. Dolan following up on the  
39 more restrictive language in the Senate Bill modified language and asked if that was done, he had  
40 not seen any follow up on that, or if it will come up tonight or maybe at the next meeting? D.  
41 Knott confirmed the comment is not to amend the minutes of 3/5/24, it is just a question, since he  
42 was in the process of stating the minutes were approved. T. Dolan is in the process of following  
43 up on what Pete referred to, the pages provided at the last meeting were the changes. J. Langdell  
44 indicated it is just following up on at topic that was discussed in the minutes that needs to be  
45 followed through. T. Dolan indicated that S. Robinson had commented that the Town's regulation  
46 is more restrictive -some are and some are not and that's when our regulations were marked up to  
47 make them more consistent with the newly approved RSA. J. Langdell said the question was if  
48 the towns could put in regulations that are more restrictive than State law, that was the question,  
49 which is why on page two the reference was for Terrey to contact the town attorney or NHMA to  
50 clarify. J. Langdell asked if C. Pattison could shed some light on this.

51  
52 S. Robinson remembers when she first started on this Board being told that each layer down, can  
53 be more restrictive than the preceding, that municipalities can be more restrictive than the State  
54 which can be more restrictive than the Federal government. C. Pattison stepped up to the

55 microphone and asked that the question be repeated, P. Basiliere had not attended the previous  
56 meeting regarding Performance Bonds and in his notes he wrote that the town was going to confirm  
57 with the attorney if we could be more restrictive than the State on Performance Bonds and he was  
58 curious what had come of that? J. Langdell noted that the discussion went from performance bonds  
59 to changes in general, state law changes, can the town have more restrictive regulations? C.  
60 Pattison answered that she would have to check that, she would like to look at the RSAs and check  
61 with town counsel, she and T. Dolan will check that out.  
62

63 P. Basiliere asked if the order for the agenda could be changed since the Marmon representatives  
64 are here and the Board can discuss the Rules and Procedures later. D. Knott noted that this agenda  
65 was set up in this order. P. Basiliere continued that the rules and procedure states that the Board  
66 can rearrange the agenda if need be, would it be more appropriate to hear the applicant first prior  
67 to Board business. D. Knott indicated this agenda was set up in this order so the Board could take  
68 care of its business before a conceptual review. J. Langdell indicated the order was changed based  
69 on the Chairman wanting to take care of the Board business before a conceptual review. D. Knott  
70 indicated the applicant was scheduled to be here at 7:30; a Marmon representative expressed that  
71 they were still waiting on attendees.  
72

73 **3. Continuation of the 3/5/24 Work Session on potential revisions to the Zoning Ordinance,**  
74 **Development Regulations & Planning Board Rules and Procedures:**  
75

76 T. Dolan said tonight he will present two topics, tonight there is no recommendation on the town  
77 ordinance. Tonight the discussion focuses on updates to the Planning Board Rules & Procedures  
78 as redlined and then the Board will go into the redlined sheets (proposed for revision) for the  
79 Development Regulations and we have until 7:30 for those discussions followed by a Conceptual  
80 Discussion. J. Langdell stated this is not a correction to the Rules & Procedures, it is an update.  
81 Okay so under Standards of Conduct, D. Knott indicated that on Item g, the word “all” has been  
82 added so the language is clarified. P. Amato asked for D. Knott to review the jist of the change,  
83 Doug responded that this update it to clarify the procedures for the Board. P. Amato stated this is  
84 to protect the Board and its process.  
85

