



# TOWN OF HUDSON

## Planning Board

Timothy Malley, Chairman

Robert Guessferd, Selectmen Liaison



12 School Street · Hudson, New Hampshire 03051 · Tel: 603-886-6008 · Fax: 603-594-1142

### MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING DATE – MARCH 25, 2026

4	In attendance = X	Alternate Seated = S	Partial Attendance = P	Excused Absence = E
6	Tim Malley	Jordan Ulery	Ed Van der Veen	Timothy Lyko
7	Chair <u>X</u>	Vice-Chair <u>X</u>	Member <u>X</u>	Member <u>X</u>
9	James Crowley	Julia Paquin	George Hurd	Todd Boyer
10	Member <u>X</u>	Member <u>X</u>	Alternate <u>E</u>	Alternate <u>E</u>
12	Bob Guessferd	Brooke Dubowik		
13	Select. Rep <u>E</u>	Town Rep. <u>X</u>		

16 **I. CALL TO ORDER BY CHAIRPERSON**

17 Mr. Malley called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

19 **II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

20 Mr. Malley invited all to participate in the Pledge of Allegiance and read through the Chairperson's  
21 introduction/order of business and cited housekeeping items.

23 **III. ROLL CALL**

24 Mr. Mallery asked the Clerk to call for attendance.

26 **IV. SEATING OF ALTERNATES**

27 None at this time.

29 **V. MEETING MINUTES**

- 30 • 14 January 2026 Meeting Minutes

31  
32 Mr. Ulery moved to approve the meeting minutes of 14 January 2026, as amended. Motion  
33 seconded by Mr. Lyko. Motion carried 5/0/1 (Mallery).

- 35 • 11 February 2026 Meeting Minutes

36  
37 Mr. Ulery moved to approve the meeting minutes of 11 February 2026, as presented. Motion  
38 seconded by Mr. Lyko. All in favor – motion carried 6/0/0.

- 40 • 25 February 2026 Meeting Minutes

42 Mr. Ulery moved to approve the meeting minutes of 25 February 2026, as amended. Motion  
43 seconded by Mr. Lyko. All in favor – motion carried 6/0/0.

44

45 **VI. CORRESPONDENCE**

46 A. Elvis Dhima, Director of Development Services

- 47 • Bond Reduction Request – Target Development Water & Sewer Onsite Improvements

48

49 *Mr. Crowley recused himself at 7:04PM.*

50

51 Mr. Dhima explained that there have been significant improvements made to the site. There is a  
52 bond in place for the water and sewer, as required for being tied into the Town’s system. The bond  
53 reduction assessment has been reviewed and is agreed with.

54

55 *Ms. Paquin excused herself from the meeting at 7:05PM.*

56

57 Mr. Lyko moved to approve a bond reduction in the amount of \$628,557.00 for the on-site water  
58 and sewer improvements associated with the Target Flow Center project, leaving a remaining  
59 bond balance of \$597,609.00 as recommendation of the Development Services Director, Elvis  
60 Dhima. Motion seconded by Mr. Ulery.

61 All in favor – motion carried 4/0/0.

62

63 *Mr. Crowley returned to the Board at 7:06PM.*

64

- 65 • Target Master Plan Fund Request – Comprehensive review & update of the  
66 Town’s Planning Board Regulations, Zoning Ordinance, and related Engineering  
67 Construction Details.

68

69 Mr. Dhima explained that the Board successfully negotiated a \$200,000 fee related to the Master  
70 Plan. This fee has been received from Target as part of its site approval. Ideally, the Board should  
71 set base Land Use Regulations in the Zoning Ordinance. Once completed, the Board can work on  
72 its Master Plan. He recommended having a third party help update the Land Use Regulations,  
73 Zoning Ordinance, and related construction details. The funds for this are proposed to come from  
74 the Target Master Plan Fund.

75

76 Mr. Ulery moved recommend to the Board of Selectman the expenditure of up to \$100,000.00  
77 from the Target Master Plan Fund, account 09-2000-2050-585, for a third-party comprehensive  
78 review and update of the Town’s Land Use Regulations, Zoning Ordinance, and related  
79 Engineering Construction Details, as requested by the Development Services Director, Elvis  
80 Dhima. Motion seconded by Mr. Lyko.

