

MILFORD PLANNING BOARD PUBLIC HEARING
March 22, 2016 Board of Selectmen's Meeting Room, 6:30 PM

Members Present:

Chris Beer, Chairman
Tim Finan
Janet Langell
Susan Robinson
Veeral Bharucha, Alternate member
Jacob Lafontaine, Alternate member

Staff:

Lincoln Daley, Community Development Director
Shirley Wilson, Recording Secretary
Nico Giokas, Videographer

Doug Knott, Alternate member

Excused:

Paul Amato
Kevin Frederico, BOS representative

MINUTES:

1. Approval of minutes from 2/23/16.

NEW BUSINESS:

2. **Controlled Fluidics - 5R Properties, LLC – Hollow Oak Ln – Map 7, Lot 5-6:** Public Hearing for a major site plan to construct a 4,455SF proposed addition to the existing facility and related drainage, grading and site improvements.
(New application – Fieldstone Land Consultants, PLLC)
3. **Angel Communications, LLC – 21 Cottage St – Map 25, Lot 112:** Public Hearing for a minor site plan to renovate existing buildings on the subject property for a dance studio, office and warehouse space and related drainage/stormwater management, lighting, parking, and site improvements. *(New application – Fieldstone Land Consultants, PLLC)*

OTHER BUSINESS:

4. **Ducal Development LLC – North River Rd & Mont Vernon Rd – Map 8, Lot 52:** Request for a six-month extension of SD2014-03/SP2014-04, Hutchinson Point Senior Housing Development Condominium Site Plan, in accordance with Milford Development Regulations, Article IV, Section 4.07. *(SD/SP approved 4/16/13, signed 4/15/14)*
5. **Planning Board Milford NRPC Commissioner Recommendation – George Skuse**
6. **Planning Board election of officers**

Chairman Beer called the meeting to order at 6:30PM, introduced the Board and staff and explained the ground rules for the public hearing.

MINUTES:

J. Langdell made a motion to approve the minutes from 2/23/16. T. Finan seconded and all else in favor. Motion carried unanimously by a vote of 6-0-0.

OTHER BUSINESS:

Planning Board Milford NRPC Commissioner Recommendation – George Skuse

J. Langdell introduced George Skuse and gave an overview of the Nashua Regional Planning Commission (NRPC). She then explained that because of Milford's size we have three seats on the commission. Chris Costantino and I are currently serving. George was asked to fill the vacancy and decided that it would be a good fit as he was interested in serving the community on this regional body.

G. Skuse gave a brief bio saying he is a self-employed as a desktop support technician and has lived in Milford for nine years. You might have seen my photos on the Milford Residents Facebook page. I am also the trails manager for Tucker Brook Town Forest and a former trail steward for the Souhegan River Trail. Milford is a great community and I look forward to volunteering and helping where I can to make it better for all the residents. The Brox Property is a regional issue and opening up access to that would be a good thing for the area. It is also important for Milford to retain its somewhat rural character and to invite businesses in to help spread the burden of the tax base. J. Langdell said that was topic at the last NRPC meeting; how to balance economic development and diverse needs of the region.

J. Langdell made a motion to recommend the appointment of George Skuse as a NRPC regional commissioner for the Town of Milford. V. Bharucha seconded and all in favor. Motion carried 6-0-0.

NEW BUSINESS:

Controlled Fluidics - 5R Properties, LLC – Hollow Oak Ln – Map 7, Lot 5-6: Public Hearing for a major site plan to construct a 4,455SF proposed addition to the existing facility and related drainage, grading and site improvements. *(New application – Fieldstone Land Consultants, PLLC)*

Abutters present:

Nancy Pollock, Oak Meadow, LLC; Hollow Oak Dr

Chairman Beer recognized:

Chad Branon, Fieldstone Land Consultants, PLLC

Tom Rohlfs, Controlled Fluidics & 5R Properties, LLC

Chairman Beer read the notice into the record and verified that the application was complete. J. Langdell made a motion to accept the application. T. Finan seconded and all in favor. J. Langdell made a motion that the application did not pose potential regional impact. V. Bharucha seconded and all in favor. S. Wilson read the abutters list into the record.