86 J. Langdell further clarified that the ex-parte communication brought up to staff should be reported  
87 to the Chair immediately and not wait until the next meeting. J. Langdell explained that the  
88 communication MUST be conveyed to the Planning Board at the next Planning Board meeting; it  
89 must be disclosed at the next meeting, she believes that is in the RSA. P. Basiliere noted that the  
90 entire Board should be made aware of the communication. D. Knott asked if the member that was  
91 part of the communication should be present for that discussion? J. Langdell was not sure, stating  
92 that should be looked up. P. Basiliere asked what happens once the communication has occurred?  
93 P. Amato indicated that the next sentence in the procedure explains that. D. Knott indicated any  
94 Board member that is approached about an active application, should halt the discussion  
95 immediately. P. Basiliere said the procedure does not state that. P. Basiliere asked if the Chair  
96 should receive communication about it? S. Smith said that Section I describes the next step. P.  
97 Basiliere is speaking of the time after it occurs and who can discuss the situation before it is brought  
98 to the rest of the Planning Board?  
99

100 D. Knott stated if he were informed of the situation, he would notify the Vice Chair, and then  
101 others may be brought in, such as the Town Administrator. C. Pattison indicated that it could be  
102 spelled out in the procedure. At a minimum, the Board would be informed at the next Board  
103 meeting. C. Pattison, stated it could be spelled out more.  
104

105 In the update, T. Dolan was trying to convey that any communication should follow a particular  
 106 path, report it to the Chair, who conveys it to the Vice Chair. The information should be provided  
 107 to staff and the Chair. Further inquiries should only be conveyed during a public hearing. P.  
 108 Basiliere indicated that as a member of the Planning Board, he should be able to ask a question of  
 109 the Chair about an active case if it is to his benefit. D. Knott asked about a situation that came up  
 110 by Board members; T. Dolan indicated if an individual asks a question of the Town Planner, that  
 111 is fine, but the Planner will not then share it with other Board members, it should be discussed at  
 112 the next public hearing. J. Langdell said that if an e-mail is sent to T Dolan with a question,  
 113 regarding an active case, that information must be conveyed to the rest of the Board and should  
 114 become part of the record.

115  
 116 C. Pattison indicated that it could be done at the next meeting, but if some information is conveyed  
 117 to the Town on a weekend, how is that handled? In the past, J. Langdell stated the Board would  
 118 get a copy of the communication, but if it comes in the day of the meeting, a hard copy should be  
 119 given to the Board at the meeting but the Board members should also be informed that something  
 120 was added to the packet. C. Pattison recommended that if materials come in after the packets are  
 121 copied, some people will not see an email, but it can get posted on the website and then bring hard  
 122 copies to the meeting, that is reasonable and then get that information posted on line as well. D.  
 123 Knott explained that if something were to come in after the fact, it will be shared the night of the  
 124 meeting, it cannot be expected that staff will share it with Board members. J. Langdell stated the  
 125 Board should be alerted of the change to the packet when members arrive. D. Knott noted that A.  
 126 Ciardelli arrived at 7:05 p.m. J. Langdell commented that the entire line regarding comments from  
 127 staff should be removed in the next version. P. Basiliere also requested a change to be consistent  
 128 to use shall or should. J. Langdell would like to see the entire Rules & Procedures to be sure items  
 129 follow through. J. Langdell does not want to tie the hands of staff pertaining to when information  
 130 comes in and whether or not it will be included in the packet or the website.

131  
 132 D. Knott asked about section 7 of the agenda, Conduct of Meetings. D. Knott stated at the next  
 133 review of the redlines, the order should be refined. P. Amato stated first the Board Accepts the  
 134 application, then Regional Impact, if yes, then halt the meeting and notify the regional towns of  
 135 regional impact, the order of the meeting should be re-ordered. P. Amato noted that lot line  
 136 adjustments should be taken first since they are quick. Recessed or continued meetings should  
 137 also be at the top of the agenda. D. Knott said that the minutes were moved to the beginning to  
 138 the end of the meeting and any other business should be after applications. P. Basiliere would like  
 139 to add additional proposed updates to the updates proposed by T. Dolan. J. Langdell suggested  
 140 that P. Basiliere get those update redlines to Terrey for the next review of same.

