

**MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD HELD
TUESDAY, JULY 5, 2011; 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

The Chair called to order the July 5, 2011 meeting of the Planning and Zoning Board at 7:30 p.m.

A. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

B. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Victor Ferrante, Edward Mead, Mark Bender, Janet Golden, KathyLynn Patterson, George Gasper, Robert Dickman, Kevin Liddy.

Not Present: Gregory Vetter

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

C. PUBLIC HEARING – Closed 6/21/11; Expires 9/15/2011

1. **42 WESTMOOR ROAD – (ZONE R-12.5)** Petition of Christopher Field for a Special Permit and Coastal Site Plan Review to construct a single family residence with re-grading in a flood zone on Map 30, Block 644, Parcel 7, of which Field and Son Builders, LLC is the owner.

The Chair commented as follows:

The Board received two letters in their packet that were received prior to the close of the public hearing on 6/21; one from Wayne Reed and Leyla Rigetti.

The public comments, as well as the Board's comments were noted as follows:

1. Concern regarding damage to the wetlands.
2. Drainage, mostly on the street and additional property flooding.
3. Species that were on or may be on that site or around the wetlands.
4. Need for open space.
5. Economic and property ownership.
6. Possibility of larger development.

Some of these issues the Board cannot do anything about.

The reason for the Special Permit is due to re-grading in the flood plain. If the re-grading was not taking place it would be a CAM Site Plan Review for the Board.

Reviewed the packet of information that were in the file that were mentioned by Mr. Codespoti during his presentation, that were in the file, but were not distributed to the Board members.

**MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD HELD
TUESDAY, JULY 5, 2011; 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

Ms. Harrigan: Reviewed the information that was mentioned by Mr. Codespoti in his presentation. Not all the information was received by the Board members at that time so they were sent in the Board's packet.

1. Wetlands approval as well as the review that was conducted regarding the Natural Diversity Data Base Maps and potential endangered species for this area.
2. Comments from Engineering
3. The Soils Report
4. Comments from Public Works.

Mme. Chair: Asked for clarification that this site is not in the wetlands.

Mrs. Harrigan: There are no flagged wetlands on this site, although it is within the wetlands review area and that is why Inland Wetlands reviewed and approved it.

Mme. Chair: An issue in the area is drainage as well as street and property flooding. The applicant's representative discussed what they are doing on site and there is discussion regarding the roadway. Is that correct?

Mrs. Harrigan: That is correct. She discussed with the City Engineer the existing drainage infrastructure in the roadway and that is entirely within the purview of Public Works in terms of maintenance and potential enlargement if they felt like that needed to occur. That is outside the scope of this particular application. It falls under the jurisdiction of the Public Works Department, as it is within the right-of way.

Mme. Chair: Getting emergency vehicles to the property by the Fire Department was brought up by Mr. Liddy as well as the public.

Mrs. Harrigan: That is correct. She had discussed at the public hearing that conversations were held with the Fire Department and correspondence with them internally regarding what they felt in terms of the potential for flooding and whether it was safe to get an emergency vehicle down the road, should the road be extended. Although she could not locate the memo in time to include it in the Board's mailing, but she could attest to the fact that they were comfortable with the construction of the road given how deep they expected the flooding to occur, given the projections based on the flood maps.

Mr. Liddy: Noted that Mr. Codespoti had said there could be flooding in front of the house approximately 20 x30 feet. Depth could be anywhere from 1 to 2 feet. The fire department might get down there but what about an ambulance or the police department? Asked if those emergencies had been addressed.

Mrs. Harrigan: Police and ambulance were not included in the review, but the fire department felt comfortable with the proposed design of the roadway and what that meant in terms of potential depths of water.

**MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD HELD
TUESDAY, JULY 5, 2011; 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

Mr. Liddy: Thought the Police Department and medical by way of the fire department should be included in the review.

He gave hypothetical situations of what could occur on that property in the event of different emergencies.

Mr. Ferrante: Recalled that the applicant agreed to a pervious driveway. The installation of a pervious driveway would not add to flooding in this area.

Mme. Chair: Believes the pervious driveway could be a condition of approval.

Stated she read Section 7.2.3.3. This is her district and she does not live far from the location. Given the applicant owns this piece of property; that it has gone through Inland-Wetlands, engineering, Department of Public Works, it is hard to find a strong enough foundation to go for a denial, although she would like to keep the area as open space.

