



# 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 – APRIL 8, 2026 - DRAFT

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>E</u>	Member <u>X</u>
9	James Crowley	Julia Paquin	George Hurd	Todd Boyer
10	Member <u>X</u>	Member <u>E</u>	Alternate <u>E</u>	Alternate <u>S</u>
12	Bob Guessferd	Brooke Dubowik		
13	Select. Rep <u>E</u>	Town Rep. <u>X</u>		

#### I. CALL TO ORDER BY CHAIRPERSON

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

#### II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

#### III. ROLL CALL

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

#### IV. SEATING OF ALTERNATES

Mr. Boyer sat for Mr. Van der Veen.

#### V. MEETING MINUTES

- 25 March 2026 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Ulery moved to approve the meeting minutes of 25 March 2026, as presented. Motion seconded by Mr. Crowley. All in favor – motion carried 4/0/1 (Boyer).

#### VI. OLD BUSINESS

- A. Washville Car Wash Site Plan  
SP# 10-25

9 Morgan Road  
Map 156/Lot 016

Purpose of Plan: to propose a new car wash building with associated parking and customer accessible vacuum machines (**Deferred from January 28, 2026**).

Mr. Ulery moved to defer the Site Plan Application for Washville Car Wash, SP# 10-25, Map 156/Lot 016, 9 Morgan Road, Hudson, NH to date certain, April 22, 2026. Motion seconded by Mr. Boyer. All in favor – motion carried 5/0/0.

44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89

**VII. NEW BUSINESS**

A. Restaurant Depot Site Plan 273 Lowell Road  
CUP# 01-26 & SP# 01-2 Map 243/Lot 034

Purpose of Plan: to depict the construction of a new commercial building for a wholesale cash-and-carry foodservice supplier, along with associated site improvements. The project has been designed to avoid any direct impacts to on-site wetlands, with all proposed work located outside of the wetland boundary. However, certain construction activities and site improvements are proposed within the 75-foot wetland buffer.  
Application acceptance & hearing.

Mr. Utery moved to accept the Non-Residential **Site Plan** for Restaurant Depot Site Development Plan, SP# 01-26, Map 234 Lot 034, 273 Lowell Road, Hudson, NH. Motion seconded by Mr. Crowley. All in favor – motion carried 5/0/0.

Mr. Utery moved to accept the **Conditional Use Permit** for Restaurant Depot Site Development Plan, CUP# 01-26, Map 234 Lot 034, 273 Lowell Road, Hudson, NH. Motion seconded by Mr. Crowley. All in favor – motion carried 5/0/0.

Keith Curran, P.E. – Bohler Engineering, LLC, explained that the Conservation Commission has completed its site walk a couple of weeks ago. This application will be back before the Commission on the 13<sup>th</sup>. There is a 3:1 slope from the entrance drive to the loading dock and the Commission may suggest this be reduced to 2:1, in order to lessen any impacts to the wetland buffer area. There are no wetland impacts proposed, but the project is within the wetland buffer. This is currently a vacant, mostly wooded lot. The proposal is a 50,000 s.f. building for the Restaurant Depot. This will be used as a wholesale retail store for food service suppliers. The plan shows four loading docks and a 30’ access drive. The plan shows 173 parking spaces. The spaces along the two faces of the building are shown as 10’x20’ and the other spaces shown are 9’x18’ with 24’ wide drive aisles. Per the zoning, a retail use would be one space per 200 s.f. and a warehouse use would be one space per 600 s.f. This would require between 84-250 parking spaces. This use is a mixture of the two uses, and 173 spaces is believed to achieve the needs of the owner.

Mr. Curran explained that this building will not be open to the general public and will require a membership. Interior landscaping is being provided, as required and is shown on a landscape plan. The plans show an infiltration basin and deep sump water catch basins to handle the stormwater. Before the water flows into the infiltration basin, there will be two water quality units for the Total Suspended Solids removal. The phosphorus removal requirements will be met by the infiltration proposed. The site generally flows from the north to the west. The drive will slightly encroach into the 75’ wetland buffer. The stormwater system meets the Town and State stormwater regulations. The applicant will still need to submit to NH DES for an Alteration of Terrain permit. The site will have public water run to it. The Fire Department is comfortable with the proposed hydrants shown on the plan. The site is outside of the public sewer district and is proposing an on-site gravity-fed leach field. Septic approval will be needed from NH DES. A photometrics plan was also submitted. The project will fully comply with the 100’ residential buffer.

