

1 MILFORD PLANNING BOARD WORK SESSION MINUTES ~DRAFT

2 January 21, 2025 Board of Selectmen Meeting Room, 6:30 PM

3
4 **Members Present:**

5 Doug Knott, Chairman

6 Janet Langdell, Vice Chairman

7 Paul Amato, Member (Via zoom)

8 Andrew Ciardelli, Member

9 Susan Smith, Alternate

10 Susan Robinson, Member

11 Chris Labonte, Selectman's Representative

Staff:

Camille Pattison, Community Dev.

Terrey Dolan, Town Planner

Nate Addonizio, Videographer

12
13 **Excused:**

14 Pete Basiliere, Member

15 Darlene Bouffard, Recording Secretary

- 16
17
18 1. **Call to Order.** The meeting was called to order. D. Knott introduced members and staff, noting
19 that S. Smith, Alternate, will be voting in the place of P. Basiliere who is not in attendance. The
20 voting will be by roll call since one member, P. Amato is attending via zoom.
21

22 **2. Public Hearings:**

23
24 **Second of two required Public Hearings for proposed Town of Milford Board Zoning**
25 **Ordinance Revisions – See separate Legal Notice:**
26

27 D. Knott provided a summary of the proposed zoning revisions for the Residential R district. J.
28 Langdell added that this hearing is to review the proposed changes; if the Planning Board agrees
29 with the proposed revisions it will be placed on the Warrant to be voted on in March in order to
30 update the Town Zoning Ordinance. D. Knott indicated the other zoning revisions proposed for
31 revision include the Family Day Care, which was changed at the State level in July 2024 and must
32 be reflected in the local zoning ordinance. The definition of Junkyards is another proposed revision
33 in order to be in compliance with the State RSA. D. Knott continued with the Open Space and
34 Conservation District to remove all references to the number of dwelling units on a property to
35 remove any ambiguous references in the language. The final proposed revision is the expansion
36 of Manufactured Home Parks to amend the Milford Zoning Ordinance to allow for the reasonable
37 expansion of manufactured housing as identified to be in compliance with the State RSA that was
38 passed in July 2024.
39

40 Planning Board member P. Basiliere, who is excused this evening, provided the following letter in
41 regards to the proposed zoning revisions:
42

43 I am in Los Angeles with the American Red Cross and cannot attend Tuesday's hearing on
44 the proposed 2025 zoning changes. Please ensure this memo is provided to the members
45 of the Planning Board and the text is read into the record before the vote on the minimum
46 lot size and frontage for single-family dwellings in the Residence R District.
47

48 To my colleagues on the Planning Board,
49 The proposal to reduce the minimum lot size for single-family homes in the Residence R
50 District will significantly impact our town for years to come.
51

52 Allowing for the construction of between 5,450 and 10,900 new homes over time provides
53 a solution to the housing crisis our town and state face. The Economic Development
54 Committee, which includes Board members along with managers and owners of various
55 employers, support this change.

56
57 Developers from Milford and beyond will have opportunities to construct and sell more
58 single-family homes at prices determined by the market. Buyers will certainly come from
59 Milford and various cities and towns across the state, as well as from out of state.

60
61 However, the proposal affecting about 15,000 of the town's 20,000 acres will significantly
62 change Milford. We aren't discussing a small part of the town; instead, we are talking
63 about three-quarters of our community.

64
65 There are several reasons not to place this change on the ballot at this time:

- 66 - No data has been provided about the number of property owners who will take
67 advantage of the change immediately, in the short term, or in the long term.
- 68 - No data has been provided about who will purchase the homes: Milford residents or
69 people from the Souhegan Valley, buyers from other parts of NH, or individuals from
70 other states, as we experienced during the COVID crisis.
- 71 - The proposal does not (and could not) solve our most pressing housing issues by
72 requiring affordable housing and workforce housing.
- 73 - No data has been provided regarding the impact on the town's infrastructure, including
74 the maintenance and repair of rural roads as well as increased vehicles traffic, such as
75 that experienced on Mason Road and Ponemah Hill Road.
- 76 - No information has been provided about the impact on Milford's school-age
77 population, which is currently decreasing but could rise by one or more students for
78 each of the thousands of new homes.
- 79 - The proposal was developed independently of the ongoing Master Plan project, which
80 involves numerous community members and their countless hours of volunteer work.
81 The proposal limits the options that these volunteer residents can consider and
82 recommend.

83
84 I cannot vote during tonight's hearing. If I could I would vote against the proposal and urge
85 the Board to ask our Master Plan project volunteers to think about the idea and its many
86 impacts on our town, schools and quality of life. Signed by Pete Basiliere, Planning Board
87 member

88
89 D. Knott noted that is the opinion of one of the Planning Board members who could not be in
90 attendance tonight.