The issues were reviewed to make sure in her own mind they were covered adequately and have addressed the concerns appropriately. Maintaining the open space and maintaining the health of the wetlands is part of the City's Plan of Conservation and it is what the Board does all the time.

With regard to open space, there was a map displayed at the public hearing that showed this site and the City owned property that should be reviewed.

Mrs. Harrigan: The map goes back to the time that the Board reviewed whether or not to recommend sale of the City of Milford parcel that is sandwiched next to this one. At that time the City Planner reviewed this at the request of the Mayor's office and had made a recommendation that not only some of the street network that is within (showed in Orange) be abandoned, but also the currently owned Milford parcels outside of the one parcel on the west side of Westmoor Road all be designated as permanent open space, so that could become one big open space in perpetuity chunk of land.

Mr. Dickman: Agreed with the Chair. For a lot that is zoned 12.5 and has been certified as a building lot, it is too far of a stretch to deny the approval of this application based on the issues raised by the residents.

The map showing the property lots that were City right-of-ways was discussed.

Mrs. Harrigan: Stated it was her understanding that the Board of Aldermen has already initiated the process to abandon those roadways, so they could then, in conjunction with the other City of Milford parcels be permanently zoned as open space. That would come before the Board as well as that would require a zoning map change.

**MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD HELD
TUESDAY, JULY 5, 2011; 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

Mrs. Patterson: Concerned about the safety aspect of emergency vehicles accessing the property. In such cases time is of the essence.

Mr. Mead: Has been bothered by the proposed extension of the road which stops right in the middle of the proposed property where the house will be built. If the reason why they cannot extend it any further is because of the flagged wetland area, if a fire truck come down and the road is stopped right in front of the house, getting the apparatus to the house will be hampered.

Mr. Bender: Motion to deny the Petition of Christopher Field for a Special Permit and Coastal Site Plan Review to construct a single family residence with re-grading in a flood zone on Map 30, Block 644, Parcel 7, of which Field and Son Builders, LLC is the owner.

Mrs. Patterson: Second.

In favor of denial: Mead, Bender, Patterson, Gasper, Liddy

Opposed: Dickman, Shaw, Ferrante; **Abstain:** Golden

The motion passed. The application was denied.

D. PUBLIC HEARING – Closed 6/21/11; Expires 9/30/2011

2. 1201 BOSTON POST ROAD – CONNECTICUT POST MALL (ZONE SCD)

Petition of John W. Knuff, Esq. for a text change in the Zoning Regulations to allow health clubs in the Shopping Center Design District (SCD Zone).

Amendment to a Special Permit and Site Plan Review, to construct a 41,000 sf health club, (LA Fitness Center) located on Maps 78, 79, 89; Blocks 811, 812; Parcels 40A/A; 40C, 13A, of which The Connecticut Post Limited Partnership is the owner.

Mme. Shaw: The first vote will be for the text change. A majority vote is required for a text change. If that passes the Special Permit Amendment and Site Plan Review will be voted upon.

Mr. Bender: Watched the DVD of the meeting. Asked if LA Fitness would be exclusive to the shopping center and would no other fitness centers be allowed.

Mrs. Harrigan: It would be exclusive to them. She explained that within the Shopping Center Design District there are a series of allowed uses and they would be adding this as one of the allowed uses. It would open up to being a use conducted in Milford Crossing, the shopping center next door. However, the way it would get reviewed, if it were to be proposed at Milford Crossing, would require a full evaluation of parking, whereas, because this is a shopping center, the parking is all inclusive to the square footage. So, it is the entire shopping center as defined by the zoning regulations within

**MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD HELD
TUESDAY, JULY 5, 2011; 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

the definition that it has to have two anchor stores of at least 100,000 SF, in an enclosed mall, that only those shopping centers can be calculated at a 1 per 250 SF ratio. So, this would allow health clubs within that envelope of the shopping center/mall.

Mr. Bender: Said his concern was that LA Fitness would have a monopoly in the Connecticut Post Mall and no other health club could go there.

Mrs. Harrigan: At the Mall, yes.

Mr. Ferrante: Westfield is the landlord. They control who their tenants are.

Mr. Bender: Stated his concern was that the change in the text of the zoning regulation would assist in allowing a monopolization of a type of business within the mall.

Mr. Liddy: Did not think the zone text change should be limited to 41,000 SF.

Mme. Chair: Referred to the wording of the proposed text change.

Mrs. Harrigan read under Tab 2 of the information submitted by the applicant:

“Section 3.9.2.17: Health centers or clubs provided that the maximum gross building area devoted to such health center or club use shall not exceed 41,000 square feet.”