90  
91 Mr. Curran explained that there are three waiver requests as part of the application. These  
92 include: **§275-8.C.(2) – Parking Calculations** – To allow for 173 parking spaces where otherwise  
93 250 would be required. The applicant states that, based on their other locations, they have a  
94 better measurement of how many spaces are needed for the site. Also, **§275-8.C.(6).(b) –**  
95 **Loading Space Dimensions** – To allow for reduced size loading docks. The applicant states that  
96 the proposed loading spaces meet the size and count requirements needed for their operation,  
97 without increasing the total non-permeable footprint. Finally, **§276-11.1.B.(25) – Setbacks** – To  
98 allow for three parking spaces to encroach into the setback. The applicant states that to provide  
99 the interior landscaping required, three spaces had to be shifted to encroach the setback lines.

100  
101 In response to a question from Mr. Crowley, Mr. Curran explained that there is a culvert shown  
102 that does not tie into the basin. The culvert will accept runoff from pervious areas.

103  
104 Mr. Ulery stated that the plan seems to show that, from the impervious levels, the water will be  
105 directed into a retention pond, not the wetlands. Mr. Curran agreed that after a certain amount of  
106 flow, the retention pond will flow into the wetlands.

107  
108 Heath Mize, ADA Architects, Inc., stated that the proposed building reflects the typical  
109 Restaurant Depot style and design. This will be a precast concrete building, painted white, with a  
110 blue band around the top and bottom of the building. The building will include a canopy along  
111 the front in order to protect customers from weather while loading. At the rear of the building,  
112 there are four loading dock doors. Also, a generator in a fenced area with white vinyl slats. There  
113 will also be a full enclosed trash compactor. Refrigeration equipment will be kept on an  
114 equipment pad, also screened with a chain-link fence with white vinyl slats.

115  
116 Mr. Crowley asked about the elevation of the building. Ms. Mize stated that the top of the  
117 building is 36' high. The bottom of the canopy of 14' high and the top of the canopy is 18' high.  
118 There are rooftop units shown on the plan. These are generally set to the middle of the building.  
119 For areas beyond the site, the road and access drive are higher than the building, but the area is  
120 generally very wooded. A sight line study was not conducted for the project.

121  
122 Shaun Kelly, Chappell Engineering Associates, LLC, explained that the site is located on the  
123 west side of Lowell Road. The site is at the corner of a signalized intersection for Lowell Road  
124 with Rita Avenue and Green Meadow Drive, the future access drive for the Hudson Logistics  
125 Center project. The study area initially included the 3A/Rita Avenue intersection but at the  
126 conceptual meeting there were questions about the downstream intersection of Lowell  
127 Road/Dracut Road and River Road/Steele Road. These intersections were thus included in the  
128 analysis. Today, the corridor carries approximately 23,000 vehicles per day, with 2,100-2,500  
129 during peak hours. The existing volumes were adjusted to account for general growth in traffic  
130 and based on ongoing or planned projects in the area. The study also included planned  
131 improvements as part of the Logistics Center project, including a widening of Route 3A  
132 southbound, giving an exclusive right turn lane into the project area, and a widening of the  
133 driveway approach, allowing for a double left turn lane. The signal control will also be replaced  
134 with an adaptive signal control. At the intersection of Dracut/River Roads, there will be  
135 geometric improvements for the southbound Route 3A approach and adaptive signal technology

136 as well. NH DOT, who has jurisdiction of the corridor, has reviewed the proposed improvements  
137 and believes them to be appropriate.  
138

139 Mr. Kelly noted that there is no specific use for traffic generation rates that a restaurant depot  
140 falls within. Restaurant Depot instead commissioned a study at five of its existing locations to  
141 create empirical trip generation rates. This showed that the store will do approximately 50 trips  
142 per hour during peak hours of traffic, both in and outbound. The bulk of the traffic should be  
143 heading northbound toward the highway. 30% of the traffic was accounted for in the study  
144 through the southbound access site. There is no border adjustment to be applied to the study per  
145 NH DOT based on the fact that the site is near to the Massachusetts border. Also, there is no  
146 sales tax on food which may help with these concerns. At the signals evaluated, the delays will  
147 increase by less than one second per vehicle. The average motorist will not notice a delay based  
148 on the proposed project.  
149

