

4 **Members Present:**

5 Janet Langdell, Vice Chairman
6 Peter Basiliere, Member (via zoom)
7 Paul Amato, Member
8 Susan Smith, Alternate
9 Dave Freel, Selectman's Rep
10 Andrew Ciardelli, Member
11 Susan Robinson, Member
12

Staff:

Terrey Dolan, Director Comm. Development
Darlene Bouffard, Recording Secretary
Andrew Kouropoulos, Videographer

13 **Members Excused:**

14 Doug Knott, Chairman
15

16

--

17
18 **1. Call to order:** Vice Chair Langdell introduced herself and that she will facilitate tonight's meeting
19 in the absence of Mr. Knott. Ms. Langdell called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. The Planning
20 Board and staff were introduced, S. Smith, Alternate Planning Board member who will be sitting
21 and voting in the absence of D Knott tonight.
22

23 **2. Approval of Meeting Minutes:** The minutes of November 21, 2023 Planning Board were
24 reviewed. Corrections were identified by Janet Langdell. P. Amato moved to approve the minutes
25 of November 21, 2023 as amended. S. Smith seconded. J. Langdell noted that since Mr. Basiliere
26 is via zoom, a roll call vote is needed: P. Basiliere in favor; S. Robinson in favor; P. Amato; A.
27 Ciardelli in favor; S. Smith in favor; D. Freel in favor, J. Langdell in favor. All were in favor.
28 Motion passed unanimously.
29

30 **3. Milford Master Plan Update:**

31 It was indicated that in order for the Board of Selectmen to move forward with Resilience Planning
32 and Design LLC, they need a vote to accept the contract for the Master Plan Update in the amount
33 stated in the contract. T. Dolan agreed the Planning Board needs to vote to accept the not to exceed
34 price, the Planning Board must take a vote to recommend to the Board of Selectmen for the
35 Wednesday December 27, 2023 meeting. J. Langdell said there had been a meeting with T. Dolan,
36 L. Daley, S. Smith and J. Langdell and Dr. Whitman about having Resilience sharpen their pencils
37 a little bit to see if they could take that amount down a little bit, right now the contract is at \$99,996
38 out of the \$100,000 that was from the AARPA funds that were approved for this. S. Smith asked
39 if Milford heard back from them? T. Dolan indicated we have not.
40

41 D. Freel said he is not in support of this and will vote against this, he does not feel its right that the
42 contract is \$4.00 less than what was approved, they should sharpen their pencils. J. Langdell
43 indicated this is comparable to other communities and is not out of scope, this is for the entire
44 Master Plan, ours is outdated. D. Freel said it would be nice to have more than one bid. T. Dolan
45 explained that this is the second attempt to get bids and they were the only bid. S. Smith indicated
46 comparable-sized towns were looked at and Resilience did provide that data. If the town wants to
47 scale back the project, they can provide a lower price. J. Langdell noted that if it is scaled down,
48 it affects the end result; other communities have been very pleased with Resilience in its entirety.
49 T. Dolan stated the current Master Plan is 8 years old. J. Langdell said there are parts of the current
50 Master Plan that are very outdated (2016). P. Amato said he could not find an hourly rate for doing
51 this work. J. Langdell said it can be backed into. There was no further discussion.
52

53 S. Smith moved to approve the Resilience Contract Not To Exceed price of \$99,996 for the Master
54 Plan update. S. Robinson seconded. P. Basiliere in favor; S. Robinson in favor; P. Amato opposed;
55 A. Ciardelli in favor; J. Langdell in favor; S. Smith in favor; D. Freel opposed. Motion passed 5/2.
56

57 **4. Public Hearings:**

58 **Case SP#2023-06-Applicant: 30 MS Milford, LLC: Design Review Phase of a proposed 34-Unit**
59 **(Apartments) Multi-Family Complex (3 living floors), located at 30 Mill Street, Tax Map 25, Lot 95.**

60 Pursuant to both Article IV (Permitting Procedures for Site Plans & Sub Divisions) and Section 4.03
61 (Design Review) of the Milford Development Regulations, the project applicant has requested a formal
62 Design Review with the Planning Board to discuss potential elements & requirements of a future Major
63 Site Plan Application for the project.