Mme. Chair: What the Board is approving is a text change that will allow in the mall a fitness center, whether it be LA Fitness or anyone else.

Mrs. Harrigan: Up to 41,000 SF.

Mr. Liddy: Did not feel the square footage should be limited to 41,000 SF.

Mr. Ferrante: Thought the square footage was established based on the parking for the mall.

Mrs. Harrigan: Attorney Knuff suggested adding a cap would make the Board more comfortable in terms of realizing there is one fitness center and health clubs generate quite a bit of parking use. The change was made by the applicant. If Milford Crossing comes in with an application for a gym that is 60,000 SF, they can come before the Board with a text change as well.

Mrs. Patterson: Questioned the need for a zoning text change. Why not a Special Permit so the Board can maintain control of what the usage will be and the mall cannot monopolize one company.

Mme. Chair: This was brought up at the last meeting, as a Special Exception, which might or might not give the Board more control. However, it would alter the parking calculations, because a Special Exception would be by use. As Ms. Harrigan

**MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD HELD
TUESDAY, JULY 5, 2011; 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

explained, it is a more intensive use. Under the text change it would be just part of the mall, so the calculation of the parking would be for the total mall.

Mrs. Harrigan: Agreed.

Mr. Bender: Stated he was all for the use of a health club in the mall, but had concerns about the traffic and parking use it would generate.

Mrs. Harrigan: The mall is parked one space for every gross 250 SF of floor area. That is all inclusive of all the uses at the mall, whether they be restaurants, retail and if this gets added, it would include fitness centers. Each use does not get pulled out and calculated at its own separate ratio, because there is an understanding at a shopping center that there is a shared parking supply that is utilized at different time periods for the different demands and needs of those different uses.

Mrs. Patterson: Asked if the application could be approved without a text change?

Mrs. Harrigan: That is the application that was submitted.

Mr. Mead: Did a calculation of the parking and including the common space of 240,000 SF, it allowed over 900 spaces that would be dedicated to the fitness center.

Mrs. Golden: Wouldn't the Connecticut Post Mall know how many people they could accommodate by adding LA Fitness as its tenant? She thinks the only time there would be a parking problem would be around Christmas time. In favor of having a fitness center there.

Mrs. Patterson: Asked if this could be approved without a text change.

Mrs. Harrigan: Not presently, as they have only applied with a text change.

Mr. Mead: At the public hearing, the attorney said the mall has 5388 spaces and they have a waiver for 394 spaces and it is 4 spaces per 1000 SF. He mentioned there are 240,000 SF of common area that is not retail or for restaurants. Based on that 240,000 SF of common area, that is 998 parking spaces. If this building of 40,000 SF was stand alone, they would need 820 parking spaces. Also, the fact that people visit the mall for multiple purposes, but only use one parking space.

Mr. Ferrante: Asked if this would have an effect on other fitness clubs in the City.

Mrs. Harrigan: There is a different analysis of the site concerns for fitness centers that are not in the mall. Their parking requirement is 1 parking space per 50 SF, but the mall has parking that is more fluid because it is a shared facility, having many uses under one parking supply available.

Mme. Chair: Asked the Board for a motion.

**MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD HELD
TUESDAY, JULY 5, 2011; 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

Mr. Dickman: Motion to approve the petition of John W. Knuff, Esq. for a text change in the Zoning Regulations to allow health clubs in the Shopping Center Design District (SCD Zone).

Mr. Dickman was asked to read the wording of the proposed text change.

Mr. Dickman removed and restated his motion: To approve the petition of John W. Knuff, Esq. for a text change in the Zoning Regulations to allow health clubs in the Shopping Center Design District (SCD Zone): 3.9.2.17: Health centers or clubs provided that the maximum gross building area devoted to such health center or club use shall not exceed 41,000 square feet.

Mrs. Golden: Second.

Eight member voted in favor. Mrs. Patterson opposed. The motion passed.

Mme. Chair: Next is the application for an Amendment to the Special Permit and Site Plan Review to construct the health club.

Mr. Bender: Asked if a parking waiver was requested.

Mrs. Harrigan: When the mall did their big expansion they were recalculated at that time to include all of their square footage. At that time when they did the expansion they asked for the waiver based on the total square footage. Now, since that regulation has been approved, the whole mall is one space per 250 SF. No need to ask for any waivers.

