

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD HELD  
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 2012; 7:30 P.M. AT THE  
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET**

Chairman Mark Bender called to order the February 21, 2012 meeting of the Planning and Zoning Board at 7:30 p.m.

**A. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**B. ROLL CALL**

**Members Present:** Ward Willis, Jeanne Cervin, Ben Gettinger, John Grant, Edward Mead, Vice Chair; Michael Casey, Dan Rindos, Tom Nichol, Mark Bender, Chair.

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

The Chair asked for a motion to move the agenda to have Item 2 come before Item 1.

**Mr. Casey:** Made the motion.

**Mr. Mead:** Second.

All members voted in favor of moving Item 2 to Item 1.

**C. 1. CGS 8-24 REQUEST – SALE OF PROPERTY – 139 NORTH STREET**

Planning and Zoning Board approval requested under Connecticut General Statutes 8-24 for the sale of 139 North Street to Torry Corporation.

**Benjamin Blake, Mayor of the City of Milford, 110 River Street.** Stated that the City of Milford is seeking the Planning and Zoning Board's approval under Connecticut General Statutes 8-24 for the sale of the property located at 139 North Street to the Torry Corporation, which is the for-profit arm of the Milford Hospital. Under the present proposal, the sale is for \$860,000 to the City. Under the contemplated proposal, the City would retain the historic home located on the property, as well as approximately 15,500 SF of land.

**Background:** John Downs was an American Revolutionary War patriot. He is credited with building the historic home. He fought in the Battle of Long Island against the British. He kept a journal for over 40 years, recording the life and times of that era. There is significant history associated with his home and the property and for the City of Milford.

For this reason in 2003, the City of Milford purchased the home in order to avoid a six lot subdivision for the cost of \$620,000. Subsequent to that an additional \$240,000 of taxpayer money was spent to preserve the home; shore up the foundation and weatherize the exterior.

The City of Milford has been offered a plan to recoup the entire \$860,000 of taxpayer money, as well as preserve in perpetuity the historic home of John Downs. The Mayor respectfully requested the Board to approve this proposal.

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD HELD  
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 2012; 7:30 P.M. AT THE  
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET**

The Mayor listed the four items that were conditional to the sale of this property to the Torry Corporation.

The Chair asked Mr. Sulkis for a brief summary of what an 8-24 request under the Connecticut General Statutes represents to the P & Z Board.

**Mr. Sulkis:** Gave the explanation as to how Connecticut General Statutes 8-24 relates to the Planning and Zoning Board. If the Board approves the 8-24 request, it goes to the Board of Aldermen for approval. Their vote would require a simple majority. If the Board votes against the 8-24, it goes to the Board of Aldermen, but they would need a super majority to pass the 8-24 request. In any case, the Planning and Zoning Board's role is advisory.

Should the sale go through, the Torry Corporation will be coming back to the Board with a site plan or an application for the property that they acquire for the approvals that will be needed.

**Ms. Cervin:** Is there any issue or concern about obtaining the Certificate of Appropriateness?

**Mayor Blake:** There will be a meeting tomorrow to discuss these matters.

**Mr. Grant:** Selling entire piece of property which will be subdivided and they will donate back the 1500 SF (**sic**) and the house. There are a lot of issues that are contingent on the sale. He understands that someone cannot be legally forced to do a donation.

**Mayor Blake:** Then the sale would not go forward.

**Mr. Casey:** Once the house is conveyed back to the City, who will maintain it?

**Mayor Blake:** Presently the Public Works maintains it, although it is minimal because there is not much to maintain other than grass mowing. In the future the hope is that the Historic Preservation Trust will take over the maintenance and do something with the house. This is what he envisions, as did Mayor Richetelli.

**Ms. Cervin:** The Open Space and General Funds initially made the purchase. Will the money from the sale go back to the appropriate funds?

**Mayor Blake:** Of the \$860,000 expended by the City, approximately \$360, 000 came out of the Open Space Fund and \$400,000 came out of the General Fund. It is expected the money will be returned to their respective funds.