C. Branon presented plans dated 1/12/16 and described the existing site conditions. We are proposing a 4,455SF addition off the west side of the existing 7,060SF building to expand the business to meet current market demands. Due to the site constraints and building requirements the expansion options on this property were limited. We have tried to minimize the impact to the jurisdictional wetlands and buffer by positioning the building accordingly and to provide emergency access. The access to and around the 55 x 81 addition, will result in an impact of 1,618SF to the wetlands and 11,352SF to the adjacent wetlands buffer, although 5,911SF will be restored as vegetative green space so the project is only proposing to permanently impact 5,441SF of buffer. We will also employ Best Management Practices during construction to reduce impacts. We are proposing to place roughly one acre of land, which is half of the land area for the project, located at the western portion of the property into a permanent conservation easement. The site provides for approximately 68 % open space. The existing twenty-one (21) space parking spaces meet requirements, even with the construction of the addition.

There will be no site alterations proposed along the frontage and no proposed modifications to the existing utility connections.

C. Branon said we met with the Conservation Commission on 3/10/16 and addressed recommendations from the subsequent memo dated 3/11/16.

1. Pervious treatment to an area for an overhead door is not applicable or appropriate due to the weight of the vehicles that will likely be traversing that area. We are not proposing any but as a compromise, we would be willing to handle the construction of that access as a second phase of this project instead of in the initial phase. The applicant might be able to operate his business out of the single overhead door but would still want to get the plan approved for the future construction, if is needed down the road, for business operations.
2. The applicant will consider augmenting the employee picnic area with site specific plantings. We also agreed to use the commission's requested seed mix on the slope; however, we would prefer to not do any additional landscaping in the northwest area, primarily because that will be used for winter snow storage. We also don't believe it will be necessary to treat any runoff from the roof as that is generally not susceptible to salt or sedimentation or other items requiring stormwater management practices. We would like to employ sheet flow practices where any runoff from the improvements would fall. When reviewing the landscaping and stormwater mitigation components of this project, we feel it is important to consider the fact that the applicant is placing approximately one half of his land into a permanent, protected, conservation easement, so there is mitigation and certainly preservation proposed.
3. We did agree to employ waddles for this project.
4. We also agreed to use the seed mix and will incorporate that into the plans.
5. This touches on the commission's request for additional landscaping in the northwest area, which we would prefer not to do, and reiterated that the preservation of an acre of land would address this request.

Staff memo dated 3/19/16

C. Branon said we generally have no problems with the recommendations; however, in regards to the West Elm Street Gateway District, we feel that this project meets the intent of the district as the addition will be situated behind the existing building and will not be visible from the roadway. The addition will also be constructed of the same building materials and will be consistent with the existing features on the site. This project will allow a local business to remain in town and encourage economic development which appears to be one of the main criteria within that section of the Ordinance; however, other parts of that Ordinance do not seem to be applicable to this project due to the nature of it being an addition, the location and it being shielded from the existing business. The other item brought up by staff is a request for a formal landscaping plan. We would like to request a waiver from submitting a landscaping plan. The site is currently landscaped but staff compared the 1999 approved plan with this current one and may have found that some plantings were missing. We have located the existing landscaping, but we haven't called out the specifics. Also, we don't want to plant any trees along Hollow Oak Ln or the southern boundary, especially since we're not proposing any modifications on the front side of the project. He then presented photos of the site. L. Daley also referenced the aerial photo included in the Board's packet.

S. Robinson asked if the applicant will be doing any additional landscaping to compensate for not submitting a formal plan. C. Branon said that we will be reseeding per the Conservation Commission's request and will specify those details on the plan. J. Langdell noted that reseeding disturbed land is not really considered landscaping.