Mr. Liddy: Motion to approve the application for an Amendment to a Special Permit and Site Plan Review, to construct a 41,000 sf health club, (LA Fitness Center) located on Maps 78, 79, 89; Blocks 811, 812; Parcels 40A/A; 40C, 13A, of which The Connecticut Post Limited Partnership is the owner.

Mrs. Patterson: Second.

All members voted in favor. The motion passed.

E. PUBLIC HEARING LEFT OPEN – Closes by 7/26/2011; Expires 9/30/2011

3. **128 MONROE STREET - (ZONE R-7.5)** Petition of Keith Aragi for approval of a three-lot subdivision on Map 20, Block 259, Parcel 4, of which HB Enterprises, Inc. is the owner.

Abigail Adams, RLA, CCA Engineering, Brookfield CT, representing HB Enterprises for a three lot subdivision. New plan was submitted responding to the Milford Police Department's report concerning proposed driveway on Lot #3. The architecture was adjusted to add a one-car garage on the northerly side which allowed the driveway to be

**MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD HELD
TUESDAY, JULY 5, 2011; 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

aligned with the Monroe Street cut through. The entire plan was resubmitted to the Police Department and have received an Addendum Report from Sgt. Sharoh which states that the previous concern of the two prior reviews has been alleviated and a favorable decision may be considered.

Installing pervious pavement for the driveways was mentioned at the last meeting. Although it was not included in the plan, the applicant is happy to do that as a condition of approval.

Mme. Chair: Anyone to speak in favor of the application. (No response) Anyone to speak in opposition? (No response).

The public hearing was closed.

Mr. Ferrante: Moved to approve the petition of Keith Aragi for approval of a three-lot subdivision on Map 20, Block 259, Parcel 4, of which HB Enterprises, Inc. is the owner, with the stipulation that the driveway areas be of a pervious material.

Mr. Liddy: Second.

All members voted in favor. The motion passed.

F. PROPOSED TEXT REGULATION CHANGE - Discussion

Section 2.5.5 Lot Access and Rear Lots

Mme. Chair: The Board has had this to review for the several weeks. There are two options: One was to firm up the language so that if consideration of rear lots came before this board, there was clarification on the issue of fee simple. The second option given in the memo that the Board received is to deny rear lots in its entirety.

Stated the basic question or feeling she would like from the Board is how it feels about rear lots. The Board hears a lot about density. Question is does the Board want to have them anymore. Milford is a built environment. Things are different than they were 20 years ago. The Board could deny the use of rear lots entirely.

Mr. Bender: In favor of getting rid of rear lots if the Board can.

Mme. Chair: Agreed.

Mr. Dickman: Stated he was opposed to denying the creation of rear lots in their entirety.

Mme. Chair: The memo prepared on June 13th, addresses an issue that has come up with the Board where rear lots have been approved with a waiver of less than an acre, which is a requirement for a rear lot. This has caused some concern to the Board.

**MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD HELD
TUESDAY, JULY 5, 2011; 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

There is suggested language in the memo that puts it in the Board's hands as to whether they want to do change the regulation. Asked if there was any question about this language, they could move forward on it tonight.

Because this would be a regulation change, it would go through the City Attorney's office and go through a process that would end up as a public hearing.

Mr. Ferrante: Had been in favor of rear lots. Now recalls all the rear lots he likes were on greater acreage than one acre, where one does not notice the closeness of the house in the backyard. He noticed when driving in an area of Stratford there were some rear lots that were right in back of the other houses. The second option on the memo is written that ZBA approval cannot be obtained. He asked if the parcel had to be at least an acre.

Mrs. Harrigan: That is not the way the regulations currently read. The rear lot has to be an acre exclusive of any access to it. They are called "flag lots". The flag portion has to be an acre. The flagpole is outside of that acre. What has been seen is a couple of approvals before the ZBA where the ZBA has approved lots smaller than an acre in the back. It depends on the situation, but when you have a lot in the front that is perhaps 12,500 SF and a rear lot that was supposed to be an acre, but is now smaller than an acre, it becomes difficult because the front yard blends into a backyard and you do not have the kind of anticipated privacy that rear lots tend to provide a vision of.

Mr. Liddy: The district that he represents has a lot of beach land. There are a lot of large homes along the beach that have smaller cottages between the big homes and the street and people live in the cottages. Asked if those would be considered rear lots along the beach.

Mrs. Harrigan: Most of those were subdivided before the City's regulations went into place.