**Ms. Cervin:** Made a motion for approval. Former Mayor Richetelli worked hard on this, as did the Historic Preservation Commission. It has been in the works a long time, with some bumps along the road. It is a win-win for the City. Also appreciated the City got the extra buffer in the back.

**Mr. Willis:** Seconded the motion.

All members voted in favor of the Mayor's CGS 8-24 request to sell 139 North Street to the Torry Corporation.

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD HELD  
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 2012; 7:30 P.M. AT THE  
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET**

**2. CGS 8-24 REQUEST – ACQUISITION OF 18 GROVE STREET**

Planning and Zoning Board approval requested under Connecticut General Statutes 8-24 for the acquisition of 18 Grove Street for the purpose of constructing a pump station.

**Raymond A. Macaluso, Owner of Westcott & Mapes, Inc., 142 Temple Street, New Haven**, the consultants to the Sewer Commission of the City of Milford, here before the Board for its approval of the 8-24 request to purchase the property located at 18 Grove Street. The Board members had received a map of the area that the Sewer Commission is looking to sewer, namely 28 properties. This project has been going on for nine years. One of the problems that the Sewer Commission has had over the years is the location of the pump station. On December 28, 2011, the owner of the property, Mr. James Vinci, signed an agreement to sell the property to the City of Milford for the proposed construction of the pump station.

Mr. Macaluso noted the location is the southeast corner of Milford. The area to be sewered is down New Haven Avenue, Rosemary Court and Grove Street from Anderson Avenue. There have been many septic system failures that are going into the Oyster River. The Sewer Commission voted to present this and go forward with the purchase with this Board's approval. Out of all the alternatives that the Sewer Commission looked at, the location of this pump station on 18 Grove Street is probably the most prudent from the environmental standpoint of the pump station. The existing house would be razed and will be smaller. Those details have not been established yet.

Requesting the Board's approval to purchase 18 Grove Street so the Sewer Commission could continue the process of designing the pump station and put it out to bid to service the 28 properties located in that area. Mark Davis, the project engineer is present to answer any technical questions, as well as Assistant City Attorney, Debra Kelly.

**Chairman Bender:** Asked Staff for comments.

**Mr. Sulkis:** Noted to the Board that this 8-24 request is strictly a recommendation as to whether the City should or should not purchase this property. The recommendation then goes on to the Board of Aldermen.

**Chairman Bender:** On behalf of his client, Jonathan Jeffrey, Attorney Case, or his designee, has filed a Verified Petition to Intervene seeking party status on the 8-24 request before the Board this evening with regard to the City's purchase of 18 Grove Street. By virtue of this intervening status only, the Board will permit Mr. Case or his designee to speak this evening.

The remarks will be limited to testimony and support of the claim that action taken this evening will have a negative impact on the environment.

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD HELD  
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 2012; 7:30 P.M. AT THE  
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET**

**Michele Kopelson, 57 Plains Road, Milford CT**, representing John and Patricia Williams Jeffrey, 17 Grove Street. Will speak to the acquisition of 18 Grove Street per the Petition to Intervene under CGS 22A-19. Also present to discuss this purchase is John Jeffrey and expert Robert Sonnichsen. Requested the Board take its time considering this acquisition and hear the evidence they have gathered. (Packets were distributed to the Board members and date stamped into the record.)

Went through the history of what took place at the Sewer Commission meetings regarding this issue and the five alternative plans. Grove Street pump station represented the most expensive option at over \$2 million. On December 2, 2010, an application and contract plans were submitted to Inland Wetlands and a Coastal Area Management report was presented, but that report was later withdraw and has never been refilled. At a February 9, 2012 Sewer Commission meeting they briefly presented information regarding grinder pumps. The Commission went into Executive Session regarding a different matter. When they came out of Executive Session, after no public discussion, the Sewer Commission voted to acquire 18 Grove Street for \$170,000.

