



TOWN OF HUDSON

Planning Board



Vincent Russo, Chairman

Rick Maddox, Selectmen Liaison

12 School Street • Hudson, New Hampshire 03051 • Tel: 603-886-6000 • Fax: 603-594-1142

-- FILE COPY --

HUDSON PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES June 13, 2012

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Russo called this Planning Board meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. on Wednesday, June 13, 2012, in the Community Development's Paul Butler meeting room in the Hudson Town Hall basement.

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman Russo asked Ms. Merrill lead the assembly in pledging allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America.

III. ROLL CALL

Chairman Russo asked Secretary van der Veen to call the roll. Those persons present, along with various applicants, representatives, and interested citizens, were as follows:

Members

Present: James Barnes, Glenn Della-Monica, George Hall, Tim Malley, Vincent Russo, Ed van der Veen, and Richard Maddox (Selectmen's Representative).

Members

Absent: None. (All present.)

Alternates

Present: Irene Merrill, Marilyn McGrath, and Jordan Ulery.

Alternates

Absent: Nancy Bruckerman (Selectmen's Representative Alternate).

-- FILE COPY --

Staff

Present: Town Planner John Cashell.

Recorder: J. Bradford Seabury.

IV. SEATING OF ALTERNATES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chairman Russo noted that all regular members were present and that no alternates needed to be seated at this time.

V. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING(S)

Chairman Russo addressed the minutes for the meeting of May 23, 2012, asking if anyone had had a chance to review those minutes.

Mr. Della-Monica requested the following changes:

- Page 6, 1st paragraph, 6th line — He said he did not understand the comment about two stores in one. Recorder Seabury said he had not understood it, either, which was why he had repeated exactly what the representative had said. Mr. Della-Monica said he thought that might have been the case, saying the text should stand as stated.
- Page 7, 1st paragraph, last line — There appeared to be a superfluous semicolon.
- Page 7, 4th paragraph, first line — The text should say it was the tree on the corner where the driveway turned.
- Page 7, 5th paragraph, third line — There should be a sentence after Mr. Ulery's comment, saying Mr. Della-Monica had said he was referring to the two currently occupied buildings, one onsite and one offsite.
- Page 7, 6th paragraph, next-to-last line — It should say that Mr. Della-Monica noted that the morning hours for the medical facility next to the restaurant were the busiest.
- Page 10, 2nd line, 2nd line — "Burger King" was misspelled.

Mr. Barnes requested the following changes:

- Page 6, 6th paragraph, 2nd line — He expressed confusion as to what the speaker had said. Mr. Della-Monica expressed a belief that what was quoted was what had been said. Mr. Barnes then said to leave it as quoted.
- Page 8, 8th paragraph, last line — He noted that Selectman Maddox was quoted as referring to E-991, saying it should be E-911.

No further change requests being brought forward, Mr. Della-Monica moved to accept the 05-13-12 minutes as amended; Mr. Barnes seconded the motion.

VOTE: Chairman Russo called for a verbal vote on the motion. All members present voted in favor, and Chairman Russo declared the motion to have carried (7-0).

VI. CASES REQUESTED FOR DEFERRAL

No cases had been requested for deferral for this meeting.

VII. CORRESPONDENCE

Chairman Russo stated that items of correspondence received in tonight's handouts would be taken up towards the end of the meeting.

VIII. PERFORMANCE SURETIES

No **Performance Sureties** items were addressed this evening.

IX. ZBA INPUT ONLY

No **ZBA Input Only** items were addressed this evening.

X. PUBLIC HEARINGS

No **Public Hearings** items were scheduled for this evening.

XI. OLD BUSINESS/PUBLIC HEARINGS

No **Old Business/Public Hearings** items were addressed this evening.

XII. DESIGN REVIEW PHASE

No **Design Review Phase** items were addressed this evening.