91
92 J. Langdell was unable to speak with P. Basiliere today since he is assisting with the Los Angeles
93 tragedy, but asked if Camille Pattison could speak to the numbers cited in the letter since she spoke
94 with P. Basiliere today. C. Pattison indicated she requested clarification on how he arrived at those
95 numbers; the data that NRPC provided was the table discussed a couple months ago and was
96 available at the last meeting in the packet and provides the NRPC information on a small scale
97 build out. The numbers were looked at to remove any wetland or unusable acreage and then it was
98 divided by the lot size, this is a worse case scenario that does not include setback, shape of land or
99 access which also needs to be looked at. When the ADU was taken into account it worsened the
100 outcome. The limitations were not taken into account. An ADU is an Accessory Dwelling Unit
101 with a limit of 750 square feet. S. Robinson said that number did not take into account a lot of
102 factors. C. Pattison said that is correct. J. Langdell said this is not a full analysis, it is just rough

numbers, it is not a deep dive. C. Pattison agreed, saying it does not take into account a lot of situations. S. Robinson asked what she thinks of that number? C. Pattison said if there were a range it would be a much better analysis. D. Knott also added that there are a lot of situations that have not been looked at. P. Amato, via Zoom, noted that please remember that the one dissenting vote at the last meeting was P. Basiliere, but it takes into all of the R district including farmlands. Further P. Amato feels the numbers do not make a lot of sense since they are not fully vetted. S. Smith noted in the minutes of the last meeting, it is noted the numbers of lots in the R zone which has a very different number than this analysis. C. Pattison said that is the issue with these numbers, it might be looking at all of the residential R lots, last month we were looking at the vacant lots. The numbers are pretty extreme. P. Amato, via Zoom, noted the Planning Board has voted on this, the purpose of these hearings is to take public comments on it. J. Langdell said that tonight, the Board can take a final vote to put it on the warrant or not. C. Labonte said it comes down to the "impact" since we do not know how it will end up, we don't know. A good point was brought up by P. Basiliere, a lot of what he said is meaningful. J. Langdell said this is one of the reasons that the Master Plan is being looked at, and how will Milford handle the amount of houses and what is affordable. There is land available, but is it the entire R district or only a certain portion? There are other alternatives and that is for the voters to decide.

P. Amato said this would be a tool that the developer would have to look at affordable housing to create more dense development, that could make houses more affordable. P. Amato said that most houses built since the two acres went into effect were built under the open space ordinance on smaller lots. Then what is the advantage of going to 40,000 square foot lots asked C. Labonte? D. Knott indicated this revision could be made in 2025 and there are pros and cons, but it is a way forward.

D. Knott opened the meeting to the public, please state name. A. Kokko, EDAC Committee, the suggestions to the Planning Board are not to recreate the ordinance, the ordinance has worked, this is not the answer to the housing crises, it is another opportunity for the town and may alleviate some of the restrictions put on the town and we are moving back to what worked in the past. Hopefully through master plan, open space, etc. there will be more available opens, this is not a drastic change, it will offer some relief. A. Kokko was surprised by the numbers that were presented. The way it was calculated did not take the requirements into consideration, these are raw numbers and not realistic, we would appreciate the Board's support.

D. White, EDAC Committee, does not like to speak with other boards but that is the process, the numbers are not realistic, the Board does not meet often enough to keep up with the numbers presented. Hendrix/Marmon and Hitchiner were very clear there is a housing problem. This is just one was to build houses to help our citizens and our corporations in town. This will not be a massive build out. If it does not work, we can change it next year. This is a fair way to relieve some of the burden in Milford. J. Langdell indicated that the Planning Board can propose changing it next year, but it is the voters that actually change it. Let's let the voters decided.

M. Thornton, North River Road, we have a lot of rented units and not a lot of single-family homes; we can change it either way. He suggests that in appropriate areas that ownerships increase, in different parts of the country, there are more homes in an area that are owned not rented. Let's take the first step and see how it goes then assess. Ownership builds better net tax revenues instead of higher density of rentals, the net revenue is not as good. M. Thornton is in favor of this as a first step and then look at the amount of rentals vs. privately owned homes and he does not think that today's ratio in Milford is becoming heavier in rentals than in privately owned.

Kevin Botte, Marmon Utilities and EDAC members, indicated they are struggling with housing for employees. More homes allows for more workforce ownership. This is one of the larger hurdles in town, to find employees that have a place to live.

After seeing no other comments or questions from the public, D. Knott closed the public portion of the meeting. J. Langdell indicated that the Planning Board vote tonight is whether to put the zoning revision on the warrant or not and with that, we should separate the Milford R Zoning District revision as a separate vote and then vote on the Family Day Care, then Junkyards, then Open Space District and then Manufactured Housing so that they are all separate votes. A. Ciardelli is in favor of that. P. Amato in favor of that (via Zoom). Before voting, S. Smith asked that some changes be made to the Guide. J. Langdell indicated the Guide is separate from the Warrants that can be done off line or in a separate meeting.

