

**MINUTES FOR TWO (2) PUBLIC HEARINGS OF THE
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, JANUARY 19, 2010; 7:30 P.M.
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

The January 19, 2010 Public Hearing of the Planning and Zoning Board was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by the Chair.

A. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

B. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Ed Mead, Mark Bender, Robert Dickman, KathyLynn Patterson, Kim Rose, Janet Golden, Gregory Vetter, Victor Ferrante, Susan Shaw, Chair., Kevin Liddy (7:45)

Staff: Emmeline E. Harrigan, Assistant City Planner; David Sulkis, City Planner; Phyllis Leggett, Board Clerk.

Mme. Chair: Stated there were a couple of items she wanted to mention. At the last meeting she neglected to acknowledge Kim Rose, who served as the Board's Vice-Chair. Kim has been a leader on the Board. She has a passion and a diligence which is reflected in some of the new regulations that the Board has been able to implement. Everyone present knows the work of the Board is labor intensive. It is doubly so, if not more, for the vice-chair. Ms. Rose has worked on behalf of the Planning and Zoning Board and the community and she was sorry to have left this out at the last meeting. She again thanked Ms. Rose on behalf of the entire Board.

Ask the Board to add an item to the agenda. This will require a 2/3 vote. Asking the Board to consider the recommendation for the reappointment of Mr. Allan Cegan to the Inland Wetlands Commission. This request comes via Mayor Richetelli for the reappointment, which comes every three years.

Mr. Vetter: Moved to add this item to the agenda.

Ms. Rose: Second.

All members voted in favor of adding the item to the agenda.

Mme. Chair: Explained her understanding of how this appointment works with the Board. The Board makes the recommendation to the Mayor and the appointment is made through the Mayor. The Board of Aldermen would then approve the recommendation.

Mr. Cegan has been on the Inland-Wetlands Commission for six years. He is certified through the Municipal Inland-Wetlands Commissioner Training Program that is offered by the DEP. The certificate is good for life and has additional courses on rivers in Connecticut.

**MINUTES FOR TWO (2) PUBLIC HEARINGS OF THE
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, JANUARY 19, 2010; 7:30 P.M.
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

Mr. Cegan is present if the Board has any questions of him.

Mr. Vetter: Commented he had been on the Inland-Wetlands Commission and served with Allan Cegan. The Wetlands Commission, like the Planning and Zoning Board, the longer you are on the board, the more you learn and the more valuable it is to the City. Very glad that Mr. Cegan wants to continue to do this.

Mr. Ferrante: Asked Mr. Cegan if he had taken the required DEP course.

Mr. Cegan: Stated he had taken the required course and has served on the Commission for three terms. Has also taken other related seminars and courses to better his knowledge.

Ms. Rose: Thanked Mr. Cegan for his service to the community as a public servant and recognized the time involved in doing this.

Made a motion for the Planning and Zoning Board to recommend to Mayor James Richetelli, Jr. to appoint Mr. Allan Cegan to another three year term to the Inland Wetlands Agency.

Mrs. Patterson: Second.

The Board voted unanimously to recommend re-appointment of Mr. Cegan to the Inland Wetlands Commission.

C. PUBLIC HEARINGS CLOSE BY 2/23/10; exp. 3/25/10

1. **255-257 NAUGATUCK AVENUE (ZONE CDD-2)** Petition of Titanium Properties for approval to re-subdivide and construct two duplex homes on Map 15, Block 244, Parcel 8, of which Titanium Properties is the owner.

George Adams, Esq., Harlow, Adams and Friedman, 300 Bic Drive, Milford, representing Titanium Properties, LLC, which is a local developer. Joseph Codespoti, Sr., of Codespoti Associates, PC., the engineering firm, is also present. He will review the technical aspects of the project.

The application is to re-subdivide into two building lots in the CDD-2 zone and to build two duplexes, each containing two 1,675 SF, two bedroom, 2-1/2 bath units, sharing a common driveway in the rear with the driveway accessing Manilla Avenue.

