



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 February 23, 2011

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Russo called this Planning Board meeting to order at 7:03 p.m. on Wednesday, February 23, 2011, in the Community Development meeting room in the Hudson Town Hall basement.

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman Russo asked Mr. Barnes to 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, Ken Massey (Selectmen's Representative Alternate), and Stuart Schneiderman (arrived at 8:05 p.m.).

Alternates

Absent: Jordan Ulery.

Staff

Present: Town Planner John Cashell.

Recorder: J. Bradford Seabury.

Right to Old Business

IV. SEATING OF ALTERNATES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

V. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING(S)

Chairman Russo said he would defer review of the minutes until later in the evening, following the public hearings.

VI. CASES REQUESTED FOR DEFERRAL

No cases had been requested for deferral for this meeting.

VII. CORRESPONDENCE

No items of correspondence were provided for this 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. OLD BUSINESS/PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Fairview Nursing Home LLA
SB# 01-11

Map 216/Lots 1 & 2
203 & 205 Lowell Road

Purpose of plan: Lot Line Adjustment between lots 1 & 2 to facilitate the proposed site plan, also prepared by this office, currently before the Planning Board. Application Acceptance & Hearing.

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

Mr. Tony Basso, of the firm of Keach-Nordstrom Associates, Inc., Bedford, New Hampshire, appearing before the Board as the engineering representative of the property owner, Merrimack Investors, LLC, discussed details of the Lot Line Relocation plan affixed to the meeting room wall, explaining that there currently were roughly two 3.5-acre lots there today and the line would be moved for the purposes of financing and future development to transfer 0.9 acre from Lot 1 to Lot 2, the nursing home lot, so that the lots would still be conforming, with 260 feet of frontage, with Lot 1 having 2.78 acres and Lot 2 having 4.32 acres, so that the lot line would fit around the building. 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 asked if any members of the Board had any questions.

Selectman Maddox asked if this change would not be creating two nonconforming lots, since there would not be any setbacks. Mr. Basso said there was nothing on one lot at this time, and the existing lot line would be going right through the proposed nursing home. He said there were no building issues.

Mr. Hall said he had no reason to vote for or to deny the subdivision, but he could not vote for a site plan on two lots, saying there had to be one site plan for each lot, with each one being reviewed individually. Protesting that Mr. Basso had gone through the whole process indicating that it was to be a site plan on one lot but now, at the last meeting, he wanted to draw a lot line through the middle, he said there were more problems than just buffering and what was being done in the setbacks. He said the Board could discuss the issues now or later, but he had a huge problem with one site plan covering two separate lots.

Mr. Basso said this had come up because the applicants needed separate stand-alone lots in order to get financing for the two projects, adding that the principals were in the process of trying to figure this out—and adding that he had brought this possibility up at the last public hearing. Mr. Hall said he disagreed, as there were plenty of buildings built on other owner's lots with long-term leases. He said the Town was looking at who was responsible for each site, saying the reason for the site plan process was to prevent conflict if the lots in the future belonged to two different parties not having the same goals, and this site plan would add to the conflict. He said there

was no reason not to have two site plans, if there were two lots—noting that one issue was that there were two parking lots bisected by a lot line, which could raise zoning questions. Mr. Basso commented about cross-line easements, saying the ownership issues could be dealt with right at the beginning. He said he agreed that something could happen in the future, but he argued that the same thing could happen with a long-term lease arrangement. Mr. Hall said it was not up to the Town to determine if all the needed easements were right, as the Town only wanted to look for the one person responsible for the land, so that the Town could go to one person who owned the lot.

Selectman Maddox expressed a belief that Mr. Basso had said early in the process that the back lot might be sold off. Mr. Basso said he had *never* said it might be sold off. Selectman Maddox said that was his recollection and he then expressed a belief that Mr. Basso was trying to combine the lots to get the most density but wanted the benefit of having two separate lots. Mr. Basso noted they had made sure that each lot complied on its own, with stand-alone green space and stand-alone parking, saying the issue was the easements and the waiver request for the driveway in the setback—adding that they were not combining the lots for convenience, to meet the requirements of the whole.

Selectman Maddox asked about the parking space; Mr. Basso said the driveway was the reason for the waiver request, saying the parking was outside the setback.