Janet Langdell moved that the presentation relative to the Family Day Care, definition of Junkyards, Open Space Conservation District and Expansion of Manufactured Homes Parks that those amendments to the Zoning Ordinance as presented be posted and published and placed on Warrant. J. Langdell withdrew the motion. C. Pattison indicated there was a question at the last meeting on the Manufactured Home Parks about the potential confusion, so the language is a "reasonable expansion of Manufactured housing both internal and to include adjacent lands as well". We just need to finalize that language. J. Langdell clarified that this is to clarify what was approve by the State. D. Knott asked if there are any questions on that clarification? J. Langdell re-stated that if there is land next to a Manufactured Home Park that could be incorporated into that Park to expand it, that it could happen or it could be that there are open spaces in the park as well to expand the lot numbers within; this is basically becoming compliant with what was approved at the State level. This is another way for the State to offset affordable housing. P. Amato, via Zoom, asked has there been a study to look at how many more lots could we add? S. Robinson responded no. P. Amato asked how can the Board vote on this if we have not done a study, could there be another 1000 homes added to the current park? P. Langdell said there are at least 3 manufactured home parks in town, if the adjacent farming land becomes available and comes out of conservation, that could happen, but J. Langdell doubts that. T. Dolan said this is a mandate from the State to allow reasonable expansion options.

M. Thornton, North River Road, asked if the land would have to be next to it for expansion? D. Knott said the language from the State is "adjacent" so it has to be next to it. J. Langdell motioned that the revisions relative to the Family Day Care, definition of Junkyards, Open Space Conservation District and Expansion of Manufactured Homes Parks that those amendments as presented be posted and published and placed on Warrant for March 2025. A. Ciardellis seconded. Roll call vote: P. Amato yes (via Zoom); S. Robinson yes; S. Smith voting in lieu of P. Basiliere yes; A. Ciardelli yes; J. Langdell yes; C. Labonte yes; Chairman Knott voted yes. D. Knott asked for another motion for the Milford Residence R District proposed revisions.

P. Amato moved to post and publish the proposed change to the R District proposed zoning revisions to the March 2025 town meeting. Seconded by S. Smith. Roll call vote: C. Labonte no; J. Langdell no, but she wants to put on the record that she is not against the concept of changing the zoning in the R district, her only concern is changing the entire R district and because the vote is supporting the language as it is written, J. Langdell voted no; A. Ciardelli yes; S. Smith yes; S. Robinson yes; P. Amato (via Zoom) yes; D. Knott yes. Motion passes. S. Smith asked which of the Voter's Guide handouts should be followed? C. Pattison said there are two memos, one is from T. Dolan and one is from P. Basiliere, that needs to be sorted out and the final language needs to be completed by the end of the week.

Case SP2024-22 Stone Ledge Major Site Plan Approval Request by Loyal Holdings, LLC for seventy (70) multi-family townhouse-style residential units along the northeast area of Nathaniel Drive & South Street, Map 43 Lot 20.

The applicant, Loyal Holdings, LLC has requested Major Site Plan Approval for a townhouse-styled rental complex to be located on approximately 15.963 acres, Map 43 Lot 20. Nine separate residential buildings shall contain a total of seventy (70) multi-family units, with a separate clubhouse building. The site is zoned Limited Commercial Business (“LCB”), pursuant to Section 5.07 of the Milford Zoning Ordinance. A singular point of primary access is being proposed for Nathaniel Drive; with an additional gated “restricted emergency access” also being proposed for the existing southern terminus of Webster Street, located along the north end of the project site.

D. Knott indicated he is recusing himself from this application to which J. Langdell thanked D. Knott and assumed the Chairman position for this application. J. Langdell asked if the application is complete? T. Dolan responded it is. A. Ciardelli moved to accept the application for review. C. Labonte seconded. Roll call vote: P. Amato (via Zoom) yes; S. Robinson yes; S. Smith yes; C. Labonte yes; J. Langdell yes.

Abutters list was read by T. Dolan, J. Langdell noted if you are an abutter please verbally indicate you are here when your name is called for the record. J. Langdell asked about Regional Impact? S. Smith moved no potential regional impact associated with this application. A. Ciardelli seconded. Roll call vote: S. Robinson yes; S. Smith yes; P. Amato (via Zoom) yes; A. Ciardelli yes; C. Labonte yes; J. Langdell yes.

J. Langdell noted the Board will hear from the applicant first, there will be opportunity for abutters and neighbors to speak as well, if needed the questions or comments will be limited to a couple or three minutes so we can get to everyone and then go around again, any questions should be directed to the Chair who will determine if the applicant should answer a specific question. Who is presenting tonight, please introduce yourself.

Pete Madsen, Project Engineer at Keach Nordstrom in Bedford, is joined by Matt Peterson the Project Manager for Keach Nordstrom as well as Bob Bollenger, Traffic Engineer from GPI, also the GC and Architect from Northpoint and Chris from attorney from Millimet as well as the applicant Nick Bolduc of Bolduc Holdings and the land owner from Salt Creek Properties, Steve Desmarais. The goal tonight is to just introduce the project, gather some input from the Board and gather public input as well. P. Madsen would like to go through the project plans sheet by sheet to become familiar with the project, go through some architectural renderings then turn it over to M. Petersen to give you a snippet on the traffic. The project is made up of 70 units, 50 of which are the standard Townhouses and the remaining 20 are the starter home units. There is also a community building, there is a nice make up of units. Access is on Nathaniel Drive, with a secondary gated access point only for emergencies along Webster Street. There will be no traffic travel through that gated access, residents will only use the Nathaniel Drive access.