XIII. CONCEPTUAL REVIEW ONLY

**A. 192 Central Street (Don Dumont) Map 176/Lot 019
CSP# 03-12**

Purpose of plan: To allow a three-family dwelling.

Chairman Russo read aloud the published notice, as repeated above.

Town Planner Cashell said he had nothing to add to his staff report.

Mr. Don Dumont, 18 Hilindale Drive, said he had not brought plans, as this was just a conceptual review and he just wanted to get input from the Board. He noted there was nothing on the property at this time, but the issue was that it was commercially zoned and a single-family building was not allowed except by variance.

Ms. McGrath noted that this was an undersize lot, substantially smaller than what was required for a three-family building. Mr. Dumont claimed that zoning did not take the size into consideration and multifamily was allowed. Town Planner Cashell demurred, noting that the Zoning Ordinance required a minimum of 53,530 ft² for multifamily housing, stating that a dimensional variance from the Zoning Board of Adjustment would be needed. Ms. McGrath said the property also did not have sufficient sight distance, noting that the previous building had been taken down because of safety issues and had not been inhabited at that time. Town Planner Cashell said probably a whole slew of variances would be required.

Town Planner Cashell said Mr. Dumont had taken the building down and had not wanted to take care of the legal requirements that would allow him to rebuild a single-family home in the same size, prior to demolition.

Mr. Dumont said he would have had to rebuild on the existing foundation, which also was not usable and had to be removed. Ms. McGrath expressed a belief that it could have been built in the same footprint. Mr. Dumont said he believed he would have had to go for a variance in order to be able to do that. Town Planner Cashell said in all likelihood it could have been worked out, to secure a future use of the property.

Chairman Russo said Mr. Dumont would have needed a variance to rebuild then, and needed a variance today.

Mr. Dumont said his understanding from the letter from Zoning Administrator Oleksak was that a three-family use was a permitted use but a variance was required for a single-family, saying it had been explained to him that same way when the building came down, saying he was not sure he could have negotiated it and did not think so. He said he had looked at it and concluded that a single-family was not allowed, so the less-impact use would be a three-family.

Mr. Barnes said a use variance was needed for a single family or an area variance was needed for a multifamily building. He said the issue for the Planning Board was whether the Board needed a site plan—adding that he would like to see some details

on whether or not all of the required parking could fit onto the lot. He noted that some waivers would be needed, as well, so he felt a site plan was required.

Chairman Russo said the plot plan that had been provided looked pretty much out of scale. Mr. Dumont acknowledged that it was out of scale but said what he had indicated would fit there as far as setbacks. He said there was actually more than 105 feet of frontage, saying this would be revealed if required. He said the proposed square footage was within 100 ft² of the building that had been on the site, which had been about 2800 ft² with a two-bay garage. He said he could actually hold it at 2800 ft² and still have a three-family.

Chairman Russo said he did not see the Planning Board waiving the engineering, because it was such a tight lot.

Selectman Maddox suggested that the Planning Board support Mr. Dumont for going to the ZBA for a variance for a single-family dwelling. He expressed concern about the parking, noting there would be no visitor parking and no turnaround space. He said he also would require a full site plan if Mr. Dumont wanted to put a three-family residence there.

Mr. Hall said this was a lot of record and the applicant had a right to use the property for something, but he could not support a site plan for a three-family house, expanding the density to a three-family, saying he could not imagine how Mr. Dumont would get all that on the lot. He then suggested that Mr. Dumont seek a variance for a single-family home.

Mr. Della-Monica asked what height was being considered. Mr. Dumont said he had not looked at that but it would probably be a two and a half story building, with a half-story out of ground. He said he had looked at about ten different plans of different types. He said his main reason for coming here tonight was that the property was commercially zoned, and the zone was what the zone was. He said he was trying to get the minimal use of the zone that he was entitled to, noting that it had been zoned commercially since 1987. He noted there were other commercial uses in that area—saying he would not want to live in a single-family home there.