Chairman Russo said the Board would first have to accept the application for the lot line relocation.

Mr. Malley moved to accept the Lot Line adjustment application for the Fairview Nursing Home, Map 216/Lots 1 & 2, 203 Lowell Road, Hudson, New Hampshire.

Mr. Barnes seconded the motion.

VOTE: Chairman Russo then called for a hand vote on the motion to accept the application. All members present voted in favor except for Selectman Maddox, who voted in opposition, and Chairman Russo declared the motion to have carried (6–1).

Mr. Basso suggested deferring action on the lot line relocation until later in the evening and taking up the expansion site plan at this time, to see if they could hear everybody's input and perhaps overcome the issues, so they could know how to proceed.

Chairman Russo asked the Board's pleasure.

Selectman Maddox suggested hearing it as a conceptual, saying until this was decided the other could not be. Chairman Russo said he had been going to suggest a conceptual at this point.

Mr. Hall said the Board had been presuming that the property would be provided as a combined lot with one site plan, and this lot line relocation had been submitted afterwards. He said he had no problem discussing it, noting that it would be up to the

applicant to accept or not to accept the Board's final decision—noting that the site plan had already been accepted and had been pretty well beat to death.

Mr. Barnes expressed a desire to talk about the changes made to the site plan.

Chairman Russo ruled that the Board would set the lot line relocation plan aside at this time and discuss the expansion plan.

**B. Fairview Nursing Home (Expansion)
SP# 04-10**

**Map 216/Lots 1 & 2
203/205 Lowell Road**

Purpose of plan: To construct an expansion to the existing Fairview Nursing Home facility to include 31 additional beds, and a new facility (23,000 square foot footprint). The proposed new facility will consist of a three-story building, which will include 73 units of assisted living and ancillary facility space. Hearing. Deferred Date Specific from the January 26, 2011 Planning Board Meeting.

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

Mr. Tony Basso, of the firm of Keach-Nordstrom Associates, Inc., Bedford, New Hampshire, appearing before the Board as the engineering representative of the property owner, Merrimack Investors, LLC, said the applicant's attorney, Morgan Hollis, had put together a document addressing the concerns that had been raised at the 11-10-10 hearing, and he distributed copies of that document to all Board members. He noted that Atty. Hollis and Mr. Tim Bealieu, the principal applicant, were present, as well as Ms. Heather Monticup, the GPI traffic consultant.

Mr. Basso described the nature off the site plan and its proposed accessways and exits, pointing out details on a copy of the site plan affixed to the meeting room wall, and he then referenced Atty. Hollis's notes.

Mr. Basso identified issue #1 as being concern over the entrance and possible stacking on Lowell Road, saying there was enough room for 13 cars, with a maximum of two cars expected during peak hour traffic conditions.

Mr. Basso identified issue #2 as being concern about northbound drivers on Lowell Road attempting to make a left turn across traffic into the southerly entrance. He stated that drivers could not turn left at that entrance, saying the development would provide NO LEFT TURN signage, making it clear that the traffic had to go in the other direction.

Mr. Basso identified issue #3 as being concern that traffic on Lowell Road was currently so bad that attempts to cross Lowell Road would be a problem. Mr. Basso said the delta island had been enhanced to further promote traffic to have to take a right turn out, adding that they had added a note to the plan requiring the staff, which he stated would be the majority of exiting traffic, to exit via Hampshire Drive.

Mr. Basso identified issue #4 as being a concern about what the Police Chief's position was, and what the accident data for that area was. Mr. Basso said the Police Chief had responded that he was in agreement with Road Agent Burns's letter and also

had provided a list of accidents, which Mr. Basso then listed, noting that all reported accidents were property damage only, with no fatalities.

Mr. Basso identified issue #5 as being concern that the traffic study only pertained to peak hour traffic. Mr. Basso said he had stated that most of the traffic was off-peak, but the reason it had not been studied was that there was considerably less going on on Lowell Road during non-peak times, so that there would be more gap space available.