It is their position that 18 Grove Street is in the Coastal Area as defined under Sec. 22a-19 of the Connecticut General Statutes and as such, because of the proximity of the Oyster River, the Board should take into consideration the reasonable likelihood this will pollute the natural environment of the Oyster River. As of 4:30 today no Coastal Area Management Plan has been submitted to the Planning Office.

Ms. Kopelson read portions of Section 8-22a of the Connecticut General Statutes.

The Sewer Commission did not hold a Public Hearing on purchasing 18 Grove Street and their expert was not given an opportunity to thoroughly explain the use of grinder pumps and why the acquisition of 18 Grove Street and demolition of the house would have a negative impact on the environment.

**Chairman Bender:** Asked if it was understood that the Board was not approving or disapproving the grinder pumps tonight. It is about the property itself.

**Ms. Kopelson:** Responded, yes. Asked the Board hear the evidence to consider the acquisition moving forward.

**Robert Sonnichsen, Environmental Specialist, State Street, Guilford, CT.** He has been asked by the Jeffreys to take a look at the New Haven Avenue/Rosemary Court/Grove Street infill project that the Sewer Commission had been trying to move forward for a number of years. He reviewed the meetings at which the five alternatives were discussed. His report of these meetings was included in the packets distributed to the Board.

At the time of the March 2010 meeting, the Grove Street location was considered to be the most difficult , most expensive and least practical place to put the pump station of all the five alternatives evaluated. There were objections from the property owners in the vicinity of the Rosemary Court pump station location and the Borough of Woodmont objected to that location for aesthetic reasons.

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD HELD  
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 2012; 7:30 P.M. AT THE  
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET**

In the course of two years the Sewer Commission looked at other alternatives and moved to select the most expensive, least practical and most difficult construction location.

**Chairman Bender:** Interrupted to ask that the discussion focus on Grove Street. Rosemary Court is not relevant.

**Mr. Sonnichsen:** The Grove Street property is located immediately adjacent to the Oyster River and its critical coastal resources. He discussed what should have been done with regard to the environmental impact of this approval.

**Mr. Sulkis:** Interjected that this issue is only for the purchase of this property. This is not a proceeding to evaluate options from the past. There are no options this evening other than the purchase of the property. This pump station has not been designed and this is strictly a purchase situation.

**Mr. Sonnichsen:** Their position is that the purchase of this property without fully evaluating all of the options will preclude the proper and complete evaluation of the other alternatives. Based on their review of the Coastal Area Management Regulations in Milford, since this is in the coastal area and none of the specific exemptions to Coastal Site Plan Review apply to this 8-24 purchase. There should be a Coastal Area Management Site Plan Review application included with this, and there is none contained in the application file.

Unless there is detailed engineering documentation that specifies the basis for the determination that the Grove Street option is superior to any other alternatives, it would not be good planning or prudent for the Planning Board to approve this purchase and that more detail should be requested so that the options could be more fully evaluated.

He has put together more technical materials showing how other alternatives are prudent, feasible and less impacting on the environment.

**Mr. Sulkis:** At such time as the actual pump station is proposed there will be a CAM review. At this time the pump station does not exist. At such time that a concrete proposal moves forward there will be ample opportunities for the public to speak at numerous boards and commissions on whatever actual proposal moves forward.

**Ms. Cervin:** Asked if Mr. Macaluso could respond to the information that was just presented.

**Chairman Bender:** Asked if Ms. Cervin had a specific question for Mr. Macaluso. Did not want to get into a rebuttal situation.

The Chair asked if the proposal was specifically for 18 Grove Street or Grove Street in general?

**Mr. Macaluso:** It is specific to 18 Grove Street. The other proposal that Mr. Sonnichsen spoke about was at the end of Grove Street, which was another alternate. The consultants believed the property at the end of Grove Street presented more of an environmental impact than 18 Grove Street.