Two ten unit walk out buildings, with other six-unit buildings. The starter home units do not have a garage all other units have a garage. The AoT has been submitted and received back last week. There are some wet areas that will not be developed but P. Madsen explained the grading/drainage plans, the underground drainage system was reviewed and complies with the DES requirements. There is a lot of off-site flow on this property. There is a catch basin on South Street. Gravel maintenance pathways run along the property both for maintenance.

T. Dolan's concern is the retention of forested land at the end of Webster Street – will there be tree buffer retained? P. Madsen said yes, a lot of the natural buffer along the back of the units will be maintained. The sewer plan on Webster Street will be tied into, water and sewer are both Town and utilities will be underground. Three fire hydrants are proposed. J. Langdell asked if the Fire Department response has been seen by the applicant? P. Madsen does not believe he has. It was requested that the information from Milford Fire Department be shared with the applicant, J. Langdell indicated that there are a number of concerns from the Fire Department. P. Madsen continued that the goal is to retain a lot of the natural surroundings on this plan which is reflected in the Landscape Plan. J. Langdell was mostly concerned with the buffer between the rear of the Townhouses and the residents on Webster Street, P. Madsen explain it is definitely a little thinner but still retained. There has been nice screening between the development and South Street. J. Langdell indicated there should be some kind of buffering between the back side of the town houses and the neighborhood on Webster/Prospect Streets.

The lighting plan was reviewed, noting the lights are down-cast. The site was walked by Pete Madsen and Matt Petersen to consider minimizing the cuts due to the terrain. Erosion control sheets are included for the contractor but he will not spend a lot of time on those. P. Madsen said that although there are slopes, we worked with them to minimize the removal of the natural landscape. Moving to sheet 17, a concern was the buffer to provide from South Street. J. Langdell asked about what appears to be a stone wall? P. Madsen indicated that is a retaining wall. J. Langdell asked about additional buffering there since a single-family home is right behind it. P. Madsen noted the retaining wall is fairly high so here would not be any view of that area since it drops off. The roadway plan is on the next few sheets, showing the grading and the cuts and fills. After walking this site, Pete and Matt looked at the possibilities and feel this plan works the best. The Site Distance dictates where the driveway could be while maintaining the site distance.

P. Madsen said he can go into the architectural plans or if there are any questions, he can address those. T. Dolan said he did not hear from the DPW Director about the snow plow turn around area, will that be a quit-claim deed to the town? P. Madsen said he believes that was subdivided off. T. Dolan indicated it was subdivided but there was no further action on how it would be handled. Chris Swinerowski, attorney will Devin, Millemet said in terms of what to do with the actual roadway, typically the best way would be to dedicated it the way any other roadway is done; if it is deeded that is just very atypical, it could be done as an easement, it does not matter that much; if the town has a preference we can do it. J. Langdell asked if that could be handled off-line, it seems an easement is the way the town has handled it in the past as opposed to the other options. This is going to be a private road? C. Swinerowski responded yes. J. Langdell said this is a private road, we would not be dedicating the road since the town will not take over the whole road, it's just the access to that turn around. C. Swinerowski said if an easement is the preferred method, that is how it can be done, it does not impact the project. S. Smith stated the Fire Department seems to want to make it a part of Prospect Street perhaps? Is there a plan for lighting on the decks and patios? P. Madsen said they may do some outside lights, it is not something shown on the plans. S. Smith feels that it should be on the plan since the decks are on the back side of the development.

C. Labonte asked about snow storage and if there is enough snow storage space? P. Madsen indicated a number of storage spaces are shown throughout the development but we can take another look. We do have a typical note regarding snow storage if it exceeds the capacity shown on the plan and how to move it off site if needed, but we can take another look. For the architectural, P. Madsen began with the Community Building with 2700 SF with two stories with a lounge area, a coffee station, dog wash area, in the lower level there is a gym, there is a patio outside on the lower ground level. The starter home units were started, which have no garage. Two

