

-- FILE COPY --

**HUDSON PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
June 6, 2007**

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Barnes called this Planning Board meeting to order at 7:07 p.m. on Wednesday, June 6, 2007, in the Community Development meeting room in the Hudson Town Hall basement.

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman Barnes asked Mr. Hall to lead the assembly in pledging allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America.

III. ROLL CALL

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

Members

Present: James Barnes, George Hall, Marilyn McGrath, Vincent Russo, and Richard Maddox (Selectmen's Representative) .

Members

Absent: Suellen Quinlan (excused).

Alternates

Present: William Cole and Ken Massey (Selectmen's Representative Alternate) .

Alternates

Absent: Brion Carroll (excused) .

Staff

Present: Town Planner John Cashell.

Recorder: J. Bradford Seabury.

IV. SEATING OF ALTERNATES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chairman Barnes seated Mr. Cole in the open position vacated by Mr. Turcotte's resignation .

large site. He said he had had a couple conversations with Mr. Marty Kennedy, the Board's traffic consultant from VHB (Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.)—adding that they had not agreed on all the details on the development traffic, but he felt confident that they would be able to, once they got to that point. What was happening tonight, he said, was to look at the existing situation and figure out the best way to plan a 400-acre development. He suggested that it should be the same as when the City of Portsmouth addressed the Pease development, looking at it as a blank sheet and planning the infrastructure over a number of months, ending up with a superb plan. He said Mr. Muller would also provide information on the Sagamore Bridge and explain that there were a number of alternatives for creating the interchange, but each had drawbacks. He said they also wanted to discuss how these different designs related to the capacity of the bypass road—adding that they also wanted to talk about where that bypass should intersect with Lowell Road or River Road. He pointed out that the decision of where to connect the bypass road to the Sagamore Bridge road was a Town decision, to be made by the Board of Selectmen, but the applicant was looking to the Planning Board for guidance, as the selectmen would.

Atty. Leonard said the last issue for tonight was to look at Vectron Drive and also the Sam's Club property—noting that no Sam's Club access was currently shown on the plans, because the applicants had opted to eliminate that possibility in exchange for a connection to Sagamore Bridge, because the development could not have both. He then concluded by restating that the purpose for tonight was to discuss the public roads and get the Board's input, as the applicants needed input in order to go to the next step, and he expressed a hope that there could be some sort of consensus on some of the issues, so that they could come back in a month with plans showing specific details to answer some of the still unanswered questions.

Selectman Maddox asked if Marty Kennedy had received all the traffic data. Atty. Leonard said it was a complicated answer, as Mr. Kennedy did not have all the information to his satisfaction on the overall development but had all the information that the applicants had. He said the applicants had made some assumptions that were not acceptable to Mr. Kennedy—citing the assignment of trips as an example. He explained that the applicants had broken the project down into Phase 1 and the rest, which they were calling Phase 2 (defining "the rest" as the master plan and uses assumed for the purposes of planning), with Phase 1 being the specific site plan. He said there were traffic numbers for the specific site plan (Phase 1) that were more complete than the numbers for the balance of the project, and Mr. Kennedy did not agree with some of those numbers, particularly with the trip assignments. He said this was not a hurdle that could not be reached, but just could not be reached at this time—suggesting that the simple solution would be to do a best-case/worst-case scenario. He then stated that the applicants were in a design stage, saying they could not plan without a specific plan, and they did not know what was to be there, especially in Phase 2. Selectman Maddox responded by pointing out that the recorded plans for Phase 2 included three 350,000-ft² buildings, which by themselves could change what this roadway network needed to be. Atty. Leonard replied that those buildings were assumed for a preliminary design, which did not mean they were being proposed—adding that a master plan should not assume a use that could be less than what might

come. He then stated that Mr. Kennedy had all the traffic information that the applicants had.

Mr. Kennedy said he had not received second -phase traffic figures , so the answer to the question was "No." Atty. Leonard asked Mr. Kennedy to explain that, and Mr. Kennedy said he had received only the Phase 1 study submitted this past January. He then stated that VHB disagreed with some of the trip -assignment numbers for that traffic study and felt that the figures would have to be revised—adding that this might be why the applicants did not want to provide figures for Phase 2, but the bottom line was that he did not have the numbers for Phase 2. Selectman Maddox then expressed a belief that the applicants were looking for Planning Board decisions about Phase 1 and Phase 2 roads but without providing the traffic figures.

Atty. Leonard said the process was getting hung up on the Master Plan, which he claimed everyone in the room knew was not being proposed for approval. Stating that the purpose of planning was to assume a use or a series of uses, and then organize a site that would handle the uses that might occur, Atty. Leonard said there was no way the applicants could plan under Selectman Maddox' s scenario unless they could get one person to come in and say he wanted to build the whole thing, and even then that one person would have to commit to particular uses. He said this was not going to happen, as this site was too large. He again referenced the Pease development, saying uses were not included when Portsmouth planned the site. He said the applicants were not proposing that these roads be designed now, but were talking about where they would be located, as a general concept, and whether the Town would be interested in the bypass road concept and the connections to the Sagamore Bridge road, contending that those decisions needed to be made before the applicants could do anything. If the applicants could not get agreement on this, he continued, he would be forced to go do something on what he actually had someone willing to buy, which meant there would not be an interchange and there would not be a bypass. He then said he did not know what to do, saying he was feeling that the Board had enabled him to ask for input but Selectman Maddox was telling him that Selectman Maddox would not review anything unless he had a specific use to propose.

Selectman Maddox expressed disagreement, saying Phase 2 in his mind was an integral part , and he could not decide on the roadway design without knowing what traffic would come there with Phase 2. Atty. Leonard said preliminary numbers had been provided for Master Plan uses, in a general sense —acknowledging that there was not agreement on the trip assignments and the traffic numbers had not been analyzed throughout the whole town but only at the interchange. He said the idea of an interchange was the first step —adding that the applicants could do something else if the Board did not want an interchange. He then asked what Selectman Maddox would suggest that he do with respect to how to proceed on this planning effort. Selectman Maddox said he wanted to know if there would be two million square feet of retail use at the end of Phase 2; Atty. Leonard replied that there was no way of knowing.

Mr. Hall questioned what difference it would make, saying the Board could discuss different mixes, but there would be a lot of traffic, and he felt the best way would be to have a connection to the Sagamore Bridge road to get people in and out of the development. He then noted that the Planning Board had raised many issues about

that connection, with many of them being raised by himself, and until he got answers to those questions and comments, he could not tell whether he wanted that connection or not. If this development were only going to have access from and to the west, he continued, that was a pretty severe limitation to the value of that interchange, as far as he was concerned, but this all depended on what would be in the development, the value of it, and what the applicants did with respect to connecting to Vectron Drive and River Road. He said it was a kind of dominoes thing, but the question in his mind was whether the Board wanted a connection to the Sagamore Bridge road —and, if so, what would it look like. He said there was a question in his mind as to what its value would be if there were only half a connection. He said he hoped the applicants would have some responses to the questions that had been asked at the last meeting. Mr. Hall then suggested that the Board should hear from Mr. Kennedy at this time.