To do this within the CDD-2 zone requires site plan approval. Therefore he is here for two separate applications; a re-subdivision application and a site plan approval.

**MINUTES FOR TWO (2) PUBLIC HEARINGS OF THE
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, JANUARY 19, 2010; 7:30 P.M.
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

The lots comply in all respects with the requirements in the CDD-2 zone, which were in effect at the time of the application. Since the time of the application the Board made a regulation change which would require 4,000 SF for a two-unit building. One of the lots is 3,700 SF; the other 4,300 SF. While there are four units at 2,000 = 8,000 SF, they will be on two separate building lots. One of them would be oversized, containing 4,300 SF on the corner. The other one at 3,700 SF does not comply with the Board's recent regulation change, but does comply with the regulation in effect at the time of the application.

The Board is empowered to grant the only waiver which is being requested as to the regulations that were in effect at the time of the application, which is with regard to the rear buffer. Asking permission to build a fence rather than provide a ten-foot buffer. Would submit that this is a reasonable request given that it is a residential use that is being proposed. Not trying to buffer a commercial use from a residential zone.

The property was originally four 20' x 100' lots, known as Lots 420, 421, 422 and 423 on an 1899 map entitled "Garden Park". That is recorded as Map No. D258 in the Milford land records. The present building was built on those lots causing those lots to merge (interpreting the zoning regs) and caused those four lots to become one. Now would like to divide those lots into two. So it is being called a re-subdivision, which is why there is a public hearing.

Since this is a re-subdivision and the open space requirements cannot be complied with because there is no contiguous land or available open space parcel, there would be a contribution made to the Open Space Fund in lieu of granting the open space should the application be approved.

The property was purchased by Titanium Properties in August 2007, in its present gutted condition, which was just in time for the real estate crash and subsequent financial downturn. An environmental site assessment was done which did not reveal any environmental issues. Gleaned from that report that it had once been an auto parts store; then remodeled to become a Chinese restaurant which was never opened; then it was gutted to accommodate a five-unit residential condo complex, which was circulated but never applied for or approved. It has been in its present condition since it was purchased in 2002, which is an eyesore.

Several different development designs were reviewed, taking into account the goals of the CDD-2 zone. One of the goals of the CDD-2 zone is to have a nice streetscape with the buildings pulled forward towards Naugatuck Avenue, instead of having big parking lots in front of them. Also, if the parking was put in the front, there would be the safety issue of people backing onto Naugatuck Avenue.

**MINUTES FOR TWO (2) PUBLIC HEARINGS OF THE
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, JANUARY 19, 2010; 7:30 P.M.
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

Considered having two lots facing Manilla Avenue, so that the cars could come out onto Manilla Avenue, but that would have the side of the buildings face Naugatuck Avenue, which would not be in compliance with the goals of the CDD-2 zone.

It was ultimately decided to have the houses pulled up front and very nice houses were designed in accordance with Mr. Sulkis' input that the architecture and quality of the building materials be high. This design resulted in the fact that one of the lots would have land locked parking. So, there is a parking situation while not ideal, most complies with what the Board is attempting to accomplish in the CDD-2 zone. The parking is behind the buildings where it will not be seen driving up and down the Naugatuck Avenue corridor, but in order to get to the garage and the parking area for lot one, lot two would have to be crossed, therefore, a shared driveway is proposed. Mr. Sulkis has pointed out that parking is tight and less than optimal and he may characterize it other than that as well, but a conscious decision was made that parking in the rear most met the goals of the regulations, as opposed to having two houses face Manilla Avenue or having the parking placed in the front.

Also considered a multi-unit building; one building on one lot. That would have saved the contribution to open space, but within that zone to have a multi-family building would have a 40,000 SF lot requirement. This would require a Special Exception and they wanted to come in with a project that complied with the zoning regulations. The plan presented meets the bulk of the goals of the CDD-2 regulations, sufficient to grant the site plan approval.