64 The project site is 9.877 acres in total size, located within both the Commercial “C” Zoning District (Section
65 5.05 of the Milford Zoning Ordinance) and the Residence “A” Zoning District (Section 5.02 of Milford
66 Zoning Ordinance). All proposed site work shall be contained within the upland portion of the site’s
67 Commercial “C” Zoning District lands, along Mill Street.
68

69 The single multi-family building is presently proposed to be fifty-two feet (52’) in height. Therefore,
70 pursuant to Section 5.08.8.A of the Milford Zoning Ordinance, a future Special Exception shall be required
71 by the ZBA for the applicant to exceed the maximum forty (40’) height within the Commercial “C” Zoning
72 District.
73

74 Janet Langdell explained this is a Design Review and is an opportunity for the applicant to bring in their
75 idea to have an exchange with the Planning Board to share thoughts about the proposal as it stands now,
76 nothing in this discussion is binding and no decisions will be made. Sam Ingram, representing the applicant,
77 is here on behalf of the applicant for a design review for a 34-unit multi-family building and the associated
78 site improvements, such as access/egress, parking and drainage. The property at 30 Mill Street falls in two
79 different zones, Commercial and Residence A. P. Basiliere asked that the camera be focused on the plan
80 being referenced. Janet indicated it is a Sheet 01 of the packet. S. Ingram continued that the existing
81 building on the property is proposed to be razed. Town sewer and water services this property. The sewer
82 runs all down Mill Street. S. Ingram has addressed the comments from T. Dolan review and can address
83 any of the Board comments tonight. The Conservation Commission memo was forwarded to S. Ingram.
84

85 S. Ingram explained the density was derived using the square footage in both zones, reference the
86 illustration in the packets for both zones which produced the 34-unit total. J. Langdell indicated the
87 numbers being presented are different than what was provided in the packets. S. Ingram provided what is
88 in the packets prior to double checking the numbers, which were subsequently fixed; he will need to re-
89 check those numbers. P. Amato asked how can these calculations be done, since multi-family are not
90 allowed in the Res A zone? J. Langdell would like to see case examples in other communities that have
91 allowed this. P. Amato said this type of development was done at the Stone House which had a steep slope
92 on the property which could not be used. All of that unusable property was used in that calculation. P.
93 Amato indicated if this was for 12 units, it would be different, but how can you use the unusable portion of
94 the acreage? J. Langdell would like to get advice on this, from S. Buckley and J. Ratigan because of the
95 two zoning districts and the wetlands that are not usable. S. Ingram said there was no consideration for a
96 split zone in the ordinance.
97

98 D. Freel would think the lower density would only be used. J. Langdell thinks this is the only plan she has
99 seen like this. P. Amato asked if they could build 21 SFR on this lot? S. Ingram said they could, there is
100 no stipulation in the zoning ordinance to apply the minimum lot size of 15,000 sf for the Res A zone for the
101 density calculation. The building would all be on the Commercial portion of the lot. P. Amato said if 21
102 house lots could be engineered on that lot, then that should be presented, to get the five units per acre. D.
103 Freel said that entire back lot cannot be used for anything, it is not buildable. J. Langdell said the 34 units,
104 with 3 stories high would be another exception to the rule (height). P. Basiliere asked how this ended up
105 being in two zones? J. Langdell explained this goes back to the historical use of this lot, it has always been
106 located on the front portion of the lot. The properties to the east and west are Residence A; the abutting
107 properties on Mill Street are Commercial and then Cottage St is also Commercial. S. Ingram said that split