Atty. Leonard said he believed Mr. Kennedy would say the retail and other uses presumed for this whole effort were high. He then suggested that the Board let Mr. Muller proceed at this time, however, saying Mr. Muller was not bound by the configuration and was prepared to show accesses from different areas, and they had to begin someplace. Chairman Barnes concurred.

Mr. Ron Muller, identifying himself as a vice-president of Greenman-Pederson, Inc. (GPI), said he wanted to talk about the concept of the connector road, stating that it was important to understand that the Town of Hudson needed to be supportive of, and in fact become the applicant to the State of New Hampshire for, a connector road that brought the access onto the Sagamore Bridge road. He said he did not think it was important to talk about what sort of development would happen on this site at this time—contending that, if there were agreement on the concept, the volume issues would simply be a matter of how many lanes needed to be built and how many ramps would be needed. When first looking at the site, he continued, it had become clear immediately that the Lowell Road intersection with the Sagamore Bridge road was critical. He noted that traffic often backed up for quite some distance from cars waiting to make a left turn onto Lowell Road, with the same thing happening with northbound traffic on Lowell Road trying to turn left onto the Sagamore Bridge road. He said those routes were already in failure, today, and adding more traffic meant these existing problems had to be fixed first, which he described as the most important thing. He noted that there was also a very heavy load on southbound traffic on Lowell Road from drivers wanting to turn left onto Dracut Road, adding that the Dracut Road/River Road approach operated poorly, with the concept of the connector road being a way to fix these problems.

Displaying an aerial photograph of the area, he said the lanes of those existing roads were already built out to the maximum, limiting what the developers could do, so they had come up with the idea of a bypass connector road, which would provide access into the site but also would alleviate some of the other issues. He contended that where the connections were made was sort of secondary. Based on origin/destination information received from the Nashua Regional Planning Commission, he continued, GPI had come up with an estimate that they could draw about 700 vehicles off the existing River Road volume onto this new connector road. He said River Road currently carried about 1400 vehicles during the evening peak hour, while Dracut Road carried about 1900, with about 3300 vehicles per hour

traveling on Lowell Road, north of the intersection with the other two roads, with about 1000 of those wanting to take a left turn from Lowell Road onto the Sagamore Bridge road. Taking 700 cars off that flow with the connector road, he argued, would reduce the waiting traffic to about 300 cars, and the green-light time for that turn could be drastically reduced, with that time then being given to some of the other approaches, as needed. He said the same effect would be obtained at the Dracut Road intersection, saying he had some ideas about changes to improve that intersection, but it was too early to get into those details now. If the Planning Board and then the Board of Selectmen agreed that this was a good idea, he said, the discussion could then go forward. Otherwise, he added, the applicants would have to change their plans.

Atty. Leonard asked Mr. Muller to address Mr. Hall's comment that he might not be interested in an interchange that only provided access to and from the west. Mr. Muller referenced the April hearing, in which he had taken the Board through some of the earlier designs leading to the final design. He then displayed the final plan, saying it was the result of many discussions with NHDOT. He asked that the Board forget about the ramps for the moment and focus on the location of the interchange, noting that the location was just west of the Sam's Club property, because they had had to push the interchange as far to the east as possible in order to meet the weaving requirements of the NHDOT standards with respect to the Daniel Webster Highway—which meant that there was not enough space between River Road and the new interchange location to provide for those standards, so interchange ramps could not be provided from the east. He noted that Mr. Hall had suggested that the different standards could be used if the Sagamore Bridge road were reclassified; he expressed agreement, but said the applicants had been told time and time again by NHDOT that the roadway had to meet the NHDOT's freeway standards, because that was how people were driving on that road. If the Town of Hudson would initiate the effort to get that road reclassified and lower the speed limit, he added, those options would become wide open.

Mr. Muller said another option that had been looked at was continuing Blackstone Drive from the industrial park, so that people coming southbound could travel down Executive Drive and then drive right into the site, but that option had not been pursued, as there was a tremendous amount of traffic coming out of the industrial park, with the majority of it turning right onto Lowell Road and then right onto the Sagamore Bridge road, so that the new access would have to have a much larger number of lanes, as all that traffic would use the new ramp system. He said it was a great idea but might not be feasible with respect to accommodating traffic. Mr. Muller said GPI had come up with a plan the applicants thought would work, saying the regional draw from a large development such as was being proposed meant that the population was not to the east but to the west, from Nashua and Massachusetts, and the majority of the traffic for this site would come over the bridge from Nashua and the Everett Turnpike.

Atty. Leonard asked Mr. Muller to give more detail on what the connection to the industrial park would look like and what would have to happen in order to get it approved by NHDOT. Mr. Muller said it would be much like the existing connection to Lowell Road, describing it as a single-point diamond intersection; he said there were options available, but the final decision would rest ultimately on how much traffic needed to be processed. Atty. Leonard asked about supposing about trying to get the right interchange and worrying about how much traffic it could process. Mr. Muller said

he did not follow this. Atty. Leonard referenced Selectman Maddox's concerns, suggesting that talking about how much traffic could be processed might indicate how the site would be limited. He then asked how NHDOT would look at that sort of intersection (tied to the industrial park). Mr. Muller said he was at a loss to explain, as that sort of design had not been presented to NHDOT—but NHDOT would be concerned about the design meeting the NHDOT design requirements for weaving and grade. He said he believed it was something GPI could make work. He said the same thing was true for the south-end connection to River Road, saying GPI's intent had been to design in a fashion that would divert the maximum number of cars away from the existing Lowell Road intersections, so that at the new connector road would be the throughway. He said the connections were not fixed at these locations, which had been picked because GPI thought they made the most sense and worked best for Phase 1, taking a substantial number of cars off the existing corridors.

Mr. Muller said a connection opposite Stewart Street could draw more traffic from Dracut Road, but they had chosen the River Road connection in order to make the connector road the new through road, and he then reiterated that there was a need to draw traffic off the corridors.

