



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 22, 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>E</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>E</u>	Alternate <u>S</u>	Alternate <u>S</u>
12	Dillon Dumont	Brooke Dubowik		
13	Select. Rep <u>X</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 Ms. Paquin and Mr. Hurd sat for Mr. Ulery.

V. MEETING MINUTES

- 8 April 2026 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Crowley moved to approve the meeting minutes of 8 April 2026, as amended. Motion seconded by Mr. Lyko. Motion carried 5/0/2 (Van der Veen, Dumont).

VI. CORRESPONDENCE

- Request for Planning Board to authorize the Chairman to sign the Lowell/Birch/Belnap Right-of-Way Lot Line Relocation Plan by Elvis Dhima, Development Services Director

Elvis Dhima, Development Services Director, explained that the Town has been working with the owners on both sides of the Belnap extension project. A purchase and sales agreement has been agreed to. The request is to authorize the Chairman of the Planning Board to sign this in order to get it recorded.

44 Mr. Van der Veen moved to authorize the Chair to sign the Right-of-Way Lot Line Relocation
45 Plan, as presented. Motion seconded by Mr. Boyer. All in favor – motion carried 7/0/0.
46

47 **VII. OLD BUSINESS**

48 A. Washville Car Wash Site Plan 9 Morgan Road
49 SP# 10-25 Map 156/Lot 016
50 Purpose of Plan: to propose a new car wash building with associated parking and
51 customer accessible vacuum machines (**Deferred from January 28, 2026**).
52

53 *Mr. Van der Veen recused himself at 7:05 PM.*
54

55 Frank Doherty, Washville Car Wash, explained that this is a continuation from the January 28th
56 hearing. At that point, the applicant had presented a proposed project and there were a few open
57 issues. There were questions regarding the proposed site design and whether the setback from the
58 residential area to the north could be increased. A previous project on this property for a restaurant
59 use was approved to within 18’ of the neighboring property lines. The current proposal’s original
60 design showed this at 41’. Since January, this has been further increased to be 67’ from the
61 neighboring property lines. This is approximately 40’ further than what the Board previously found
62 acceptable.
63

64 Mr. Doherty stated that in January, the application did not yet have a state Alteration of Terrain
65 (AoT) permit. This is embedded in the process of reviewing stormwater, wetlands, and endangered
66 species items. The applicant has worked with the state since January and achieved the AoT permit.
67 The state has determined that the project is acceptable within their regulations. Up until December,
68 US Fish & Wildlife was in charge of endangered species, but the state has since taken over that
69 role. While the state has not adopted formal regulations, they have asked the applicant to contribute
70 to a mitigation fund towards endangered species. The project will not directly impact any species
71 but is on a property with suitable habitat for the box turtle. The applicant will contribute \$24,000
72 to this fund. The state has determined that the project will have no adverse impact on endangered
73 species and had thus issued the permit.
74

75 Mr. Doherty stated that an additional open item in January dealt with the noise study. He reviewed
76 the Town consultant’s report. The applicant’s obligation from a permit compliance standpoint is
77 to comply with the Town ordinance related to noise. The Town hired Fuss & O’Neil to review the
78 noise study, and their acoustic specialists submitted a report back to the Town. The report states
79 that the applicant’s noise study was comprehensively and conservatively completed and addressed
80 all pertinent local noise regulations. It also states that the modeling will comply with the noise
81 ordinance. The consultant noted two items. One was that the study noted items that needed to be
82 renumbered in the noise limit table. The second was that Figure 8 did not have receptor labels.
83 These two administrative changes have been made, though the Town’s consultant has not yet
84 confirmed that they have been done acceptably. These items do not change the study or the
85 conclusion that the project will be in compliance with the noise ordinance.
86

87 Regarding traffic, Mr. Doherty explained that the applicant did not have a DOT permit in January.
88 At this time, the applicant has completed a traffic study and the Town’s consultant has reviewed
89 it and concurred that it was done correctly. DOT also agreed and has issued a permit for a widening

90 of the shoulder. The Town's Development Services Director does not agree and believes that a
91 turn lane is needed. Notwithstanding the fact that DOT has jurisdiction, Town staff believes this
92 will be a benefit to the project and Town overall. Out of respect for that opinion, if the project is
93 approved, the applicant is willing to install a turn lane, if DOT will allow it. From a traffic
94 standpoint, the report does not show an issue, and the DOT does not believe there will be an issue,
95 but the applicant is willing to do the extra work and help the Town, as long as DOT will allow it.