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD HELD  
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 2012; 7:30 P.M. AT THE  
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET**

**Mr. Rindos:** If the Board is going to make a determination as to whether or not to purchase this property, how is the Board qualified to make the determination as to whether this property is the right piece of property for the City to buy.

**Mr. Sulkis:** The Board has to rely on the City experts; the sewer consultants, the Sewer Commission, Public Works Department, Engineer Department who have determined that this is the preferred route to go for this particular issue. They are the experts. The City would not be spending tax dollars on a piece of property that would not be in the expert's opinion the way to go for this particular project. The Board's role is advisory to the Board of Aldermen.

**Mr. Rindos:** If the property is purchased, and it does not meet certain qualifications for the CAM report, what happens then?

**Mr. Sulkis:** Like any excess property that the City does not need, it will be sold.

**Ms. Cervin:** It is rare for this Board not to pass on such a request to the Board of Aldermen. She made a motion to approve the 8-24 request to purchase 18 Grove Street.

**Mr. Grant:** Second.

There was no discussion. A vote was taken. All members voted in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

**D. ZONING TEXT REGULATION CHANGES – DISCUSSION**

Section 5.17	Special Event/Temporary Tents
Section 6.2.6.1	Tropical Storm Irene related residential restoration/reconstruction.
Section 3.1.4.2	Building Height in Residential Zones
Section 2.5.5	Lot Access and Rear Lots
Section 9.2.3.	Prohibited Variances
Definition Text Change:	First Floor – Crawl Space

**Mr. Sulkis:** We last left off looking for the Board's review of the information handed out at the last meeting. Tonight looking for the Board's guidance as to whether to pursue the changes in the regulations or not.

Special Event/Temporary Tents was generated by Staff. It has to be tweaked based on comments received from the former City Attorney. Based on those comments it will be resubmitted to the new City Attorney. This change would be a very customer service and friendly change to the regulations. These tent events would be handled administratively instead of always coming to the Board. These are for the retail tent sales that are temporary, mainly along the Post Road.

**Chairman Bender:** Recollected that the first time an applicant wants to do this he has to come before the Board...

**Ms. Cervin:** This goes back over three years. Everyone was in favor at that time. Asked if something was to be added to this?

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD HELD  
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 2012; 7:30 P.M. AT THE  
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET**

**Mr. Sulkis:** In the packet from the last meeting there was the proposed language and the comments by the City Attorney's office at the time it was first proposed, which Staff never got around to addressing. This would now be done, if this Board wants to move forward with the change.

The Board's consensus was to move forward with this change.

**Mr. Mead:** No tents larger than 50 x 200. Was the tent for the circus last year bigger?

**Mr. Sulkis:** Believes it was a larger tent. However, since that application came before the Board and was approved, it would not have to come before the Board again if it was held in the same or a similar location at the mall. If it moved to another location, that would be different.

**Mr. Mead:** As long as it goes back to the Mall it's ok?

**Mr. Sulkis:** Yes, and as long as it is the same general layout.

**Mr. Casey:** How long would it take if the permit was to be approved administratively?

**Mr. Sulkis:** That depends on the applicant, as are all applications. Staff presents them with the information that they are required to submit and then they have to get that information. It took a long time for that carnival to get all the information that was required and it took even longer to get all the information necessary for the Building Department.

The applicants are not planners or in the business of knowing what the necessary requirements are for permits. Doing this in-house the process can be handled faster and get them out the door faster than going before the Board and having a hearing.

**Chairman Bender:** Recalled an application for a church carnival that was to take place very soon and had to get almost immediate approval. Whatever information the applicant has to bring to the Planning and Zoning office would be the same thing that would be given to the Board, however, they would not have to go through the process of a Board hearing and wait for the process of scheduling a board meeting.