The plans were circulated to the City departments a couple of times. The comments of the City departments were met. There are some open issues, i.e, how to deal with the sidewalk. Mr. Sulkis has pointed out that the sidewalk, as shown on the plans, only creates a very narrow one-foot, one and one-half foot planting strip. He suggested that a sidewalk easement be granted so that the sidewalk could be moved closer to the building and further away from the paved street, which would increase the size of the planting strip. Bruce Kolwicz, Director of Public Works said that he does not like to have sidewalk easements. He likes the sidewalks on City property. Engineering said that they did not care which way it was done. So, if the Board sees fit to grant the application, exactly where the sidewalk is put or perhaps narrowing the width near the street trees, will be up to the Board.

Mr. Sulkis' comments to the Board pointed out there was no snow shelf. The plans did go through Engineering and Public Works and these two departments did not object to this. The trees in terms of selection, size and quantity were adequate as far as the Tree Commission is concerned. A change was made to a dry well in accordance with the recommendation of the Engineering Department. The Sewer Commission approved.

While this may not be an ideal proposal for the use of this property, it is the best use of the property under the circumstances and thinks it merits the Board's approval.

**MINUTES FOR TWO (2) PUBLIC HEARINGS OF THE
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, JANUARY 19, 2010; 7:30 P.M.
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

Joseph Codespoti, Sr. PE, Codespoti & Associates, Boston Post Road, Orange. Summarized his firm's credentials. Noted that over the years the Devon area has gone downhill, especially along Naugatuck Avenue. At this time it is a pleasure to see the improvements and new activities going on in that area. The Board should be commended for permitting some zone changes that is reasonable that helps redevelop that area.

Via an easel display described the existing condition of the site, which is an abandoned building which will be coming down. There is an impervious area in the front. In the back the parking area is deteriorated. Manilla Avenue is a short side street. Greatest concern was the streetscape along Naugatuck Avenue. Would like to set a precedent for the future in having the home entrances in the front and the parking in the rear.

This is a two-lot subdivision of approximately 8,000 SF. Going from four lots to two lots and asking to put two duplex homes on each lot.

Showed the proposed buildings in relation to their location. Showed the improvements that will be made. There will be less impervious surface than now exists. Described the engineering features and hookups. The houses will be connected to the sanitary sewer and drainage will be provided where there is none presently on the site.

Showed the proposed landscape and lighting plan. There will be a lawn and/or plantings. There will be a hedge row in the back where there is presently a fence. On Manilla Street there will be two street trees and one on the front on Naugatuck Avenue, along with some plantings in the yard of the duplexes. Bryan Mancini of the Tree Commission commented, "The applicant has met our recommendations or requirements for the correct number of trees. The trees are a good mix of a different species and overall the landscaped property will brighten up the outlook of the neighborhood".

Stated the intent was not to just build two duplexes, but making them look more attractive and to improve the area. As the houses in the area are replaced, this streetscape, which is ten feet back, will keep an urban look, but one that is very attractive.

Described the architecture: Rear will have two garages; the front will have two entrances. There will vinyl siding that looks like clapboard. Architectural type roof. Windows and architectural features are very attractive. Side views of the buildings are tastefully done.

Modest size homes. Two townhouses, side by side and each one is a duplex. Two bedrooms to each unit. No basement, so the attic area will be used for storage and air conditioning units.

**MINUTES FOR TWO (2) PUBLIC HEARINGS OF THE
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, JANUARY 19, 2010; 7:30 P.M.
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

Mr. Codespoti noted his receipt of Mr. Sulkis' comments, which he stated he would attempt to address:

1. Discussed the size of the garage that was provided which is a standard size. Did not know the reason Mr. Sulkis objected to the parking space in front of the garage.
2. The parking in the back of the property is narrow and they would have liked to have more area. However, this is not commercial property, it is residential.

Normally a driveway is 12-feet wide and a turnaround is about 18-feet. This is not a road that goes through, or a parking area where cars are parked and backing in and out. One of the aims of this zone is to cut down on the impervious surface. Showed that the turnaround for the vehicles could be done without a problem. The cars that are parked behind the garage could make a turn and come out, with the exception of the last vehicle. He showed the turning radius for an automobile.