108 zones are not called out in the ordinance, which is why he addressed the split zones to come up with density.
109 P. Amato asked if the back lot has been flagged for wetlands yet? S. Ingram said the leading edges have
110 been, where the development will be located. That front lot was always a Commercial use. S. Ingram said
111 the density was unresolved at that time. T. Dolan noted that a special exception would be the process for
112 height and he has reached out to Town Counsel for density. S. Ingram said this is just a design review right
113 now. D. Freel said the proposed building is 3-stories with 1000 sf units. The town has been working toward
114 getting more affordable housing, will this be affordable? Right now anything more than one bedroom costs
115 over \$1800 per month. D. Freel also added that M. Fougere came to the Selectmen recently about affordable
116 housing and for towns to allow certain lots to have additional bedrooms. The town should try to allow more
117 affordable housing units. If we allow the density but it is not affordable, it is not helping the situation. P.
118 Amato said the way they are coming up with 34 units is by using land that cannot be used, that does not
119 work for him. J. Langdell said we are not sure of the thinking behind this, is the applicant looking to have
120 affordable housing or to get top dollar? The applicant may decide on a whole different plan after the Design
121 Review. S. Ingram could not answer that.
122

123 T. Dolan mentioned sidewalks in his staff report and Milford Conservation commented about the 2014
124 Pedestrian Connectivity Plan – since 2014 has there been any development of sidewalks in Milford? J.
125 Langdell said there were two major plans on Nashua Street and from Adams Field down Melendy Road,
126 but both failed for the funding. Conservation has been working on the trails and they are also part of the
127 connectivity plan. P. Basiliere saw the comment from T. Dolan about the curve on Mill Street, that needs
128 to be addressed and also the method used for the number of units. There does need to be a better way for
129 pedestrians and bikes to navigate Mill Street. S. Ingram would like to see if there are any sidewalk plans
130 for Mill Street. J. Langdell said Peter made a good point – that road is a cut through and she is concerned
131 about the road capacity issue and the curve/blind spot. S. Ingram will review the access plans with DPW
132 and will discuss traffic control as well, but that seems to be an enforcement issue that the property does not
133 add to. The people entering or exiting the parking lot does not add to the speed, it is enforcement of
134 something that will still exist.
135

136 P. Basiliere said having slow speed vehicles entering or exiting will definitely impact and make the road
137 more dangerous. J. Langdell said there is potential to look at that road configuration to make the road better.
138 S. Ingram’s conversations with DPW will continue about the traffic and sidewalks. J. Langdell said the
139 road is narrow. T. Dolan indicated traffic calming devices might be considered for that road. J. Langdell
140 said there are some additional elements for a sense of community for this project. P. Basiliere agreed,
141 stating internal trails and a dog park are being added to other developments for a sense of community. Until
142 the wetlands are delineated, J. Langdell said we cannot just assume that the wetlands cannot be used.
143

144 D. Freel said the architectural renderings make that building look like it does not belong in that
145 neighborhood. It is just a large building. A. Ciardelli said that is for the ZBA to talk about, and has not
146 been approved. J. Langdell said this is a design review so we do need to talk about all of this, the ZBA just
147 makes the decision on height. A. Ciardelli suggested the density be reduced which might allow adding
148 some outdoor areas for the neighborhood to use and not just this massive building. P. Amato suggested
149 looking at a 12-unit building which is allowed in the Commercial zone. S. Smith asked about the parking
150 in the front, which makes it look like a strip mall, she would prefer a Townhouse style instead of a big
151 building of apartments. With 34 units there are two cars per unit, so 68 cars plus visitor parking would be
152 needed. P. Basiliere asked about where the snow will be stored in winter and dumpster location? And will
153 Fire trucks be able to drive completely around the building? The Fire ladder truck must be able to turn
154 around and have rear access. D. Freel asked about water and sewer. T. Dolan said Water Utilities provided
155 input to the plan. S. Ingram will follow up with Jim at Water Utilities. D. Freel asked about storm water?
156 J. Langdell indicated that will be addressed with the stormwater process. P. Basiliere asked if these units
157 will be ADA accessible.

158 Janet Langdell opened the meeting to the public for comments and questions. Jay Duffy, 491 Nashua
159 Street, grew up in this neighborhood and is shocked that this would even be attempted. It is an extremely
160 wet parcel and Mill Street is very narrow, he cannot see that building on that road so close to the road. J.
161 Duffy trusts the Planning Board but this is just common sense and he does not think this belongs there. T.
162 Dolan said we need to read the abutters into the record.