141  
 142 D. Knott stated the proposed updates to the Development Regulations were presented by T. Dolan.  
 143 Doug Knott indicated we will begin on page 17. It was the understanding of T. Dolan that some  
 144 Board members were under the impression that there were two 6-month extensions allowed for a  
 145 Site Plan but that is not expressed in the development regulations so he is proposing an update to  
 146 the regulations to include such. After the second extension, no other extensions will be granted.  
 147 P. Amato asked when this clock would start, would it start when the Board votes on it, it would  
 148 start when the permit is signed, correct? T. Dolan agreed. P. Amato stated that could be months  
 149 after it was approved. T. Dolan said it should not be, it should be five calendar days. P. Amato  
 150 said that is not practical. S. Robinson asked if the plan were approved then received a 6-month  
 151 extension, and then another 6-month extension; at that point if they are not done yet would they  
 152 start all over again? What if they need an AoT and the AoT process got held up? T. Dolan said  
 153 that is something for consideration. P. Amato asked why we are in a rush to do this, seasons go  
 154 by very quickly and it's a process to get a site plan approved and it may get done in one meeting  
 155 or in six meetings, so as an example, a big apartment complex takes a lot of time, but if during that

156 time the applicant decides it is not practical to start yet, and nothing changes, why do we want to  
 157 tell them they have to start all over again? What is gained by that, except for making it harder to  
 158 develop in town. S. Robinson asked that question because we approved a plan and they had one  
 159 year, then received an extension of 6 months and now are discussing another extension so she  
 160 wondered what would be the protocol? P. Amato would recommend a one-year extension with  
 161 the possibility of a second one-year extension. We do allow two years from the date of signing to  
 162 act on final and complete plans to finish the build out, we give them two years to start construction.  
 163 P. Amato just does not see the point, what are we trying to get at? Sometimes business changes  
 164 and it's not practical but if the applicant has gone through all the dog & pony show to get an  
 165 application approved and then in a year they have not done substantial improvement, then do they  
 166 have to do that all over again and spend \$50 or \$60,000 to do it again? That's absurd.

167  
 168 S. Robinson asked should a project go through the process and then it takes as long as it takes, is  
 169 that what P. Amato is proposing? P. Amato responded that if the zoning is changed substantially  
 170 it may be grandfathered or something like that, or a period of time, but it may not be grandfathered  
 171 forever. J. Langdell said if something is approved today and then receive 6-month or one-year  
 172 extensions, the project is approved at that point in time and what is active on that date, that is the  
 173 challenge of having these longer term extensions that things could change in five years including  
 174 town ordinances, State rules, or Federal rules but the applicant would still be held to the  
 175 requirements at the time of approval. Paul Amato can remember that when things were changing  
 176 more actively and the Board was trying to get something in before a zoning change was posted so  
 177 the plan could come in whether the change was voted in or not. The Town has not made any large  
 178 zoning changes in almost ten years so it has not been a problem, but if a plan was approved three  
 179 years ago and it was not done and the developer wants to do it now, he does not know of anything  
 180 that has changed in the Town, maybe in the State and they will always have to follow the state  
 181 rules. J. Langdell indicated there have been some zoning changes, such as districts. P. Amato said  
 182 the town has not gotten stricter on its open space or what is allowed in zoning areas. J. Langdell  
 183 said we have changed the LC and the ICI1 and ICI2 zones. P. Amato would prefer to make the  
 184 change a one-year extension followed by a one-year extension. Unless there is a reason why the  
 185 town will be harmed by that, he would prefer two one-year extensions.