J. Langdell asked if a waiver request would have to be noticed. After a brief discussion on the technical aspects, L. Daley verified that a waiver request would have to be noticed, per our Development Regulations. He added that there may be a way to work around the request. The 1999 approved site plan did have an extensive landscaping plan associated with it and staff is suggesting that if they would plant the two missing cherry trees along Hollow Oak Ln and verify that the shrubs and bushes along the building frontage match that of the site plan, they would meet that approved plan and therefore not need a waiver. J. Langdell said that would seem like a reasonable compromise. T. Rohlfs stated that he is good with that. C. Beer noted that the applicant can work

with staff on the matter. J. Langdell stated that note #5 can be revised to reflect that the landscaping must be brought up to, at least, what is defined on the 1999 approved landscaping plan. She then inquired about the ZBA decision and any possible ZBA conditions. C. Branon stated that they were scheduled to meet with the ZBA last week, but unfortunately there was no quorum and the hearing was continued to 4/7/16. L. Daley said there is a distinct possibility that the ZBA could add specific conditions which could have an impact upon this site plan. J. Langdell brought up the language for the conservation easement reflecting permanent restrictions for no further development. C. Branon said yes, that is my understanding. J. Langdell inquired about snow storage and outside storage. C. Branon said snow storage will be labeled on the plan and there is no outdoor storage for the business use. T. Rohlfs stated that there is a shed for maintenance equipment.

C. Beer inquired about signage. C. Branon replied that there is an existing small sign, which is located on the site plan. We are not proposing any visual modifications.

L. Daley brought up treating the sheet flow from the roof and asked if that also accounted for peak flow as a result of the increased impervious surface. C. Branon stated they have not submitted a stormwater permit yet and will have to determine that, but in general trees and vegetation are not going to attenuate peak flow. It also depends on the event but he reiterated that additional landscaping would not attenuate peak flow. J. Langdell asked if there will be opportunity to do additional landscaping, if needed, to accommodate the stormwater plan when submitted. L. Daley replied that if the Environmental Coordinator feels additional landscaping is required, it can be incorporated into the stormwater plan, at that time.

L. Daley inquired if there would be additional lighting as a result of the addition. C. Branon said he will add a note on the plan that all lighting will be downcast and meet the regulations. There might be a building mounted sconce or security light and it will certainly be downcast.

L. Daley brought up Fire Department correspondence regarding access. C. Branon stated that we will be submitting a state wetland permit for this project and because there were no specific comments in the staff memo, I solicited feedback to include as part of our application. Jason Smedick stated in an email dated 3/21/16 that he would prefer access behind the addition and as long as the site is graded to accommodate that access it will not need to be paved. We are not proposing to pave the area right now, only if future business deems it necessary. J. Langdell brought up grass pavers and referenced those used at St Joe's. C. Branon said grass pavers are great for emergency access which is very infrequent use. After meeting with the Conservation Commission, the applicant thinks he will be able to have his business work with only one overhead door. If the business needs to grow and he builds the overhead door, grass pavers will not be an adequate surface for a fork truck to offload machinery. The pavers do not hold up in a situation with frequent use. Discussion on use and cost ensued.

Chairman Beer opened discussion to the public.

A. Fraizer, Milford Conservation Commission Chairperson, clarified that the commission asked for plantings along the side of the building because the runoff at the door, coming from the roof, will sheet down into the wetland. Plantings on the east side would also help catch the rain from the roof.

Chairman Beer closed the public portion of the hearing.

Chairman Beer reviewed the staff recommendations from the memo dated 3/19/16.

J. Langdell brought up recommendation #8 and said this is new language for the Board. L. Daley explained that this is standard language that puts the applicant on notice for all previous plans and prior approvals associated with it and brought up compliance with the 1999 site plan. The language was taken from previous experiences and was typical language incorporated in our decisions that binds property owners. When you buy property, you buy all conditions, covenants, and restrictions associated with that property. C. Branon said from a professional standpoint it is difficult to understand what commitments were made on a previous approval if they're not addressed in this the current staff memo. How far back does one have to go on a piece of property to research

prior approvals and pull those forward; ownership can be transferred many times. He expressed concern with how open that note was and the impact on projects. L. Daley said that the Board has expectations of applicants and this extends to past approvals. This language instills awareness of those approvals and whether or not they should be bound by them. C. Branon countered by saying he understands and appreciates the intent but if staff reviews this against prior plans, why does it have to go any further? We don't research prior approvals for site plans, and at some point everything has to reset. T. Finan asked if the applicant's obligations were defined in laws or regulations. This language is a nice reminder, but is it truly necessary? C. Beer ended a brief discussion by stating that this language certainly warrants further discussion and suggested removing the recommendation and continuing this discussion at a worksession.