Chairman Russo noted that the sense of the Planning Board seemed to be that a three-family home was not the optimal choice. Mr. Dumont said it seemed to him the minimal allowed use. Chairman Russo said Mr. Dumont had a number of choices. Mr. Dumont asked if there were any other suggestions.

Mr. Della-Monica said a duplex would probably require about the same number of hoops to go through. He said he could not really see putting a three-family there, and two would be a push but a lot better than three.

Mr. Ulery said it appeared that access to the former garage had been from the adjoining property. Mr. Dumont demurred, saying it had had its own entrance.

Mr. Ulery noted that the building next door had four families, and the one on the corner had two families. He said the rental was not in the range of \$1,000, so maybe it would not be a bad idea to utilize his property, in view of the need for workplace housing, even to consider the possibility of an apartment building. Chairman Russo

said that was not before the Planning Board but was up to the ZBA, adding that he would not want the applicant to expend the funds if it were too close. Mr. Dumont said it would fit most of the setbacks but not all. Chairman Russo said if it were to be proposed, it should be professional.

Mr. van der Veen said it was a gray area whether it would fit, noting that the drawing that was not to scale did not show if it would fit. He asked if it had natural gas. Mr. Dumont answered in the affirmative, saying it had gas, water, and sewer.

Selectman Maddox said this had been designated as a business zone for a major corridor, but it was a challenge, since this lot had so small a size. He said he thought Mr. Dumont should ask for a single-family and be done. Mr. Dumont said in today's economy he did not see anyone buying adjacent property and combining them, saying people did not do that anymore.

Mr. Dumont said he had been asked to take it down and he had asked at that time what he could put there and had been told it was a commercial zone and he should figure out what would go there. He said it was pretty clear from the Zoning Administrator's letter that a three-family was an allowed use in that zone, while a single-family was not. Chairman Russo said a three-family would be an allowed use by variance; Mr. Dumont said he did not think Mr. Oleksak had pinpointed which variances he needed, but there might be several, but the only real one was the area variance. He then noted that he had gone on the Internet and seen that there were similar cases to this, in his opinion, that applicants had won in court—commenting that Mr. Vigeant had won because the court had ruled that the Town did not have the right to say someone could not have a use within its zone by simply saying it did not have the proper area.

Town Planner Cashell suggested that the consensus of the Planning Board was that Mr. Dumont could consult with legal counsel to determine what he needed to address for zoning issues, adding that the workforce housing statute might allow some allowances. He said it was clear that the Planning Board was not going to go forward for a multifamily without having a site plan.

XIV. NEW BUSINESS/PUBLIC HEARINGS

- A. **New England Solid Surfaces Site Plan** **Map 161/Lot 044**
SP# 04-12 **7 Industrial Drive**

***Purpose of plan:* To propose a 5,000-ft², (foot print) industrial/light manufacturing facility with 2,000 sq. ft. office/storage mezzanine and associated parking and access improvements. Application Acceptance & Hearing.**

Chairman Russo read aloud the published notice, as repeated above.

Town Planner Cashell said the plan was ready for Application Acceptance. Selectman Maddox so moved; Mr. Hall seconded the motion.

VOTE: No further comment being brought forward, Chairman Russo called for a verbal vote on the motion. All members voted in favor, and Chairman Russo declared the motion to have carried unanimously (7–0).

Town Planner Cashell noted he had said that Fire Department representation would be here but there was a little bit of transition going on and their recommendation would be pending at this time.

Mr. Patrick Colburn, of the firm of Keach-Nordstrom Associates, Inc., Bedford, New Hampshire, appeared before the Board as the engineering representative of the property owner, Mr. Dan Preston, who was also present.