96
97 Public input opened at @ 7:21 PM.

98
99 Maurine Costa, Bowes Circle, asked the applicant to consider that Bowes Circle is a 55+
100 community with retirees who like to be outside. This is a quiet neighborhood, and she believes
101 the noise from this project will impact the quality of life for those who live there. She asked if
102 people would want a car wash to abut their neighborhood.

103
104 Laurie Greer, 28 Derry Lane/35 Bowes Circle/President of Abbies Landing, expressed concern
105 regarding potential traffic. This company promotes and operates as a membership service. She
106 believes traffic will back up along Route 102 and 3A. This could create unwanted traffic
107 congestion for CVS and their customers, and greater congestion at the Route 3A and 102
108 intersections. She noted that Augusta Maine had to impose fines and signs due to traffic waiting
109 to get into their Washville location. She thanked the applicant for donating to the Eastern Box
110 Turtle Foundation but expressed concern about impact to the species from the project. She
111 expressed concern regarding potential impact on the environment and the brook that runs
112 through the lot. This brook runs down to the river which is where the Town's drinking water
113 comes from. She believes any requested buffer exceptions should be denied. Those buffers were
114 defined for a purpose. In terms of noise, the applicant was asked to decrease the number of
115 vacuums in their system, but it is unclear if that has happened. Exposure to noise at a car wash
116 can cause permanent hearing damage, often without noticing until it is too late. The equipment
117 used, especially in automatic tunnels, generates significant and dangerous levels of noise. High
118 pressure sprayers can reach over 100 decibels and industrial blowers over 105 decibels.
119 Sustained noise over 85 decibels can cause damage, per OSHA regulations. Hearing loss from
120 loud environments is known as noise-induced hearing loss. Loud sounds affect the tiny hairs in
121 inner ears. This is irreversible. Noise induced hearing loss has a cumulative effect. Even a short
122 exposure over the years can cause many issues including tinnitus. At 80-85 decibels, hearing
123 damage is possible at two hours. At 95, there is hearing damage/loss within 50 minutes.
124 According to the chart and study, the data seems to show that the project will exceed the
125 residential limits by 12-21 decibels and Abbies Landing was 21 decibels in excess. It is unclear
126 how nearby residents can protect themselves. It is not fair to ask residents to close their windows
127 or wear ear plugs. Excessive noise also drives down local property values. Nobody wants to buy
128 a house with a noisy car wash next to it. Section 249, the purpose of the Town's noise ordinance,
129 recognizes that people have the right to and should be ensured an environment free from
130 excessive sound and vibration capable of jeopardizing their health. This proposal will degrade
131 residents' quality of life. This section was enacted to protect, preserve, and promote public
132 health, safety, and welfare and the quality of life for the citizens of Hudson. Prevention of noise
133 by establishing maximum noise levels upon and between premises, prohibiting certain noise
134 producing activities, and providing for inspection should be considered. Regarding definition of
135 offences and penalties under noise pollution, there is mention of noise interfering with the

136 comfortable and reasonable enjoyment of life and property. She reviewed the decibels allowed
137 for residential and business areas per the ordinance. Noise limits shall not apply to noise emitted
138 by or related to the following: emergency sirens, snowplow equipment, natural phenomenon, any
139 bell or chime from a school or church, and farming equipment or farming activity. Car washes
140 are not mentioned. She stated that she believes a car wash proposed on Lowell Road next to a
141 residential area was not approved due to noise. If the Board were to approve this, even if the
142 levels were within the Town noise ordinances, she would like to see an actual sound absorbing
143 fence proposed to protect the residences surrounding it. There are very little plantings proposed
144 on the plan. She stated that she believes the vacuums on the site will run constantly creating
145 additional noise. There are building enclosures to make these quieter. She stated that she does not
146 believe Washville should be allowed to build a facility that violates the Town's noise
147 ordinances. She asked if the sound study took into account cars idling, vacuums running, and the
148 car wash running simultaneously. She believes the proposal violates Section 249. She noted that
149 over 60 residents who directly and indirectly about this property have signed a petition. 60 equates
150 to 2.4% of the number of people who show up at the polls to vote.