Discussed the different aspects of the parking situation that could play a role in the parking area, i.e, size of vehicles, incoming traffic, etc. Does not believe it would be necessary to pave twelve more feet for this purpose. Defeats the purpose of the zone, which is to conserve and have as little impervious surface as possible. There might be a minor inconvenience in certain instances, but with regard to the parking no safety hazard is created. Would not want to move the parking to the front or move the buildings back. That would not be in keeping with the intent of the CDD-2 zone.

3. With regard to refuse, do not want to put a dumpster on the site. Would rather there be individual pickup.
4. There is no snow shelf. It may mean there would be an inconvenience during snow storms. There is no room on the property for this purpose. Need to keep enough room for the trees to grow and be healthy.

Mr. Codespoti believes this is a worthwhile project that has value. Believes Devon would still be in the doldrums if the Board did not see the need at times to make small exceptions so that the development could continue in a logical way and the area could continue to grow.

Mme. Chair: Asked for comments from staff.

Mr. Sulkis: Agreed with Mr. Codespoti that a 12-foot driveway would be adequate if he was talking about a single family home. Having four properties with a 12-foot driveway would not be adequate. Cited 450 Naugatuck Avenue where there is a courtyard setting with a similar parking pattern to this. Stated he has had trouble getting in and out of the parking area in his compact City car.

**MINUTES FOR TWO (2) PUBLIC HEARINGS OF THE
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, JANUARY 19, 2010; 7:30 P.M.
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

He cautioned the Board to minimize the impact of the parking in the back.

The lack of a snow shelf is a concern because looking at the parking lot, the only place it could be is at the end of the parking area where the last parking spot in the unit would be. It could be problematic for a car to back out of this area.

Other than these points, they did a nice job on the buildings. If the Board approves this application, work would have to be done on the sidewalks. Suggested a narrower sidewalk in the area of where the street trees are. That way there could be a larger area at the base of the trees. The sidewalk would be oddly shaped but in this way there would be no encroachments onto the site, since the public works director is concerned with that.

Mrs. Patterson: Asked if a traffic report from the Police Department was obtained.

Mr. Sulkis: For this type of residential project a traffic report is not required.

Mr. Ferrante: Asked if it was possible to have a smaller building which might solve some of these problems.

Mr. Codespoti: Replied that 1,675 SF for a two bedroom would be necessary in order for it to be saleable. The size of the building has been reduced. Reducing it 12 additional feet would be out of the question.

Mr. Ferrante: Asked the number of square feet in each unit and if the square footage included the third floor.

Upon review it was established that the third floor had a family room as well as a storage area. Mr. Codespoti described how the third floor area could be used.

Mr. Vetter: Asked if that area was calculated into the 1,675 SF of the living space.

Mr. Adams: Stated he would have to check with the architect before making a definite statement on the total square footage.

Mr. Vetter: Asked for the calculations of the parking spaces that are on the garage apron.

Mr. Codespoti: It is 30 feet from the garage door to the edge of the parking. The area left after accounting for the size of a car (which could be between 13-16 feet), could be between 17 and 14 feet left, which would be more than enough space to make a turn and come out.

**MINUTES FOR TWO (2) PUBLIC HEARINGS OF THE
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, JANUARY 19, 2010; 7:30 P.M.
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

Ms. Rose: Asked why the garages and parking were not in the front, other than people would be backing onto Naugatuck Ave.

Mr. Codespoti: Said that from the streetscape standpoint, it was more attractive to see the buildings and trees from the street rather than the garages. If parking is put in the front, the vehicles would have to back out onto Naugatuck Avenue.

Mr. Adams: Thought that the goal of the CDD-1 zone was to have the streetscape with the uniformity of setback and to get away from parking lots in the front and the ugliness that comes with it. There is also the safety factor.

Mr. Sulkis: Agreed that it is understandable why this project was designed in this way and it does comply with the intent of the CDD-1.

Mr. Mead: Questioned the location of the fence, which appears to be on the applicant's property. Asked where would the hedges be placed? Would the fence be realigned with the property and the hedges. If the hedges grew too big they could obstruct the vision of someone pulling out from the parking area.

