

1 MILFORD PLANNING BOARD WORK SESSION MINUTES ~DRAFT

2 APRIL 16, 2024 Board of Selectmen Meeting Room, 6:30 PM

3
4 **Members Present:**

5 Doug Knott, Chairman
6 Janet Langdell, Vice Chairman
7 Susan Robinson, Member
8 Susan Smith, Alternate
9 Pete Basiliere, Member
10 Chris LaBonte, Selectman’s Representative

Staff:

Terrey Dolan, Town Planner
Andrew Kouropoulos, Videographer
Darlene Bouffard, Recording Secretary

11
12 **Excused:**

13 Paul Amato, Member (arrived 6:55)
14 Andrew Ciardelli, Member (arrived 7:05)

- 15
- 16
- 17 1. **Call to order:** Chairman Knott called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. indicating that tonight
- 18 there are two applications and noting that S. Smith, Alternate, will be sitting in for A. Ciardelli
- 19 until his arrival and P. Amato will also be arriving soon. Planning Board members and staff were
- 20 introduced by D. Knott.
- 21
- 22 2. **Meeting Minutes Approval:** There were corrections to the minutes of March 19, 2024 provided
- 23 by J. Langdell and S. Smith. J. Langdell moved to approve the minutes of March 19, 2024 as
- 24 amended. S. Robinson seconded. All were in favor. Motion passed.
- 25
- 26 3. **Public Hearing:**

- 27
- 28 a. **Continuation of Case SP#2023-06 (Design Review Phase)-Applicant: 30 MS Milford, LLC-**
- 29 **For a proposed 34-Unit (Apartments) Multi-Family Complex (three living floors), located at**
- 30 **30 Mill Street, Tax Map 25, Lot 95.**
- 31

32 This meeting shall be a Continuation of the initial December 19, 2023 Planning Board Meeting,
33 pursuant to both Article IV (Permitting Procedures for Site Plans & Sub Divisions) & Section 4.03
34 (**Design Review**) of the Milford Development Regulations. The project applicant had originally
35 requested to continue a discussion for the formal *Design Review* with the Planning Board to discuss
36 potential elements & requirements of a future Major Site Plan Application for the project.

37
38 The Planning Board formally approved a further Continuance Request at their February 20, 2024
39 Mtg. of this application, **to the April 16, 2024 Pl. Bd. Mtg.**

40
41 The overall project site is 9.877 acres in total size, located within both the Commercial “C” Zoning
42 District (Section 5.05 of the Milford Zoning Ordinance) and the Residence “A” Zoning District
43 (Section 5.02 of Milford Zoning Ordinance). All proposed site work is proposed to be contained
44 within the upland portion of the site’s Commercial “C” Zoning District lands, fronting along Mill
45 Street.

46
47 A Variance shall be required (to be heard by the Milford Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA), at a
48 future scheduled date to permit the requested transfer of multi-family density from the (to be
49 preserved) Residence “A” portion of the overall site, over to the Commercially-zoned portion. The
50 proposed singular multi-family building has now been revised to be forty feet (40’) in height.
51 Therefore, pursuant to Section 5.08.8.A of the Milford Zoning Ordinance, a Special Exception shall
52 no longer be required by the ZBA for the applicant to exceed the maximum forty (40’) height within
53 the Commercial “C” Zoning District.

54
55 Chairman Knott indicated that this is a continuation of the initial Design Review from December
56 19, 2023 that was continued to February 20, 2024 and then continued to April 16, 2024. After the

57 Design Review phase, this will come forward as a major Site Plan for review. A variance is
58 required by the Zoning Board at a future date for the multi-family density (Commercial &
59 Residence A zones). D. Knott asked why this is here tonight at all, since the ZBA approval is still
60 outstanding? Sam Ingram, Meridian Engineer representing the applicant, passed out a plan to
61 members with updates and design based on the last discussion with the Planning Board. S. Ingram
62 explained this will not be back to the Planning Board until the applicant has gone to the ZBA for
63 the split zone (Commercial/Res A) and that determination. Currently Meridian is following the
64 path of allowing for the Residence A density to be used for multi-family in a Commercial zone.
65 We have done the calculations for Res A and Commercial and found that 34 units without the
66 Commercial district acreage of the site being used. The wetlands application is in process. The
67 height changed from 52' to 40' after different options were reviewed to reduce the height. The
68 building and parking was moved back from the original design. It is back about 15' from that
69 original design and allows more landscaping and parking. They are looking to create separation
70 from the road by moving it further back which will allow more landscaping and would be beyond
71 the requirements and the hope is that this satisfies the Board.
72