151
152 Steve Boufford, 6 Easy Street, stated that when he bought his property, there was no
153 development on the property in question. In recent years, this has been sold as a development for
154 a CVS, gas station/convenience store, and a restaurant. He is now being told that there will be a
155 car wash in his direct backyard. This could, on any given Saturday, have 20-30 cars stacked up
156 waiting for a car wash and others waiting at the vacuum stations. He stated that he does not want
157 this in his backyard and asked how many other people would want it in their backyard, versus a
158 quiet restaurant.

159
160 Public input closed at @ 7:34 PM.

161
162 Mr. Doherty agreed that the regulations are intended to protect the public and guarantee
163 residents' welfare. This is the reason that the Town has an ordinance. The Town's consultant
164 reviewed the sound study and found that it complies with the ordinance's business requirement.
165 He noted that the vacuums do not run all the time and there is very little noise coming out of
166 them. There are enclosures around the vacuum motors themselves.

167
168 Mr. Malley asked if the noise study included the vacuums and vehicles running simultaneously
169 and the joint noise that could be generated. Mr. Doherty stated that he is not sure of this. The
170 study was done based on industry criteria and the Town's consultant assessed the report based on
171 that criteria.

172
173 Mr. Boyer noted that the noise study contains a color rendering showing the distance in which
174 the acoustics will travel from the site. He asked if the study recommended the use of stealth
175 blowers in order to reduce the noise. Mr. Doherty stated that the noise will be much quieter than
176 what the residents are currently presuming right. Mr. Boyer asked if the applicant could present
177 data showing that the proposed system will be quieter than the typical system. He explained that
178 the noise study contained decibel readings which may serve the public well in determining that
179 the noise will not travel as far as they believe it will. The noise study also states that the applicant
180 will change to using stealth blowers. If this information could be presented, the abutters may feel

181 better about what the applicant is proposing to do to mitigate the noise. Mr. Doherty stated that
182 he would prefer to have his noise expert present, in order to best address these items.

183
184 Jim Waterman, Executive Vice President for Washville, explained that the company has been
185 operating for over 30 years. The Tyngsborough location operates a non-stealth dryer, and a
186 different location uses the stealth dryer. A sound study was conducted and showed the
187 manufacturer decibel ratings of the stealth dryer which can be provided to the public. Also, an
188 OSHA noise study was carried out and found that the car washes comply with OSHA standards
189 regarding decibels inside of the buildings, safely under 85. All employees are required to always
190 wear ear plugs as part of operational requirements. Mr. Boyer explained that all of this
191 information was included in the packet, he was hoping to see it presented this evening by the
192 applicant. Mr. Waterman explained that they had not previously been asked to present this type
193 of information and so did not come prepared with a formal presentation of it.

194
195 Mr. Dumont stated that the report which was reviewed by Fuss & O'Neill stated that one of the
196 recommendations includes extending the western wall of the car wash to block additional noise.
197 Mr. Waterman noted that this is not required in order for the project to be in compliance. This
198 would create an operational issue but could be considered if necessary.

199
200 Mr. Boyer asked the applicant to speak to Figure 8 in the packet. Mr. Waterman stated that he
201 would like his expert to speak to this.

202
203 Mr. Crowley stated that the recommendation in the noise study review mentioned that at the
204 northern car wash building, a wall to the west would block direct sound passing from the car
205 wash exit to many of the homes in Bowes Circle. Such an extension of the wall at a length of 25'
206 would provide significant additional noise shielding to the neighborhood. The project's design
207 plans indicate that such a wall would not require changes to any planned driveways. The
208 applicant should consider all items possible to help alleviate any potential issues. Extending the
209 wall in question another 25' does not seem to be a major issue for the project. The car wash
210 proposed on Lowell Road was too close to residences and the noise study for it did not work.