Selectman Maddox asked if the number for Phase 1 was 40,000 cars a day. Mr. Muller said he did not know, off the top of his head. Selectman Maddox said that 40,000 was the number he had heard at a NHDOT meeting—adding that, if 70% went through Nashua, that meant that 30% would be going through Hudson, meaning that 1200 cars would be added to Lowell Road for the 700 being taken away. Atty. Leonard said the applicants would address off-site intersection impacts, saying this plan was not a solution for the overall problem but was the first step in a plan. Mr. Muller said the Phase 1 traffic study that had been submitted addressed 30 locations, mostly throughout Hudson, with some in Nashua, with all of those being reviewed from the basis of what was the impact on those locations, with and without this connector road. If there still were issues, he added, saying he expected that there would be issues at a number of those locations, GPI would look at ways to address and alleviate those impacts, but they had not gotten there yet.

Ms. McGrath asked about Mr. Muller's statement that diverting traffic from Flagstone Drive to the bridge would help. Mr. Muller said right turns were generally the easiest to make, saying there were about 1,000 vehicles making a right turn out of Flagstone and onto Lowell Road in the evening peak traffic, representing a heavy demand which ate up the green-light time and reduced capacity—and reducing that traffic by giving it an alternative, easier route to the highway would provide the ability to shift some capacity to the other traffic paths. Ms. McGrath noted that he had said that was not a preferred access. Mr. Muller said the reason was the need to be able to process that increased volume of traffic, saying it might need three lanes of traffic to accommodate the additional industrial traffic, and these would have to be merged down to one lane before reaching the highway, which was why he had said it would not be preferred, as it would not meet the NHDOT standards for weaving.

Atty. Leonard said another way of saying it was that that particular design carried more traffic from the future proposed site than the one being discussed, but the applicants were willing to talk about other designs, as well. He also noted that bringing

industrial traffic directly onto the Sagamore Bridge road used some of the capacity of the interchange. He then commented that all of this analysis had been done without reference to a Hudson Circumferential Highway, saying the applicants believed the proposed development continued to be a source of funds that might address that circumferential highway issue.

Ms. McGrath asked why the applicants would not want the bypass road to have interconnections to both River Road and Stewart Street. Mr. Muller said that was also a possibility.

Mr. Russo asked what the peak -hour traffic on Dracut Road was. Mr. Muller said it was 1900 for Dracut Road and 1400 for River Road. Mr. Russo then questioned what would coerce himself to take that bypass, as he looked at it as a traffic nightmare and did not see a benefit, as their project would have 10,000 cars an hour traveling through it. He expressed doubt that the connector road would work effectively as a bypass, as it was basically a n access to the applicant's site. He said he found taking 700 cars off the road to be optimistic, adding that he saw no gain —saying he took the path of least resistance and he felt most people did so. He then commented that he had heard nothing about addressing the traffic going north on Lowell Road, which he described as absolutely horrible.

Mr. Muller said the 700 figure was an estimate. He expressed agreement that people would take the path of least resistance, saying drivers would not take the connector road if it were designed to have congestion and less than excellent levels of service—which was why it was important for the applicants to design the connector road for full build-out conditions, whatever they were felt to be, or at least design it for Phase 1 conditions and then accommodate Phase 2 by being able to add an additional lane or signals or whatever was needed.

Atty. Leonard asked Mr. Muller to explain what he had done to make sure it did not get congested. Mr. Muller said GPI had designed the connector road as a five-lane road, with two through lanes in each direction, plus a ride median that would allow left-turn lanes to be carved out at each intersection. He noted that two of the intersections would have signal lights, so Phase 1 would provide four signalized intersections instead of two, and another would be added for Phase 2 —adding that all of these were up for discussion. Mr. Russo said adding signal lights was not ideal, for him —adding that he felt the reason the traffic backed up on Lowell Road was not so much for people turning left but because of traffic going straight. Mr. Muller expressed agreement. Mr. Russo said there would be four lights for southbound traffic either way, with full build-out. Mr. Muller said that was true for southbound, but it was northbound traffic that was critical. He said there was a critical problem now at the intersection of Lowell Road and the Sagamore Bridge road, and this plan addressed that problem indirectly, by providing more green-light time for northbound traffic, so those long backups would not occur. Mr. Russo asked if other Board members who lived in that area of the community would say whether they felt that the northbound traffic was really backed up so much as to make it difficult to go north on Lowell Road. Ms. McGrath, Mr. Hall, and Mr. Massey confirmed that this was the case, especially in the evening.

Mr. Massey stated that there were two sets of backups, with one extending from the intersection with the Wal-Mart access and the Sagamore Bridge traffic light, the other stretching from Rena Drive to Dracut Road. Addressing the proposal, he then expressed a belief that to most people a "bypass" meant a way to get around congestion. He said the proposed connector road was not a bypass, but instead would be a major road in and out of the proposed development site, and he asked what Mr. Muller's design did for queuing. Mr. Muller acknowledged that the majority of the traffic on the connector road would be site related, but he said the connector would function as a bypass by relieving corridor traffic; he expressed a belief that both roadways would eventually operate at the same level, so that instead of being levels F on Lowell Road and A on the connector road, the level F service on Lowell Road would shift to D or C, while the level of service on the connector road would become B or C—adding that as many lanes as were needed could be provided on the connector road to achieve the desired level of service.

Selectman Massey questioned what would happen if Mr. Muller were wrong in his estimates, and the development drew significantly more amounts of traffic than were expected, and he asked what difficulty Mr. Muller would have in creating an east-bound ON ramp and a west-bound OFF ramp. Mr. Muller noted that there were questions of distribution, pointing out that there was disagreement between GPI and Mr. Kennedy at this time as to what that distribution was; he said they might have to run two sets of numbers and say what would happen in each case. Selectman Massey said he felt that an east-bound On ramp and a west-bound Off ramp should be considered. Mr. Muller said he could state with 100% certainty that those ramps could not be built if NHDOT continues to view the Sagamore Bridge road as a freeway-type road. To achieve that, he said, NHDOT would need to be approached about reclassifying the road, adding that he personally felt that was a great idea, but he could not tell if NHDOT would go along with it, as NHDOT argued that the Sagamore Bridge road intersected with the Everett Turnpike and traffic coming off the turnpike expected the same type of radii and weaving distances. Selectman Massey noted that a result of that thinking was that eastbound cars on that roadway had been clocked going 80 mph, even though that road was not built to take that sort of speed. He then suggested that Mr. Muller should provide a sketch to show what the interchange would look like with an east-bound On ramp and a west-bound Off ramp provided, so that the Town could use that sketch to discuss reclassification of the road with NHDOT.