Mr. Mead: Commented when he was on the ZBA Board they had a rear lot near Calf Pen Meadow School. They came for a variance for the width of the driveway. It was a shared driveway in front of the house and they were going to extend the driveway to the back and it was not 25 feet to begin with. It ended up that they had to cut part of the front yard of the existing house in order to make a driveway at least wide enough for two cars to get through. As long as there is a stipulation that the driveway has to be a minimum of 25 feet, with no variances applied to it through the ZBA Board, that could be one stipulation that could be incorporated into the language.

Mrs. Harrigan: The larger question is: Do you [the Board] decided you want rear lots or do you decide you do not want rear lots. If you do want rear lots, how do you want rear lots? Do you not want to allow them in the smaller zones? Do you want to allow them only in the larger zones? Do you want to make rear lots two acres? So there is a lot of flexibility. This is a good thing to think about with the Plan of Conservation and Development. Think about the neighborhoods. Think about where there are rear lots.

**MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD HELD
TUESDAY, JULY 5, 2011; 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

What works? What doesn't work. What do you want to exclude from becoming rear lots? If you want to see more of them, what do you want to see? It is a large question. From a zoning enforcement perspective, rear lots are troublesome in a very compact city. There are a lot of private property issues, but there are a lot of calls and complaints, people who are in rear lots who just have no privacy, because it may be a rear lot that is an acre, but it butts up to lots that are 12,500 SF. Maybe they have 30 feet to a property line and then another 20 feet to their house and it just isn't enough.

Mr. Bender: Asked how this change would apply to rear lots on paper streets.

Mrs. Harrigan: Thought the paper street would have to be developed at that point in order to allow it. For example, Westmoor Road. That was a paper road until they proposed to expand it. So, if a house were to go there, they would actually have to have street frontage.

Mr. Dickman: Remembered in a past meeting this year, the Board was discussing paper streets with Mr. Sulkis, he emphatically stressed that they were streets. Not that they did not exist, or they weren't paved, but that they were not "paper" streets; they were streets. He thought that would cover what Mr. Bender was asking.

Mr. Mead: Mr. Sulkis had said that before the change would be made on rear lots, there were two applications to be brought before the Board that were on rear lots. He inquired about them.

Mrs. Harrigan: Responded it was not appropriate to discuss the applications before they come before the Board. Noted those two applications would not be affected by the proposed regulation today.

Mr. Ferrante: Recalled he [Mr. Sulkis] did not say they were rear lot, it was said that they were subdivision applications and they would not be affected.

Mrs. Harrigan: They are subdivision applications with rear lots.

Mme. Chair: Asked for a consensus of opinion from the Board on this matter of rear lots.

Asked for a show of the members who would want to deny rear lots in their entirety.

Mr. Bender: Rethought what he had said previously about doing away with rear lots entirely and felt it should be conditional upon certain criteria.

Mr. Ferrante: Thought what this is all about is if someone has 12 acres in any zone, or in a one acre zone, they may look for rear lots and the staff is telling the Board that one acre lots, a subdivision of one acre lots, is not something that lends itself to rear lots. He does not think that anyone is being deprived of developing twelve acres. He thinks when they sell these 12 acres, if there are any left, that the sales price factors in how

**MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD HELD
TUESDAY, JULY 5, 2011; 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

many lots the developer can get, so the developer will not be deprived. He will know he cannot put in a rear lot.

Mr. Bender: Said he did not literally mean 12 acres, but more to limiting small properties to not having rear lots.

Mr. Dickman: Expanded upon his original comment blanketly opposing the forbiddance of rear lots. The Board requesting or changing the text of the regulation to require the discretion of the Board is reasonable and appropriate. He thinks that a blanket elimination of the approval of rear lots is ham handed. That is where he stands on this issue. He is generally opposed to over-regulating, but he thinks it is reasonable to allow rear lots with the requirement that those requests are brought before this Board.

Mrs. Patterson: Agreed totally with Mr. Dickman. It is something the Board should look at and it should be prohibited until it is approved by the Board.

Mr. Liddy: ZBA holds hearings on hardships for land use, such as Mr. Mead brought up with regard to the driveway not being wide enough. It would seem that a rear lot that has a problem would have to go to the ZBA if it was a hardship and fitting within the Board's regulations. For example, if the requirement is one acre and a .95 acre hardship is brought to the ZBA, and the ZBA may feel they cannot make that decision is taken out of their hands.

Mme. Shaw: The ZBA is addressed in the changes included in the memo under 2.5.5. It prohibits variances, etc.

Asked if Mr. Bender was suggesting rear lots not be allowed in certain zones.