81 All in favor – motion carried 5/0/0.

82

83 **VII. OLD BUSINESS**

84 A. Nottingham Square Fast-Food Restaurant  
85 SP# 14-25

142 Lowell Road  
Map 204/Lot 73

86 Purpose: to depict the layout of a proposed fast-food restaurant with drive-thru and the  
87 accompanying parking lot modifications on the property. Application acceptance &  
88 hearing. **(Applicant requesting to withdraw application)**  
89

90 Mr. Mallery read the applicant's request to withdraw into the record.  
91

92 Mr. Ulery moved to accept the applicant's request to withdraw the Site Plan Application for the  
93 Nonresidential Amended Site Plan, Nottingham Square Fast-Food Restaurant SP# 14-25 142  
94 Lowell Road, Hudson, NH, Map 204/Lot 73, without prejudice. Motion seconded by Mr. Lyko.  
95 All in favor – motion carried 5/0/0.  
96

97 B. Washville Car Wash Site Plan 9 Morgan Road  
98 SP# 10-25 Map 156/Lot 016  
99 Purpose of Plan: to propose a new car wash building with associated parking and  
100 customer accessible vacuum machines. **(Applicant requesting a deferral to April 8,**  
101 **2026)**  
102

103 Mr. Lyko moved to defer the Site Plan Application for Washville Car Wash, SP# 10-25, Map  
104 156/Lot 016, 9 Morgan Road, Hudson, NH to date certain, April 8, 2026. Motion seconded by  
105 Mr. Crowley. All in favor – motion carried 5/0/0.  
106

107 C. Proposed Retail Building Site Plan & Conditional Use Permit 1 Bockes Road  
108 SP# 11-25 & CUP# 04-25 Map 145/Lot 001  
109 Purpose: to propose a 12,000 SF multi-tenant retail building with associated parking and  
110 drainage improvements. The retaining wall and minor site grading will encroach into the  
111 75-foot wetland buffer. Application acceptance & hearing. **(Deferred from January 28,**  
112 **2026).**  
113

114 David Jordan, Greenman-Pedersen, Inc. (GPI), reviewed the changes to the plan since January.  
115 One item of concern was to understand the limit of the soil cap. This is an asbestos fill site which  
116 was capped a number of years ago with 2.5' of soil. The existing conditions plan outlined the area,  
117 which comprises most of the site, except the edges along Bockes Road and Lawrence Road. There  
118 was discussion at the last meeting regarding a waiver request to allow for 88' of buffer separation  
119 between this commercial development and the residential lots across Bockes Road, where 100' is  
120 required. Through discussion with the Board, it was suggested that the applicant consider reducing  
121 the depth of some of the parking spaces and potentially turn the back driveway into one-way  
122 circulation to move the development away from those residential lots. This was done to provide a  
123 102' setback buffer between the commercial development and residential lots. This waiver is no  
124 longer being sought.  
125

126 Mr. Crowley stated that the buffer is measured, per Sheet 4, from the northern boundary of Map  
127 144/Lot 21-9. However, the reference deed identifies this area as a drainage easement. Per RSA  
128 477:26, easements are appurtenant rights and do not constitute independent land uses. In this case,  
129 the underlying use of Map 144/Lot 21-9 remains residential, consistent of all the parcels within  
130 Rolling Woods Association. The easement does not convert the parcel to a nonresidential use under  
131 NH law. The 100' buffer required should be measured from the northern Bockes Road right of

132 way. As a result, a waiver should be required. It would be appropriate to seek an opinion from  
133 Town Counsel.

134  
135 Mr. Ulery noted that the open space is not an easement, but a declaration of the Homeowner's  
136 Association as part of their Site Plan. That area has to remain open space and cannot be residential.  
137 Mr. Mallery stated that it is still a residential district. A waiver is needed if within 100' of the  
138 residential district. Mr. Ulery suggested that Mr. Crowley is correct on the northern end. Mr. Jordan  
139 stated that he believes the Zoning Ordinance mentions a residential use, not a residential district.  
140 Mr. Mallery stated that this is an open space for the residents of the development. Ms. Dubowik  
141 stated that she does not believe this is open space. It is simply an easement. Mr. Jordan stated that  
142 it is an easement over open space. The use is open space, not residential.