211
212 Mr. Malley stated that the peer review report notes that the proposed decibel levels will come in
213 under the requirement. He asked what the Board is looking for the applicant to do additionally.
214 Mr. Boyer stated that the proposal seems to meet the criteria. He was simply hoping the applicant
215 could present this information to make the public potentially feel better. The applicant seems to
216 be proposing items that are above and beyond what are required. Mr. Crowley stated that
217 Attachment I from another noise expert states that the fence should be extended 25'. There are
218 other issues with the noise study that should be corrected. Mr. Malley noted that the
219 recommendation regarding the wall does not state that the current proposal does not meet the
220 requirements.

221
222 Mr. Doherty stated that the use of stealth blowers on the site can be incorporated into any
223 approval. The sound wall is not needed to meet the ordinance, but the applicant is willing to
224 include it in the project, in order to be a good member of the community.

225

226 Eric Poulin, P.E., Jones & Beach Engineering, confirmed the reduction in the footprint and
227 reduction in number of vacuums proposed. This pulled the building farther away from the
228 residential buffer. There are no impervious fixed features of the site, such as pavement or buildings,
229 within 100' of the property line. The vacuums immediately closest to the building were eliminated
230 from the plan, which allowed the building to be pulled tighter to the front parking lot and away
231 from the residential buffer.

232
233 Mr. Crowley stated that the drainage report, dated February 6th, states that the proposed
234 development will result in reduced peak stormwater runoff rates across all analyzed storm events.
235 Subsequent treatment for the subject site is proposed to be self-contained and not interact with
236 collection or treatment systems originally proposed as a common scheme. Mr. Poulin agreed that
237 the car wash will have its own self-contained stormwater system. Mr. Crowley noted that the Town
238 also requires that the drainage analysis include calculations comparing pre- and post- development
239 storm water runoff rates. This volume comparison is missing from the report. Mr. Poulin stated
240 that this could be provided. He noted that the stormwater report was reviewed by AoT and the
241 third party reviewer. It was approved by AoT and there were no further comments from the third
242 party reviewer.

243
244 Mr. Crowley stated that the stormwater calculations for link AP-3 show a post-development rate
245 greater than pre-development for stormwater volume in that area. The stormwater flows
246 downgradient from the proposed site development towards residential properties on Easy Street,
247 Abbies Landing, and Bowes Circle. The drainage report states that existing wetlands and abutting
248 property owners will suffer minimal impacts resulting from this development. The statement does
249 not provide the Planning Board or public with sufficient engineering calculated details or a
250 definition regarding what minimal impact means. Other applications reviewed by the Planning
251 Board have addressed the increased volume by making design changes or requesting a waiver.
252 Town code states that the water drainage system shall not result in flooding or functional
253 impairment to streets, adjacent downstream properties, soils, or vegetation, while accounting for
254 upstream and upgradient runoff flows onto, over, and through the site. He asked if the applicant
255 would agree to revise the site design and stormwater management report to eliminate the calculated
256 increase in volume impact or request any necessary waivers. Mr. Poulin stated that he would look
257 further into this. AoT prohibits infiltration of stormwater on this site based on the PFAS mapping
258 per the State. The PFAS origin is south of this site. This is one of the primary ways to mitigate
259 volume.

260
261 Mr. Dumont asked if Fuss & O'Neill reviewed the applicant's waiver request to AoT regarding
262 the stormwater infiltration prohibited on site. Mr. Poulin stated that Fuss & O'Neill was cc'd on
263 all correspondence during the process for the AoT permit.

264
265 Mr. Crowley stated that, per the Fuss & O'Neill peer review, a utility access easement will be
266 required in the event that one or both properties are conveyed separately in the future. He asked if
267 the applicant would agree to a stipulation addressing this as a condition of approval, in the event
268 that Lot 15-1 and Lot 16 are not under common ownership in the future. Mr. Doherty stated that
269 the applicant would agree to this.