bedroom, two stories, similar style to community building. The standard townhouses have a garage, two bedroom, 2 ½ bath, 2100 SF, there would be 50 of the standard unit. This concluded the presentation from P. Madsen and it was turned over to Matt Petersen, Keach Nordstrom, indicated we did understand tonight was a full agenda so we are hoping to get some input from the Board so he will just provide an overview on the traffic. GPI has done a complete traffic study which results in the need for a traffic light with the Gas Station, the Q and with this project all being approved and which hits two of the three points that make it clear that a traffic light is warranted at the intersection of Nathaniel and South Street (Route 13), however the 10-year projection of that shows that the worst level of service we end up with is a Level C. Being a Level C warrants the need for a traffic signal, however when a signal is installed it will disrupt the flow on Route 13 to allow the residents to be able to get out easier. The bigger question brought up in the Hoyle Tanner report is that the developer installs the signal but the maintenance of those signals is on the town because that maintenance does not stay on the developers it stays with the town. M. Peterson would like to see a letter come from Hoyle Tanner explaining that specifically in order for the town to make that decision. As part of the off-site improvements for the Rashid Gas Station on South Street who in their final plans have included the turn lanes to get on to Route 13; if it is decided to include the light, it will be placed at that intersection. The Planning Board needs direction from Hoyle Tanner on why they do not think there should be a light there. Just cause two of the warrants are met does not mean a signal is required and a determination is needed by the Planning Board to make that decision.

Janet Langdell stated when a representative from GPI, from the State DOT both recommend a signal because it is warranted, we listen, so we need to talk about it based on this recommendation. Robert Bolenger, Engineer with GPI spoke about the traffic study for this application as well as the Q and the gas station, we performed an analysis indicating the outcome based on the two previously approved plans and the one we are currently looking at, the town can justify traffic signal control at that intersection which is the conclusion that we drew, we do not advocate for that one way or the other because just because it meets one or more of the warrants does not Require that a signal be installed. The conclusion seemed to be that traffic will operate at acceptable measures and a signal would not be warranted. J. Langdell said that the recommendation also stated that a fund be set up for future mitigation. That is a conversation that the Planning Board will have. T. Dolan requested that he requested Mr. Haas to attend this evening and he was unable to attend tonight. What is the estimated cost of a signal being added. Robert Bolenger stated he estimates it to be approximately \$300,000, but please do not hold him to that number. J. Langdell said this Board has to discuss this, as it is important. There is a gas station/convenience store being added to South Street at that intersection, so we need to be proactive. S. Robinson said the signals were referred to as a disruption. Robert Bolenger stated that a signal stops traffic on a road. It sounds like there will be additional discussions with Hoyle Tanner, it was not expected to be resolved tonight. The signal would be to the benefit of the residents from Stone Ledge and the Q.

Paul Amato said there is a similar intersection at Route 101 heading west that sometimes requires the vehicles to wait a bit, he has never seen the need for a light there. S. Smith noted that the site distance in the letter states it is less than required; R. Bolenger noted that in the letter it was actually a human error there, on the plan it looks like there is full site distance. Regarding Route 101, R. Bolenger noted that those intersections are under the complete DOT jurisdiction at the 101 ramps, that would need to be a traditional DOT project going through the 10-year plan and would be outside of any local application. Matt Peterson noted that he would like to work that out with the traffic engineer at Hoyle Tanner to get to a conclusion. C. Labonte also indicated that the traffic at the off-ramp of Route 101 could cause difficulties at certain times of day for the residents turning left onto Route 13. J. Langdell responded that we cannot take that off-ramp into consideration as that interchange is the jurisdiction of the State DOT.

J. Langdell opened the meeting to the public asking that abutters speak first, state your name and address. Joan Dargie, Prospect Street, indicated that whenever Route 101 is closed for whatever reason, there is a lot of traffic flowing down Route 13. The other thing is the buffer between the development and existing neighborhood, it would be better to have a mature buffer rather than starting with new trees or buffer that take years to develop. The other question of Ms. Dargie was if the turn-around would be before the gate on the Webster Street side? T. Dolan responded it will be on the development side of the gate. J. Dargie mentioned the lighting will be downcast, but Ledgewood is lit 24 hours a day and our property is sandwiched between this development and Ledgewood with lights all the time; how will trash removal be handled since it is a commercial property right next to a residential neighborhood and the trash company will want to pick up the dumpsters early in the morning and it is difficult in the warmer months when windows are open and the banging of the dumpster wakes people up not sure how controls can be put on that, but something to consider. J. Dargie asked if there will be blasting done and if so, how much notification will be given to abutters? J. Langdell asked if that topic could be re-visited after everyone says their piece. Shawn Dinsmore, Prospect Street, said that blasting was his main concern of who would be responsible for any damage; his other concern is the buffer and foliage that may be left. Sue Sexton appreciates the vegetation being paid attention to because when this land was sold, along Route 13 was clear cut, so there is no vegetation up where these homes will go; the trees at the end of Prospect are also very sparse so the concern is noise and light. S. Sexton asked about the town adding more rentals that are market driven. J. Dargie added on other thing, asking why those units are not going to be condos? J. Langdell said that could be done down the line. Louis Inkel, Webster St, concern is the sewer and water coming off Webster Street, what can assure that those additional dwellings will not affect water and sewer negatively? He asked about the locked gate for emergency services only, hopefully that will not be left unlocked, Webster Street cannot handle the additional traffic.

