

**Town of Milford  
Zoning Board of Adjustment  
April 19, 2018  
Case #2018-13  
Hitchiner Manufacturing, Inc.  
Special Exception**

Present: Steven Bonczar, Chair  
Michael Thornton  
Rob Costantino  
Wade Scott Campbell, Alternate  
Tracy Steel, Alternate  
Robin Lunn, Zoning Administrator

Absent: Joan Dargie  
Jason Plourde, Vice Chair  
Karin Lagro, Alternate  
Laura Dudziak, Board of Selectmen Representative

Secretary: Peg Ouellette

**Case #2018-13**

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 VI, Section 6.02.6.B to allow for a 10 foot permanent, 10 foot temporary encroachments and slope construction within the wetlands buffer.

**APPROVED May 3, 2018**

Steven Bonczar, Chair, opened the meeting and introduced the Board members. Two regular members were absent, so the Alternates, T. Steel and W. Campbell were seated as voting members. He informed all of the procedures of the Board. He read the notice of hearing and invited the applicant to present their case.

Earle Blatchford, of Haynes/Swanson, Inc. came forward, with Anthony Rodriguez of Hitchiner Mfg. E. Blatchford said they had been in preliminary talks with the Planning Bd. and were scheduled for a meeting with Planning Bd. on April 23. The addition construction was being finished (Plant 1), substantially done. New parking constructed to the east of that. He pointed out the new building on the overhead plan. An 85,000 SF manufacturing building. Essential expansion to Hitchiner in town; announced by the Governor recently. Partial three-story building, all manufacturing with associated

office and facilities for employees. Adding little bit of parking along common drive between buildings and loading service area in back along east boundary – area they will be talking about. He had plan on screen. He said applicant came in last year for Special Exception for privacy fence or jersey barrier along east boundary to adjacent property (MD's Trash). Lot of unsightly stuff. They were on the other side of swale. Manmade drainage swale constructed many years ago. Has taken on characteristics of a jurisdictional wetland. 25 ft. buffer associated with it. Segments that were separated by other culvert. Initial plan discussed with Community Development about adding paved to the east and 10 ft. into the buffer. Ultimately able to pull almost all pavement out of the buffer except for up near drive, isolated area that circles around. Because service drive was fixed; it was existing drive crossing the railroad. Because of configuration of the building they have to swing into the site. There was 460 ft. of permanent disturbance. With edge of pavement just outside buffer they will have equipment running along the edge of the little bit of slope in that area. They were asking for temporary encroachment into that buffer area. He showed plan that came in the application and the highlighted area. Most recent are highlighted in light green was permanent – 460 SF. At that time assuming about 10 ft. off the edge of pavement would be encroachment. Now there was a little bit less. One other along detention basin with a bit of encroachment. Area they were asking for was more than what they need. He pointed to another small area to the south where the riprap was. Minor grading. As part of this they have to expand the detention basin constructed last year; need to expand in the north side toward their pavement. Temporary – going in, doing grading, and then out. Historically, ten to eleven years ago there was Plant 2, which was a large industrial building. Pavement in that went pretty much all into the buffer before regulations were established. That had been removed; now a large open field except for a few trees. He showed photos of the swale. Few mature trees at the edge. They were pretty much on the reference line. Buffer area 25 ft. back was the grassy field where Plant 2 used to be. He pointed out the existing drive. The location of the lone tree was where they come across the buffer with paved area which will be permanent disturbance. S. Bonczar said it was pretty flat. Not that wet. A. Rodriguez said no. E. Blatchford said it was jurisdictional but very low value. Just a drainage swale. Over time it was high enough water table and had taken on character of a wetland, but low value. E. Blatchford asked for any questions from the Bd. S. Bonczar said E. Blatchford had answered his question with the drawing. What was total disturbance? E. Blatchford said temporary about 3,000 SF. S. Bonczar said he meant 25,000. E. Blatchford said temporary, and then permanent 25,000. It was a big building. Loading docks. Tried to pull as tight as possible and still get in and out. He had meeting with A. Rodriguez and executive staff and went through trial and error to get this configuration. Loading dock pointed north and south rather than right off the building because they couldn't do that and have enough room. Decided it was best to get size of the building needed and minimize encroachment in the buffer. No tree cutting. No issue with planting a few trees -new plantings. S. Bonczar said he didn't think so. E. Blatchford said the landscaping architect would like to. M. Thornton said that was usually encouraged. R. Costantino asked what the area was. M. Thornton said in the way of landscaping. E. Blatchford said a few trees and shrubs. Not really as a buffer to the neighborhood. Just wanted to mention it as a detail they hadn't thought of in the application. S. Bonczar said that was fine. Said the members had gotten to look at applicant's answers to the criteria for the application. He could ask applicant to go over them, or were they satisfied with what was there. They all said they had read them. S. Bonczar didn't see reason to read them. He said they received correspondence from the Conservation Commission and they didn't have a problem with applicants meeting the criteria in the application for wetlands. No issues there. It was very minimal impact; and looking at the pictures and knowing of that