186  
 187 For clarification, S. Smith clarified that once a plan is approved the applicant has two years for  
 188 substantial completion, then can get a one-year extension and potentially follow that with another  
 189 on year extension? J. Langdell clarified that the substantial completion has to do with a building  
 190 permit to get a CO, that is separate from the Site Plan approval. It is suggested that a 6-month  
 191 extension be allowed for Site Plan signature and then another 6-month extension, but what P.  
 192 Amato is suggesting is to change the 6-month to one-year, which would bring it three years out to  
 193 have an unsigned, but approved, Site Plan. P. Amato said it sounds like T. Dolan thinks the  
 194 conditions of a Site Plan can be met in 5-days, but the regulations say it is one year from the  
 195 Planning Board approval, then they have a year to get the Site Plan done to sign the plan which is  
 196 done by the Chairman, so when a plan is approved, the Board assumes that when a plan is approved  
 197 it will get signed in the next couple months but they have up to one year. And then possibly the  
 198 extensions, said J. Langdell. Yes, but it could also be tomorrow that the plan gets signed. S.  
 199 Robinson asked if Paul is comfortable with having three years to get the plans signed? P. Amato  
 200 responded that we cannot predict how long it will be until the plans get signed. S. Robinson asked  
 201 for P. Amato to clarify what he thinks is necessary? T. Dolan chimed in that he understands that  
 202 a one-year extension followed by another one-year extension (instead of 6-month). P. Amato  
 203 agreed to the two one-year extensions from the time the plan is approved.

204  
 205 Paul Amato asked if Terrey remembers it taking longer than 6 months to get the approved site plan  
 206 signed? T. Dolan recalls that the approved Storage Sense on Elm Street took longer but it is not

207 frequent, in that case the applicant did not provide the final mylars. D. Knott remembers that it is  
 208 rare. D. Knott stated it is almost 7:30, is anyone opposed to having the one-year and another one-  
 209 year extension? T. Dolan recommended that a vote be taken on the one-year then another one-  
 210 year extension. S. Robinson is concerned with what is best for the Town of Milford. D. Knott  
 211 added that consideration of the applicant must also be taken into account. T. Dolan suggested  
 212 taking a vote and if that fails, maybe revise it to one-year then another 6-months. P. Basiliere  
 213 thinks three years is too long, that is his input. P. Amato said the Board still has discretion, so if  
 214 the applicant did not do something or if something changed, the Board can always make a change.  
 215 A. Ciardelli indicated there are circumstances when an applicant might face economic challenges  
 216 that might delays signing of the plan or making substantial progress and he does not see it as being  
 217 detrimental to the Town to allow a longer extension, he would be fine with a one-year extension  
 218 and then a 6-month extension.

219  
 220 S. Smith is okay with that, noting that the longer the plan is not signed off, the more of a change  
 221 that the laws could change, but they are grandfathered in to the rules on the books at time of  
 222 approval. A. Ciardelli said the town can say no to an extension after the first extension. P. Amato  
 223 added that the zoning laws could also get less restrictive and they would have to come back to the  
 224 Planning Board if they want to change their plan. P. Basiliere asked if the second extension needs  
 225 to have a time frame or could it be left open? D. Knott liked that idea and then the applicant and  
 226 the town could get together to talk it through. J. Langdell asked why it would take two years to  
 227 get a Site Plan signed? P. Amato indicated it is only one year to get the Site Plan signed. In  
 228 reading the language in the Development Regulation, J. Langdell said it can go to two years  
 229 without a signed Site Plan, its approved but not signed and in the language T. Dolan has added it  
 230 states “active and substantial”. D. Knott said that statement only has to do with the construction,  
 231 not the Site Plan. In order to sign the Site Plan, P. Amato said the AoT permit has to be approved,  
 232 any condo documents must be completed, the mylars have to be printed – all of that is not needed  
 233 to approve the plan just to sign it. D. Knott agreed with J. Langdell about the language added by  
 234 T. Dolan it’s confusing in the two paragraphs, there are two separate actions – the signing of the  
 235 Site Plan and activity having to do with construction. P. Basiliere suggested that this language be  
 236 re-worked for the next meeting and suggested having a subsection for Site Plan signature and  
 237 substantial activity for the construction it might make it more clear for future Boards. D. Knott  
 238 indicated the conceptual review is now on deck and the balance of the redlines can be reviewed at  
 239 the next Planning Board meeting.