Bill Parker, Webster Street, supports this project, as it meets the zoning and he wants to have assurances that Webster Street will not be opened up. As far as the Community itself goes, he suggested there should be a playground and additional parking for the visitor parking. J. Langdell thanked Mr. Parker for the idea on the parking, but playground, we will get there. J. Langdell asked if there are any further comments or questions from the neighborhood. Seeing none, M. Thornton, North River Road, commented that there are rental units, apartments; this is about balance, if these were owner occupied it would be better for Milford. J. Langdell closed the public portion of the hearing. The topics left to explore include blasting, said J. Langdell. M. Peterson said he would like to respond to comments made tonight, but at the next meeting. J. Langdell said there is a process and responsibility in place in the Town of Milford. M. Peterson noted that if any blasting is done, there are regulations that will be outlined at the future meeting. Chris Swinearski said that there is a good change that these will be converted to condominiums. Economically it is different, right now, it makes sense to construct them as apartments; for a community, ownership is preferred and it not always feasible. The long-term plan is to ultimately have a condominium conversion. Milford leads towns with the apartment to ownership ratio because there is town water and sewer, second only to Nashua. J. Langdell said this will; the last application for the Q brought up the issue of the flow and water pressure, if this pulled off of Webster, there could be issues, but there will be a loop to help with that pressure.

Steve Desmarais, Salt Creek, said when we Nathaniel we put in a 12-inch line to create a loop to get from Ponemah Hill Road; this development is helping to create that very significant loop. S. Smith asked about sidewalks, it looks like they are through the development and on Nathaniel. P. Madsen said yes those are proposed both within the development and along Nathaniel. J. Langdell asked if it is a sidewalk or a walking path. S. Smith asked why the sidewalk is on the side it is since residents would need to cross over. M. Peterson said that is the location it made more sense

with the driveways. J. Langdell said the Fire Department memo needs to be provided to the applicant. T. Dolan said one of the recommendations included in that memo was to continue the name of Webster Street within the development, but he feels that will lead to more confusion and people will think they can drive into the development if it is a continuation of the name. That would include delivery trucks, etc. that will come up to a locked gate, it would create a GPS nightmare, the internal (private) Stone Ledge Road should have a different name. M. Peterson added that for E911 the emergency vehicles might go up Webster Street and come up to a locked gate, that would not be okay, but he will talk to the Fire Department. J. Langdell continued that the Board will re-visit the light signal issue and if a fund could or should be established which is a conversation to have with staff and should include a Planning Board member, other outstanding items? C. Labonte stated if there will be blasting how will that be handled? M. Peterson said that is why he needs to sit down with Pete Madsen to figure out what will be needed. J. Langdell stated that it looks like the plans were reviewed with a fine-toothed comb to bring forward the best information on the first pass, it is appreciated. T. Dolan noted there is 85% open space on this parcel for the record. J. Langdell asked for a motion to continue to February 18. S. Smith motioned to continue the plan to February 18. S. Robinson seconded. Roll call vote: P. Amato yes; S. Robinson yes; S. Smith yes; A. Ciardelli yes; C. Labonte yes; J. Langdell yes. Motion passed. J. Langdell thanked the applicants and the public stating that they are welcome to come back February 18 and the associated documents will be posted on the Town website for review. J. Langdell asked that all the conversations be brought out to the Lobby as there is another case to be reviewed. There will be a brief recess. J. Langdell stepped down to the Board.

Case SP2024-21 McDonald's West, Major Site Approval Request by Milford Gateway LLC, for a new restaurant facility to be located at 792 Elm Street, Map 11, Lot 22.

The applicant, Milford Gateway, LLC has requested Major Site Plan Approval of a new 3,694 square foot McDonald's Restaurant on an approximate 1.84-acre vacant site, located at 792 Elm Street, Map 11 Lot 11. The site is zoned Integrated Commercial Industrial ("ICI"), pursuant to Section 5.08 of the Milford Zoning Ordinance; and also contained within the West Elm Street Gateway District, pursuant to Section 6.07 of the Milford Zoning Ordinance. A formal Waiver has been requested to seek approval to not install a sidewalk along the site frontage, pursuant to pedestrian facilities criteria within the West Elm Street Gateway District Section 6.07.6.F.4 (a-e).

D. Knott stepped up to the Board as Chairman, introducing the application. T. Dolan indicated the application is complete. J. Langdell moved to accept the application as presented. A. Ciardelli seconded. Roll call vote: P. Amato yes; S. Robinson yes; S. Smith yes; A. Ciardelli yes; J. Langdell yes; C. Labonte yes; D. Knott yes. J. Langdell moved there is no potential Regional Impact associated with this application. S. Smith seconded. Roll call vote: C. Labonte yes; J. Langdell yes; A. Ciardelli yes; S. Smith yes; S. Robinson yes; P. Amato yes; D. Knott yes. The abutters list was read by T. Dolan.