Mr. Basso identified issue #6 as being concern about total daily traffic for the site during the daily hours. Mr. Basso said the calculations suggested that there would be two additional entering cars and "minus one" exiting cars during the morning peak hour and three entering cars and 12 exiting cars during the evening peak hours—adding that a recent weekday gap study performed on February 17th, a Thursday, during both the morning and evening peak hours, had shown that there were 74 gaps in the traffic stream during the morning peak hour and 111 gaps during the evening peak hour, which were sufficient to accommodate turns in and out on the two driveways for this site. He then discussed the gap created when the nearby traffic light turned red.

Mr. Basso identified issue #7 as being concern about employee traffic, noting that he had already stated that employees would be directed to use the Hampshire Drive exit.

Mr. Basso identified issue #8 as being concern about bottle-necking at the site, itself. He said the access would be widened to 24 feet, with a sidewalk providing pedestrian refuge.

Mr. Basso identified issue #9 as being a suggestion for a specific sign. Mr. Basso said a number of signs had been added to the sign plan, encouraging people to exit via Hampshire Drive.

Mr. Basso identified issue #10 as being a suggestion of making the delta islands sharp enough to restrict turns; he said they had done that.

Mr. Basso identified issue #11 as being concern about the curb cuts on Lowell Road. He said analysis indicated that the driveway would operate at level of service B or better, with less than one vehicle and with an ample number of gaps to accommodate left-turning traffic.

Mr. Basso identified issue #12 as being a suggestion to have a short decel and/or accel lane. Mr. Basso said they had looked at that, finding that creating a taper meant that the accel lane on the other side had to be tapered in the other direction, based on speed limits, which created a confusion at the driveway into the Haffner's service station/car wash, making that location unsafe because some drivers would think that the lane could be a route into Haffner's. Because the traffic did not warrant it, he said, and it would make an unsafe condition, they had felt it better not to do that.

Mr. Basso identified issue #13 as being a suggestion to move the southerly driveway further south. Mr. Basso said they technically could do that, under the NH-DOT guidelines, but they had put it where it was shown on the plan in order to move it away from the Haffner's driveway and provide more weave time, so they were proposing to leave it where it was.

Mr. Basso concluded by saying the plans had been amended to change the things that they could do, and he 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 asked if any members of the Board had any questions.

Selectman Maddox asked about the signage. Mr. Patrick Colburn, of the firm of Keach-Nordstrom Associates, Inc., Bedford, New Hampshire, also present as another engineering representative of the applicant, distributed copies of a sign plan prepared by GPI, dated 02-11-11, with no revisions.

Selectman Maddox referenced the ramp exit at Nottingham Mall, asking if this were the same design. Mr. Basso said he had not compared them, but that a right-in/right-out exit had a specific geometry, according to NH-DOT specifications. He said he wanted to emphasize the major difference, in that these drivers pertaining to this site would be either employees or visiting relatives of long-term residents, saying this was a whole different ballgame from any commercial site.

Heather Monticup, a traffic consultant from GPI, said the access had been necked down to 12 feet, the minimum distance for passenger vehicles, the design vehicles, saying it was closed down as far as it could be and still accommodate the design vehicles coming to this site. Mr. Basso added that the ramp had a very tight radius, saying it was a raised island and it would not be convenient to make the turn.

Selectman Maddox asked about truck loading, asking if there were none at this site. Mr. Basso identified the loading locations, saying the trucks would not be using that Lowell Road access, but instead would use the main entrance off Hampshire Drive.

Selectman Maddox asked why there was a secondary driveway, the southerly driveway. Mr. Basso said it was to create individual identities for each facility, saying they needed their own driveway for that purpose, and the owners felt they needed that in order to market this facility.

Mr. Della-Monica asked if there would be a requirement to enlarge a driveway if trucks needed to get there. Mr. Basso answered in the negative, saying they were proposing a cross-access easement, so that trucks could enter via the main entrance and access the other facility.

Mr. Della-Monica referenced issue #12, saying he agreed that there would be confusion caused by a decal/accel lane, and noting that there was a similar thing on Route 102 for Dunkin Doughnuts, which caused a lot of confusion.

Mr. Barnes referenced the Lowell Road access allowing a left-turn in, asking if the Fire Department equipment could get in. Mr. Basso answered in the affirmative, saying the Fire Department had reviewed the plan.

No other questions being raised, Chairman Russo asked if there were a motion.