73 Sam Ingram continued to say that there are multiple trees requiring further discussion for which he
74 hopes for a positive outcome. There will be a sidewalk proposed along the front of the property in
75 order to keep with the connectivity for the Town. The applicant will propose sidewalk along the
76 front which is a substantial improvement of what it there now. The applicant is hopeful that this
77 will add to the town connectivity for the trails.
78

79 P. Basiliere asked about the bump in the sidewalk on the plan provided? S. Ingram explained that
80 bump out is for a utility pole, this is our first attempt at that. There is some leeway on that proposed
81 sidewalk and can be improved. Tonight is a short discussion for these updates of the improvements
82 that were made and would alleviate any comments going forward to the ZBA application. D. Knott
83 asked about snow storage? S. Ingram responded that it is planned to be stored at the island area of
84 the parking lot which would be coordinated with the manager. D. Knott indicated that if the snow
85 melts, it will then freeze and become ice, then what? S. Ingram said we can discuss that at the next
86 hearing, snow storage and other options for it will be an item for discussion. We might need a note
87 on the plan to haul away large amounts of snow. D. Knott added that the melting snow from the
88 load will go into the driveways, so something could be used instead of sodium chloride.
89

90 Chris LaBonte asked about the proposed sidewalk and how does snow melt get out there? S. Ingram
91 responded that due to the wetland buffer line, it is within the treated area. J. Langdell said that
92 Milford Conservation Commission might want those wetland buffers marked. D. Knott asked
93 about turf and any chemicals used? S. Ingram said those have not been identified yet. J. Langdell
94 asked if there will be patios out back for residents? We want to create community for these areas.
95 S. Ingram does not know if there are doors in the rear, that is part of the discussion for the Site Plan.
96 J. Langdell said an area other than the summer decks on the second floor should be considered. S.
97 Smith asked if the sidewalk will connect to any other sidewalk? S. Ingram said no, it is just out in
98 front of the building but if we offer the sidewalk and it is beneficial for walkers, it may go the entire
99 frontage. P. Basiliere said a crosswalk on the pavement for pedestrians is a thought. J. Langdell
100 said we could take a look at that as a town and for people to cross at a certain location.
101

102 S. Ingram showed an initial rendering of the building and asked if there were any comments. S.
103 Robinson asked how the design was changed to reduce the height? S. Ingram was unsure of the
104 details of the re-design, it was looked at to reduce the height; once we get into the initial design we
105 can iron things out and explain any changes made. The design has not been finalized yet. P. Amato
106 arrived at 6:55 p.m. J. Langdell commented that the rendering looked very "Bostonian" – maybe
107 it could look something more New England-like. The height maximum would be 40'. S. Ingram
108 hopes that this can be a possibility and be a beneficial project and help with walking to down town
109 and to Keyes Park. There are both one- and two-bedroom options with these. P. Basiliere said
110 there are two different zones, Commercial and Res A, can that site be further developed by putting
111 in additional homes? S. Ingram said the back portion of this parcel would be restricted and after
112 the 34 units, the rest could not be developed plus it is wet.

113
114 J. Langdell asked when are the Zoning meetings in May? S. Ingram responded said the end of next
115 week is one of the deadlines. Terrey Dolan, indicated May 16 is the earliest meeting the Variance
116 can be heard. Dave Palance, Chairman of Heritage Commission, asked via zoom about the curve
117 on Mill Street by the Cemetery? S. Ingram responded that right in front of the proposed building
118 is where that curve is located. D. Palance asked if there could be consideration of that cemetery
119 wall and could there be some financial contribution to the repair of that wall? S. Ingram said that
120 wall is in the town Right of Way (ROW) and on cemetery land, J. Langdell said that would be a
121 conversation to have with the town Department of Public Works. Andrew Ciardelli arrived at 7:04
122 p.m. This ended the discussion for the Mill Street Design Review.
123

124 **b. Case SP #2024-05: Chappell Properties, LLC Minor Site Plan Approval, with Waiver**
125 **Request:**

126 The applicant, Chappell Properties, LLC, has applied for Minor Site Plan Approval, with Waiver
127 Request for their existing developed self-storage facility property located at 454 NH Rt. 13 South,
128 (Map 48 Lot 8). The lot is 2.74 acres in size. The lot is zoned Integrated Commercial-Industrial
129 (“ICI”). The applicant proposes to modify & convert approximately 40 liner feet of their existing
130 eastern-most self-storage building, (approximately 1,205 sq feet) into a garage bay configuration
131 for the proposed Chappell Detailing Garage. The existing garage will have three (3) detailing bays
132 and a dedicated office area. Three other adjacent self-storage units within this building shall be
133 eliminated to make room for parking. No building expansion, or any additional impervious surface
134 areas, are being proposed with this existing building conversion proposal. The Waiver Request is
135 for relief from Sections 6.08.6 & 6.08.7 of the Milford Zoning Regulations in regards to building
136 frontage & parking lot landscaping requirements, due the nature of the existing developed site.