Jim Cranston of Bohler Engineering, representing the applicant to discuss this application, it is currently a vacant lot next to the Circle K gas and convenience store which has an existing signal at the intersection. This site is within the Shoreland Protection Area so they must go through DES for this project, there is shared access with Circle K. The project does comply with zoning, there are 44 parking spaces provided, there 35 were required. This will be a high-level presentation and if there are any questions, please let me know. There is a closed storm water catch basin, all of the run off flows to Elm Street. The one waiver requested is for sidewalks. A traffic study was prepared and concluded that the signal is a level of service C and would not change.

The architecture was an issue of concern, so some additional features were added to soften up the look of it. The staff memo and fire hydrant were received and will be addressed. J. Langdell said

that hydrant locations are an issue with the location. D. Knott asked what will be offered to the town in exchange of the waiver? S. Robinson asked if there are sidewalks at that end? T. Dolan said the closest sidewalk is or will be at the Horseless Carriage and has not been installed as of yet. J. Langdell explained a bit of the area and closest sidewalk and the thought behind adding sidewalks to allow residents in the Mill to safely get to Dollar General or Market Basket.

The architectural plans were shown for discussion, which shows that the HVAC equipment would be screened on the Elm Street side. J. Langdell stated that the West Elm Overlay District ordinance was reviewed, presumably since this is at the entrance of the West side of Milford. Jim responded that McDonald's has their own architect that they hire and is a part of the team. J. Langdell understands but this is not a soft ask for the entry to Milford there needs to be concessions for the design of the building. S. Robinson asked about the other examples of McDonald's architecture. T. Dolan noted that those were just examples of other buildings used for McDonald's. J. Langdell stated this is a similar exercise that was done with Dollar General when they came in with a flat building and research was done to get something different for this location. D. Knott asked if the architect had seen those examples to which he replied that he did.

P. Amato could not see what was being shown, to which T. Dolan indicated they were not seen until just now. P. Amato indicated he can see what is on the easel and it looks fine from the front; this is not nearly the size of the Dollar General and it is set back more from the road (Elm Street). The color on the architectural is not the finished color and it is a smaller building for this application. S. Smith asked if it is sided? Jim responded it is hardi-board which is very durable. D. Knott asked if we have a copy of the West Elm Gateway District ordinance? T. Dolan indicated it was in tonight's packet, D. Knott just wanted to make sure it meets the requirements.

Jim asked if these area requirements or recommendations? J. Langdell said they are expectations. It is more than just encouraged. We want the applicants to work with the Town. It is the gateway to Milford and the opposite direction to Wilton. A. Ciardelli thinks it looks pretty good from the Elm Street side, and there really is no point in adding a gabled roof. J. Langdell said this is an improvement from the first picture provided with the flat roof and an improvement on the building at the East end of Milford. Once the landscaping is shown it might be further enhanced. A. Ciardelli asked what is the purpose of three drive through windows. Jim responded that they are not always used, but the two drive through lanes speeds up the orders and reduces wait times. D. Knott asked if the grass will be irrigated, Jim did not know that answer. S. Smith asked about the West Elm Overlay encourages parking the rear of the building as opposed to the front, on the plan there is parking on the side. J. Langdell said that is a good observation, but to access the site you come in the front of the building and it is odd, pulling the building forward will impact the ability of driving in safely. Jim indicated the entry creates a one-way circulation. T. Dolan noted that there is a recorded access easement which is the plan for this access. T. Dolan asked that the driveway access be shown. Jim indicated that the only access in through the Circle K access, so on entering, it implements one way circulation with parking along the perimeter. Jim, explained the parking that will be available. S. Smith asked if there is any other place where traffic crosses over the drive through queue. Jim responded yes, it is very common.

T. Dolan noted he took a lot of pictures last week and this site is very set back from Elm Street there is a very wide, very deep drainage ditch on the Elm Street side. It will be quite set back from Elm Street. P. Amato noted that when the Irving Station went in about 20 years ago, this parcel was vacant and was never developed and he thinks this is a great use for the lot, having it set back from the road. They know traffic flow, this is what they do, we can tweak the architecture, the landscaping has been worked and he likes that it is not right on the road. Jim noted they are set back 150' from the property line. J. Langdell asked about traffic queuing and the entry/exit of Irving, her concern is the way it is configured and the traffic coming out or turning onto Route

101. C. Labonte added that when trucks come in it could cause a backup. Jim responded that there will be signage that people not block the intersection. J. Langdell said it is more of leaving the site and taking a left, going West. C. Labonte asked how many mobile order only are allotted. Jim said there are designated spots for that, 8 total for delayed orders. T. Dolan asked if there are these spots allotted? Jim said there are spaces allotted. There are 35 required and there are 36 on the plan. C. Labonte asked about delivery trucks and that there will not be any backing up of trucks? Jim explained where deliveries will be done.