150 Mr. Crowley expressed surprise that ITE does not have a land use code for a similar use. Mr.  
151 Kelly stated that the applicant is confident that the study commissioned contains accurate data  
152 for the use. Mr. Crowley asked if the proposed footprint is average to their other buildings. Mr.  
153 Kelly stated that the proposed size is slightly on the smaller side, comparatively.  
154

155 Mr. Ulery noted that the traffic flow for this site will likely be for NH stores, as there is an  
156 existing location in Andover, MA.  
157

158 Mr. Malley asked why 173 parking spaces are needed for the site, based on the projected traffic  
159 counts. Mr. Kelly explained that the applicant conducted an observed parking demand at some of  
160 its other sites. Typically, 60 vehicles were the number seen on site at any given time. The  
161 maximum seen was in the 80-90 vehicle range. The 173 spaces proposed is more than  
162 appropriate for the site's traffic. He noted that Avon's location is 88,000 s.f. and Andover's is  
163 80,000 s.f.  
164

165 Mr. Kelly noted that he did not see large vehicles being used at the other sites, which would  
166 require larger sized parking spaces on the site. Mr. Crowley noted that there is a mixture of  
167 spaces being proposed where Town code requires a certain size, unless otherwise approved by  
168 the Planning Board. He suggested a waiver request in order to receive more detailed information.  
169

170 In response to a question from Mr. Crowley, Mr. Kelly explained that the maximum queue  
171 expected for the nearby access drive would be approximately six vehicles in each of the left hand  
172 turn lanes. This would not extend back to the site's driveway.  
173

174 Mr. Ulery asked how a Restaurant Depot may impact Sysco carriers traffic loads. Mr. Kelly  
175 stated that he does not know this answer.  
176

177 Mr. Boyer suggested eliminating seven parking spaces, thus eliminating a waiver, reducing some  
178 of the impervious asphalt and still meeting the applicant's parking needs. Mr. Curran explained  
179 that the applicant would like to make sure there is enough parking on site but that he would  
180 speak further with his client.  
181

182 Larry Cohen, Restaurant Depot, LLC, stated that parking is a huge mentality in the restaurant  
183 business. This use will typically require between 80-100 spaces. If using the ITE for a warehouse  
184 use, this proposal would be way above the requirement. If using the ITE for a retail use, the  
185 proposal would be way below it. The intention is to maximize the parking to the greatest extent  
186 possible. Mr. Boyer stated that the corner of the lot with the three parking spaces which will  
187 require a waiver, includes a total of seven spaces. He again suggested eliminating these, still  
188 leaving the applicant with more than double the spaces required for a building that is 30,000 s.f.  
189 larger than the proposed building. Mr. Cohen stated that the argument makes sense, and he would  
190 agree to remove the seven spaces.

191  
192 Public input opened at @ 8:02 PM.

193  
194 Edward Thompson, 22 Burns Hill Road, asked about a noise study. There are neighbors living  
195 close by to this site. In 2022, a Warrant Article was approved at the Town election to afford  
196 abutters a 400' setback to commercial development. He asked why the proposed setback to this  
197 project is only 100'. The traffic from the Target flow center has not yet been realized and this  
198 project will increase traffic in the area. He noted that the applicant's company was recently  
199 purchased by Sysco.

200  
201 Mark Tempesta, 12 Linda Street, expressed concern regarding noise from this project. This  
202 building will be approximately 150' to his son's window. He asked about any wood lines, berms,  
203 or walls to mitigate the noise to his property. The company's website states that business hours  
204 are from 7am, but he asked the loading hours in terms of additional noise. He noted that his  
205 property has a point well and the runoff from this site could impact his water quality. He asked  
206 about trash from this site, in terms of potential odors from food items being thrown away.

207  
208 Public input closed at @ 8:07 PM.

209  
210 Mr. Curran stated that the proposal will meet the zoning noise requirements. Also, the 100'  
211 residential buffer will be wooded. Approximately 90' of vegetation will remain between the drive  
212 and the nearby residences property lines. Mr. Cohen explained that there will be a fully enclosed  
213 trash compactor on the site. There is typically no spoilage as part of the business. There is  
214 generally not an odor to the stores, as this would turnoff customers. The business opens at 7am  
215 Monday through Friday. Orders are not received until 7am. The business closes at 6pm most  
216 days but is open until 7pm on Thursdays. There will be no operation outside of those hours. He  
217 noted that the deal with Sysco will likely not close for approximately one year. The CEO has  
218 committed to run this business as a separate entity. Mr. Malley noted that the approval will be for  
219 a certain land use. If the parent company changes the concept, the applicant would need to come  
220 back before the Board.