137 Chris Guida, Fieldstone Engineer representing the applicant, explained this is a minor Site Plan for
138 Planning Board review. P. Amato moved to accept the application for review. P. Basiliere
139 seconded. All were in favor. Motion passed. J. Langdell moved no potential Regional Impact
140 associated with this application. P. Basiliere seconded. All were in favor. Motion passed. T.
141 Dolan indicated the application is complete. D. Knott confirmed there have been no
142 communications with any of the applicants? Members confirmed there were not. Abutters were
143 read into the record by D. Bouffard. Abutters that were present included the applicant, Engineering
144 Firm and the Town of Milford.
145

146 Chris Guida, Fieldstone, explained the application for the Change of Use of one of the existing
147 garages to be used for Auto Detailing and use 4 of the parking spaces for parking. The area of the
148 Change of Use for auto detailing includes a proposed well and a minimal site septic for car washing.
149 There is no change to the building, it all is change to the interior. We do not have issue with any
150 of the comments from DPW or the Fire Department. The landscaping is one concern, it is a little
151 tight to be able to add any trees. The building was built in 1975, the area is very steep and the
152 landscaping waiver was to just have a dense ROW and request that the landscaping not be done,
153 the building is 20’ above Route 13 in this area. The applicant is not opposed to putting additional
154 plantings in another area as it would not be prudent to plant in this (steep) area but rather have
155 landscaping in another area and to prevent blocking the building that will also have signage. The
156 building will be re-painted and the applicant would rather not block any signage. A couple of sugar
157 maples could be added which would add some color. Maintaining any plantings on the slope would
158 make it difficult to maintain. Chris Guida said the car washing and detailing would require
159 drainage, therefore he talked to DES who recommended the use of a holding tank approved through
160 DES for any run-off. The existing septic and leach field would be for domestic use only.
161 Stormwater permits are not applicable for this use.
162

163 The only access for this parcel is off Old Brook Road. S. Robinson asked if shrubs could be planted
164 near the building? C. Guida said that low-growing shrubs and some taller shrubs were suggested
165 in the staff memo but lower shrubs would be easier to maintain. Low shrubs on a slope might work.
166 J. Langdell said the building is self-storage, it is not just for Chappell equipment? K. Chappell

167 indicated the self-storage is rented. J. Langdell said that the self-storage ordinance states that it
168 should be used for self-storage only. Reading from the ordinance, J. Langdell said this is a service
169 business. C. Guida said it is not really a service. T. Dolan looked in the ordinance and his research
170 provided input that this would be an acceptable request to take a portion of the existing self-storage
171 building for this service. J. Langdell said when this was built (1975) the bottom line is that this
172 definition for self-storage is the same as it was when it was built. P. Amato indicated that it was a
173 self-storage building, but if a portion is being taken for this use, is it allowed in this zone? J.
174 Langdell said if it is self-storage, it is self-storage so if there are other self-storage bays around
175 town, could those have a Change of Use for something else?
176

177 S. Smith asked about how the ordinance and how it is meant? C. Guida said to him it sounds like
178 the ordinance is so that there is not another use. D. Knott asked should it specify that there are
179 other self-storage units? T. Dolan said yes there will still be self-storage and mixed use on the
180 parcel. P. Amato said this is just a Commercial use, just for this section of the storage buildings.
181 There is nothing that says it cannot be changed to something else. C. Guida said there are other
182 uses along that area. There is already mixed use there. C. LaBonte asked what is the difference
183 when there are already mixed uses now? C. Guida said the Fire Department memo will be used for
184 fire separation requirements. P. Amato said in the main building, they have offices and rented
185 offices and retail. This is no different.
186

187 Kent Chappell, applicant, explained that one of the buildings is self-storage. P. Amato just that
188 before Currier self-storage on that road, there is an oil change shop and that was allowed. D. Knott
189 asked about any hazardous chemicals? C. Guida said any chemicals will go into the storage tank
190 after use, eventually. P. Basiliere said there might be other chemicals that are captured and taken
191 away but all chemicals will not go into the ground water. C. Guida said when the holding tank gets
192 pumped, it is done by a licensed company to haul it for proper disposal. P. Basiliere asked where
193 the leach field and effluent holding area are located. C. Guida said the tank will be between the
194 effluent holding area and the building. There are two tanks, the chemicals go to a holding tank to
195 be pumped and one goes to the septic tank and leach field.
196