143  
144 Mr. Crowley moved to require a waiver to §276-11.1.B(12)(B) regarding the 100' residential  
145 buffer for a 100' waiver. Motion seconded by Mr. Van der Veen. All in favor – motion carried  
146 5/0/0.

147  
148 Mr. Jordan explained that the with reduction in parking space depth and the change of the back  
149 driveway to one way flow, the pavement edge is now 14' further from the residential district than  
150 it was at the last hearing. There was also discussion at the last meeting regarding the  
151 dumpster/trash enclosure being closer to the back of the building and Bockes Road. The  
152 applicant has since rotated it away from the residential area. He noted that a driveway permit has  
153 been obtained from New Hampshire DOT. The applicant has submitted the intersection  
154 improvement plans that DOT has required be implemented.

155  
156 Mr. Mallery asked about the traffic report submitted, which appears to be 12 years old. Mr.  
157 Jordan explained that the applicant submitted an updated memo dated October 2025. It  
158 summarizes the peak AM, PM, and Saturday midday traffic that was submitted to both the Board  
159 and NH DOT. Mr. Mallery explained that the Board has a memo from a project that was  
160 previously approved across the street from this site, stating that a traffic light is warranted for  
161 that project. He noted that the traffic memo submitted by the applicant does not take that into  
162 account. Mr. Jordan stated that the applicant was not made aware of that project, including in its  
163 discussions with DOT. Mr. Mallery stated that this needs to be solved. There is an existing  
164 requirement for a traffic light. Mr. Jordan asked how that property owner's requirement to install  
165 a traffic light would impact this project. Mr. Mallery stated that, if the project across the street  
166 does not move forward, this would need to be taken into account. Mr. Jordan stated that, if the  
167 project across the street does not move forward, then the applicant's traffic memo stands as  
168 submitted. Mr. Mallery stated that the applicant's traffic memo does not take into account  
169 changes in the community that have recently occurred. Mr. Jordan stated that a full traffic study  
170 for this project was not requested.

171  
172 Mr. Ulery noted that a current member of the Board, sitting then as an alternate, once suggested  
173 including a crossway or traffic light for future. The Board ruled that as a potential, not an actual  
174 at that time. 84 Lumber has taken no action. Their plan will expire in a short period of time, if  
175 they continue to take no action. Mr. Mallery stated that this is not the case today. Mr. Ulery  
176 noted that 84 Lumber has stated they will install a traffic light. The applicant in question has  
177 stated that they will install a turn lane. If 84 Lumber decides to move forward, it must be done

178 under the current conditions, not the conditions at the time of their approval. Mr. Mallery asked  
179 if the traffic situation will be worsened if this application moves forward and 84 Lumber does  
180 not. Mr. Ulery suggested that a traffic study be required.

181  
182 Mr. Jordan noted that this is DOT's roadway. When DOT reviewed the plan and the submitted  
183 trip generation memo, they determined that the appropriate mitigation would be a right turn lane  
184 on Route 111 and a second exit lane off Lawrence Road. No further traffic study or signals were  
185 tripped. Mr. Mallery asked how DOT could make this determination when it previously  
186 determined that the development across the street would require a traffic signal. Mr. Jordan  
187 stated that this was likely due to that project's trip generation report.

188  
189 Mr. Lyko asked who completed the applicant's traffic study. Mr. Jordan stated that GPI's traffic  
190 engineering group put together the study, and he believes it was then reviewed by Fuss &  
191 O'Neill. Mr. Lyko noted that the applicant then submitted the study to DOT who recommended  
192 going through with the proposed turn lanes but did not mention anything about a traffic signal. It  
193 appears that DOT did not believe there would be enough traffic without 84 Lumber to warrant a  
194 traffic signal. If the applicant is made to conduct a traffic study, it would probably continue to  
195 show that a traffic light is not needed. Mr. Mallery stated that the Board required 84 Lumber to  
196 conduct a traffic study as part of its approved Site Plan. DOT reviewed that traffic study and  
197 determined that the intersection warranted a traffic light. The Board is now considering another  
198 project at the same intersection, and it is unclear what triggered the qualification for a traffic  
199 light. Mr. Ulery stated that this is DOT's road and they made determinations about what is  
200 needed. Mr. Lyko stated that additional information would not hurt.