He identified the plans mounted on the meeting room wall as follows:

- Existing **Conditions and Removal Plan, New England Solid Surfaces, Map 161/Lot 44, 7 Industrial Drive, Hudson**, prepared by Keith Nordstrom Associates, dated March 26, 2012, with no revisions.
- **Presentation Plan, New England Solid Surfaces, Map 161/Lot 44, 7 Industrial drive, Hudson**, prepared by Keith Nordstrom Associates, dated March 26, 2012, with no revisions.

Mr. Colburn said the existing building was located in the industrial park on Industrial Drive, noting that it was a metal building, used for building countertops, with seven vehicles shown, with a loading dock. He said most of the applicant's work was done through general contactors. He described details of the access and maneuverability, noting the property was served by both municipal water and sewer, with natural gas, with overhead utilities. He said the proposal was for a small expansion, including a mezzanine. He said Mr. Preston was planning on using the building himself, at least initially, using the building for overflow storage of the large molds that he used, with the inside not being set up for usable space at this time.

He noted he had planned for a ten-space parking lot in the gravel area, and access would be just paving the gravel access. He said the main issue was groundwater out back from a steep slope, so the plans took extra precaution in intercepting the groundwater with a cut-off trench and hard piping to move it down to a storm sewer. He said one light pole was being proposed, with landscaping where appropriate. He said he would need four waivers. With the first two being noise and fiscal impact/environmental impact—adding that the noise would be inside, and that he asked for fiscal and environmental impact study waiver on just about every plan. Because the building was only 5,000 ft², saying he needed to add ten spaces, he continued, he was requesting waiver of a traffic analysis, saying this was a very low trip generator. Finally, he was asking for a waiver of green space, which he fought often, as a green island turned into a real maintenance issue.

He then offered to answer any questions.

Chairman Russo opened the meeting for public input and comment, in favor or opposition. No one coming forward to provide input, despite two requests by the

chairman for comment for or against, Chairman Russo declared the matter before the Board and asked if any members of the Board had any questions.

Ms. McGrath asked if the countertops were for commercial or residential use—and if there were any granite used. Mr. Colburn said Mr. Preston mostly did commercial work. Mr. Daniel Preston, the owner, said residential countertop work had dried up some time ago. He described the countertops he made for commercial use, saying they was not granite, but he used a branded material, and he needed storage space—noting that his business was wholesale only.

Ms. McGrath asked if the trailers, one of which seemed to be in the setback, would remain. Both Mr. Colburn and Mr. Preston said the intent was to remove those once the building was up.

Ms. McGrath asked if the blasting note could be limited to Monday through Friday. Mr. Colburn concurred.

Mr. Barnes asked about the disturbed area in the back. Mr. Colburn said he was not cognizant of the amount of area but it would be about 3300 yards. Mr. Barnes asked if it were affected by state requirements with respect to drains. Mr. Colburn said it was not even close. Mr. Barnes asked about a gravel passageway at the back, asking if it were for fire access. Mr. Preston confirmed it was there when he purchased the property. Town Planner Cashell said in all likelihood the Fire Department would require some kind of access to get around to the back of the property. Mr. Barnes asked if the Fire Department would require access behind the new building; Town Planner Cashell said that in all likelihood they would.

Mr. Barnes asked about the driveway shared with Lot 45, asking if there were an easement. Mr. Colburn said there was no formal easement, saying Mr. Preston and the neighbor had a gentleman's agreement—adding that he had a letter that the two had signed, formalizing that gentleman's agreement, but there was no legal document. Chairman Russo asked if it were the intent to get something legal if this site plan were approved. Mr. Colburn said he had so advised Mr. Preston.

Selectman Maddox asked if he had heard that the overflow went out into the street. Mr. Colburn said there was a storm sewer under Industrial Drive, saying the overflow would flow to a catch basin and then through a closed sewer line.

Selectman Maddox questioned how possible subdivision would make sense without having some loading dock connected to the building. Mr. Colburn described the grade conditions, saying the new building would be at grade. Selectman Maddox said he would suggest some kind of small island to show it was not a continuous curbcut.