Mr. van der Veen expressed a belief that it was hard to proceed with one site plan, asking how it had gotten to this point, if there were an intention to split the two lots.

Town Planner Cashell said he had looked at this as one entity creating dual buildings under one ownership, but the applicant needed the project financed with two mortgages, to stretch out the liability. He said it was a financial issue—acknowledging that the two could be separated in the future, but there would be a site plan showing the two buildings and parking approved by the Planning Board, with cross-access easements. He expressed a belief that the Town would not have to worry about this in the future—adding that he did not find it different from other proposals he had looked at before, and adding that the Green Meadow development probably would have turned out the same way.

Selectman Massey said that, in order to protect the future use of this property, if it was determined to sell one of the facilities in the future, it would have to be in the plan notes that the owners could not make the southerly-most entrance the main entrance to the proposed three-story facility. He said there was a danger, if there were not a note to prohibit that, noting that the Board had already heard tonight that the developers needed that driveway in order to make the facility marketable. He concluded by saying he felt there should be some stipulations to prohibit that southerly driveway from ever being the main entrance to that facility, binding the cross-access easements forever.

Mr. Hall noted that Mr. Cashell had alluded to the fact that the Green Meadows might be similar; he expressed disagreement, saying the Green Meadows plan had been one owner with one plan, but this was already two different owners. He said the site plan process was to prevent conflicts between separate lots, and the Planning Board had to assume that at some time in the future these lots would be owned by separate parties. He noted that the drainage system was split between the two lots, which would mean confusion as to how they would be maintained in the future. He pointed out that the water line for the assisted living development was partly on the other site, and the parking situation was interrelated—adding that the Zoning Ordinance prohibited off-site parking. He asked why the Planning Board would approve a driveway that went down the entire side of the lot. He then expressed a belief that this was the same as what had happened with Bensons, when the Town had wanted to do a business man a favor. If the plans had been presented separately, he argued, the Planning Board would not approve a driveway down the entire sideline setback—saying it would be fine if it were one owner, as originally presented—and he repeated that there were plenty of buildings built on land belonging to someone else, and approving this plan would just create future conflicts. If it had to be two separate facilities, he argued, it should be presented as two separate plans.

Mr. Barnes asked, if the Planning Board approved this and the two facilities subsequently were owned by separate owners and one of them wanted to make a change on one facility, would they have to change the entire site plan? Town Planner Cashell said it would be done by an amendment to the site plan. Mr. Barnes expressed concern that this would mean that the owner of the other lot at that time would have to agree to making that change, saying this was treading into areas that the Planning Board had not trod before. Town Planner Cashell said he did not look at this as any different from approving a condominium project, and he suggested that the Board hear from the applicant's attorney, who was sitting in the audience. He then added that the layout was busy, but this was the site plan that had been developed over the course of

the past year—saying they had originally looked at it as one lot, but the applicant said they could not get financing without doing it this way.

Selectman Maddox said the Board was being asked to give an awful lot of waivers to put buildings on two lots. He suggested that the Planning Board should talk to its own attorney, adding that he agreed that something was needed to ensure the southerly driveway would only be for southbound traffic—adding that he had a problem with two driveways going out onto Lowell Road. He said Mr. Cashell's analogy about condominiums had not been good, as condominiums were all owned by one entity, the association.

Mr. Hall said there were two separate owners today, and they would remain two separate owners in the future, with different names and different addresses, and the Planning Board had to ask itself why it would approve something like this without having two site plans being submitted.

Mr. Malley asked if the Planning Board had ever before forced people to exit via a driveway on another owner's property. Town Planner Cashell said a development had the ability to guide its employees to go a certain way and this would utilize the signaled intersection—adding that the extra driveways were extra for the public's use.

Selectman Massey said there were at least two similar situations in town—one being the cross easements between Hafners, Burger King, and Dunkin Doughnuts allowing an exit onto Flagstone drive, and the other being a cross-easement between Rite-Aid and the T-Bones Restaurant building, where people could enter or exit either way.

Mr. Della-Monica noted that a homeowner had testified at the last meeting that a development had used his driveway as a shared driveway, as forced by the State.