S. Robinson made a motion to grant conditional approval of the application, subject to the following conditions from the staff report dated 3/19/16, and those discussed tonight, that;

1. A note be added to the plan stating the subject property lies within the West Elm Gateway District and is subject to the requirements and restrictions set forth in Section 6.07.0 of the Milford Zoning Ordinance.
2. A note be added to the plan stating that the subject property lies within the Groundwater Protection District 1.
3. A note be added to the plan stating that the new addition shall be subject to Police Impact Fees which are to be determined at the time of Building Permit Application.
4. A note to be added to the plan stating that "All exterior lighting shall be downcast Per the Milford Development Regulations".
5. A note be added to the plan stating that there will be no outside storage associated with the business use.
6. The applicant must bring the landscaping up to, at least, what is defined on the 1999 approved landscaping plan.
7. Site Plan - Amend Sheet 3, Construct Sequence Notes 11 to include a conservation seed mix rather than a lawn grass mix to stabilize the soil on the graded slope into the wetland west of the addition.
8. Project is subject to the submittal of a Town Stormwater Management and Erosion Control Regulation permit application.
9. The approval is contingent upon receipt of a Special Exception from the Zoning Board of Adjustment pursuant to Article VI, Section 6.02.6.B of the Zoning Ordinance to allow the disturbance of approximately 11,352 SF associated wetland buffer areas to construct a 4,455 SF addition and related grading and site improvements.
10. Snow storage be labeled on the plan.

J. Langdell seconded and all in favor. Vote 6-0-0; motion carried unanimously.

Angel Communications, LLC – 21 Cottage St – Map 25, Lot 112: Public Hearing for a minor site plan to renovate existing buildings on the subject property for a dance studio, office and warehouse space and related drainage/stormwater management, lighting, parking, and site improvements. (*New application – Fieldstone Land Consultants, PLLC*)

No abutters were present.

Chairman Beer recognized:

Chad Branon, Fieldstone Land Consultants, PLLC

Scott and Patty MacIntyre, Angel Communications

Chairman Beer read the notice into the record and verified that the application was complete. J. Langdell made a motion to accept the application. V. Bharucha seconded and all in favor. J. Langdell made a motion that the application did not pose potential regional impact. J. Lafontaine seconded and all in favor. S. Wilson read the abutters list into the record.

C. Branon presented plans dated 3/07/16 and reviewed the site's history. We are proposing to renovate the former 7,200SF garage/warehouse labeled as Building #1 into a dance studio and the 3,200SF warehouse labeled as

Building #2 into office and warehouse space for the business. There will be a drop off lane along Cottage St and a ten (10') ft wide curbed, landscaped island that will better define traffic flow. We will also construct five (5) parking spaces and add a raised landscaped bed along the building on Cottage St which will soften the foundation and improve the appearance. We will reconstruct the access within the Garden St Ext ROW, maintaining the secondary access to the Legion, widening the entrance and improving access into the rear of the site. We are proposing to remove the existing lean-to structure and install pavement up to five ft (5') off the property line, so that will be an improvement of what currently exists. We are also proposing a handicapped access ramp for Building #2 and landscaping along the front and on the south sides of that building. We are proposing a twenty-nine (29) space conventional parking lot in the rear. There will be ample parking with thirty-nine (39) spaces; thirty-four (34) are required for places of assembly without seats. We will employ Best Management Practices throughout construction. The open space at 33% exceeds requirements and again, will improve what exists today by reducing the impervious surfaces as part of this re-development plan. The site will be re-graded for positive drainage flow. Both buildings will be on municipal water and sewer. The studio has been designed to accommodate 100 students to allow for future growth. Initially there will be three studios with approximately 45 students at maximum capacity. Two of the studios will be 30' x 40' and one will be 20' x 30'. P. MacIntyre added that no recitals will be held on site; we use the Amato Center.