Mr. Della-Monica said he understood why they had runoff problems with a 30-foot drop-off. He asked if the existing drains had been built adequate for the kinds of rains that had occurred in the past few years. Mr. Colburn described details of the drain layout, saying the groundwater would be captured in the cut-off trench and also by a second underdrain at the bottom of the slope, saying he believed it was adequate.

Chairman Russo asked about two lines on the plan, asking if it were a dock area. Mr. Colburn said the lines represented a grade change (5 feet wide, left to right, with

the access to the right). Chairman Russo asked how a semi-trailer truck would maneuver. Mr. Colburn said he had designed it to accommodate a WV50 (describing it as a 30-foot box on a tractor trailer), saying he had prepared an exhibit. He said these would be quick deliveries, not long term. He showed on the plan how the vehicles would drive on the property. Chairman Russo said he felt it would be very important to have a shared-access agreement.

Mr. Ulery said the loading dock was also just talking about a flat surface.

Selectman Maddox noted there was not room to do that today, as shown on the aerial view. Mr. Colburn concurred, saying the trees behind the building would have to go.

Mr. Ulery noted that the steepest part of the slope was the tree area up toward Clement Road, but the rest was flat. Mr. Colburn demurred, saying it was not flat but that the grade change was shallower.

Chairman Russo asked again about removal of the trailers, as they were shown on the plan. Mr. Preston said that was the intent, but not until the new building was in place. Chairman Russo said the storage trailers should be removed from the plan, as they affected the maneuverability.

Ms. McGrath said it was important for the shared agreement to be formalized, as the gentlemen's agreement would disappear if the adjoining lot were to be sold in the future.

Mr. van der Veen asked about a short black line on the plan, near the street. Mr. Colburn said it was a painted STOP bar.

Selectman Maddox moved to grant the requested waiver: of HTC §275-9 D, *Fiscal Impact Study*, citing the reason for granting this waiver as being because the said study, in addition to the subject CAP Fee and other submitted application materials, was not necessary to evaluate the fiscal impact of this development—and, as such, the granting of this waiver was not contrary to the spirit and intent of the Site Plan regulations.

Mr. Hall seconded the motion.

VOTE: No further comment being brought forward, Chairman Russo called for a verbal vote on the motion. All members voted in favor, and Chairman Russo declared the motion to have carried unanimously (7–0).

Selectman Maddox moved to grant the requested waiver of the requirement of HTC 275-9C, *Noise Study*, citing the reason as granting this waiver as being because such a study was unnecessary, taking into consideration the proposed use was not expected to create noise levels that would violate Town noise ordinances—and, as such, the granting of this waiver was not contrary to the spirit and intent of the Site Plan regulations.

Mr. Hall seconded the motion.

VOTE: No further comment being brought forward, Chairman Russo called for a verbal vote on the motion. All members voted in favor, and Chairman Russo declared the motion to have carried unanimously (7–0).

Selectman Maddox moved to grant the requested waiver of the requirements of HTC 275-9B, *Traffic Study*, citing the reason for granting this waiver as being because this project was expected to create minimal traffic increase within the affected roadway system—and, as such, the granting of this waiver was not contrary to the spirit and intent of the Site Plan regulations.

Mr. Hall seconded the motion.

VOTE: No further comment being brought forward, Chairman Russo called for a verbal vote on the motion. All members voted in favor, and Chairman Russo declared the motion to have carried unanimously (7–0).

Addressing the fourth waiver request, Selectman Maddox said he would rather see some delineation at the end of the lot, rather than have a wide-open curbcut. Mr. Hall said he had the same concern, but he did know if this satisfied it. Mr. Hall then asked about the size requirement. Mr. Colburn referenced Sheet 3, saying it required 440 feet and they had 345. Mr. Hall said that it would be a 5-foot by 30-foot island. Selectman Maddox said he just wanted something to break it up. Mr. Hall suggested a 5-foot wide space by 20-foot long space, adding that he felt it should be referenced in the easement. Mr. Colburn said he would have to talk to his client about that, saying it was restrictive to have a patch in between, saying the maneuverability with respect to the two loading docks would be hindered, and noting that it was an existing condition. Mr. Hall suggested that the Planning Board wait to see what they came up with.