**Mr. Sulkis:** Agreed that it would be the same process, without having to come before the Board.

**Chairman Bender:** The Board will move forward on this.

**Chairman Bender:** Section 6.2.6.1 Tropical Storm Irene. The Chair gave the history of this regulation which had been proposed by Mayor Richetelli after Tropical Storm Irene, in an effort to resolve saving an applicant from going to the Zoning Board of Appeals. If they had a footprint, this change allowed them to go back to that footprint. If there were any FEMA or State requirements, they still had to abide by those. It basically circumvented setback laws and allow them not to go to the Board of Appeals to get new setback approved.

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD HELD  
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 2012; 7:30 P.M. AT THE  
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET**

**Mr. Sulkis:** After the fact, all this was going to do was save them the extra step of going to the Zoning Board of Appeals. In reality, no one can predict how a board would vote. In situations like this in the past, the ZBA would approve to restore what was there, if there were no other changes. It gets more complicated when a Certificate of Zoning Compliance would be required, i.e. from a bank.

**Mrs. Harrigan:** Added that this change was borne out of a sense of urgency to help people get back into their homes. Unfortunately, there is nothing quick about dealing with insurance companies and going through that very lengthy process in terms of rebuilding. This regulation addresses those properties that have been damaged more than 50%. We are now five and a half months out since the storm and we have not seen a lot of those people. In view of all the ramifications, this change would not fulfill the need that it was beneficially intended for.

**Chairman Bender:** Some, but not many of these homes have come before the Board due to damage. He has not heard from the Mayor's office requesting this regulation change be put into effect.

The Board decided not to go forward with this change.

**Chairman Bender:** Section 3.1.4.2 Building Height in Residential Zones.

**Mr. Sulkis:** This change was proposed to clarify the building heights and to add some graphics to show what the regulations intend with regard to certain roof lines. It does not change the definition that much, but it makes it clearer for when you have unusually designed buildings.

**Mr. Grant:** Had two suggestions based on the proposed regulation change. (1) He could not see a person coming to the Board to establish the points of how they are going to determine the height of their structure because that would hold up the whole process of designing a building and (2) It seemed like the sentence in parentheses just dropped off and should be completed.

**Mr. Sulkis:** Will review Mr. Grant's suggestions.

**Ms. Harrigan:** For number two, from a drainage perspective she would want to keep it at natural grade. Do not want to suggest that people should be filling or regrading their property. Leave it at natural grade. Do not give them the alternative for structural fill around a foundation.

**Mr. Grant:** Agreed with respect to the residential properties. He was thinking more in terms of commercial properties where there would be structural fill.

**Ms. Harrigan:** This change pertains to the residential section.

**Ms. Cervin:** Commented she was glad to see the illustrations included in this change.

**Chairman Bender:** This will be reviewed next time. Section 2.5.5. Lot Access and Rear Lots. This is a more recent proposed change.



**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD HELD  
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 2012; 7:30 P.M. AT THE  
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET**

**Mr. Sulkis:** Looking to make sure that the creation of rear lots is squarely within the subdivision regulations. Right now it is in two different places; the zoning regulations and the subdivision regulations. In the past someone has wanted to create a rear lot and there are very rigorous standards for those, but the applicant would go to the ZBA to have those standards waived. For example, for a rear lot, no matter what the zone, a full acre is required. In some cases the ZBA has approved something that is significantly less than that.

The proposed change would not allow them to go to the ZBA for that. They would bring that application to the Planning and Zoning Board. If the circumstances exist where the applicant makes the case that the subdivision cannot be that size, the Board has provisions in the Subdivision Regulations to waive those standards.

Also, the wording has been tightened up to make it clear that the access way from the street to the rear lot has to be fee simple, basically part of that rear lot. There have been instances in the past where that was not the case. It is important that these rear lots have their own access way to the street because there must be frontage on a road to have a legal lot, even if it is the minimum 25 feet that is required for the rear lot.

**Mr. Grant:** Asked if it is the intention to delete the existing wording of Section 2.55 and replace it with the language in the proposed text change?