Selectman Maddox said he felt the applicants needed to consider how the design would work if the Sagamore Bridge road did not stop at Lowell Road but continued along the proposed path of the Hudson Circumferential Highway. Mr. Muller said construction of the Circumferential Highway or a portion of it would not change the situation, as there would be ramps to Lowell Road. Selectman Maddox expressed a belief that there would be lots more queuing. Mr. Muller questioned what traffic would use the extended roadway. Selectman Maddox said the Circumferential Highway had been planned since 1952, adding that Wason Road could not handle another 1200 cars, and something would have to be provided. Mr. Muller contended that extending the Sagamore Bridge road over Lowell road would not change the design—but that it would completely eliminate any possibility of access from the east. He then added, however, that there were many options that could be looked at. He said the most

important thing would be if the applicants and the Board could walk away from this meeting with consensus that the proposed connector road was a good idea, so that he could start exploring those types of abilities.

Chairman Barnes said he wanted to give the Board's traffic consultant an opportunity to speak at this time. Mr. Marty Kennedy, of VHB, said VHB's opinion was that the numbers that had been provided underestimated the amount of traffic coming to the development from the east, with the bottom line being that VHB's opinion was that improved access to the site from the east was needed. With respect to the proposed intersection arrangement with the Sagamore Bridge road, he continued, the break in the limited -access right-of-way was different from what was called a controlled -access right-of-way on any other State roads. On controlled -access roads, he said, a property owner had a right to access that point, but a property owner did not have a right to break the access on a limited -access roadway. To do so, then, the property owner would have to put in an interchange that would meet all of the NHDOT design standards, and the petition to allow this would have to come from the Town. He said it might very well be that the Town could come to the conclusion that this was something the Town wanted to do, but the Town would have to have all the needed information first in order to do that, with some good estimate of Phase 2 traffic. He said the Phase 2 traffic did not need to be known exactly, and he expressed agreement that the applicants could not know the exact figures at this time, but they needed to have some estimate, so that those numbers could be put into the calculations to show that the connector design and/or the interchange design worked with those numbers, after which the Town could make a decision as to whether it would be best for the Town.

With respect to the bypass road, Mr. Kennedy said, his opinion was that it would be preferable to have the southern connection closer to Dracut Road, or there would be the problem of traffic filtering through the local streets. Before getting to that point, however, he continued, what the applicant was asking for tonight was for the Board to say whether it did or did not want a break in the limited -access road. If the Board did not want that, he said, the Board should tell the applicants now, so that they did not spend a whole lot of time looking at it —but, if the Board felt it was a good idea, the Board should tell them, so that they could go ahead and make the associated decisions. Noting that the applicants had said they were willing to work with the Town, he said he thought the initial submittals had been a mistake, with too much final design submitted without discussion with the Town. He said he sensed that the applicants now wanted to have those discussions, saying this type of meeting being held tonight should have been held a year ago, before anything was submitted —adding that he thought this type of meeting was a good idea and that the Board ought to tell the applicant whether it thought the idea of a connector road was a good one or not.

Town Planner Cashell said the issue was whether the Town would be willing to have this bypass road connected to the limited -access highway, knowing that it would lead to a maximum build -out. He noted that there were politics involved in this decision, saying the people opposed to maximum build -out would vote against the selectmen who supported it. He then pointed out that there were lots of bypass roads that worked very well.

Ms. McGrath asked Mr. Kennedy if the assumptions for Phase 2 should be worst case, or should the applicant be looking for real numbers. Mr. Kennedy said there should be a little of both. He said traffic from and to the east was the critical thing.

Ms. McGrath noted that she liked the idea of having access to both Dracut Road and River Road, asking Mr. Kennedy his opinion on that. Mr. Kennedy expressed favor, saying both would do the job. Ms. McGrath said she was concerned about the traffic, noting that she traveled daily along the path of River Road, Lowell Road, and the Sagamore Bridge road, going both north and south. She stated that this parcel of land was going to be developed in some way, at some time, and she expressed a belief that it would be done piecemeal if there were no master plan, meaning that it would be done without beneficial improvements.

Mr. Russo expressed a belief that a lot depended on whether the Town could get the road reclassified. He said the State had built the road for 90 mph traffic, adding that he felt reclassification would open up a lot of options. He suggested that the State might have made commitments to get federal funding. He then said the Town needed to find a way to move forward, adding that he knew a lot of people who lived in the south end of the community were opposed to this development—adding, however, that he found it hard to believe that those people were willing to live in the situation they had now, knowing full well that the town was going to continue to grow and the roadways were going to continue to get more congested, but they were not coming up with a solution, and this development might do it.

Ms. McGrath said she agreed that getting the Sagamore Bridge road reclassified might be a good idea, as drivers on that road scared her on a daily basis—adding that she would like to see more police on that road.

Town Planner Cashell said reclassification of the road was a great idea, stating that there were too many weaving actions on that road and the traffic was going much too fast. He said the owner was going to develop this property, and the roads needed to be made better, adding that he felt the proposed bypass road was the best approach.

Selectman Maddox contended that piecemeal development would be dealt with as needed. Ms. McGrath responded that piecemeal development would mean that no bypass road would be created. She said the owner had the right to develop—and the Town would get improvements only if the Town worked with the property owners.

Chairman Barnes declared a break at 9:00 p.m., calling the meeting back to order at 9:14 p.m.

Chairman Barnes asked if the Planning Board wanted to entertain the idea of supporting reclassification of the Sagamore Bridge road. If so, he asked, what would the process be?

Ms. McGrath said she was in favor, just based on safety. She then asked if the Highway Safety Committee would be a place to start, or should the Board have staff find out what the process would be? Town Planner Cashell said ultimately it would be to have the Board of Selectmen petition NHDOT. He noted that it had been denied originally because of the association with the long-proposed Circumferential Highway,

but the Town could argue that, if the Circumferential Highway was not going to happen, a slower roadway would be better for the Town.

Mr. Hall said it would be a political decision but would have to start with the Board of Selectmen, adding that the Planning Board would have to find out if there were political support for the change.

Ms. McGrath asked if it would be productive to talk to the Police Chief and find out his thoughts.

Selectman Massey said he thought the Planning Board should make a determination, adding that he thought the sort of development being proposed would only make sense if there could be access both to and from the eastbound roadways, as well as the westbound, and saying that he would not want to get the NHDOT all ramped up, only to find out afterwards that it was not feasible to have access to and from the east. He then suggested that the Planning Board should first make up its mind as to whether it wanted the connector road —and/or if it would be okay with just one-way access, as proposed. Ms. McGrath asked about the reclassification concept. Selectman Massey responded that he did not know what the effect would be to get the road reclassified if the Town did not have the money to make the changes. Mr. Kennedy expressed a belief that the Board needed to separate whether the Board wanted the roadway reclassified independently of this project —in which case, the process would be to contact the State, and he could do that, to find out what the process was. He questioned whether the Town could get the road reclassified just to lower the speed limit, because of the geometrics of the roadway design, and he expressed a belief that getting the road reclassified without doing anything to the road would really not get at the problem, because people would still drive the way they were going to drive. If the Board were thinking of reclassifying the road for the purposes of this project, he continued, he would suggest that the Board let the applicants' team do their evaluation of different possibilities, and one of those might work with the reclassification, at which point they could go to the NHDOT.