240  
 241 **4. Conceptual Review for Potential future Major Site Plan for the existing Marmon Utility Site**  
 242 **(Map 14, Lots 8 & 9, 53 Old Wilton Road) – Building Expansion Plans (Estimated Start**  
 243 **Time: 7:30 p.m.) Discussion**  
 244

245 D. Knott indicated this is a discussion of concept with no votes to be taken. Chad Branon,  
 246 Fieldstone Land Consultants; Kevin Boette, Marmon Program Manager; and Tom Quinn, Project  
 247 Attorney are all here for this discussion. Proposal is to expand the existing facility, this is informal  
 248 for a conceptual discussion. They are working toward a formal Site Plan package and would  
 249 appreciate any feedback so that it can be incorporated into the expansion plans. Marmon has  
 250 occupied this site for some time, going back to 1957. Kevin Boette stated that currently, there are  
 251 approximately 180 employees and 150 working at this site. Chad continued that there are a number  
 252 of site improvements planned.

253  
 254 Tax maps 14/8 and 14/9 are the properties to be expanded, the zoning is Industrial. There are 3  
 255 additions to the facility being proposed. D. Knott asked about building height. Kevin Boette said  
 256 the height would be under 32’. The building designs are not complete yet. P. Basiliere asked if  
 257 the expanded building along Old Wilton Road will be lower than what is existing? C. Branon

258 explained it is a large building and the video displays what the expansion would look like. The  
259 video was run and shows the inlay of each building expansion and product lines.  
260

261 P. Amato asked if the building can stay off Old Wilton Road by 30'? C. Branon indicated the  
262 applicant is requesting a special exception for that along Old Wilton Road. T. Dolan explained  
263 the encroachment is within the setback a good portion of the stretch of the building. It will be a  
264 building of metal construction, there will be significant landscaping along Old Wilton Road, and  
265 it is hoped there will not be much variation in the building. C. Branon indicated the expansion  
266 will allow improvements to the site including, launching a new product line, allowing the business  
267 to stay in Milford. D. Knott asked if the equipment additions will keep staffing levels the same or  
268 increased? Kevin said the operation runs 24/7 and they anticipate an increase in staffing of about  
269 21 people in addition to the current staffing, which is 5 people per shift. D. Knott so this will  
270 provide additional jobs. S. Smith asked about parking? C. Branon indicated the parking will be  
271 improved and currently the parking does not meet the regulations; the machinery requires more  
272 than one person to run the equipment. J. Langdell said Marmon was in front of the Board a few  
273 years ago and that was addressed. K. Boette explained there are two people in the building at a  
274 given time.  
275

276 S. Robinson said there are a lot of businesses that are going that route. J. Langdell asked if the  
277 small house is owned by Marmon, Kevin Boette said they do. C. Branon said that the property  
278 along Old Wilton Road is the longest single piece of property to use for an expansion. The plan  
279 is to merge the lots together. The open space calculation has a hurdle, relief was granted previously  
280 at 27% open space; we are looking at 5% open space and relief for that in order to expand. Property  
281 across the street is owned by Marmon and perhaps could be used to satisfy the requirement. If that  
282 was connected to this lot, it would be 30% open space. Discussions have been had with Town  
283 staff about Open Space and it was decided to get relief through ZBA. This has been presented to  
284 the Conservation Commission and they are in support.  
285

286 The site is active and it is felt that ongoing manufacturing will not be interrupted during this  
287 process. P. Amato said he has never seen a parking problem on the Marmon site to date. He is  
288 concerned with stormwater runoff with all the roofs and the retention is a concern. C. Branon said  
289 they are actively working on the stormwater drainage mitigation and chamber storage. D. Knott  
290 indicated that there should be trees planted for water absorption in the space along the building  
291 (Old Wilton Road), currently it is just low bushes, is there enough space? C. Branon explained  
292 the burm area is the same design, any landscaping along the building needs to be tolerable of water.  
293 The bioretention system will support the plant and support the growth. D. Knott feels that the long  
294 expanse of building might cause concern when the plan comes forward. C. Branon explained that  
295 the regulations talk of what the town would like to see, and we might face challenges along Old  
296 Wilton Road and landscaping in order to accomplish the goal; he is hoping for feedback on this  
297 site. J. Langdell said she would like to see rain gardens; could a mural work there? D. Knott said  
298 there may not be opportunities to landscape that big building.  
299

