

**Town of Milford  
Zoning Board of Adjustment  
November 15, 2018  
Case #2018-31  
Hitchiner Manufacturing, Inc.  
Special Exception**

Present: Steve Bonczar, Chair  
Michael Thornton  
Wade Scott Campbell, Alternate  
Robin Lunn, Zoning Administrator

Absent: Jason Plourde, Vice Chairman  
Joan Dargie  
Rob Costantino  
Karin Lagro, Alternate  
Tracy Steel, Alternate  
Laura Dudziak, Board of Selectman Representative

Secretary: Peg Ouellette

**Case #2018-31**

Hitchiner Manufacturing, Inc. for the property located at 594 Elm Street, Milford Tax Map 13, Lot 6, in the Industrial district, is seeking a Special exception of the Milford Zoning Ordinances per Article V, Section 5.06.2A.3 to allow for a reduced front yard setback per the plan submitted October 25, 2018.

**APPROVED December 20, 2018**

Steve Bonczar, Chair, opened the meeting and introduced the Board members. He informed all of the procedures of the Board. He explained that the rules allow for a 10 p.m. adjournment. Any cases not heard would be re-scheduled to a date and time certain. There being only two regular Board members present, he asked to seat Wade Scott Campbell, Alternate, as fully participating and voting member. All in favor.

S. Bonczar read the notice of hearing and invited the applicant to present the case.

Anthony Rodrigues, who works for Hitchiner Mfg., came forward. He said he put together a brief presentation re what they were looking for. Wood and gas turbine operation along Hitchiner Way in the photo on the right building had separated along the corner of the building. Other photo showed different side. They submitted application to square off that corner. Will be working on adjacent building,

demolishing it and rebuilding in that same spot. Front to rear skin so that everything is aesthetically the same. That construction today is concrete block. Want to get metal insulated panel. Reason for applying for special exception is to simplify the metal panel and square it off to make it more uniform to the adjacent buildings to the left and right of the space. Lot is zone Industrial. This corner will not affect public or vehicle traffic. Seeing 7 ft. encroachment into that setback. 7 ft. on one side and 3 ft on the other side.

M. Thornton understood once the additional building had been built this would be overcome. This was temporary.

A. Rodrigues said no, it was permanent.

M. Thornton said he didn't state it correctly. Once the adjacent building was erected this would be in keeping with..

A. Rodrigues pointed out building that will be demolished and rebuilt and will match the same as what they were doing in another space which also matched what was done on this earlier.

S. Bonczar said basically trying to square it off.

A. Rodrigues said it will all be the same outside with panels with white aluminum pilasters every 25 ft.

W. Campbell said, instead of several outbuildings.

A. Rodrigues said setting up the flow of the building. More comprehensive flow. Will be complying with town requirements for whatever is required for this construction. He showed a plan with the building just added – 30,000 SF space – white panel section built and opened in March. He pointed out they were looking to use same white panels.

M. Thornton said it was not structural, but a skinning to conform to the property.

A. Rodrigues said yes. Building is standard structure – just putting a skin on it. He pointed out lot line 4 ft. on one side of the triangle and 7 ft. on the other side. They were trying to square it off.

S. Bonczar said it was pretty simple. They wanted to put a right angle in. He asked for questions from the Bd.

W. Campbell had none.

M. Thornton said it was too simple to have questions.

S. Bonczar, saying there was no audience, open public comment for anyone who wanted to speak. There being no other questions from the Bd. he closed public comment. He asked for any discussion.

W. Campbell had none.

S. Bonczar said it was very minimal impact.

R. Lunn, responding to question from M. Thornton, said the metal panels are enclosed.

M. Thornton wondered if the panel in itself wasn't part of the building.

S. Bonczar said it was attached so it was still part of the structure.

M. Thornton agreed. By itself only to the other landscaping, the way it was situated on the lot.

S. Bonczar and W. Campbell agreed.

S. Bonczar said they were planning ahead, so to speak, when they removed that other building and put new one up and can be squared off.

M. Thornton said you could. Didn't see reason that they would have to deny, other than to say it was to conform to the property line, because from how it was presented and looking at it from the street you cannot see a benefit for the town to say no.

S. Bonczar said they would go through criteria for Special Exception and then he can ask for opinions for those questions.

**A. Is the proposed use similar to those permitted in the district?**

S. Bonczar said it was a structure. The skin was part of the structure that was going to enter into the setback. Photos not looking like they were proposing something out of the ordinary.

M. Thornton said no, they weren't.

**B. Is the specific site an appropriate location for the proposed use?**

S. Bonczar said with these criteria, it was sometimes hard to match the criteria to the application. He said where they were going to put the panels on the building was appropriate location.

**C. Will the proposed use adversely affect the adjacent area?**

M. Thornton didn't see any possible harm by using the difference in the siding if they were to say yes or no.

S. Bonczar agreed. Adding panels and going into the setback, he didn't see any. It was very minimal.

W. Campbell agreed.

M. Thornton commented it hardly bore talking about 7 ft.

**D. Will there be no nuisance or serious hazard to vehicles or pedestrian?**

W. Campbell said none.

M. Thornton said he couldn't see it.

S. Bonczar agreed.

**E. Will adequate appropriate facilities be provided for the proper operation of the proposed use?**

S. Bonczar said it was hard to answer this to that.

M. Thornton agreed.

W. Campbell said these criteria fall over each other all the way down.

S. Bonczar moved on to vote on the Special Exception:

**VOTE: On Special Exception:**

**1. Is the Special Exception allowed by the ordinance?**

**M. Thornton – yes**

**W. Campbell - yes**

**S. Bonczar - yes**

**2. Are all the specified conditions present under which the Special Exception may be granted?**

**W. Campbell – yes**

**M. Thornton - yes**

**S. Bonczar - yes**

S. Bonczar said due to the voting the criteria for special exception were satisfied and the application was unanimously approved.

There being no other business before the Bd., S. Bonczar asked for motion to adjourn.

M. Thornton moved to adjourn.

W. Campbell seconded.

Meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.