**Mr. Sulkis:** Yes. That would be the new wording in the Zoning Regulations.

**Chairman Bender:** Stated he had a letter sent by Mr. Sulkis to the City Attorney's office on November 25, 2011. He asked if there was ever a response received from them on this proposed change and Prohibited Variances.

**Mr. Sulkis:** We may not have gotten one.

**Chairman Bender:** Would like to see their response before acting on this change.

Section 9.2.3 Prohibited Variances. This also falls under the same letter from the City Attorney's office.

**Mr. Sulkis:** It is on the same sheet and it is broken out separately because it is a number. You cannot go to the ZBA for that kind of a variance. It would be solely up to this Board to make that determination within the Subdivision Regulations.

**Mr. Grant:** In reviewing the other items within that section, they all ended with "Shall not be accepted by the Zoning Board of Appeals". Made the suggestion to add the same wording to this proposed text change.

**Mr. Sulkis:** Looks forward to reviewing what Mr. Grant wrote and to see if it can be used.

**Chairman Bender:** Definition Text Change – First Floor – Crawl Space

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD HELD  
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 2012; 7:30 P.M. AT THE  
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET**

**Mrs. Harrigan:** This regulation clarifies the three stories allowed in a single family residential structure.

Approximately 3-1/2 to 4 years ago the regulations used to allow an exemption for those properties within flood hazard zones, so that the number of stories would actually not start at a "garage" level. Essentially, there would be four story residential structures. There was a very visceral reaction to this new construction because you were tearing down one story beach cottages and putting up four story single family residential structures. One of the ways in which the prior Planning and Zoning Board felt that this could be addressed was to say that the first level (floor), that garage level, is the first story, because that has value. In these neighborhoods that are tightly constrained, where there is very little parking that is available on the lot itself, this was a way in which to provide an enclosed garage parking level, which adds value to the structure. That means, depending on how high your flood zone is, it may mean that you "lose" a story to a garage level and then you have two finished floors above that. Three stories, as allowed by the zoning regulations, and that is all you get.

There has been some questioning in terms of what happens when you have taller than a four-foot crawl space from several potential applicants. Staff has received feedback from those applicants that the regulations are not clear in terms of addressing if you have a "crawl space" that is over five feet, is that the first story? Based on the direction of the prior Planning and Zoning Board, the answer is "yes". Even if you have a six-foot crawl, a seven-foot crawl space. Most people will capture the value of a garage level and make that first elevated level a garage and then you get two stories above that for a maximum of three stories in a residential structure.

The language that is being proposed is to clarify that so that it is known where the first floor begins; what is exempt as a first floor but where it also has to be counted. If something is not a four foot crawl space, that is the first floor. That is what needed to be clarified in the regulations.

**Mr. Grant:** Disagreed. FEMA and the building code have no definitions for first floor. In zoning and designing a building the lowest floor and the basement are already defined as a story. There are three things that are looked at to determine what is a story. A first floor can be called a garage, a basement, a first floor, ground level, etc. It is just a term. It has no bearing on how to figure the stories, because there is the lowest floor and the height and in the case of flood areas, you have the base elevation. His suggestion is to delete the entire term. He drew up a sketch to show how the different terms determine what something is defined. He has additional drawings that tells how to figure what is a first story, basement, crawl space, etc., if the Board wanted to see them.

**Ms. Cervin:** Disagreed with Mr. Grant. Thought anything that could be done to clarify the regulations and help staff deal with some of the issues they are confronted with is something that should be supported.

**Chairman Bender:** Recalls the history of people manipulating this aspect of building a home, especially along the shoreline. Will discuss moving this forward at the next meeting.