201  
202 Mr. Crowley moved to require that SP# 11-25 submit a Town required traffic impact study.  
203 Motion seconded by Mr. Lyko.

204  
205 Discussion:

206 Mr. Ulery asked the estimated time and cost for such a study. Mr. Mallery stated that this is  
207 irrelevant to him.

208  
209 Mr. Lyko noted that the study should include all existing approvals. Mr. Mallery stated that it is  
210 up to the applicant to research other approved developments to include that traffic into the  
211 calculations.

212  
213 All in favor – motion carried 5/0/0.

214  
215 Mr. Jordan noted that the request will take at least eight weeks. He expressed disappointment  
216 that this was not determined some time ago.

217  
218 Mr. Ulery moved to defer SP# 11-25 & CUP# 04-25 to date certain July 8, 2026. Motion  
219 seconded by Mr. Crowley. All in favor – motion carried 5/0/0.

220  
221 D. The Meadows Mixed Use Development  
222 SP# 02-26 & CUP# 02-26

207 Central Street  
Map 176/Lots 41, 44, & 45

223 Purpose: to propose a residential and mixed-use development that includes three (3)  
224 residential apartment buildings within the south-central portion of the property, and one  
225 (1) mixed-use building located on the northern portion of the property. This Site Plan  
226 Application also includes a separate Conditional Use Permit Application, which is a  
227 request to allow encroachments into the wetland buffer areas. Application acceptance &  
228 hearing. **(Deferred from February 11, 2026)**  
229

230 Mr. Van der Veen moved to accept the Non-Residential **Site Plan** for the Mixed-Use  
231 Development Meadows Non-Residential Site Plan, SP# 02-26, Map 176 Lots 041, 44, 45, 207  
232 Central Street, Hudson, NH. Motion seconded by Mr. Lyko. All in favor – motion carried 5/0/0.  
233

234 Mr. Van der Veen moved to accept the **Conditional Use Permit** for the Mixed-Use  
235 Development Meadows Non-Residential Site Plan, SP# 02-26, Map 176 Lots 041, 44, 45, 207  
236 Central Street, Hudson, NH. Motion seconded by Mr. Lyko. All in favor – motion carried 5/0/0.  
237

238 Mr. Crowley moved that the Non-Residential Site Plan for the Mixed Use Development, The  
239 Meadows, SP# 02-26, Map 176/Lots 41, 44, & 45, 207 Central Street Hudson, NH, is a  
240 development of Regional Impact. With no second, the motion failed.  
241

242 Ryan Hudock, Verdantas, explained that the project consists of one mixed use building along the  
243 frontage of Central Street. Phase 1 for the project will be commercial space on the first floor of  
244 the building and eight residential units on the second floor. There will be a new access road  
245 coming in on the western side of the property for the three proposed residential apartment  
246 buildings of varying sizes and unit counts. There will be new water and sewer main extensions  
247 into the property to serve the residential units. The mixed-use building along Central Street will  
248 connect to the new service connections. Engineering was used for the utility design, stormwater  
249 design, and environmental impacts. The plan was designed to best optimize the buildable area  
250 and stay outside of the wetlands as much as possible, as these consume a good portion of the  
251 property. The plan accounts for the floodplain constraints as well. A FEMA application and a  
252 letter of map amendment were previously submitted and approved, so none of the project is  
253 within the flood hazard area. The applicant has received comments from the Fire Department and  
254 has demonstrated that there is adequate access for vehicle turning. The applicant has addressed  
255 some further comments from the third party review engineer, Fuss & O'Neill, which did not  
256 result in any substantial changes. That material is not in front of the Board for tonight's meeting.  
257

258 Mr. Mallery noted that the Conservation Commission would like to hold a site walk jointly with  
259 the Planning Board on April 18<sup>th</sup>.  
260

261 Mr. Crowey moved to hold a site walk on April 18, 2026, at 8AM. Motion seconded by Mr. Van  
262 der Veen. All in favor – motion carried 5/0/0.  
263

264 Mr. Ulery noted that there is consistent flooding on Central Street this time of year and again in  
265 the fall. He asked about the elevation of Central Street compared to proposed buildings B & C.  
266 Mr. Hudock stated that the elevation along Central Street is approximately 172. Buildings B & C  
267 are approximately 6' higher, at 178 and 177. The water in this area generally flows downgradient

268 towards Central Street. However, the flooding situation typically occurs on the opposite side of  
269 the street from this site. This project should not impact that flooding.

