

## PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MINUTES FOR ONLINE MEETING HELD TUESDAY 4 MAY 2021, 7:00 PM

The meeting of the Planning and Zoning Board came to order at 7:00p.m.

### A. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AND MOMENT OF SILENCE

### B. ROLL CALL

**Members Present:** N. Austin, J. Castignoli, J. Kader, B. Kaligian, P. Kearney, J. Quish, R. Satti, M. Zahariades

**Not Present:** J. Mortimer, C.S. Moore

**Staff:** Joe Griffith, DPLU Director, David Sulkis, City Planner; Meg Greene, Rec. Sec'y

**Chairman Quish** said the Coastal Area Management Site Plan Review had erroneously been listed on the agenda as a public hearing, when it is actually a site plan review under New Business. He reordered the agenda accordingly.

### C. NEW BUSINESS (*heard as fourth item pending applicant's arrival*)

**VOTE BY JULY 22, 2021**

- 1) **153 Milford Point Road** (Zone R-10) Petition of David Plaskon for a Coastal Area Site Plan Review for a proposed single-family dwelling to replace existing single-family dwelling on Map 6, Block 83, Parcel 6 of which David Plaskon is the owner.

**Mr. Plaskon** said he and his family live in a flood-prone area and wish to mitigate their flood risk. **Mr. Castignoli** asked about the height of the proposed home; a discrepancy was noted between 2 drawings until **Mr. Sulkis** said that in the links provided on the agenda, the correct height was displayed, which was zoning compliant. **Mr. Satti** said his home is nearby and he did not think an ethics issue exists to prevent him from commenting. He discussed the level of the garage relative to the grade of the road and noted a letter from the City Engineer requiring changes; he asked if the owner would accept the changes as a condition of approval.

**Mr. Kader moved to approve with the following modifications** the petition of David Plaskon for a Coastal Area Site Plan Review for a proposed single-family dwelling to replace existing single-family dwelling on Map 6, Block 83, Parcel 6 of which David Plaskon is the owner; Mr. Kader accepted a suggestion to amended by Mr. Sulkis to add the condition of approval discussed.

**Proposed Condition:** Approval should be conditioned on satisfying the concerns of the City Engineer in his letter dated 4/27/2021.

**Second: Ms. Austin** seconded.

**Discussion:** None.

Vote: **Motion carried** with Mss. Austin and Kearney and Messrs. Castignoli, Kader, Kaligian, Quish, and Zahariades voting **with the motion**. Mr. Satti abstained.

### D. PUBLIC HEARINGS

**CLOSE BY APRIL 20, 2021; VOTE BY JUNE 24, 2021**

- 1) **51-53 Roses Mill Road** (Zone SCD) Petition of Raymond Paier, Westcott & Mapes, for Special Permit with Site Plan Review for a proposed mixed-use building to replace former fire damaged building on Map 90, Block 812, Parcel 44 of which 51 Roses Mill, LLC is the owner.

**Mr. Satti** recused himself.

**Attorney Lynch** introduced his client and said the building had been destroyed by fire except for the foundation, which will be reused for the current proposal. He reviewed the zoning of the parcel when it was constructed, noting that it was a mixed-use building. He discussed the lower-level's previous and proposed uses, saying all living spaces would now be above grade with the lower level only being used for parking and storage. He said the first floor is already attracting interested tenants and there will be 12 apartments above. He praised the new aesthetics of the new building. He said because of the site's location in the SCD zone, additional challenges were presented. He said variances were required to allow the property's lot size to be used and the percentage of residential and of the entrance.

**Ray Paier**, Westcott & Mapes, Inc., 142 Temple, New Haven, described the property and its topography. He noted that the current entrance is being retained because it currently has traffic safety features. He said there is room for a drive-through banking kiosk with safe queuing. He said green space buffer had been increased to 2500 sf and that said Wetland approval had been granted. He said the new plan improves water quality and a storm water detention has been added, which met with approval by both the Inland Wetlands Agency and the City Engineer. He said added fire protection had been added.

**Joe Rousseau**, JMR Associates, 215 Research Drive, described his architectural design as the classic New England shingled style generally favored in Milford. He reviewed several features of the building in more detail.