Selectman Maddox said he thought the Sagamore Bridge road had been built with federal funds. Mr. Kennedy said it was. Selectman Maddox said the federal government therefore would be involved with any reclassification. Mr. Kennedy said he thought that was true and that the Federal Highway Department would have to sign off on the proposal, as well. Atty. Leonard stated, as a point of order, that the applicants were willing to do what Mr. Kennedy had stated—to look at some of the alternatives, to find out what the process was, and to help the Town understand what would be required, if this Board were interested.

Mr. Cole stated that thus far this evening most of this had been improvisational theater. He said it had always been distasteful to him when a developer would come before the Board and give a solution to a problem that did not exist until the applicant came in with the project. He said the Board had tonight been given several versions of a solution to a problem that did not exist —adding that the reason he said the problem did not exist was that he did not know what was going into the site, as Selectman Maddox had alluded to several times. He declared that he did not believe for a minutes, based on recent events, that a retail-centric development that W/S

Development had put before the town was in the future of that area. He said he knew something was going to be there in the future, but the question had always been not *if* but *what* it was going to be, and he was pretty sure it was not going to be the three - phase development that W/S Development had proposed, so the reason of why the Board was talking about that this evening eluded him. He said he had hoped that what was going to happen this evening was that the Friel family would come together with the Town and actually sit down and do some meaningful discussions with regard to the most beneficial use of that property, both to the Town of Hudson and to the Friel family—but so far everyone had spent 2.5 hours discussing absolutely nothing. Noting that he had been involved in various Town organizations for about 18 years, he declared that Atty. Leonard could come back every month and discuss things, but would be no further along at the end of the evening —stating that the Board needed to sit down with the principals and develop a master plan, as alluded to in Town Planner Cashell's staff notes, and anything short of that would be a waste of time and money, leading to unsatisfactory results not only for months to come but also years and possibly decades. He suggested that Atty. Leonard sit down with appropriate Town staff and look to the format so that everyone could talk about a master plan, rather than talk about something that was not going to happen—adding that he did not feel the applicants had a plan, other than what had been developed by W/S Development.

Chairman Barnes asked the Board's pleasure as to where to go from here.

Mr. Russo said the Planning Board should encourage the applicants to redesign the roadway for access to the Sagamore Bridge road, with the possibility of it being reclassified, and then showing the Planning Board the options, so that the Board might support that and then get the Board of Selectmen to get the ball rolling. He said he did think the road needed to be reclassified and slowed down, but he agreed that not much was going to happen if the road were reclassified as it was.

Town Planner Cashell said the Town would benefit if the Board realized that this was the most valuable parcel of land in Hudson and could not be considered to be developed if it just held two 18 -hole golf courses. As a planner, he said, he saw that this land offered sizeable economic benefits, but the unfortunate thing was that it abutted a sizeable residential area, and more effort would have to be put into the master plan for the development would have to address those residents' concerns. He said the community had to look at the overall picture to make sure the developer was working with a plan that would take care of the traffic and consider the concerns of those residents to the extent possible. He said this was going to be important in the future, to make sure that quality services would be borne by the commercial interests — stating that the community could not survive with trying to provide quality services on the backs of its residents.

Chairman Barnes asked Atty. Leonard if the applicants would be willing to work with the Town to develop a master plan for the site. Atty. Leonard said the applicants were very interested in talking with the Town —saying the difficult was that they did not know who to talk to, and this had seemed the forum. If the Board could agree on how the applicants should proceed, he continued, they would do it. He then stated that he would also like to keep going on the other front, because it related to the project , no matter what the master plan was. He said he thought Mr. Cole had been talking about

uses, in particular locations, but the road being discussed tonight was a universal -type road, calling for a universal -type decision.

Chairman Barnes asked if any Board members had any idea as to how to move forward with this, questioning if there were any venue for working out a master plan other than with the Planning Board.

Ms. McGrath asked what the problem was with meeting with the Planning Board, noting that the public had been given a perception of the applicants having made secret deals with the Board of Selectmen, but she felt it would be far more preferable for the applicants to meet with the Planning Board in open session than to meet with Town staff in private meetings—noting that the Town staff had taken a hit because the previous Board of Selectmen had directed them to meet with the applicants and keep it quiet, which she did not think had been fair to the staff, had not been fair to the Planning Board, and certainly had not been fair to the Town of Hudson. She said it would be better to have open discussion, on television.

Mr. Cole said that had not been what he was suggesting. He noted that Town Planner Cashell's staff report had said that the Board might want to consider actively participating with the property owners relative to developing a new master plan for the site. He then asked Mr. Cashell, as a professional planner of many years' standing, what he thought would be the best mechanism for the Board to accomplish that, given the atmosphere, the personalities, etc., etc. Mr. Cashell said he thought what Ms. McGrath had just said was best, so as to keep everything open and accessible to the public. Since the meetings were now on television, he continued, this would give everyone who wanted to have the chance to participate and see what was going on, and he felt everyone should be provided with the information. When time provided, he continued, he believed that these applicants should come in and be dealt with on the agenda—adding that there could be workshop meetings or added meetings if that became necessary, but he felt everything should be as open as possible.

Mr. Cole said Atty. Leonard was looking for direction as to how he and his principals could get together with the Town for some meaningful dialog. He said he personally did not care, but that he wanted it to be a meaningful dialog—adding that he thought the method should be what Mr. Kennedy had recommended a year and a half ago: to have an *ad hoc* committee to start working with Atty. Leonard and his principals to develop a master plan. He said this should not be in secret but should be focused on something. He contended that having them come in for an hour or so at regular meetings would not work, but would simply be improvisational theater over and over again, with things being made up as they went along. He said there had to be something structured that would be beneficial both to Atty. Leonard and his principals and to the Town of Hudson.