270  
271 Mr. Ulery noted that the snow storage for the site is proposed directly next to the wetlands. He  
272 asked if this includes a drainage trap. Mr. Hudock stated that each area of the site has stormwater  
273 ponds, including a forebay. This will allow for pretreatment before runoff enters the ponds. The  
274 snow storage locations can be adjusted.

275  
276 Mr. Van der Veen asked if a sidewalk is proposed along Central Street. Don Dumont, applicant,  
277 stated that he believed the improvement fees would go towards allowing the Town to construct  
278 this.

279  
280 Dillon Dumont, 195 R Central Street, stated that the plans for this project show a sidewalk. The  
281 connection, on land that is not owned by the applicant, does not show a sidewalk. Central Street  
282 needs a larger capital improvements project overall. The corridor fees will be substantial and  
283 could be used for this project.

284  
285 Mr. Ulery noted that the proposed entrance to Building A is directly across from a broad,  
286 unmarked entrance into the plaza. This could be a safety hazard. He does not see improvements  
287 in the plan to increase cross-traffic safety. Mr. Dillon Dumont stated that a complete traffic study  
288 was completed and reviewed by Fuss & O'Neill. This showed a larger concern at the western  
289 entrance, including left hand traffic turning into the site. The area in which the road widens out  
290 allows for enough room for a left hand turn lane to access the westerly entrance. There were no  
291 major concerns mentioned regarding the eastern entrance.

292  
293 In response to a question regarding recent updates to the plans, Mr. Dillon Dumont explained  
294 that one of the larger changes which benefited the plan was that the wetland buffer determined  
295 by the residential zone decreased from 75' to 50'. The current plans show much more impact  
296 than there actually will be. The buffer is designed to mitigate stormwater runoff and flow from  
297 the impervious areas. This will all be filtered before it flows into the wetland. Currently, this  
298 flows directly in without any filtering. He noted that one plan change being considered is to  
299 isolate parking for the residential tenants of building A. This may be located on the westerly side  
300 of the building, requiring the building to shift in location a bit.

301  
302 Mr. Crowley stated that he asked the Town Planner if the Planning Board could obtain more  
303 detailed information supporting the asbestos cap area. Currently, the Planning Board only has  
304 approximate limits of the asbestos cap, and no details of the cap thickness or depths of  
305 contaminated soil under it. He asked if the applicant will be able to obtain any additional  
306 important information related to this application. Mr. Dillon Dumon explained that the  
307 information in the packet is the most up to date, though it was done a significant amount of time  
308 ago. This is recorded in the deed and shows approximate locations. The soil types above the cap  
309 are clean filled and sandy, shown from test pits that were dug. However, DES does not want  
310 anything to touch the cap and has stated that this area should not be disturbed until the applicant  
311 is ready for construction. At that time, there will be an asbestos mitigation plan in place, with an  
312 outline of the appropriate actions to take through the State. The exact locations will not be  
313 known until construction occurs, and this is handled through the State.

314  
315 Mr. Hudock stated that the existing conditions plan contains information from all available  
316 records about the asbestos on the site. A new wetland delineation was conducted for the recent  
317 survey. An overlay is shown between the approximate asbestos area and recently delineated  
318 wetlands boundary. The proposed mitigation strategies and construction conditions through the  
319 State should alleviate impacts.

320  
321 Mr. Crowley reviewed the wetland impact exhibit which summarizes permanent and temporary  
322 wetland and buffer impact square footages. He noted that he does not see any headwalls at the  
323 driveway crossing point, which could reduce the impact to wetlands. He asked if the applicant  
324 would agree to review and finalize the crossing design to see if the permanent wetland impacts  
325 can be reduced. Mr. Hudock stated that this could be done. The crossing was designed to be at  
326 the narrowest part of the wetland, and the grading is minimal in this area, but this can be  
327 reviewed to be further reduced.