Atty. Morgan Hollis, the legal representative of the applicant, said Mr. Hall's point was well taken, and that what was missing was legal documentation defining the cross-access easement and spelling out the review of the drainage system and the water line, etc. On the other hand, he continued, what was being proposed was not unusual, adding that many communities required coordination between sites that were close to each other, coordinating utilities, best means of access, etc—noting that there were many of these on the Daniel Webster Highway in Nashua, as well as in other communities. He said this was a plan asking for a waiver of buffers and a shared driveway down the lot line, and it was not anything new in his view. He said shared driveways were common elsewhere, and he thought appropriate documentation should be presented to the Board, with the Board being asked whether they would approve with a lot line going down the middle. He referenced the Tully property in Nashua, saying there were various cross-easements between several facilities there, sharing various things between separate lots. He said he would like a chance to provide a document that the Board could then review.

Town Planner Cashell recounted an anecdote of a recent experience in which he had been able to use the Tully access to get around an accident scene on the Daniel Webster Highway. Atty. Hollis said there were several such things further down Daniel Webster, that had existed for years—adding that this was not full access and the document could say so, so that any planned change in the future would have to come

back to the Planning Board. He then concluded by saying the traffic engineer had been consulted on all of the previously listed issues.

Town Planner Cashell noted that, when this Planning Board approved the Rite-Aid development on Lowell Road, it had Atty. Buckley approve the cross-easement documents.

Selectman Maddox said eliminating the southmost driveway on Lowell Road would eliminate the problem, pointing out that it could not be changed if it were not there.

Chairman Russo said one of the issues with the Rite-Aid/T-Bones complex was that there were two existing structures and the desire had been to find a way to make it work—but this was a situation in which there was only one thing already there, and the proposal was to build two large buildings. He said some of the pain was self-inflicted, adding that he for one did not like shared driveways and never had. He noted that the driveway behind Burgher King needed to be repaved, but he did not think anyone knew who owned it, saying this was an issue. He reiterated that much of the problem would go away if the buildings were reduced in size, adding that he was not thrilled with the plan, as he had issues with the number of driveways and the location, as well as the traffic—predicting that people would jump in the morning to bypass the traffic light. He said he would like to see two separate site plans, but he was not going to be a fan of shared driveways.

Mr. Hall said he did not disagree with many of the comments that Atty. Hollis had made, but most of those sites had been done such that from the beginning the Planning Board had known where it was going with the access, but the problem here was that the engineer had developed a site plan for one site but it was now being separated in the ninth hour for financial purposes. He said a lot of things would have been done differently if the Board had known from the beginning that there would be two sites, and it would have been a better product, but the Board was now being asked to accept whatever it could to salvage all the engineering and effort that had been put in. He concluded by expressing a belief that the Board was being asked to jam this into a situation that was not going to result in a good product.

Selectman Maddox referred to the landscaping, saying there were only a couple snow storage locations, and there did not seem to be much landscaping. Mr. Colburn said Sheet 8 of the plan broke it out for Lot 1 and Lot 2, with 31 trees and 191 shrubs for Lot 1 and 17 trees and 140 shrubs for Lot 2.

Selectman Maddox commented that failure to remove the snow would hinder the parking and maneuvering on the property.

Mr. Barnes said one of his major concerns was traffic exiting from this lot, but he was comfortable with the changed design, as he felt it would encourage people to go in the direction the Board wanted them to go. He expressed a desire to see something such as Selectman Massey had suggested, to ensure that the southern driveway would not become the main entrance of the southern lot in the future. He suggested including a visual barrier between the existing building and the lot, to improve it for the residents of the facility.

Chairman Russo asked if each lot stood alone with respect to parking. Mr. Colburn said the required property was only 46 parking spaces, and there were 157 proposed, as what was required according to the code was not acceptable to the applicant because he needed more. Chairman Russo asked if each lot had enough parking for its own facility, saying he was not talking about calculated parking spaces but about what the owner needed. Mr. Basso said they had discussed this with the owner and had shown him what it was—adding that each site stood alone and could do so, and that they were increasing what was there now. Chairman Russo expressed a belief that there were a lot of parking spaces around the assisted living facility, designed to be for overflow from the nursing home/healthcare facility, so he felt the lots would not stand alone. Mr. Basso responded that each lot had its own parking. Chairman Russo said he agreed that the assisted living facility had more than enough parking but he would not agree that the nursing home/health care facility did. Mr. Bealieu said the plan had been designed for future growth, with enough parking that they would not have to come back and add more parking. Chairman Russo expressed a belief that the row of parking spaces on the back side of the assisted living faculty on the plan were not needed, saying this was pushing the green space and maximizing everything. Mr. Basso concurred but said it was within the rules.