197 S. Smith asked if a vent system will be installed in the building? C. Guida said right now it is not
198 heated, so there will be an HVAC system installed for that. A. Ciardelli asked if there are glass
199 doors out back? K. Chappell said yes they are 10 feet high and the building will be painted. A.
200 Ciardelli said the paint will be great for an old building. The Fire Department letter was also given
201 to Chris Guida. J. Langdell asked when the pods started being used on this site? K. Chappell said
202 about 25 years ago. P. Amato has never noticed the building at all on Route 13S. D. Knott opened
203 the meeting to the public and asked that abutters please go first and state your name.
204

205 Anita Stevens, 19 Ashley Drive, stated they did receive the certified notice of this
206 meeting and asked what chemicals will be used to process the detailing? C. Guida said
207 that list will be provided to the Fire Department and will not go into the runoff, it will go
208 into a holding tank and be taken away. A. Stevens sked what will be used? C. Guida
209 said types of soaps that will go into a holding tank will be used to clean and a licensed
210 provider will haul away the contents of the concrete holding tank with any residual
211 chemicals. Hearing no further questions or comments from the public, D. Knott closed
212 the public portion of the hearing.
213

214 P. Amato asked about any signs? K. Chappell showed the Board where the proposed
215 signs will be placed, in two places and he will get a sign permit application for that. P.
216 Amato understands not trying to get landscaping in that location but suggested getting
217 some foliage trees to dress it up a little.
218

219 P. Amato moved to approve the landscaping waiver as a condition of the Site Plan
220 requiring two 2” caliper deciduous trees be planted and moved to waive the rest of the
221 landscaping requirements. P. Basiliere seconded. All were in favor. Motion passed.
222

223 P. Amato moved to approve the application for the Minor Site Plan Change of Use of the
224 section of the building in the ICI zone. A. Ciardelli seconded. All in favor, with the
225 exception of J. Langdell who was opposed. Motion passed 6/1.
226
227

228 **4. Continued Board Discussion on potential revisions to Zoning Ordinance, Development**
229 **Regulations and Rules and Procedures:** T. Dolan asked that this item be continued to the next
230 Work Session on May 7, 2024. All concurred.
231

232 It was discussed that this Board needs to look at the State criteria and maybe be more stringent for
233 certain applications. As far as The Q application goes, T. Dolan indicated that there was an appeal
234 to the decision which has a 30-day window for a decision by the Housing Appeals Board. The
235 decision was rendered that the applicant did not exhaust their chances to speak during the
236 application period and why was nothing brought up until a decision was made, the law says you
237 have to state your piece during the application process. The petitioner did not have standing to
238 appeal.
239

240 T. Dolan indicated that there is a desire to have a joint ZBA and Planning Board meeting soon.
241 Camille Pattison will reach out to handle that, it will happen but at this point, T. Dolan has no
242 input. J. Langdell said that the ZBA, Planning Board and MCC had meetings pre-covid when they
243 would all get together to talk about ideas that might require some changes to the Town regulations.
244 Sometimes the changes are brought up by one board or another. M. Thornton said that last year
245 the CIP was not understood by the Department Heads and there were issues with the criteria, he
246 feels it is good this process is starting sooner this year.
247

248 P. Amato added that the CIP is a Planning Board Tool and done to assist the Board of Selectmen
249 for budgeting decisions. A. Ciardelli asked if the CIP has more or less people than last year? P.
250 Basiliere said there are 9 members on the CIP Committee. A. Ciardelli asked if more people would
251 mean it is more efficient? P. Basiliere said it is hard to say since people have different input and
252 there are a lot of discussions. J. Langdell always wanted to have the School involved to have input.
253 C. LaBonte questioned one member that does not live in town. Should that person have a vote?
254 M. Thornton said the school representative should have input. S. Smith said by having the school
255 present, prepare a warrant and go to the meetings, they should have a voice. J. Langdell said back
256 in the day, the school had a member representative from the School Board. J. Langdell said the
257 Planning Board should provide input that it feels the School representative should be a town
258 resident and be a School Board member. All concurred.
259

260 P. Amato thinks it is important to have a School Board member on the CIP Committee. J. Langdell
261 thinks we need to make sure that there is input from the school for what they are planning in the
262 future of the school. S. Smith stated this is a two-way communication tool between the Town and
263 the School. P. Amato said the CIP is a marketing tool that is brought to the Board of Selectmen
264 for what the Departments need.
265

266 Janet Langdell moved to ask Camille Pattison to contact the School Board and try to get a School
267 Board member on the CIP Committee instead of a staff member. P. Basiliere seconded. All were
268 in favor. Motion passed.
269

270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283

5. Other Discussions:

5/07/24 – Planning Board Work Session
5/21/24 – Planning Board Meeting

6. Upcoming Meetings. The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m. on a motion made by S. Smith and seconded by S. Robinson. All member were in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

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

The Planning Board minutes of 3-19-24 were approved 4-16-24

DRAFT