Mr. Della-Monica expressed a belief that, invariably, large sized driveways with any kind of islands presented an invitation for people to hit them, especially in snow conditions, saying drivers saw a big driveway and did not realize there was something there to hit. He said it was a nice idea but they posed a hazard as much as a benefit.

Chairman Russo, noting the reference to curbing, asked if there were any sort of impervious area that could be put in that would withstand harsh conditions. He noted the Board had been shown things that looked green. Mr. Colburn said it was difficult to maintain green in such small spaces, which did not get much water. He noted that the State had gray substances, a very shallow concrete construction, that were mountable and could be driven over.

Mr. Ulery said the purpose of delineation between the two properties was the event of liability, and the existence of something green was only to fulfill the 95 feet that the property was shy of the greenspace requirement if a waiver were not granted. He suggested just using a ribbon, as done at the mall.

Mr. van der Veen said this was a rather difficult corner, that needed that space to bring in customers; if they were willing to share, he said, let them do it.

Town Planner Cashell pointed to the aerial view, suggesting a different area in which they could add green space without disrupting the traffic.

Selectman Maddox said his thinking had been to eliminate the wide open driveway that encouraged turns. He said he had just been looking to see if they could break that area up a bit. He said he was in agreement with the idea of putting something there to show it was not just a wide-open space.

Chairman Russo asked if the Board wanted to wait to see what they came back with. Selectman Maddox demurred, saying they had heard what he had said. Selectman Maddox then moved to grant the requested waiver of the requirements of HTC §275-8.B.31.(a), *Interior Landscaping*, citing the reason for granting this waiver as being because the Site Plan depicted a substantial green area associated with the perimeter of the site, and the waiver involved only 90+/- ft² less green space than required, together with the fact that the proposed onsite landscaping was in scale and in character with that of the abutting properties—and, as such, the granting of this waiver was not contrary to the spirit and intent of the Site Plan regulations.

Mr. Hall seconded the motion.

VOTE: No further comment being brought forward, Chairman Russo called for a verbal vote on the motion. All members voted in favor, and Chairman Russo declared the motion to have carried unanimously (7–0).

Selectman Maddox moved to defer further review of this plan to the meeting of July 25, 2012.

Mr. Hall seconded the motion.

VOTE: No further comment being brought forward, Chairman Russo called for a verbal vote on the motion. All members voted in favor, and Chairman Russo declared the motion to have carried unanimously (7–0).

XV. OTHER BUSINESS

Chairman Russo asked about the correspondence item.

Town Planner Cashell said he wanted to know if the Planning Board agreed with the tone of his draft letter.

Selectman Maddox questioned the joint funding idea, as stated by Town Planner Cashell.

Town Planner Cashell referenced recent discussions held with NRPC personnel, who had also been talking with Selectman Maddox, saying there were willing to help out, such as providing traffic data and analysis of any private data, etc., such as the

work that had been done with respect to the previous Green Meadow development proposal.

Mr. Della-Monica said wording the letter the way it was might increase attendance, as fiscal impact was implied.

Ms. McGrath asked if any interest had been expressed by other members of the public, other than Mr. Monahan. Town Planner Cashell responded in the negative. He noted that Mr. Monahan would be responsible for a certain amount of the traffic, since he owned 250 acres of land.

Selectman Maddox said the area of concern, up to Central Street, was not the area of concern to Mr. Monahan. He questioned if the concept was being expanded too far. Town Planner Cashell asked if he should limit it to Executive Drive. Selectman Maddox said that made sense. Mr. Hall said the road from Wason to Executive had already been done; he suggested stopping at Wason Road.