221  
222 Mr. Curran stated that the groundwater flow does not head toward the nearby residences. The  
223 project will not impact the water quality to nearby residences.

224  
225 Mr. Malley asked about the areas of noise generation for the site. Mr. Curran explained that the  
226 loading dock areas will be utilized within the normal hours of operation. The potential noise  
227 generation areas of the site will be approximately 230'-250' away from the residences. The

228 refrigeration units will be within an enclosed fenced-in area. Ms. Mize noted that the fencing is  
229 not designed as an acoustic enclosure, per say, but will minimize the noise a bit. Mr. Ulery  
230 suggested making the enclosure a bit more substantial in order to focus the noise upward. Ms.  
231 Mize stated that an acoustic fabric can be hung within the fence. Another option would be an  
232 acoustic fence along the retaining wall next to the compactor. This would cover noise from the  
233 compactor, refrigeration equipment, and the trucks. Mr. Cohen agreed to this acoustic fence  
234 along the 60' wall.  
235

236 Mr. Crowley stated that the travel lane and emergency generator noise near the residences could  
237 be impactful. The drainage plan shows a slope from the loading docks to the wetlands. These do  
238 not seem well protected. The refrigeration unit will likely make a bit of noise. There will be  
239 backup alarms. There may also be noise from the rooftop equipment.  
240

241 Mr. Crowley moved to require a Noise Study for Non-Residential **Site Plan** SP# 01-26. There  
242 was no second. Motion failed.  
243

244 Mr. Crowley stated that, during the conceptual site plan hearing, the applicant was to select the  
245 category for parking space requirements. The calculation for the required parking spaces still  
246 seems unresolved in a sense.  
247

248 Mr. Crowley moved that the parking space requirement for Non-Residential **Site Plan** SP# 01-26  
249 shall be calculated using one space per 200 s.f. of retail business use. There was no second.  
250 Motion failed.  
251

252 Mr. Crowley stated that the landscape plans do not seem to show even a minimal effort to supply  
253 a screening fence or landscaping for the residential properties on Linden Street. Per Town code,  
254 there should be screening of any utility apparatus appearing above the ground surface, other than  
255 utility poles. Also, per Town code screening, shall be provided for visual separation of  
256 incompatible uses, and shall be required between parking or loading areas and an abutting  
257 residential zone. Screening must adhere to certain requirements, with the plantings type, size,  
258 and spacing to be approved by the Planning Board. He stated that he would like the applicant to  
259 supply a more robust screening and landscaping plan in that area. Mr. Curran stated that the  
260 intention is to leave as much mature vegetation in this area as possible. Creating a berm or  
261 additional plantings would require the removal of some of these mature trees. Mr. Crowley  
262 expressed concern that most of the landscaping appears centered along the commercial area of  
263 the site and not the residential side. Mr. Curran stated that adding landscaping in this area would  
264 require the removal of mature trees, thus defeating the purpose of the vegetated buffer. Mature  
265 trees are a better buffer than other things that could be created. Mr. Crowley stated that there will  
266 be zero screening to these hardwood trees during the winter months. Mr. Curran noted that there  
267 is no operational activity proposed along that side of the building that abuts the residences. There  
268 is an emergency access drive there, as required. Mr. Ulery stated that the 90' of tree buffer is  
269 landscaping. Mr. Crowley stated that a residential neighbor should not have to watch trucks  
270 access the loading docks on this site. Mr. Boyer noted that the applicant is willing to add an  
271 acoustic fence along the retaining wall, which will absorb some of the noise. Mr. Malley noted  
272 that screening was never intended to make the use disappear.  
273

274 Mr. Crowley stated that the edge of Lowell Road is on a slope approximately 26' above and  
275 adjacent to the proposed parking area. Any stormwater flowing down that slope is currently sheet  
276 flow which will run across the parking spaces and drive aisle to catch basins that will capture the  
277 surface runoff. He expressed concern regarding any hazardous ice accumulation on the pavement  
278 surfaces in that location. Generally, there is a diversion swale at the toe of the slope to mitigate  
279 against this. Mr. Curran explained that there is not a huge amount of flow coming off that hill.  
280 There is a curtain drain shown on the plan to help with the groundwater flow due to the ledge in  
281 this area. The post development runoff from the site will be equal to or less for all of the storm  
282 events.