Mr. Hall said his suggestion would be that for the applicants to come in and ask what the Planning Board wanted was not going to get anyone anywhere. He said the developers needed to decide what they would like to see there—adding that there might be several options. If an option were all retail, he noted, that would be simple: just say how many square feet and what the operation was. If it was to be a million square feet of retail use, he said, the Board would not care where the access was to be

right now—noting that other options could be mixed use, industrial, residential, institutional, or other. He said the applicants certainly knew what the complications would be with a higher traffic count, with peak -traffic count causing the biggest problems—adding that mixed use and uses that did not require the same peak traffic would mitigate that. He said the applicants could give a couple options, but they had to make their decision as to what made best sense to them—adding that he had a hard time believing they could lease two million square feet of retail space in any reasonable amount of time, but if that were what they wanted to do and what they felt made sense for developing that property, and they could get someone to buy it on that basis, and they could solve the traffic problems, then that was what they ought to do. He said the applicants had to make the suggestions to the Board, and then they could discuss them, but asking the Board what the Board wanted was not going to get anywhere. He suggested that the proposal options should be presented a month before the meeting, with written dialog and sketches, so that everyone could look at it. He expressed a belief that the access to the site was key, as it would predicate how much traffic they could get in and out of the site, so he believed that was the first issue that needed to be resolved, but many Board members would still want a breakdown of what the uses would be. He said the developers had to lead the process.

Atty. Leonard said he was hearing that there were a couple things going on, saying they still had not lost the issue about the roads but now there was a concurrent issue about the master plan. With respect to the road matter, he said, he thought he was hearing that the applicants should come in with redesigns regarding alternatives for the access—including access to the Sagamore Bridge road and options regarding two connections to Dracut Road and River Road, and they would bring those in at the next meeting for some further discussion. At the same time, he continued, they would investigate the process for reclassification and other issues that might occur at the NHDOT level. With regard to the master plan, he said, he heard the comments and he, too, preferred to be proposing things on television, and he wanted to work with the Town in the context of the Zoning Ordinance. The difficulty, he said, was that this was a large project and there was no certainty as to the future use, and the only certainty would be for the immediately proposed use. As long as everyone knew they could talk about that, he continued, he also agreed the traffic was going to be a primary determiner of the overall mix of uses, and he wanted to on record as recognizing that. Atty. Leonard said he would ask the chairman to schedule a meeting in July. Mr. Muller suggested pushing that meeting date out to August.

Selectman Maddox said he felt as if he were on a see-saw, saying he needed to see some options. If the proposed use was to be all retail, for some two -million-plus square feet, he stated, he believed the roadway connection to Route 111 must be built, and that would certainly be a concern if the applicants came to the selectmen. He then expressed agreement with what Mr. Hall had said, saying the applicants should come in with a number of different options as a starting point, so the Planning Board would have the ability to balance what they were going to say to the selectmen, but all the Board had heard so far was that the plan was for two million square feet of retail use, with 300,000 -ft² buildings at the back. He said these figures, and the associated traffic, concerned the Board members and concerned the neighbors.

Ms. McGrath that there should be consideration of transitional uses near the abutting residences.

Chairman Barnes asked Town Planner Cashell when the next meeting should be scheduled. Mr. Cashell gave the date of August 8th.

Selectman Massey said Mr. Hall had been on the right track, but there was another consideration that needed to be put in play, in that there was now proposed a 500,000 - ft² operation across the river, which could impact what the road accesses were going to be, because he had to believe that there would be people from the east who would want to go over there, and the only way they could get over there would be to be in the right-hand lane across the Sagamore Bridge so as to get of onto the Daniel Webster Highway. He said the Board of Selectmen had requested the Nashua mayor to have his land-use boards declare that new operation to be a regional impact development, and he thought it should be factored into any plan on this property. The bottom line, he concluded, was that it would be very important to know how the development on the Friels' property would play with that other development in terms of traffic.

Mr. Russo asked how much time the applicant thought it was going to take to continue the discussion—a whole meeting, half a meeting, or what? Atty. Leonard said he felt two hours would be good. Chairman Barnes said it would be limited to two hours. Selectman Maddox then moved to defer this item date specific to the August 8, 2007, Planning Board Meeting. Ms. McGrath seconded the motion ...

VOTE: Chairman Barnes called for a verbal vote on the motion. All members voted in favor, and Chairman Barnes declared the motion to have carried unanimously (6–0).

Ms. McGrath noted that the recent article in the *Hudson-Litchfield News* had indicated that she was an abutter to this property; she stated that she was not an abutter, noting that she lived considerably south of this property—and adding that she would feel compelled to step down if she were an abutter.

VIII. WORKSHOP

A. Review Proposed Zoning Amendment to rezone from General-One (G-1) to Residential-One (R-1), re: Stoney Lane, Beechwood Road, Stonewood Lane, Heritage Circle, Jeremy Lane, Boulder Drive, Terra Lane, Chagnon Drive, Henry Drive, Rear Henry Drive, Maureen Lane, and Tear Drop Circle.

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

Town Planner Cashell said he wanted everyone to be aware of the fact that the residential properties abutting Robinson Pond were R -1 zoned. Selectman Maddox

asked if the change would be tied to the GIS mapping. Mr. Cashell answered in the affirmative, saying it was really a simple change for NRPC to make.

Mr. Russo noted that one lot on the drawing stood alone with a dark circle on it. Mr. Cashell explained that this symbol was placed on the drawing when a given lot number was used to call up the map.

Town Planner Cashell asked if the Board wanted to include the properties on the westerly side of Robinson Road, and he pointed to the locations of these lots on the map. Mr. Hall contended that those lots were included with the subdivision, and he expressed a belief that the change should go to the road, not stop one lot away from the road. Mr. Cashell said the zoning change ought to be along the center line of Robinson Road, in a westerly direction. Mr. Russo noted that this included about eight lots along Robinson Road. Mr. Hall said it would be crazy to leave the lots along Robinson Road in the G -1 zoning district.

Ms. Linda Walsh, 5 Stoney Lane, said that after she had originally brought the proposal to the Planning Board, she had located the original subdivision plan. She noted that one of the three lots on Robinson Road at the end of Stoney Lane was a part of her subdivision, but the next lot became part of the subdivision that became the Stonewood area, and the next lot was on Henry Drive but she had not known if that were part of their original subdivision. She said they had tried not to touch anything beyond that, but just to include what was part of the original subdivisions.

Mr. Hall confirmed that what Ms. Walsh was saying was that she had not originally included several of the lots that had frontage on Robinson Road. Ms. Walsh agreed, saying they had only included the lots on Robinson Road from Stoney Lane to Henry Drive.

Ms. Walsh noted that the list included Teardrop Circle, but she did not know where that was. Mr. Hall explained that it was the cul-de-sac off Woodcrest Drive, saying it included four lots that presently were in the G -1 zoning district.

Selectman Maddox asked that Town Planner Cashell provide a single drawing on an 8.5"-by-11" sheet of paper, covering just what had been asked for. He expressed concern about expanding beyond what had been asked for, adding that he could not tell the difference between what the citizens had asked for and what the Town Planner had added in. Mr. Cashell noted that he had provided a draft of the change on the next page.