T. Finan referenced note F on the plan and asked what would happen if DES doesn't give the ok to remove the paved portion of contaminated area. C. Branon explained that the only restriction for the site is that we accommodate the existing DES owned monitoring wells. They want to continue to monitor the site but they don't have any issues and no permits or oversight is required as part of this project. L. Daley asked if we could get a letter to that effect. C. Branon said based on the initial discussion between DES and the applicants, any remediation of the prior petroleum spill would be dependent on the results of the monitoring wells. At this time, DES is not experiencing any levels that would put this site in a regulatory situation or require remediation and they will continue to monitor the site after the contamination area is removed. The vacant containment area is a concrete bunker but it's not holding any fluids. Initially, we are only proposing to bring some fill in to skim the gravel parking area for drainage purposes. We are paving only to line shown on the plan and the rest of the area will be improved, but will be gravel until DES gives approval to pave. As a whole, everybody including DES is happy to see this site be redeveloped and our improvements will be favorable to the site. J. Langdell inquired if the applicants would be cleaning up the area. C. Branon reiterated that there is nothing to clean up, he doesn't have the data but reiterated that in discussions with DES, background levels on this site do not require remediation.

J. Langdell inquired if there would be any façade changes. C. Branon reviewed the elevation plans and said they will paint the building, improve the trim, and do new soffits. The color scheme is in flux but most likely will be burgundy, grey and black; the pallet is consistent with the renderings depicted in the charrette from a few years ago. We are also proposing windows and an entry door to break up and soften the façade. There may be some zoning relief required for the stairs. The long range plan is to build a bump out from the building at Garden St and although still conceptual it is important to show this in order to understand the investment being made to this site. The primary entrance will most like be in the rear, closest to the parking lot. Angel Communications will occupy Building #2 for warehousing and offices. There is sufficient room for more parking if needed.

L. Daley brought up the lighting plan and expressed concern with safety in the southwestern portion of the property as the parking lot is not well lit and because of its close proximity to the railroad tracks. The lumens may not be sufficient to get to the back of the lot. C. Branon said there are no regulations that define minimum lighting standards and this is a similar situation to our office parking lot. It is not perfectly lit, but there is still ample lighting and there is presence of light back there. We would prefer not to do a pole mounted light, but that is an option if needed. There will be a building mounted light at approximately twenty-eight (28') feet high and he feels lighting will be adequate. J. Langdell said we also need to consider balancing safety with the effect on abutting properties if more lighting is added. L. Daley brought up LED lighting that has good impact but also insulates other properties from the glare of abutting properties. He is just recommending that the applicant consider this.

L. Daley inquired if there would be fencing along the perimeter of the side by the railroad tracks. C. Branon said we are not proposing any fencing; the distance between the property line and building is 3-4ft. There are a

number of ways to address security. A fence is one option but it would be preferred for the land owner to have the ability to address it as they see fit and it will have to be addressed if there is an issue. J. Langdell agreed and said that risk management, in this instance, should go back to the owner instead of the Planning Board. A fence may be a deterrent but it may or may not be aesthetically appropriate and video cameras are very affective.

L. Daley brought up section 6.08.7 of the Development Regulations pertaining to the ten (10') ft landscaping strip and said this plan actually meets the intent of the regulation. Adding the five (5') ft grass strip will be an improvement over what's currently there. C. Branon referenced the existing conditions plan and explained the proposed improvements and said this is a very unique site in that it is an existing non-conforming site. We are substantially improving the green space and buffering along the railroad and the situation along the common line with the Legion. We are making this site more conforming. L. Daley said there are opportunities to reduce the for additional green space if you reduce the parking space size to the minimum and also reduce the landscaping near Building #2. C. Branon said our preference would be to keep the spaces at 9' x 20' which would be more comfortable for the dead end space. L. Daley agreed that this was a very unique site and with the topography the railroad is elevated. Maybe the focus should be on the interior portion of the site rather than along the railroad tracks. J. Langdell stated this is an existing developed site so the expectations of some of the requirements certainly don't fit and we have the ability to take that into consideration. However, please don't remove any landscaping by Building #2. C. Beer stated that he also prefers the larger spaces, for larger vehicles. In this situation we could proceed as is. S. Robinson stated that she was impressed with the proposal as it is.