Mr. Adams: Responded if the project was approved he would ask the neighbors to relocate the fence so as not to encroach on each others properties. If arbor vitae is used, they would grow up and be trimmed.

Mr. Codespoti: The fence that is there is only a portion of the fence and it is hopeful that it will be relocated. The hedge row that has been designed will be attractive and will not be encroach on the fence or the parking area.

Mr. Sulkis: Regal privet hedges have been designated for this use. Privets generally grown tall and wide and there is less than a 3-foot wide strip there. Chances are they will grow into the driveway paved area.

Mr. Liddy: Stated the fence should be removed and hedges should be put in its place, so that there would be additional green space which would be more attractive to passers by.

Sheet SP-5 was discussed, which did not clearly show the placement of trees with the sidewalk. It appears they run into each other.

Mr. Sulkis: Explained why he thought the fence would not be a problem and in fact, would be needed as a security measure.

**MINUTES FOR TWO (2) PUBLIC HEARINGS OF THE
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, JANUARY 19, 2010; 7:30 P.M.
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

Mme. Chair: Asked if Mr. Codespoti understood Mr. Sulkis' comment regarding computing the parking space outside the garage.

Mr. Codespoti: Reviewed the measurements of the interior garage and the outside parking area. Understands that Mr. Sulkis would like the outside space to be 18' and 24'. All they can do is 16' and 14'.

Mr. Sulkis: Explained that the length of the space is not the issue, it is the width. The standard parking space is 9' x 18'. There is an 8-foot wide way of getting into the spot. When there was parking underneath the buildings (on Bridgeport Ave.) there was a support structure within that envelope. When the parking count is looked at, it is looked at free and clear. There are many sizes of garage doors. Pointed out the space was not free and clear to get into that space. Once you are past that door, yes, there is the 9' x 18' spot.

Mr. Liddy: Asked if the setbacks of the newer duplex homes in the nearby Bridgeport Avenue area were the same as this project.

Mr. Sulkis: Could not respond without further information.

There were no further questions from the Board.

Mme. Chair: Asked if there was anyone to speak in favor of this application? (No response). Asked if there was anyone to speak against the application. (No response)

The public hearing was closed at 8:26 p.m.

2. **35 PAGE STREET (ZONE R-12.5)** Petition of Joseph Mager, Jr., Esq., for re-approval of an expired 2-Lot Subdivision on Map 19, Block 232, Parcels 6A, 7 and 7A, of which Damon Daniels is the owner.

Mr. Sulkis: Pointed out to the Board that this is a subdivision that last year's Board had previously approved. In the process of approvals and putting the subdivision into place, the last step is filing the subdivision mylar. There are many steps that must take place between the Board's approval and the filing of the mylar. The allowed extensions had been requested and obtained. Just as everything was completed and the mylar was presented, the final extension expired. Therefore, the need to reapply for approval of the same application.

Nothing has changed from the original approval and all the requirements of the original approval have been met. Asked the Board to take a vote on this application this evening, should they see fit.

**MINUTES FOR TWO (2) PUBLIC HEARINGS OF THE
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, JANUARY 19, 2010; 7:30 P.M.
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

Joseph Mager, Esq., Mager & Mager, 87 River Street, Milford. Representing Damon and Ellen Daniels. This is a reapplication of a two-lot subdivision that was unanimously approved by the Board on March 17, 2009. The conditions of approval were not met within the mandated time, hence the need to come before the Board for approval. This application is an exact duplicate of the one that was presented last March.

The Board has the subdivision maps. The parcel at 35 Page Street is on an oversized lot in the R-12.5 zone, located at the end of a cul-de-sac. It consists of approximately 33,000 SF. The proposed development plan prepared by Codespoti & Associates shows the house parcel as Parcel A. That consists of 13,900 SF. The proposed building lot is shown as Parcel B and consists of a net area of 17,000 SF. This calculation does not include the easement that can be seen on the right side of the property, which is a driveway feeding 41 Holly Street.