328  
329 Mr. Crowley noted that the proposed locations of the best management practices are all in the  
330 wetland buffers. He asked if this could be reconsidered. Mr. Dillon Dumont stated that he  
331 believes the Board understands the goal of a buffer. This includes to stop buildings, parking lots,  
332 or impervious area from being constructed within the buffer. Also, to stop runoff or mitigate it in  
333 the best way possible to protect the wetlands. This parcel is currently problematic. There is a  
334 huge issue with runoff on Central Street into the wetland. The covered asbestos area in the back  
335 has virtually no vegetation because nothing can grow on top of it. This allows a lot of stormwater  
336 to run into those wetlands. The proposed best management practices, along with the stormwater  
337 management plan, will improve the buffer and protect the wetlands.

338  
339 Public input opened at @ 8:50 PM.

340  
341 Susan Clement, Thurston's Drive, expressed concern regarding the potential increase in traffic  
342 and its impact on the surrounding road network and Benson Park. According to data from the  
343 Nashua Regional Planning Commission (NRPC), traffic volumes entering Benson Park are  
344 already significant on a Fridays, based on a study from 2024. Counts showed up to 1,414  
345 vehicles entering the park. Since 2024, traffic in that area appears to have increased further. The  
346 proposed development includes three residential buildings and additional mixed-use activity  
347 which could add a substantial number of daily vehicle trips to an already busy corridor. Benson  
348 Park and the surrounding roads already experience congestion and safety concerns during peak  
349 hours. Increased traffic generated by the proposed development could worsen those conditions  
350 and affect residents, park visitors, and emergency access. Additionally, the proposal includes  
351 encroachments to the designated wetland buffer areas. These environmental protections exist to  
352 manage stormwater, protect wildlife habitat, and reduce downstream flooding risks. She asked  
353 the Planning Board to carefully review the traffic impacts and environmental concerns before  
354 approving the project. She noted that there have been several accidents in the area around her  
355 road and she is concerned with adding more traffic into an area without a good solution.

356  
357 Debra Putnam, 59 Rangers Drive, acknowledged that the builder has made the point that they  
358 will be converting land that is not producing income for the Town into land that is generating  
359 income in the form of property taxes. In the field of geology, converting polluted land to income-

360 producing land is called creating a brownfield. The information she presented comes from her  
361 history as the owner of property on Rangers Drive, where a proper geological assessment of the  
362 proposed subdivision was not done. This has resulted in the flooding of basements, with certain  
363 properties including her own, relying on a French drain system to keep the basements dry. The  
364 overriding concern about the proposed project should be hydrostatic pressure due to the wetlands  
365 and the asbestos fill. She proposed that the site be assessed by someone with a PhD in geology  
366 and a professional geologist license. Based on information in the packet, page 36 Attachment D  
367 #19, it is unclear how an oil spill or gas spill could be contained within the paved parking area  
368 without curbing or catch basins, taking into consideration that the entire project is surrounded by  
369 wetlands. The response from the applicant was that curbing and swales are shown on the plan  
370 around the parking areas, which will divert surface runoff towards the proposed forebays. The  
371 forebays are designed to be lined and can be used to capture and contain oil spills in addition to  
372 the pretreatment of stormwater. In summary, no untreated stormwater will discharge into the  
373 wetlands. That ends the builder's response to these concerns. In New England, cracks exist and  
374 are enlarged during every freeze and thaw cycle. Thus, the presumed asphalt curbing and swales  
375 will need to be lined with an impermeable layer, most likely heavy plastic, as eventually the  
376 curbs and swales will no longer function as required. A second concern is that any basin or  
377 forebay will no deeper than 4' with an impermeable liner, but the liner should be double layered  
378 like the requirement on oil tankers. The construction needs to be able to handle the higher  
379 hydrostatic pressure that will occur during heavy rainstorms and hurricanes. There was an  
380 inground lined swimming pool up the street from her home and the liner raised up due to  
381 hydrostatic pressure. It is important to have a proper designs and materials Item #18 in the plan  
382 states that the plans do not indicate if catch basins are proposed. The builder's response was that  
383 no catch basins are proposed due to the shallow groundwater table. The stormwater plan is  
384 largely based on surface sheet flow. It is unclear if the stormwater design addresses a probable  
385 overflow of the proposed forebays. An overflow from any forebay will most likely pollute the  
386 surrounding wetlands, wildlife areas, and Benson Park. In summation, she stated that, while the  
387 goals are to turn the land into a brownfield, generating tax income for the Town, if the matters  
388 she presented are not addressed, it is unclear at what price an approval would come to the  
389 environment, especially Benson Park.