Mr. Bender: Possibly, but as Mrs. Harrigan noted there are so many options and could the Board pare down the qualifications enough, or should all rear lots come before the Board. Does not know if it can be cut and dry.

Mrs. Harrigan: Generally, if it will be a subdivided piece of property and it is not a first cut, it would come before the Board anyway, as a subdivision. The question is whether or not there are waivers available to that. She thinks the first rule of zoning is you do not create nonconformities. You deal with the nonconformities that you have, but to create nonconformities is problematic. Thinks with any rear lot if the Board is going to stick with them it will have to decide if you are comfortable with the fact that the rear lots are not problematic in the future in terms of the access to them, etc.

Mr. Liddy: What is an ideal rear lot situation, in order to establish a standard?

Mrs. Harrigan: In a multi-acre neighborhood, usually rear lots are bigger than what the minimal requirement is for a front lot. In the more dense neighborhoods there is not enough buffer to have somebody living behind you. If you want to keep rear lots in certain zones you can increase the acreage requirement.

**MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD HELD
TUESDAY, JULY 5, 2011; 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

Mr. Mead. Noted some houses on Rose's Mill Road with two houses in the front and two in the back. Asked if those were one acre lots.

Mrs. Harrigan: They are one acre lots that are wide as opposed to deep. They are misleading because they go right to the bank and their lot lines may extend into the water and that would be part of the one acre.

Mr. Bender: Asked Mrs. Harrigan to put on paper what she was relating to the Board on this issue.

Mme. Chair: Thought this would be helpful to narrow the uses of rear lots, perhaps as an option. Would like to narrow the parameters as to what is allowable. The sense is that on bigger properties where there is not a subdivision, the Board may be open to having rear lots, but in denser areas it may pose a problem.

Mr. Ferrante: Asked if the Board could get an indication as to whether it is opposed to rear lots in anything smaller than an acre front or rear. There are additional factors that enter into it as well.

G. BOARD MEMBERS GREEN GUIDELINE BOOK AND BYLAWS

There was no update. The next subcommittee meeting is scheduled for August 2nd.

H. PLAN OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Mme. Chair: Milford Progress, Inc. had a meeting with Alan Platus, who has been retained by Milford Progress (Chamber) as well as the P&Z Board to work on the POCD. She attending the meeting on 6/28. Discussed sustainability, walkability, looking at downtown as having the access to the railroad station and doing more for transit oriented development. Pointed out obstacles to walking, which include people who live in the downtown area, as well as people trying to get to the train station. Looking for better connections between the harbor and the town and the town and the train and the connections by walking, bike path, signage. Believe the City will be able to stimulate development by leveraging Milford as a transit hub.

The Yale focus is on the south side of the Green (Harrison's). The north side which is the train station. The future development of the courthouse. Parking for the train and the post office. Also looking at Fowler Field and Wilcox Park and the advisability of any future development at those sites. Also looking at the Cherry Street corridor, which the Board is working on as well. That area includes the old cinemas property and what the property could be used for; i.e, multi-use such as density house and retail on the bottom. Easy access to the Merritt and I-95, and within walking distance to the train station.

They made some points that were made in the previous Yale study that was done in

**MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD HELD
TUESDAY, JULY 5, 2011; 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

2002, such as under- utilized parking areas in downtown. In addition, working with economic development on the idea of a municipal development plan. The Chair will type up these notes. There will be another meeting of the MPI in a month.

Mrs. Harrigan: No update as yet. In the process of compiling the sixth grade project. She will email it out when it is ready.

I. LIAISON REPORTS – None.

J. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – (6/21/2011)

Mrs. Patterson: Motion to approve.

Mrs. Golden: Second.

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

K. CHAIR’S REPORT

The Board has received a communication from Matthew Woods, the City’s trial counselor. The appeal was denied and the decision by the Planning and Zoning Board was upheld.

L. STAFF REPORT – None.

Mr. Liddy: Told the Chair that he found it amazing that a member of her party is violating the zoning laws by having his signs up way before the official start of 90 days before the election. Feels that the zoning enforcement officer should aggressively pursue the removal of all these signs throughout the City as they are a blight on society.

The Chair thanked Mr. Liddy for his comment.

Mrs. Patterson: Motion to adjourn.

Mrs. Golden: Second.

The Board voted to adjourn the meeting at 8:51 p.m. The next meeting will be held on July 19, 2011.

Phyllis Leggett, Board Clerk

**MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD HELD
TUESDAY, JULY 5, 2011; 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**