300 Kevin Boette said the intent going forward is to maintain a good-looking property and maintain  
301 that going forward. S. Robinson said the intent is to improve the site, perhaps with a mural on the  
302 expansive building. A. Ciardelli said if they can come up with a suitable Industrial building design  
303 with HVAC, etc. that can be talked through at the Site Plan meeting. High quality windows can  
304 be used as architectural features. Kevin Boette indicated there will be windows, but not with  
305 hanging plants, it is an industrial building. J. Langdell said there need to be features to break up  
306 the expanse of building along the road. D. Knott indicated that Marmon does keep the site very  
307 attractive and well maintained. P. Amato asked if the stormwater calculations can be shown for  
308 the entire site, not just the building to be expanded? This adds more roof and where does the

309 drainage go? C. Branon explained there are a number of drainage systems on the site currently.  
 310 A lot of the drainage makes its way along the railroad to the north side and eventually goes under  
 311 Elm Street. We will submit for an Alteration of Terrain permit, but going back to 1956 there were  
 312 improvements that were captured along the way, and that will be captured in the AoT. P. Basiliere  
 313 asked why the building is so long and so wide? Kevin Boette explained that a lot of insulation is  
 314 required for their process, and it requires time to cool in the water, and then come back, the longer  
 315 and straighter the building, the faster it goes, that is the need for that length. J. Langdell said they  
 316 need the length because they need the cable straight for certain processes. Kevin Boette explained  
 317 the cables go from one side of the site to the other and then back. P. Basiliere thanked him for the  
 318 explanation and asked what happens with the spent water? Kevin Boette responded it is recycled,  
 319 we re-use the processed water and also discharge some of the processed water to the Town Sewer,  
 320 we have an Industrial discharge permit with the Town.

321  
 322 P. Basiliere asked about the width of the building along Old Wilton Road, if it were not as wide,  
 323 the landscaping could be done. K. Boette said the width is due to the continuous operation with  
 324 the reels, as one is unloaded, another is re-loaded and to make that happen that width is needed.  
 325 P. Basiliere is concerned with the location of the roadway off Old Wilton Road, the truck traffic  
 326 will be coming and going in the center of the site. Kevin Boette explained most of the truck traffic  
 327 is on the west end of the campus. C. Pattison asked about snow removal and where that will be  
 328 stored, since some of the parking will be removed. The net result is they are gaining parking,  
 329 according to C. Branon, we will go from 129 spaces to 140 spaces with drainage details still being  
 330 worked out. The current snow storage is in different areas of the product storage area and in the  
 331 case of excess snow, there will be a note on the plan that it will be removed from the site which is  
 332 done currently. Kevin Boette explained a company is hired that takes the snow off site. C. Pattison  
 333 noted that there are design requirements for the West End Overlay District, so please try to achieve  
 334 those. C. Branon is glad the Board brought up the West End Overlay District for which we may  
 335 be looking for relief.