area, it was not a typical wetland which you would think of with frogs and ducks. More of an existing drainage that had become wetland. Any overall questions of the applicant?  
R. Costantino couldn't imagine how trucks would get into the dock. Enough room?  
E. Blatchford said yes.  
S. Bonczar said it was not to do with wetlands, but it would be a manufacturing and second floor offices? Third?  
A. Rodriguez said third floor, they were looking at mechanical systems and a mezzanine.  
E. Blatchford said about first floor 75,000 SF, just partial.  
S. Bonczar said similar to the addition they did.  
E. Blatchford said another 10,000 for the partial second and third stories. As far as getting in and out, one truck would pull by dock and faces south. Other has to come in and swing around the circle, start heading south and back into it. They did turning radii.  
S. Bonczar said a good driver could turn on a dime.  
E. Blatchford said drivers did try it and it was tricky but it worked.  
S. Bonczar asked for public comment. None. He asked for any questions from the Bd. None. He closed public comment. He said they would discuss the criteria and then vote.  
S. Bonczar said they would first go over the seven criteria for the wetland, Sec. 6.02.7.

**1. The need for the proposed project.**

None disagreed.

**2. The plan proposed is the alternative with the least impact to the wetlands, surface waters, and/or their associated buffers.**

All agreed.

**3. [Taking into consideration] The impact on plants, fish and wildlife.**

W. Campbell said yes.

S. Bonczar thought they had. In this case, the type of wetland, not sure it had even any fish.

T. Steel said it didn't have any.

M. Thornton said it was a linear wetland.

**4. The impact on the quantity and quality of surface and ground water.**

S. Bonczar didn't see any issue.

W. Campbell didn't see any.

R. Costantino said they were getting all permits.

S. Bonczar said they were putting in other things mentioned where they where the riprap was for collection the water.

**5. The potential to cause or increase flooding, erosion, or sedimentation.**

None had any issue.

S. Bonczar said the impact was minimal. It was long and narrow and would not close off drainage swale.

**6. The cumulative impact that would result if all parties owning or abutting a portion of the affected wetland, wetland complex, and/or buffer area were also permitted alterations to the wetland and buffer proportional to the extent of their property rights.**

W. Campbell said none.

M. Thornton didn't think it bothered anything.

154 S. Bonczar said even if MD's did, it was not an issue.  
155

156 **7. The impact of the proposed project on the values and functions of the total wetland or**  
157 **wetland complex.**

158 R. Costantino said there was little impact.

159 S. Bonczar said that was addressed by the applicant.  
160

161 S. Bonczar moved on to discussion of criteria for special exception:  
162

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

164 S. Bonczar said there were other wetland impacts. This was an odd one to try to fit into  
165 this. Other areas in that district where wetlands have been allowed.

166 W. Campbell and T. Steel agreed.  
167

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

169 R. Costantino said in the proper zone.

170 W. Campbell – yes

171 S. Bonczar said they had chosen to basically minimize and chosen how to do parking and  
172 road to minimize impact.  
173

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

175 R. Costantino said it was all manufacturing area anyway.

176 S. Bonczar said actual impact of wetland buffer would not have issue with other adjacent  
177 area.  
178

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

180 W. Campbell – none

181 T. Steel – none

182 S. Bonczar – this was making sure that didn't happen.

183 T. Steel said they were pulling off the road.

184 S. Bonczar said they were making access road and area for trucks to park safely.  
185

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

188 W. Campbell said they had covered that, especially with the trucks turnaround.

189 S. Bonczar said the design shown supported that.

190 T. Steel agreed.

191 S. Bonczar asked if there was anything else. No.  
192

193  
194  
195 S. Bonczar moved on to vote on the Special Exception:  
196

197 **VOTE: On Special Exception:**  
198

199 **1. Is the Special Exception allowed by the ordinance?**  
200

201 **W. Campbell – yes**

202 **T. Steel – yes**

203 **M. Thornton – yes**

204 **R. Costantino - yes**

205           **S. Bonczar - yes**  
206  
207           **2. Are all the specified conditions present under which the Special Exception may be**  
208           **granted?**  
209  
210           **M. Thornton – yes**  
211           **R. Costantino – yes**  
212           **W. Campbell – yes**  
213           **T. Steel - yes**  
214           **S. Bonczar - yes**  
215  
216           S. Bonczar said due to the voting the criteria for special exception were satisfied and the application was  
217           unanimously approved. He reminded applicants of the 30-day appeal period.