390  
391 Jane Lo, co-founder of p!ng located at 207 Central Street, thanked the Town for its continued  
392 support and guidance. She also thanked the Dumonts for allowing access to the site and being  
393 open to the technology of her business as a small startup. She expressed gratitude to the  
394 community for welcoming the business and giving great feedback. She expressed support for this  
395 project.

396  
397 Ed Thompson, 22 Burns Hill Road, noted that the traffic impact study only included three of the  
398 nearby intersections. One major intersection at Kimball Hill Road and Central Street, was not  
399 part of the study. He agreed with the comment from Fuss & O'Neill that the applicant should  
400 confirm if any consideration was given to analyzing the Central Street and Kimball Hill Road  
401 signalized intersection due to its proximity to the project site. He reviewed the crash reports from  
402 that area, including information gathered from January 2022-2025. At the Burnham Road/Central  
403 Street intersection, there were 19 identified crashes and three reported injuries. At the Kimball  
404 Hill Road/Central Street intersection, there were 43 vehicle crashes resulting in ten reported  
405 injuries. It appears to make more sense to study the intersection that has had more than twice the

406 number of accidents. Also, the total number of crashes between the Burnham Road light and the  
407 Kimball Hill Road light was 75, which seems high even over the span of four years. He noted  
408 that the study was conducted during one weekday and asked why this was not instead conducted  
409 on a Saturday or Sunday, when there may be more cars accessing Benson Park and travelling  
410 along Central Street. He asked if the modelling considered the Central Street gas station plan for  
411 traffic counts, as that project had already been approved. It appears the two unsignalized  
412 intersections are the problem. The one at Cumberland Farms is a level of service D, and this  
413 project would keep it at that level. The unsignalized intersections turn to a level of service F  
414 during peaks times. The engineer that completed the traffic study stated that no outside  
415 mitigation is required. It is unclear how this is possible if the Town will end up with two  
416 intersections at level of service F and one remaining at level of service D. This project abuts  
417 what is likely the most valuable and environmentally sensitive asset in Town.  
418

419 Maureen Granger suggested that the dynamic of the Town and Benson Park may change with the  
420 impending development and construction. She is opposed to this plan based on the potential  
421 change in that dynamic and the overall enjoyment of the park itself.  
422

423 Public input closed at @ 9:11 PM.  
424

425 Mr. Dillon Dumont stated that Benson Park is a crown jewel of Hudson and this is why the plan  
426 includes architectural improvements that improve the look of the building. In terms of easements for trails, the  
427 applicant plans to consider this. There is a dry piece of land which abuts the old entrance to  
428 Benson Park and there is interest to allow the Town use of that. It will not otherwise be utilized  
429 by this plan. There is willingness on behalf of the applicant to consider things to try to benefit  
430 Benson Park. He noted that Kimball Hill Road was the signalized intersection was reviewed and  
431 the traffic counts failed because it did not pick up the cars in the right hand turn onto Kimball  
432 Hill Road. Due to that, another third party reviewer recounted the data. It is no secret that this  
433 corridor is currently an issue and, whether this project moves forward or not, it will continue to  
434 be an issue. This is an opportunity for the corridor to be improved and to offset some of the  
435 taxpayer costs for this. Simulated tests were run to show how people would exit and enter the  
436 property safely. In terms of geology, there are studies when roadways are built which will  
437 continue through this process.  
438

439 Mr. Ulery noted that the project will require an Alteration of Terrain (AoT) permit, also known as  
440 a dredge and fill, though he does not see much dredging proposed. The fill will require the walls  
441 mentioned by Mr. Crowley. Mr. Hudock stated that the site is quite flat and the proposal looks to  
442 minimize earthwork to the maximum extent possible. The plan is to match existing grades and  
443 create minimal earth disturbance. The identified asbestos areas largely have an impervious cap.  
444 DES seems to be supportive of the plan because it will make for a more robust cap than what is  
445 presently in place.  
446