This property received a variance in October 2006, allowing a lot width of 60 feet of 60 feet per Parcel A. Parcel A abuts the back end of the Jonathan Law Athletic Fields. The garage on the property to be developed will be removed. There will be a reconfigured driveway for Parcel A and a new driveway that will service the new dwelling as shown page 2 of the plans. This property is not subject to a free split because it had been split off in 1942 from the Honnick property. An open space fund payment will be donated to the City upon development.

As was pointed out, there are two requirements that his clients had to comply with. They had to install a fire hydrant, which has been taken of, and there were two trees which were required by the Tree Commission to be placed at the front of the property. He is advised that has been taken care of as well.

There were no questions from the Board.

Mme. Chair: Asked if any members of the public wished to speak in favor of the application. (no response). Asked if anyone wished to speak against the application. (No response)

Mme. Chair: Declared the public hearing closed.

Asked if the Board if they were prepared to discuss this application tonight and perhaps render a decision.

Ms. Rose: Considering the fact that this is just a re-approval of something that was previously approved by the Board, because a deadline was missed, move to approve the petition of Joseph Mager, Jr., Esq. for re-approval of an expired two-lot subdivision on Map 19, Block 232, Parcel 6A, 7 and 7A, of which Damon Daniels is the owner.

**MINUTES FOR TWO (2) PUBLIC HEARINGS OF THE
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, JANUARY 19, 2010; 7:30 P.M.
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

Mr. Ferrante: Second.

All members voted in favor of approving the motion.

D. NEW BUSINESS

3. **55 SOUTHWORTH STREET – JOHN HENRY ESTATES SUBDIVISION**

Request by Richard Gustafson for full release of a maintenance bond for the above subdivision in the amount of \$10,980.00, which was approved by Bruce C. Kolwicz, Public Works Director, in his memo dated January 11, 2010.

Mr. Ferrante: Relying on the staff's review, made a motion to release the bond in the amount of \$10,980.00.

Mrs. Patterson: Second.

All members voted in favor of releasing the remaining bond for 55 Southworth Street.

E. PROPOSED REGULATION CHANGES

Mme. Chair: Asked Mrs. Harrigan for an update on the sign regulations.

Mrs. Harrison: Said the regulations had not previously been sent to the City Attorney for review, but that has now been done. Awaiting the reply from the City Attorney.

Mme. Chair: Inquired about the tweaking of the Off-Street Parking Regulations.

Mr. Sulkis: Stated he had reviewed the minutes of the 11/4 and 11/17 meetings at which time this proposed regulation change was discussed. The Board passed the motion on the change. It was requested that "tandem parking" be defined. He presented a definition of "tandem parking" that would give the Board leeway to waive the definition, should they see fit, based on the merits of an application.

The Board discussed at length the wording and interpretation of the definition presented.

Mr. Bender: Questioned if this subject was ever reported as an issue or a problem, based on the amount of time the Board was giving to it.

Mr. Sulkis: It has not been an epidemic.

Mr. Ferrante: Made a motion to approve the regulation as written by Staff.

**MINUTES FOR TWO (2) PUBLIC HEARINGS OF THE
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, JANUARY 19, 2010; 7:30 P.M.
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

Ms. Rose: Second.

Mr. Bender: Confused because it was stated that this had already been approved at a previous meeting. Why is the Board approving something that has already been approved?

Mr. Sulkis [and Ms. Harrigan] conferred. It was determined that on November 17th the Board voted on creating a new section, 5.1.17 called Tandem Parking. It said: "Any application that proposes a parking plan where cars parked in front of the other, whether open or closed, shall be subject to *Section 7.2. This section shall not apply to single family residences in the single family zone." (*Special Permit section)

By doing that, the Board removed the language on the chart in Section 5.1.4, which is in bold "tandem parking prohibited". That wording was removed because of the new section 5.1.17. That is what the Board approved.

Mr. Liddy: Asked if the application that came before the Board tonight would be subject to this new rule and would have to apply for a Special Permit because one car would be parked in front of the other.

Mr. Sulkis: The application that came before the Board tonight came in before the change was voted upon.

Mr. Liddy: But going forward, that would apply.

