



# 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 - APPROVED

In attendance = X    Alternate Seated = S    Partial Attendance = P    Excused Absence = E

Tim Malley                      Jordan Ulery                      Ed Van der Veen                      Timothy Lyko  
Chair X                      Vice-Chair X                      Member E                      Member X

James Crowley                      Julia Paquin                      George Hurd                      Todd Boyer  
Member X                      Member E                      Alternate E                      Alternate S

Bob Guessferd                      Brooke Dubowik  
Select. Rep E                      Town Rep. X

#### 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 9 Morgan Road  
 SP# 10-25 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.

## 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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Public input opened at @ 8:02 PM.

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

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

Public input closed at @ 8:07 PM.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Crowley asked for a profile to prove that the vertical elevations will not obstruct the required line of sight for the access drive. Mr. Curran explained that the goal is to maintain less than 2.5' of height for any objects within that area. The driver eye height is 3.75' going uphill. There should not be any sight lines issues. The road is not designed to have any horizontal or vertical curvatures that would impede the sight lines. Mr. Crowley asked that the standard profile be added to the plans. He asked about the maintenance of a clear sight line. Mr. Curran noted that drivers will enter the site through the Target property and an easement to allow that has been granted. The easement language was included as part of the package. The easement allows for access and a monument sign. He is unclear if it speaks to sight distance maintenance. Mr. Crowley asked that this be reviewed.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Meeting adjourned at 9:20 P.M.

---

Ed Van der Veen  
Secretary

*Mr. Crowley moved to approve the minutes as presented on 04/22/26.  
Motion seconded by Mr. Lyko. Motion carried 5/0/2 (Van der Veen, Dumont).  
**These minutes are in draft form and have not yet been approved by the Planning Board.**  
**Note: Planning Board minutes are not a transcript. For full details a video of the meeting is available on HCTV (Hudson Community Television) [www.hudsonctv.com](http://www.hudsonctv.com).***