J. Langdell expressed concern with the location of the handicapped space and having to back out onto Cottage St. Can it be moved to the first spot on Garden St Ext? C. Branon said he can look into that but is not sure. T. Finan brought up other locations in town where handicapped parking backs out onto a road. J. Langdell referenced a past situation and said we have the opportunity to not perpetuate something that may not be best planning practices and discussion on feasibility and safety followed. C. Branon acknowledged that it is not an ideal situation and said he will look at trying to make the space on Garden St Ext work. L. Daley said he will clarify the regulations. J. Langdell asked if Garden St Ext could be shifted north to add more space to re-locate the handicapped space. C. Branon said there is still the concern with the grade but we will try. If we are unable to do so, we could position the handicapped space as a pull in, off the drop off lane and we would ask that the Board allow the door to stay where it is, if it can't move based on internal configuration. J. Langdell said that would require the Building Official's approval, but is a reasonable approach. C. Beer stated that the preference of the Board is to re-locate the handicapped space to the north side along Garden St Ext, but if that is not possible, the space will be changed to a pull in along the Cottage St drop off area. The specifics can be worked out with staff.

J. Langdell referenced past discussion of this road when this site was being considered for the ambulance facility. L. Daley said Lorraine Carson did research the history of this section of roadway which has been in existence since around 1850. The thirty (30') ft laid out roadway has not been maintained by the Town and was not ever discontinued. It is actually a Class VI road and as such requires special approval from the Town for the applicant to utilize it. Ultimately the Town should consider the discontinuance of this section of roadway and appropriate it to the landowner accordingly. That would require special approval similar to Linden St on this year's town warrant and there is a desire from the applicant to move forward with that. For tonight's purposes, it is a two-step process involving the Planning Board and the Board of Selectmen. RSA 674:41 allows the applicant to work with the Selectmen to take control of and use that Class VI road. The RSA also states that the responsibility of maintenance and liability will be placed on the applicant. He then read a recommended resolution from Town Counsel in correspondence dated 3/22/16 and said that the Planning Board will first have to make a recommendation for the Board of Selectmen. J. Langdell noted that the discontinuance of the road would be a separate issue and suggested additional language stating that the Board of Selectmen should consider and evaluate the discontinuance of Garden St Ext as a next step in this process, given the historical lack of use, maintenance and location. And as good neighbors there can be some type of easement arrangement or a joint access point with the property next door. C. Branon added that the first part of the process will allow the applicant to construct the parking along Garden St ext. and he wanted to thank Lincoln for all of the background work that has been done. Also, critical for this project is the planned stairway off Building #1 and we are hoping that can be framed in the conditions of approval so we can obtain a building permit and start work on this site. We will go forward with the zoning application immediately, but would like to add a note on the plan that the construction of the stairwell entranceway, which shall require a special exception from the ZBA, be included as part of phase II of the project.

L. Daley verified that an approved site plan is required to obtain a building permit and a brief discussion on the building process ensued.

Chairman Beer opened discussion to the public; there being none, the public portion of the hearing was closed.

A Fraizer, Milford Conservation Commission Chairperson, said the Board is in a good spot and there is sufficient landscaping relative to the Conservation comments from 3/11/16. L. Daley added that the Environmental Coordinator has also reviewed the application and noted that the issue here is preventing infiltration, given the potential environmental concerns; however, staff is satisfied that what is being done on the property will minimize and direct runoff into the detention basin.

Chairman Beer reviewed the staff recommendations.

J. Langdell made a motion to grant conditional approval of the application, subject to the following conditions from the staff report dated 3/19/16, and those discussed tonight, that;

- 1) A note be added to the plan stating the subject property lies within the Nashua and Elm Streets Corridor District and is subject to the requirements and restrictions set forth in Section 6.05.0 of the Milford Zoning Ordinance.
- 2) A note be added to the plan stating that the subject property lies within the Groundwater Protection District 1.
- 3) A note be added to the plan stating that the new addition shall be subject to Police Impact Fees which are to be determined at the time of Building Permit Application.
- 4) A note be added to the plan stating that “All exterior lighting shall be downcast Per the Milford Development Regulations.”
- 5) A note be added to the plan stating that Phase II will include the construction of the stairwell entrance way which shall require a Special Exception from the Zoning Board of Adjustment.
- 6) A note be added to the plan stating that “The Planning Board having reviewed the plan as well as RSA 674:41 approves the same, such approval being conditioned on the applicant procuring approval under said statute from the Board of Selectmen to utilize the Class VI road which constitutes the western extension of Garden Street on the west side of Cottage Street as access to the site as proposed and the Planning Board also recommends that the Board of Selectmen grant such approval subject to such terms and conditions as are required and/or they deem appropriate.
- 7) Project is subject to the submittal of a Town Stormwater Management and Erosion Control Regulation permit application.
- 8) The applicant work with staff to reconfigure the handicapped parking space; either relocating it to the side of the building or make it parallel with the front of Building #1, to avoid backing out onto Cottage St.
- 9) The Board of Selectmen consider the discontinuation of Garden St Extension, given the historical lack of use, maintenance and location.