Mr. Sulkis: Yes. Any application that came in after December 3rd, would be subject to this change.

Mr. Vetter: Pursued the matter that the Board would have the authority to deny an application if the members were uncomfortable with tandem parking.

Mr. Sulkis: Yes.

Mr. Ferrante: Withdrew his previous motion.

Ms. Rose: Withdrew her second.

**MINUTES FOR TWO (2) PUBLIC HEARINGS OF THE
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, JANUARY 19, 2010; 7:30 P.M.
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

F. LIAISON APPOINTMENTS

Police Commission	KathyLynn Patterson
Fire Department	Janet Golden
Sewer Commission	Greg Vetter
Economic Development	Susan Shaw
Regional Council of Governments	Susan Shaw; David Sulkis, Alternate
Board of Aldermen	Kevin Liddy/Susan Shaw
Harbor Commission	Victor Ferrante
Inland Wetlands	Ed Mead
Tree Commission	Not assigned as yet.

Mr. Bender: Asked if these were volunteer assignments, as the only representation required of this Board was to the Board of Aldermen and Regional Council of Governments.

Mme. Chair: The members volunteer to attend these meetings and report back to the Board. The Conservation Commission and Milford Preservation Trust could also have Board liaisons to attend their meetings.

G. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – (1/5/10)

Mr. Vetter: Motion to approve.

Mrs. Golden: Second.

All members voted in favor of approving the minutes as recorded.

H. CHAIR’S REPORT

At the last meeting, it was briefly mentioned extending an invitation to Mr. Novak, the Interim Executive Director of the Department of Permitting and Land Use.

Stated she and Mr. Liddy drafted a letter to Mr. Novak formalizing the request from the Board. The letter was read into the record, as follows:

“Douglas Novak, Interim Executive Director
Department of Permitting and Land Use

“Dear Mr. Novak,

**MINUTES FOR TWO (2) PUBLIC HEARINGS OF THE
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, JANUARY 19, 2010; 7:30 P.M.
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

“At our January 4, 2010, Planning and Zoning Board meeting, the Board agreed to extend a request to you to come before the Board to discuss the role of the Director of Permitting and Land Use.

“The Board has no interest in discussing matters not affecting the Planning and Zoning Department.

“For the purposes of our Board, we are only interested in matters under the prevue of our Board and having bearing on land use. It would be useful, for instance, for the Board and public to know how the community will be working with the DPLU; what changes are underway or envisioned that affect the permitting process including reviews by Inland Wetlands; as well as any changes to the job descriptions of our city planner and members of his staff. These matters, as you are well aware, are of keen importance to the public as it is for all of us who serve on this Board.

“Members of the Planning and Zoning Board have already contacted you with constituent concerns or questions, which you have been able to efficiently resolve. This facet of your job is certainly one that should be brought forward.

“There is a good deal of confusion in the community about the difference between the roles and operation of the Building Department and that of the Planning and Zoning office and its elected Board; it would certainly be a service to our Board to help draw out that distinction while clarifying your role.

“The changes implemented by the Kimball Report Implementation Team, for which you were a member, are significant. Your willingness to ensure that any issue pertaining to land use, and therefore of interest to our Board and the public, are thoroughly reviewed is very necessary.

“We look forward to scheduling this meeting at your soonest convenience.

“Respectfully yours,

“Susan Shaw,
Chairman, Planning and Zoning Board

“Kevin G. Liddy
Vice Chairman, Planning and Zoning Board”

Mr. Liddy: Corrected the meeting date to be January 4, 2010.

**MINUTES FOR TWO (2) PUBLIC HEARINGS OF THE
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, JANUARY 19, 2010; 7:30 P.M.
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

I. STAFF REPORT

Mr. Sulkis stated he sat on a committee that interviewed a candidate for the Zoning Enforcement Officer position. He is not at liberty to discuss anything further on this.

Mr. Vetter: Made a motion to adjourn.

Ms. Rose: Second.

The meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m. The next Board meeting will be held on Tuesday, February 2, 2010.

Phyllis Leggett, Board Clerk