There are two dumpsters on the plan and an area for snow storage. Jim indicated if there was a snow storage issue, it will have to be taken off the site. S. Smith asked about the building materials, the hardi-board is horizontal and there are tile walls and metal roofing with a standard seam. T. Dolan asked what is the color of the hardi-board. Jim asked what color would the town want to see? T. Dolan said people will ask him what color it will be. J. Langdell said to bring the color choice to staff to work out with the applicant and the Board. C. Labonte asked if this is 24 hours? Jim was not sure, and noted depending on the town needs. J. Langdell asked if there is a note on the plan that snow will be removed if it exceeds the storage area, it should also note Green Snowpro. D. Knott said a Green Snowpro contractor could be hired but they follow the contract that they are hired under. It's not as simple as just adding it to the plan. J. Langdell said it does extend the expectation of the town and of what will be in the plow contracts. D. Knott said there is a misunderstanding of the whole Green Snowpro process. It is a directive from the EPA. J. Langdell said the point of having it on the plan is to raise the expectation that the Board discussed it. J. Langdell asked if there was a formal waiver requested. T. Dolan indicated the wrong letter got put in the packet that cited a lot of waiver requests. J. Langdell wants to see the official form requesting the sidewalk waiver that is signed by the applicant requesting a waiver, that is standard operating procedure in this office. Jim explained that the sidewalk would be required along the frontage which would not be advantageous for this property. J. Langdell said the formal letter is dated January 13, 2025 and passed the letter to other board members. T. Dolan asked the applicant to provide a separate letter and they did but he does not know why it is not in the packet.

There were no further comments or questions from the Board, D. Knott opened the hearing to the public, asking that abutters can please go first, state your name and address. C. Costantino, via Zoom had questions about access, noting that she uses this location at all times of day and has the applicant spoken to the Circle K and Irving people about this access. Chris noted that the last pump is a diesel pump and there are often trucks sometimes with a trailer that uses up more of the space and she can see that this could be an issue with a large vehicle causing a backup. Just because there is an access does not mean it must be used? Jim said there is an access easement in place that allows the applicant to have applicant and they have been notified of this meeting as an abutter. There will be scenarios when people will have to yield. C. Costantino said there are a lot of vehicles that enter and exit this location. P. Amato said that there is one access there so that both of these lots can use the light, there is one light that was put in at the request of the Town of Milford Planning Board. J. Langdell asked if Paul Amato remembers if that drainage on this vacant lot was there when Irving first went in? P. Amato believes that at the time we all thought that lot would be a drug store at some point to service the Wilton, Lyndeborough residents without coming all the way into town but he thinks this is fine use of the lot. J. Langdell asked how often the tanker comes to drop fuel, that would be good to know. Jim indicated that the peak hours are morning and evening, those will be the most challenging times.

M. Thornton, North River Road, asked if the ditch in front of this lot have any conservation use? J. Langdell said it is a drainage ditch. D. Knott said it is a hundred feet away from the lot. S. Smith indicated the snow storage is on the plan. M. Thornton was asking a question. What about sidewalks, there are no sidewalks, but someone has to be first. D. Knott closed the public portion of the meeting.

Janet Langdell moved that the waiver request be dealt with, to not install a sidewalk on the frontage of the site as outlined in the West End Overlay Corridor District, she suggested that the Board approve the request that they not install it, given the context of where this is and when there might be sidewalks and additional pedestrian development out there, she thinks it is appropriate to not worry about that with this development. P. Amato seconded. C. Labonte asked about a crosswalk, but that would have to land on a sidewalk, correct? J. Langdell said the whole intersection would need to be re-done, that is a bigger project. Roll call vote: P. Amato yes; S. Robinson yes; S. Smith yes; A. Ciardelli yes; J. Langdell yes; C. Labonte yes; D. Knott yes. Motion passes.

J. Langdell moved to conditionally approve based on condition to complete any items related to the Fire Department, hydrants and comments in the MFD memo, finalization of any of the architectural details and colors with staff and any other permits for certifications that are needed either from the State or Town (AoT, driveway) and other items to be done before this can be signed off on, such as updating the plan relative to snow removal and SnowPro. Jim asked for the specific language, J. Langdell noted that staff can provide that as it has been used in other plans. C. Labonte questioned the note in the MFD memo that states that no fire suppression system alarm system is required? P. Amato stated that is correct, as it is less than 5000SF. P. Amato seconded. Roll call vote: C. Labonte yes; J. Langdell yes; A. Ciardelli yes; S. Smith yes; S. Robinson yes; P. Amato yes; D. Knott yes. Motion passed.

3. Other Business:

4. Approval of Meeting Minutes: S. Smith moved to approve the minutes of December 17, 2024 as amended. S. Robinson seconded. Roll call vote: S. Robinson yes; S. Smith yes; A. Ciardelli yes; J. Langdell yes; C. Labonte yes; D. Knott yes. Motion passed.

5. Upcoming Mtgs: February 4, 2025 - Planning Board Work Session; February 18, 2025 - Full Meeting. Wednesday February 5 4:00-8:00 the Envision Work Session is an open forum that the Board is involved in and would like people from the public to attend.

6. Adjournment: S. Smith made the motion to adjourn; S. Robinson seconded. All were in favor with none opposed.

Respectfully submitted by:

Signature of the Chairperson/Vice-Chairperson:

Date: _____

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES OF 21JAN2025 WERE APPROVED