J. Lafontaine seconded and all in favor. Vote 6-0-0; motion carried unanimously.

OTHER BUSINESS cont’d:

Ducal Development LLC – North River Rd & Mont Vernon Rd – Map 8, Lot 52: Request for a six-month extension of SD2014-03/SP2014-04, Hutchinson Point Senior Housing Development Condominium Site Plan, in accordance with Milford Development Regulations, Article IV, Section 4.07. *(SD/SP approved 4/16/13, signed 4/15/14)*

Chairman Beer recognized:

Erol Duymazlar, Ducal

Ken Clinton, Meridian Land Services, Inc.

Chairman Beer read the notice into the record.

L. Daley said we met with the applicant in regards to moving forward with the project and in further discussions with town staff, several amendments were requested pertaining to some notes on the plan and items to be addressed. They are not substantive in nature and all items involve DPW and Water Utilities. Those conditions have been met and the issues have been resolved.

J. Langdell made a motion to grant a six month extension, subject to the conditions set forth in the staff report dated 3/19/16;

1. Amend Sheet 1 (of 23), Notes: 21 of the plan entitled, “Hutchinson Point Senior Housing Development, Subdivision & Condominium Site Plan, Land of: Decal Development, LLC, Tax Map 8 Lot 52, Milford, New Hampshire, February 12, 2013”, Revised 3/21/14, PB signed 4/15/14 to read as follows:
 - a. *“All public water, sewer, road, and drainage work shall be constructed in accordance with the Town of Milford’s Water Utilities Department and Public Works Department Standards. All road construction within the Route 12 and North River Road Right of Way shall be in accordance with the following design standards: NHDOT – “Standards Specification for Road and Bridge Construction, 2010.”*
 - b. The applicant shall resubmit sheet one to the Community Development for review and approval.
2. For review and approval, the applicant shall submit a Utility Easement to Community Development to allow the Town to access and maintain a portion of the 8” water line beginning from the entrance Hutchinson Drive off of North River Road to the hydrant.
3. The applicant shall submit an internal Condominium Unit directional signage plan to Community Development and the Fire Department for review and approval.
4. Pursuant to Section 4.07 of the Development Regulations, if active and substantial development or building is not accomplished by the end of the extension period, the site plan approval expires and any proposed development will have to apply to the Planning Board with a new site plan application.

S. Robinson seconded and all in favor. Motion carried 6-0-0.

Planning Board election of officers

S. Robinson made a motion to nominate Chris Beer for another term as chairman of the Planning Board. V. Bharucha seconded and all in favor. C. Beer accepted.

V. Bharucha made a motion to nominate Janet Langdell for another term as vice-chairman. S. Robinson seconded and all in favor.

Membership

There was a brief discussion on how to fill Steve Duncanson’s vacant position.

C. Beer read email correspondence from Judy Plant thanking the Board for the nice write up in the Cabinet.

J. Langdell stated that the Board of Selectmen are forming an advisory committee to take a look at Capital Reserve Funds and are looking for representation from the Planning Board. T. Finan volunteered and V. Bharucha said he would also consider it, but it comes down to scheduling.

C. Beer said that a Public Input Forum for Phase II of the Oval Area Improvements will be held 3/29/16.

S. Robinson made a motion to adjourn the meeting. V. Bharucha seconded and all in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 9:05PM.

MINUTES OF THE MAR 22, 2016 PLANNING BOARD PUBLIC HEARING APPROVED APRIL 26, 2016.