447 Mr. Mallery asked how the proposed food truck areas were included in the traffic count. Mr.  
448 Dillon Dumont explained that the numbers for this were accounted using a retail food  
449 establishment use and the proposed parking spaces. He suggested that the traffic engineer draw  
450 up a memo detailing this. Mr. Crowley expressed concern regarding the calculations as to how  
451 the parking was determined for these food truck areas. Mr. Dillon Dumont noted that there is not

452 an exact parking calculation that can be used for food trucks. There are parking spaces shown for  
453 the westerly food truck. A designated parking area for these is being considered at this time,  
454 though this could change. Mr. Hudock stated that greater detail can be added to the food truck  
455 areas on the plan. Per zoning, 247 spaces are required for the site, and 271 are proposed. A  
456 conservative calculation was used, and this could be scaled back, if needed.

457

458 Mr. Dillon Dumont noted that there are State requirements for food establishment areas and as  
459 those are worked out, details will be added to the plans. Mr. Crowley suggested hours of  
460 operation and other sanitary details.

461

462 Mr. Crowley asked about penetrating the asbestos area for the stormwater features. Mr. Hudock  
463 stated that material would have to be removed by a licensed professional and documented. It is  
464 unknown at this time if there is asbestos in the area of the proposed ponds. The ponds are likely  
465 the only places where the cap may be impacted but the exact depth of the cap in these areas is  
466 currently unknown. The ponds are designed in accordance with the DES AoT requirements. The  
467 details for each pond will be included in the plans.

468

469 Mr. Crowley stated that he would send along a memo to the applicant with additional items of  
470 question and concern. He suggested a sight distance plan be submitted. Mr. Dillon Dumont stated  
471 that he is familiar with the Master Plan and the amount of work that the Board put into it. One of  
472 the things in that Master Plan is an update to the Town's growth management practices, including  
473 high density housing. This is called out numerous times in reports from NRPC, the Board, the  
474 Master Plan, and the Zoning Ordinance. In terms of sight distances, they are in the traffic report.  
475 He noted that each entrance will need its own driveway permit, which will go through  
476 engineering as required. Mr. Crowley noted that school buses for this property will generate  
477 additional traffic and this information is not included in the traffic impact study. Mr. Dillon  
478 Dumont noted that there is no way to tell how many children will be in the proposed units. The  
479 school department would determine where necessary school bus stops would be located.

480

481 Mr. Lyko asked if there will be a drive-up in the retail building. Mr. Dillon Dumont stated that  
482 one is shown on either side of the retail building currently.

483

484 Mr. Van der Veen moved to defer the Non-Residential **Site Plan** for the Mixed-Use  
485 Development Meadows Non-Residential Site Plan, SP# 02-26, Map 176 Lots 041, 44, 45, 207  
486 Central Street, Hudson, NH, to date certain May 13, 2026. Motion seconded by Mr. Lyko.  
487 All in favor – motion carried 5/0/0.

488

489 Mr. Van der Veen moved to defer the **Conditional Use Permit** for the Mixed-Use Development  
490 Meadows Non-Residential Site Plan, CUP# 02-26, Map 176 Lots 041, 44, 45, 207 Central Street,  
491 Hudson, NH, to date certain May 13, 2026. Motion seconded by Mr. Lyko. All in favor –  
492 motion carried 5/0/0.

493

#### 494 **VIII. ADJOURNMENT:**

495

496 Mr. Lyko moved to adjourn. Motion seconded by Mr. Van der Veen.

497 All in favor – motion carried 5/0/0.

498  
499 Meeting adjourned at 9:54 P.M.

500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506

---

Ed Van der Veen  
Secretary

*Mr. Ulery moved to approve the minutes as presented on 04/08/26.*

507  
508 *Motion seconded by Mr. Crowley. Motion carried 4/0/1 (Boyer).*

509 ***Note: Planning Board minutes are not a transcript. For full details a video of the meeting is***  
510 ***available on HCTV (Hudson Community Television) [www.hudsonctv.com](http://www.hudsonctv.com).***