Selectman Maddox suggested deferral to consult with the Town Attorney. Town Planner Cashell suggested April 13th as the next hearing date. Selectman Maddox so moved, moving to defer further review of the proposed expansion to the Fairview Nursing Home facility, located at 203/205 Lowell Road, Map 216/Lots 1 & 2, date specific, to the April 13, 2011 Planning Board Meeting. Mr. Della-Monica seconded the motion.

Mr. Barnes said part of what the board would be looking for would be input from the Town Attorney not only with respect to the easements but also to provide guidance—adding that he would like the Town Attorney to review the plan in accordance with HTC §275-6 F, and he then read a portion that he felt applied to this situation, pertaining to shared access between two or more proposed site plans, which said the parcels then would be considered a single parcel of land.

Chairman Russo said his next question would be whether this Board wanted the applicant to be going away thinking that the Board would go forward with a single site plan or if the Board would prefer to see two separate site plans.

Mr. Della-Monica said he would prefer to decide based on what the Town Attorney said. Chairman Russo expressed agreement.

VOTE: 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).

Mr. Barnes asked if the motion also pertained to the lot line change. Chairman Russo said that should be deferred as well. Selectman Maddox then moved to defer further review of the Fairview Nursing Home LLA plan, date specific, to the April 13, 2011, Planning Board meeting; Mr. Della-Monica seconded the motion.

VOTE: 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).

Chairman Russo noted that Mr. Schneiderman, a nonvoting alternate, had arrived at 8:05 p.m.

V. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING(S)

Chairman Russo referenced the minutes for the February 9, 2011, meeting.

Mr. Della-Monica referenced Page 3, down toward the bottom, noting that the text gave two names for moving a motion, saying he felt one was the mover and the other was the seconder.

Mr. Della-Monica then referenced Page 7, fourth paragraph from bottom, in which he had been speaking to his motion, saying the text should say “disproportional” distance.

No other change requests being brought forward, Mr. Della-Monica moved to approve as amended; Mr. Hall seconded the motion.

VOTE: Chairman Russo called for a verbal vote on the motion. All members voted in favor except for Mr. Barnes who abstained because he had not been present at that meeting, and Chairman Russo declared the motion to have carried unanimously (6–0–1).

XI. DESIGN REVIEW PHASE

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

XII. NEW BUSINESS/PUBLIC HEARINGS

No **New Business** items were addressed this evening.

XIII. CONCEPTUAL REVIEW ONLY

No **Conceptual Review Only** items were addressed this evening.

XIV. OTHER BUSINESS

Selectman Maddox reported that the Board of Selectmen had felt that holding a CIP this year would be an exercise in futility, so it would be put off to next year. He then suggested that there be a workshop or two looking for a better procedure. Mr. Hall said

-- FILE COPY --

he thought the existing process was good, saying the problem was that everyone got hung up on the numbers, which did not mean anything.

Selectman Massey said he strongly believed that Town and School projects should be separate from the sewer and water projects, which were self-funded and should have their own priorities and should have their own scoring systems. Mr. Hall said there was another category that should be separate—the roads, which no one paid for, so they always came out as Number 1 on the rating.

XV. 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 8:45 p.m.

Date: May 9, 2011

Vincent Russo, Chairman

J. Bradford Seabury, Recorder

Edward van der Veen, Secretary

These minutes were accepted as amended following review at the 03-02-11 Planning Board meeting.

-- FILE COPY --

**HUDSON PLANNING BOARD Meeting Minutes
February 23, 2011**

Page 14

The following changes were made in accordance with the Board's review of these minutes at its March 2, 2011, meeting:

Page 1 title block — The applicable date was added between the month and year designations.

Page 6, 4th paragraph from bottom, 1st line — Corrected typographic error to spell "decal" correctly, so that the phrase now reads "to have a short decel and/or accel lane"