336  
 337 The West Elm Overlay District Regulation has a section for the Industrial zone, C. Branon asked  
 338 is Marmon considered a “campus”? That would be interconnected areas, he feels this is more of  
 339 a traditional Industrial setting. There are architectural guidelines which could be an issue and we  
 340 are hoping to achieve that in other ways. J. Langdell said the neighbors of Marmon had to do the  
 341 same thing, let’s look into the future and try to move things forward bit by bit. Kevin Boette said  
 342 this situation is adding to an existing building. C. Branon hears what the Board is saying and they  
 343 will try to apply the West End Overlay District regulation to this. It will apply but we may be  
 344 looking for some relief, there are some challenges. One topic C. Branon would like clarification  
 345 on is the vehicular parking, the turn radius has been designed and with the re-layout of the parking  
 346 area, they were not planning on doing additional landscaping and how that would apply with the  
 347 existing lot being restriped, the parking will not be lost, nor the access. The catch basins would  
 348 remain and he does not plan on landscape improvements. J. Langdell said to design what you can.  
 349 A. Ciardelli asked if the roof is a shed roof on the long building? Kevin Boette said it is a shed  
 350 roof with a pitch. S. Smith said it would be helpful to the Board to know how many employees  
 351 are for each shift in regards to the parking and what the overlap is so the maximum number of  
 352 vehicles at the overlap times of the day. C. Branon said that’s a great point. S. Smith said this  
 353 would also be helpful for the waiver on parking.

354  
 355 Janet Langdell asked about the easternmost driveway, who will be using that, is it just for parking  
 356 or delivery trucks? K. Boette responded that is for parking and there will be some deliveries there  
 357 as well for empty spools (tractor trailer) and compounds will be delivered there as well (via tractor  
 358 trailer). P. Amato said currently the empty spools come in and the trucks pull into your lot across  
 359 the street and back up on Old Wilton Road, so this will be better than that, but I don’t see enough

360 room for the tractor trailer to turn around and get back out. C. Branon said that is a great question  
361 and we are looking at the layout of the storage yard to accommodate the tractor trailer turning  
362 around on site, it will not be backing in. P. Amato commented that he thinks there are more empty  
363 spools on the trucks coming in, is that the case? Kevin Boette answered that the reels come out  
364 on the other end, more reels come in on the trucks since they can “nest” and when reels are full  
365 they cannot “nest”.

366  
367 P. Amato suggested that C. Branon look at the West End Overlay District ordinance and give it  
368 your best shot and then the Planning Board will have to decide if that’s good enough because we  
369 understand Marmon may not meet it but he does not think the Board can just ignore it completely.  
370 J. Langdell agreed, stating it’s the spirit of the ordinance. T. Dolan asked C. Branon about the  
371 timing, there is a May 21 and a June 4 meeting, what do you anticipate at this point in time? T.  
372 Dolan is asking because the May 21 meeting has started filling up at this point with small projects  
373 plus the continuation of the Rashid gas station major site plan. C. Branon responded that the goal  
374 is to try to make a submission for the May 21 meeting deadline, we are still waiting for the building  
375 design details so that will come into play with whether we can make that submission deadline, so  
376 he cannot say for certain that we will be submitting but that is still our goal. The timeframe here  
377 is tight said C. Branon, ultimately Marmon Utility has to make a decision on the investment here  
378 in town and so it is important to lay out a schedule that is doable for that and he knows the Milford  
379 team at Marmon would really like to see the effort be successful so we are being aggressive on the  
380 design side and he does not want to make any presumptions that we will not be submitting later  
381 this month, but realistically we have a lot of work to do. T. Dolan just wanted to make all aware  
382 of the submission deadline April 22 for the May 21 meeting.

383  
384 Paul Amato asked where C. Branon stands with the AoT and the drainage? C. Branon responded  
385 that typically he submits locally before a submission is made for Alteration of Terrain so that if  
386 there are any changes that need to be accommodated with the State submission, the critical path is  
387 to get a submission to the Town, go through a local review with the town engineer, we will be  
388 designing for Alteration of Terrain standards so when we submit for the local permit it will be to  
389 the State standards which means that we meet or exceed the local standards. Ideally we would be  
390 submitting to the Alteration of Terrain Bureau within about three weeks of the formal Site Plan  
391 submission which would mean we have gone through a department review, at least the initial  
392 review. C. Branon continued that if they submit to the State, a large change cannot be made, it is  
393 a fee-based system, so we would basically start over, it is not an efficient process. Paul Amato  
394 agreed it is not an efficient process. S. Smith asked if there is a fence along the property line of  
395 the easterly driveway? C. Branon said there is a fence existing, the landscaping standards are ten  
396 foot wide, six foot tall for buffering, he does not think that is met along some of the existing  
397 landscaping along the railroad; we were thinking of continuing the fencing that we have there and  
398 do the best we can with landscaping.