Mr. Russo noted that there were four lots that had not been requested, that were in the G-1 district, but would have been surrounded by R -1 properties on all sides, so it only made sense to include those. Other than that, he said, all of the lots indicated had been on the submitted list; he then noted that what had been said to the Board was that the members should look at it and see if there were anything else that should be included, and these were the only ones that had been suggested.

Mr. Hall said what Selectman Maddox was asking for was to see the difference between what the neighborhood residents had asked for and what Town Planner Cashell had recommended—adding that he would like to see that, as well, and it would be easier if the drawing were a little larger. Mr. Hall said his recollection about the two

large lots at the bottom of the diagram were that a brother and sister had come in for a subdivision, with each of them building a house on one of the two lots, and the Board had stipulated that there would be no further subdivision. He suggested that those two lots should be included in the change, as well.

Mr. Russo moved to conduct a public hearing on the proposed rezoning of Beechwood Road, Stoney Lane, Stonewood Lane, and Heritage Circle, Jeremy Lane, Boulder Drive, Terra Lane, Chagnon Drive, Henry Drive, Rear Henry Drive, Maureen Lane and Tear Drop Circle neighborhoods from G -1 to R-1, at the August 8, 2007, meeting. Ms. McGrath seconded the motion.

Mr. Hall questioned why the Board would send this to a public hearing at this time, when the Board had just asked to see the drawings. He pointed out that there was no hurry, as the change could not take effect until Town Meeting, saying he wanted to discuss it after seeing the requested drawings. Mr. Russo withdrew his motion.

Town Planner Cashell suggested that the matter be deferred to the August 1st workshop, saying he would make all the changes and supply the requested drawings for that meeting. Selectman Maddox expressed agreement.

Mr. Russo said he understood what Mr. Hall and Selectman Maddox wanted, but the Board had already spent a couple of hours on this issue, and what Town Planner Cashell had highlighted on the handouts was what was being asked for. He said the four lots on Tear Drop Circle could be included, and the two lots mentioned by Mr. Hall could be included, but he did not understand why the proposed change could be sent to a public hearing at this time, adding that it would be nice to get something done, and these were tiny little changes.

Ms. McGrath moved to defer further discussion on this item, date specific, to the 08-01-07 Planning Board Meeting. Mr. Hall seconded the motion. Speaking to her motion, Ms. McGrath expressed a hope that Ms. Walsh would sign up to become a member of the Planning Board. Ms. Walsh referenced the number of times she had attended meetings, saying she had found what the Planning Board went through to be mind-boggling, and adding that she was not convinced she could do it.

VOTE: Chairman Barnes called for a verbal vote on the motion. All members voted in favor, and Chairman Barnes declared the motion to have carried unanimously (6 -0).

B. Discussion on Municipal Planning; re: parking requirements for restaurants.

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

Town Planner Cashell noted that a parking analysis had been requested, to compare what other communities did. He said the interesting thing in the analysis was that Hudson's requirements were a lot less than those of other communities. He then discussed details of the provided analysis list.

Ms. McGrath asked why the T-Bones restaurant had not been included. Mr. Cashell said T-Bones was not included mostly because of time but also because it was part of a multiple-use site, with cross-easement parking. Ms. McGrath stated that the patrons were parking on the street in the evenings.

Mr. Russo said the analysis suggested that there was a ratio of 50 or 55 ft² of building space per parking space, but these numbers did not work for something such as Dunkin Donuts, which had an early -morning peak business. The Board discussed the issues of drive-through restaurants, with Mr. Cashell contending that the drive-through business eliminated a lot of the need for parking, saying it boiled to making decisions on a case-by-case basis.

Mr. Russo said this matter had come to the Planning Board because of a problem, and he suggested that the Board should err on the side of caution. He said the Board needed to come to an understanding.

Mr. Hall suggested Dunkin Donuts was a special class of restaurant. He noted that the Board would have been way too low if it had gone to a requirement of one parking space per 100 ft² in the case of Burger King and Charmin's, but would not have been too far off with Dunkin Donuts; he then stated, however, that some Dunkin Donuts customers were parking at the adjoining businesses, and he expressed a belief that a special class was needed for Dunkin Donuts, to cover the drive aisles and parking.

Selectman Maddox said this analysis was good information that possibly should be fine-tuned, adding that he felt the Board should have requirements, perhaps at 50 ft², that could be waived if the Board were convinced there was reason to do so. Town Planner Cashell said the Board had come up with a requirement for one parking space for every three seats for a sit-down restaurant, and he expressed a belief that it could really be handled by one parking space for every two seats. Mr. Russo said what the Board had come up with was the fact that a building could support so many people per square foot; he said the Board had to realize that this was a rural community and everybody drove to the restaurants —adding that he really wanted to go with square footage of the building, rather than the number of seats.

Selectman Maddox moved to defer further discussion on this item, date specific, to the 08-01-07 Planning Board Meeting, with Town Planner Cashell to come up with something based on a square-footage number and give the Board something to look at. Ms. McGrath seconded the motion.

Mr. Hall said he would not be adverse to a combination, but two members wanted just square-footage. He then stated that he would be willing to hear any other thoughts that Town Planner Cashell might have. Mr. Cashell said he agreed that a square-footage basis had to be used for fast-food restaurants, but he felt that the universal requirement for sit-down restaurants was one space for every three seats. He contended that the reason the Lowell Road Dunkin Donuts was getting by with 22 spaces was that everyone was running in and out of the place, with a lot of transition going on, but that to require that business to have 50 spaces would be overkill. Chairman Barnes suggested that less parking spaces would be needed if that business had more queuing spaces. Selectman Massey said the Board should not lose sight of the fact that that the Lowell Road Dunkin Donuts was a special case, as it had been an

existing building and the State had taken some of their property when the road was widened.

Selectman Maddox asked that some of the older restaurants be included. Mr. Russo asked that Town Planner Cashell add T-Bones to the list, especially with respect to its evening business.

VOTE: Chairman Barnes called for a verbal vote on the motion. All members voted in favor, and Chairman Barnes declared the motion to have carried unanimously (6 -0).

C. Review Final Draft of the Proposed Amendments to Article VII — Dimensional Requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.

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

Town Planner Cashell said he was proposing to reduce multifamily use from an acre to 30,000 ft², with 30,000 ft² also being required for the first three units of a multi-family complex.

Ms. McGrath asked why the Planning Board would want to reduce the acreage requirement for multi-family housing, saying this did not make sense. Mr. Cashell said the intent was to clarify the ordinance. Ms. McGrath responded that reducing the requirement did not make sense. Mr. Cashell said he would make the first unit require 43,560 ft²; Ms. McGrath expressed agreement, saying she would make that motion. Mr. Russo seconded the motion.