Mr. van der Veen noted that the distance was only a mile, saying the impact would be much more far-reaching than that.

Mr. Hall noted that he still felt the study should go south to the State line, noting that there were possible impacts on Dracut Road.

Mr. Ulery said the purpose was to set common plan goals for a specific area. He suggested first setting a date and a topic and then inviting the businesses involved, with the formation of this letter being the first step, so that affected businesses could say what they felt was important. He suggested saying the Board wanted an open discussion on a large area, to hear what if the property owners had to say and to see if they were interested in participating.

Mr. Hall suggested that the Board members think about why the Board was doing this. If only to update the corridor study, he said, or to identify what improvements would be needed for the existing corridor—noting that Dracut Road had never been included before—to identify what capacity increases there could be made to generate additional development. He said the Planning Board had spent money to do this in the past, to justify the CAP fee, noting it had been a long time since the corridor studies had been updated. If a developer were going to contribute some of that money, he continued, the Board could do that and increase the CAP fees based on what the improvement were projected to cost. If doing something that was limited to Mr. Monahan's property, he added, he did not know why the Town would be involved in paying for anything.

Mr. Della-Monica said that was an excellent argument, saying it might also broaden the scope of everyone's participation. He said the smaller the study, the fewer people who would be affected by raised CAP fees; if they agreed to expand it, that would result in a larger number of people sharing the impact.

Town Planner Cashell noted the evening peak traffic on Lowell Road was the most congested. If the Planning Board wanted to, it could study that with a long-term projection of widening Lowell Road. He noted that the roadway had been improved south, but development of Mr. Monahan's large acreage meant that this study would

have to come up with solutions to that road study, saying the Board was not going to let the current Level Of Service C and D intersections become Level Of Service F, making the traffic situation worse for the citizens after development of that property.

Mr. Della-Monica said he would love to see a report that said, if the Town wanted to improve traffic up Lowell Road all the way out to Greeley, you could spend the money on projects all over town or just on one big project. He said Lowell Road would be C and D all the way if we had the Circumferential Highway.

Selectman Maddox said the Town did not need a study to show the fact that Lowell Road went down to one lane, adding that the answer clearly was the needed boulevard from Lowell Road to Route 111. He said the Board had a developer that wanted to develop one end of the town, he then suggested that Dracut Road should be added as a corridor. If the Board picked an area, he added, it should be in the newspaper.

Town Planner Cashell asked if the Board wanted to have Mr. Monahan and his representative present to continue the discussion at the 25th.

Selectman Maddox suggested doing it at the second meeting in July.

Town Planner Cashell noted that the shooting range and the Benson Plan also were coming in for the July 25th meeting.

XVI. ADJOURNMENT

All scheduled items having been addressed, Selectman Maddox moved to adjourn; Mr. Della-Monica seconded the motion.

VOTE: Chairman Russo called for a verbal vote on the motion. All members voted in favor.

Chairman Russo then declared the meeting to be adjourned at 8:46 p.m.

Date: July 14, 2012

Vincent Russo, Chairman

J. Bradford Seabury, Recorder

Edward van der Veen, Secretary

These minutes were accepted as amended following review at the 08-01-12 Planning Board meeting.

-- FILE COPY --

**HUDSON PLANNING BOARD Meeting Minutes
June 13, 2012**

Page 14

The following changes were made to the draft copy in accordance with review comments at the Planning Board meeting of 08-01-12:

Page 4, 4th paragraph, last line — At the request of a Board member, changed “an” to “a” so that the phrase reads “a whole slew of variances.”

Page 4, 5th paragraph, last line — Added “prior to demolition” at end of sentence.

Page 8, 8th paragraph, 2nd line — Changed “loops” to “hoops.”

Page 8, last paragraph, next-to-last line — corrected mistyping “word-place” to “work” so that the phrase now reads “the need for workplace housing.”