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD HELD  
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 2012; 7:30 P.M. AT THE  
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET**

**E. PLAN OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT – UPDATE**

- a. Map Development**
- b. P & Z/Interest Group Follow-up**
- c. Compile Draft Plan**

**Ms. Harrigan:** Map Development - Worked with Meghan and John of the MIS-GIS department in producing excellent draft maps. Working on providing a snapshot of where Milford is with certain types of amenities with regard to the Plan. Draft maps in process: First is Classifications of Open Space. Open Space and Recreation is a big chapter within the POCD. Will be looking at where new parcels can be acquired based on the Mayor's Open Space Advisory Committee and Conservation Commission. The map will target locations as to where to focus for acquiring properties, either adjacent to existing open space properties, or in other desirable locations due to their desirable natural features.

A Recreation Map will be specific in goals that the Recreation Department has given their understanding for the next ten years, i.e. aging population, new sports to be accommodated for playing space.

Map for Housing Units Per Acre: Where are we today based on the census data. How has Milford grown in the last ten years in terms of housing units, population, etc. Quite a few housing units have been added to the Milford Center area over the past ten years. Smith Craft has done a lot of denser development in terms of apartment style living. By looking at this data can determine where the trends in Milford have been changing.

Transit Map: One of the most significant chapters to be discussed is circulation and what are the different modes in terms of getting around the City of Milford connecting into the greater region and the State. It will have the bus stops, the bus routes, the transit routes, the railroad line, highway, street s, sidewalks. Even required to talk about multi-use trails and bike routes throughout the City. Will be working with MIS professionals on this.

**Chairman Bender:** Interest Group Follow-Up. Asked if there was a list of the groups that have had discussions with regard to the new Plan.

Ms. Harrigan will provide that information at the next meeting.

Chairman Bender noted it would be helpful to have such a list as he has had questions from other boards and commissions as to whether they would take part in such discussions.

**Chairman Bender:** Compile a Draft Plan

**Mr. Sulkis:** Still compiling information for a Draft Plan.

**Ms. Cervin:** There will be a public meeting at the Library on February 29<sup>th</sup> that will unveil the Downtown Plan commissioned by Milford Progress (MPI).

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD HELD  
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 2012; 7:30 P.M. AT THE  
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET**

**F. LIAISON REPORTS**

**Mr. Mead:** Attended the Police Commission meeting last week. They voted on some traffic studies that Sgt. Sharoh had followed up on. The Police Chief made a recommendation that in order to move the process along, on routine traffic reports, Sgt. Sharoh could sign off on them, and at the following Police Commission meeting they would vote the approval into their recommendations. This will help Planning and Zoning receive Police Traffic Department responses in a more timely manner.

Chairman Bender: Reviewed the Board Liaisons:

Mr. Casey: Board of Aldermen

Mr. Willis: Inland Wetlands and Harbor Commission

Ms. Cervin: Tree Commission and Conservation Commission

**G. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – (2/7/2012)**

**Mr. Gettinger:** Motion to approve.

**Mr. Casey:** Second.

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

**H. CHAIR'S REPORT**

**Chairman Bender:** There will be a mock application meeting to be held at 6:30 p.m., prior to the regular Board meeting, on Tuesday, March 6<sup>th</sup>.

**Mr. Sulkis:** The Board will receive a plan that had been approved in the past that can be reviewed by the entire Board.

**Chairman Bender:** The plans should be sent to the Board members ahead of time, as is usually done so they will have an idea of what they are looking at.

There was discussion as to whether this meeting would be televised because a quorum of the Board would be attending.

**Ms. Cervin:** Would like to work with Mr. Sulkis on updating the members' Green Book. She knows of things that should be changed. If the Board members have any suggestions after they review the book, please let her know.

Stated that she hopes that funds can be found for the Planning and Zoning Board members to attend a Connecticut Land Use Seminar when one is offered in the near future.

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD HELD  
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 2012; 7:30 P.M. AT THE  
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET**

**Chairman Bender:** Agreed. He will look into how funding can be provided.

**I. STAFF REPORT**

**Mr. Willis:** Motion to adjourn.

**Mr. Rindos:** Second.

All members voted to adjourn the meeting at 8:45 p.m. The next meeting will be held on Tuesday, March 6, 2012.

---

Phyllis Leggett, Board Clerk