Mr. Hall asked for further explanation. Mr. Cashell said the existing table required that multi-family use have a minimum lot size of 43,560 ft², and he was suggesting that it go back to what the Town had before.

Selectman Maddox asked to hear the motion again. Ms. McGrath said she had moved that 43,560 ft² of buildable lot area be recognized as the minimum lot size for the multi-family use in the B zoning district and that such use shall be serviced by both Town water and sewer. Selectman Maddox suggested that the asterisk be changed to numbers for clarity. Chairman Barnes concurred.

Mr. Cole asked if this were tied in, questioning what could be built on 43,560 ft². Mr. Russo said the answer was nothing—that one could not build a multifamily home on 43,560 ft², because that could not be a multi-family home at that point. Mr. Hall said that was not what the ordinance should read, if that were the interpretation. Mr. Russo asked when the additional 5,000 ft² requirement would kick in; Town Planner Cashell said that was in the second draft motion.

Mr. J. Bradford Seabury, a member of the Zoning Board of Adjustment, pointed out that this motion, as stated, was throwing out 10,000 ft² from what currently existed, as the present requirement required 5,000 ft² for each unit after the first. He then expressed a belief that what was being proposed was going to make it a lot easier for some developers to do some tardy things. Mr. Hall then expressed a belief that the

text for the first motion should require 53,560 ft², to keep things the same —adding that it would be foolish to say a lot was buildable if it were not, and no one could build a multi-family home on 43,560p ft².

Ms. McGrath moved to amend her motion to read that 53,560 ft² would be required for a buildable lot. Mr. Russo concurred, noting this was a friendly amendment.

Selectman Massey said he would not vote for this amendment, if he were a voting member. He pointed out that this was in the Business zoning district, with Town sewer and water required —adding that one could put four units in 43,560 ft² in the TR zone. He contended that 43,560 ft² with sewer and water was not big density, saying requirement of 53,560 ft² would be overkill. Town Planner Cashell expressed agreement.

Mr. Hall said the intent had been to keep the requirement what it was. He said the other numbers might have merit, but keeping the status quo had been the intent, and there should be an whole other discussion if the intent were to change things. Town Planner Cashell said it was not changing, as it had never been clarified until this point.

Mr. Russo said he interpreted the original text as requiring 43,560 ft², to start with, and then 5,000 ft² per unit, so there should be 15,000 ft² added, not 10,000 ft².

Ms. McGrath changed her motion to read 58,560 ft² as the requirement. Mr. Russo said he would not second that change. Mr. Cole seconded the motion.

VOTE: No further comment being brought forward, Chairman Barnes called for a verbal vote on the motion. Ms. McGrath and Mr. Cole voted in favor; all other members present voted in opposition. Chairman Barnes then declared the motion to have failed (2 –4).

Mr. Hall said he would make the same motion, but for 53,560 ft². Mr. Russo seconded the motion.

VOTE: Chairman Barnes then called for a verbal vote on the motion. All members present voted in favor except for Ms. McGrath, who voted in opposition, and Chairman Barnes declared the motion to have carried (5 –1).

Mr. Hall moved that 53,560 ft² of buildable lot area provide for the building of three attached dwelling units of a multi-family complex, with each additional dwelling unit requiring a minimum of 5,000 sf² of additional buildable lot area. Mr. Russo seconded the motion.

Discussion took place as to whether the problem was resolved by the change, with concern being expressed as to whether this text would encourage multi-unit buildings with large numbers of units. No further changes were made.

VOTE: Chairman Barnes called for a verbal vote on the motion. All members present voted in favor except for Ms. McGrath, who voted in opposition, and Chairman Barnes declared the motion to have carried (5 –1).

D. Review Final Draft Copy of the Proposed Amendments to the Table of Permitted Accessory Uses of the Zoning Ordinance.

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

Town Planner Cashell described how he had marked the changes to the table.

Ms. McGrath questioned putting Home Occupations in the TR zoning district. Mr. Hall concurred.

Ms. McGrath then moved to change the “P” designation for a Home Occupation in the TR zone to an “S” designation. Mr. Hall seconded the motion.

VOTE: Chairman Barnes called for a verbal vote on the motion. All members voted in favor, and Chairman Barnes declared the motion to have carried unanimously (6 –0).

VIII. OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Russo commented that the added turning lane in front of the Nottingham Square site was being used by speeders to pass slower traffic, because it was not marked for right-turn-only traffic. He suggested that the Planning Board should address this situation, noting that he had almost been hit, himself. Selectman Massey said the Police Chief had made the same comment to him the preceding week.

Following further discussion, Ms. McGrath moved to send to the Highway Traffic Safety Committee a request that that committee review the extra lane in front of Nottingham Square with respect to safety concerns and determine whether that lane should be designated and marked as a right -turn-only lane. Mr. Russo seconded the motion.

VOTE: Chairman Barnes called for a verbal vote on the motion. All members voted in favor except for Mr. Hall and Mr. Barnes, who both abstained. Chairman Barnes then declared the motion to have carried (4 –0–2).

Mr. Hall reported that the Highway Traffic Safety Committee had voted today to approve making an ordinance to place NO PARKING signs on the guardrails on Greeley Street.

Town Planner Cashell discussed the traffic flow on Lowell Road, noting that traffic was backing up all the way to Haefner's from the turn onto the Sagamore Bridge road ; he suggested that there was a need for two lanes, saying this would alleviate a lot of the morning backup, and he expressed a belief that the painted island could be used for that purpose. Chairman Barnes expressed concern that there might be a lot of crisis crossing as a result.

Selectman Maddox said he felt this might be a good thing to consider as part of the Friels development discussion, but he did not think the Town wanted to take that on, and he did not think this was the appropriate venue for that discussion. Selectman Massey said he felt the Town might be able to get the State to make two turning lanes for southbound traffic turning onto the Sagamore Bridge road.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

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

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

Chairman Barnes then declared the meeting to be adjourned at 11:07 p.m.

Date: August 6, 2007

James Barnes , Chairman

J. Bradford Seabury, Recorder

Marilyn McGrath, Secretary

-- FILE COPY --

**HUDSON PLANNING BOARD Meeting Minutes
June 6, 2007**

Page 24

The following changes were made in accordance with the Board's review of these minutes at its September 26, 2007 meeting:

Pages 3, 4, and 10" — various citations of "CLD (Costello, Lomasney, and deNapoli, Inc.) were changed to "VHB (Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.)," the Planning Board's traffic consultant.