283  
284 Mr. Crowley explained if the applicant would agree to use on site snow removal contractors with  
285 Green Snow Pro Certification. Mr. Curran stated that this was agreed to.

286  
287 Mr. Cohen noted that there was a comment made by a nearby resident regarding the color of the  
288 building being blue and white and requesting a more neutral color for the wall of the building  
289 that faces nearby residences. Mr. Cohen stated that he would agree to paint the building on that  
290 side a neutral color. Mr. Boyer noted that the resident in question testified that he lives at 12  
291 Linda Street. He asked if the resident is looking for the southern wall of the building to be  
292 painted. Mr. Cohen stated that he believes it to be the southwest wall. Mr. Malley noted that the  
293 resident agreed from the audience.

294  
295 In response to a question from Mr. Crowley, Mr. Curran stated that test pits were completed for  
296 the infiltration area and in the leaching area for the septic. These were used to estimate the  
297 seasonal high groundwater and the infiltration rate. The designs were done based on the test pits.  
298 Mr. Crowley asked about the septic system design and infiltration. Mr. Malley stated that this is  
299 not in the purview of the Planning Board. Mr. Curran stated that the State will receive the test pit  
300 information while reviewing the septic design. Mr. Crowley stated that Town Code §276-13.G.  
301 states that a typical design should be submitted. Mr. Curran noted that the Town will be fed that  
302 information when the septic permit is applied for to the State.

303  
304 Mr. Crowley asked for a profile to prove that the vertical elevations will not obstruct the required  
305 line of sight for the access drive. Mr. Curran explained that the goal is to maintain less than 2.5'  
306 of height for any objects within that area. The driver height is 3. going uphill. There should not  
307 be any sight lines issues. The road is not designed to have any horizontal or vertical curvatures  
308 that would impede the sight lines. Mr. Crowley asked that the standard profile be added to the  
309 plans. He asked about the maintenance of a clear sight line. Mr. Curran noted that drivers will  
310 enter the site through the Target property and an easement to allow that has been granted. The  
311 easement language was included as part of the package. The easement allows for access and a  
312 monument sign. He is unclear if it speaks to sight distance maintenance. Mr. Crowley asked that  
313 this be reviewed.

314  
315 Mr. Crowley asked about adding a plan purpose note. He stated that he would also like to see the  
316 hours of operation documented. Mr. Malley noted that this could be included as a condition of  
317 approval.

318

319 Mr. Crowley suggested removing 20' from the 250' parking area depth, which could eliminate  
320 many of the conditional use requirements. Mr. Cohen noted that this is less about square footage,  
321 and more about rack capacity Rows of racking will be running north to south and making this  
322 narrower would reduce a row of racking. The store needs to be built to be sufficient for the  
323 volume and to have enough parking for the potential volume. Reducing this area would likely not  
324 be possible. Mr. Curran stated that the limit of work will be 50' from the wetlands. The building  
325 cannot be pushed further from the wetlands on the site, due to the ledge. The building will be  
326 outside of the ledge. The only blasting needed will be for the drainage utilities.

327  
328 Mr. Crowley noted that the outdoor lighting requirements seem to show an issue at the end of the  
329 access driveway onto Green Meadow Drive. There should be no light spilling offsite. He asked  
330 that the applicant review §275-17.D.6. Mr. Curran noted that a waiver from this item could be  
331 submitted, though the intention is for safety of the access drive area.

332  
333 Mr. Boyer moved to continue the Non-Residential **Site Plan**, SP# 01-26, and **Conditional Use**  
334 **Permit** CUP# 01-26, for Restaurant Depot Site Development Plan, Map 234 Lot 034, 273  
335 Lowell Road, Hudson, NH, to date certain, May 27, 2026. Motion seconded by Ulery.  
336 All in favor – motion carried 5/0/0.

337  
338 **VIII. ADJOURNMENT:**

339  
340 Mr. Boyer moved to adjourn. Motion seconded by Mr. Crowley.  
341 All in favor – motion carried 5/0/0.

342  
343 Meeting adjourned at 9:20 P.M.

344  
345  
346  
347  
348 \_\_\_\_\_  
349 Ed Van der Veen  
350 Secretary

351 *These minutes are in draft form and have not yet been approved by the Planning Board.*  
352 *Note: Planning Board minutes are not a transcript. For full details a video of the meeting is*  
353 *available on HCTV (Hudson Community Television) [www.hudsonctv.com](http://www.hudsonctv.com).*