399  
400 P. Amato asked if this will run into the same problem that the Boys & Girls Club ran into with the  
401 residential use and the Industrial use? And the driveway is there, can that be in the setback? T.  
402 Dolan said that is can. J. Langdell responded that this is a different beast than Boys & Girls Club.  
403 P. Amato asked how so? There is residential and Industrial. T. Dolan added that it needs to be  
404 checked if the residence is actually zoned residential or Industrial. C. Branon believes it is a multi-  
405 family residence in the Industrial zone and Son’s Chimney has the warehouse on the next lot, it is  
406 all Industrial zoned. C. Branon said they are in communication with that abutter.

407  
408 Tom Quinn, Attorney for applicant, indicated this will go before the ZBA on Thursday and the  
409 decision about the open space and setback is up to the ZBA but asked if there is any Board member  
410 that is uncomfortable or outraged with the idea of mitigating the loss of open space on the north



411 parcel by setting aside open space on the south side. P. Amato does not have any issue with that,  
412 it makes complete sense to which P. Basiliere agreed, it needs to be made to look appropriate, but  
413 he does not have a problem with it. T. Quinn said that open space cannot be improved upon, it  
414 does not have to be contiguous, it is just open space and on the other side of the road, it is just  
415 trading open space, the public benefit is with the trail, which we have proposed a location for. A  
416 declaration of open space needs to be prepared and the plan will show the location of the trail, it  
417 will not be public access. D. Knott is happy Marmon is trying to make it work to stay in Milford,  
418 and will continue to make efforts to maintain the site. T. Quinn said there will not be any kind of  
419 obvious open space, it is more fragmented. K. Boette appreciates the Board for allowing us to  
420 come tonight to talk about this.

421  
422 **5. Board Member General Discussion on potential Goals and Objectives for 2024**  
423 **consideration.** Goals and Objectives will be discussed at the next Work Session.

424  
425 **6. Other Business:**

426  
427 Chair & Vice Chair Annual Election: P. Amato nominated D. Knott as Chair and J. Langdell as  
428 Vice Chair. A. Ciardelli seconded for another term. Role call vote: P. Amato yes; S. Robinson  
429 yes; A. Ciardelli yes; P. Basiliere yes. D. Knott yes; J. Langdell yes. Election complete.

430  
431 Scheduling of Planning Board and ZBA Joint Meeting: Potential Date 4/30/24 – T. Dolan indicated  
432 he was trying to find a date to have a joint meeting with ZBA. The next meeting on April 16 is  
433 the continuation of Mill Street design review – they do need to go to the ZBA for a Variance for  
434 the density. The continuation of design review, the engineer has new information he would like  
435 to present before it goes before the ZBA. P. Amato asked if T. Dolan sees any inclination from  
436 the ZBA for that application? T. Dolan did not.

437  
438 The other application is for Chappell Tractor to convert units in the existing garages to be used for  
439 an auto detailing business. The details will be presented on April 16. T. Dolan will be on vacation  
440 April 8 to April 12.

441  
442 Janet Langdell asked if the Mill Street case could be first on the agenda.

443  
444 **7. Other Business:**

445 4/16/24 – Planning Board Meeting  
446 5/7/24 – Planning Board Work Session

447  
448 **8. Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned. on a motion made by P. Basiliere and seconded by A.  
449 Ciardelli. Role call vote: P. Amato in favor; S. Robinson in favor; J. Langdell in favor; P. Basiliere in  
450 favor; D. Knott in favor. All were in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

451  
452  
453  
454  
455 \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
456 Signature of the Chairperson/Vice-Chairperson:

457  
458 **The Planning Board minutes of 4-02-24 were approved** \_\_\_\_\_