DISCUSSION

**Ms. Kearney** asked about the traffic flow and how many businesses would be on site. **Attorney Lynch** explained traffic flow for a medical practice visitor versus a bank customer visiting the site. He said the same curb cut would exist as had been formerly there. He allowed that the shopping plaza might have more traffic on a weekend, but said the sight lines are clear.

**Chairman Quish** asked for public comment. Hearing none, he closed the hearing and asked for a motion.

**Mr. Castignoli moved to approve as presented** the petition of Raymond Paier, Westcott & Mapes, for Special Permit with Site Plan Review for a proposed mixed-use building to replace former fire damaged building on Map 90, Block 812, Parcel 44 of which 51 Roses Mill, LLC is the owner.

**Second: Ms. Austin** seconded.

**Discussion:** None.

**Vote:** Motion carried unanimously excepting the recusal of Mr. Satti.

- 2) **Proposed Regulation Change #21-1** Proposed by Planning and Zoning Board Regulation Subcommittee for changes to Article 6, Section 6.4.2 Merger Options; to remove the regulation that prevents an owner from developing a second lot, where 2 existing pre-1929 abutting lots have the same owner, and at least one is undersized.

**Mr. Sulkis** explained the operation of the current regulation and how it compares to other towns. He said the impetus was Milford's current practice of "merger by use" where applicants have to prove that no subordinate structure was ever present on the smaller abutting lot, assuming both lots are owned by the same owner. He provided background on other towns, saying that most towns' regulations are silent on the issue.

DISCUSSION

**Mr. Kader** asked about other multiples of ownership. **Mr. Sulkis** said most developers ask for lot line adjustments to create more conforming lots. **Mr. Kader** and **Mr. Sulkis** discussed preexisting nonconforming lots and how zoning changes affect them.

**Chairman Quish** asked for public comment. Hearing none, he closed the hearing and asked for a motion.

**Mr. Kader moved to approve as presented** the petition of Proposed by Planning and Zoning Board Regulation Subcommittee for changes to Article 6, Section 6.4.2 Merger Options; to remove the regulation that prevents an owner from developing a second lot, where 2 existing pre-1929 abutting lots have the same owner, and at least one is undersized. Effective Date: May 21,2021.

**Second: Ms. Austin** seconded.

**Discussion:** None.

**Vote:** Motion carried unanimously.

- 3) **Proposed Regulation Change #21-2** Proposed by Planning and Zoning Board Regulation Subcommittee for changes to Article 5, Section 5.8 Flood Hazard and Flood Damage Protection; to make language consistent with a previous language change.

**Mr. Sulkis** said that a year ago some terminology for flood elevations had been updated, but that a few mentions were missed. This change makes the language consistent throughout.

**Chairman Quish** asked for public comment. Hearing none, he closed the hearing and asked for a motion.

**Mr. Castignoli moved to approve as presented** Proposed by Planning and Zoning Board Regulation Subcommittee for changes to Article 5, Section 5.8 Flood Hazard and Flood Damage Protection; to make language consistent with a previous language change. Effective Date: May 21,2021.

**Second: Ms. Kearney** seconded.

**Discussion:** None.

**Vote:** Motion carried unanimously.

**D. OLD BUSINESS – None**

**E. NEW BUSINESS – None**

**F. LIAISON REPORTS– None**

**G. SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS—**

**Chairman Quish** said a Request For Quote is now available to allow the Plan of Conservation and Development subcommittee to hire a consultant to help guide the POCD process and that a budget is available. **Mr. Satti** asked if a full board vote was needed for approval; **Chairman Quish** said the process was via administrative action. He said the next POCD meeting is on Wednesday 5/12, following by meetings of both subcommittees toward the end of the month.

**H. APPROVAL OF MINUTES—4/6/2021** minutes were approved unanimously.

**I. CHAIR'S REPORT** -None.

**J. STAFF REPORT** - None.

**K. ADJOURNMENT** was at 8:02

Attest:

M.E. Greene

New Business, not on the Agenda, may be brought up by a 2/3's vote of those Members present and voting.

ANY INDIVIDUAL WITH A DISABILITY WHO NEEDS SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THE MEETING SHOULD CONTACT THE DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, (203) 783-3230, FIVE DAYS PRIOR TO THE MEETING, IF POSSIBLE.