270

271 Mr. Crowley noted that the Fuss & O'Neill comments mention that the applicant will create a
272 stormwater pollution prevention plan. He asked if the applicant would agree to this as part of
273 conditions of approval. Mr. Doherty stated that the applicant would agree to this.
274

275 Mr. Crowley stated that the plan shows lighting crossing the property lines for Lot 15-1 and Lot
276 16 in both directions. He believes this should be addressed by a waiver request. Mr. Doherty agreed
277 that there is light trespass onto Lot 16 from Lot 15-1, as this is Morgan Road and the area should
278 be lit. Mr. Malley stated that these are access roads which need to be lit. Mr. Crowley agreed but
279 stated that this still requires a waiver.
280

281 Mr. Dumont noted that the engineering comments in the staff report state that, based on the latest
282 traffic report, a design plan should incorporate the right turn slip lane from Route 102 into the site.
283 The applicant has agreed to do so, if DOT allows. He asked if that satisfies the engineering
284 comments. Mr. Crowley stated that, based on staff recommendations to the Board and following
285 public hearing, he would recommend that the Board consider a continuance to allow for additional
286 evaluation of the sound study and traffic analysis. Mr. Dumont stated that, based on the applicant
287 agreeing to add the right turn slip and some of the sounds study improvements, the engineering
288 department may be satisfied. Ms. Dubowik agreed that the applicant has satisfied the requests
289 made by engineering.
290

291 Mr. Boyer moved to grant a waiver from **§276-11.1.B.(12) – Parking in Front Setback** – To
292 allow for a travel way inside the 50' front setback where it would otherwise not be allowed, based
293 on the Board's discussion, the testimony of the Applicant's representative, and in accordance
294 with the language included in the submitted Waiver Request Form for said waiver. Motion
295 seconded by Mr. Lyko.
296

297 Discussion:

298 There was discussion regarding the queuing lane, with Mr. Waterman explaining that the level of
299 queue on the outside lane is very small, with none in that lane on the majority of days.
300

301 Mr. Dumont asked if CVS also has parking within the front setback. Ms. Dubowik stated that
302 CVS has some encroachment and the restaurant use would have had the same. Mr. Dumont
303 stated that this does not appear to be a new condition of the site.
304

305 Motion carried 5/1/0 (Crowley).
306

307 Mr. Boyer moved to grant a waiver from **§275-8.C.(6).(a) – Loading Space**, to allow for zero
308 loading spaces where one would otherwise be allowed, based on the Board's discussion, the
309 testimony of the Applicant's representative, and in accordance with the language included in the
310 submitted Waiver Request Form for said waiver. Motion seconded by Mr. Lyko.
311

312 Discussion:

313 Mr. Crowley asked how packages will be delivered to the site. Mr. Waterman stated that
314 chemicals are received via a small van 1-2 times per month.
315

316 All in favor – motion carried 6/0/0.

317
318 Mr. Boyer moved to approve the Washville Car Wash Application SP# 10-25, Map 156 Lot 016,
319 9 Morgan Road, Hudson, New Hampshire; prepared by: Jones & Beach Engineers, 25
320 Portsmouth Ave, PO Box 219 Stratham, NH 03885; prepared for: Hudson Enterprises, LLC, 69
321 Atlantic Avenue, North Hampton, NH 03862; consisting of 18 sheets and general notes 1-14 on
322 Sheet 3; dated August 28, 2025, last revised March 24, 2026; and:

323
324 That the Planning Board finds that this application complies with the Zoning Ordinance, and
325 with the Land Use Regulations and for the reasons set forth in the written submissions, together
326 with the testimony and factual representations made by the applicant during the public hearing;

327
328 Subject to, and revised per, the following stipulations:

- 329 1. All stipulations of approval shall be incorporated into the development agreement, which
330 shall be recorded at the HCRD, together with the Site-Plan-of-Record.
- 331 2. All improvements shown on the Site Plan-of-Record, including all Notes, shall be
332 completed in their entirety and at the expense of the applicant or the applicant's assigns.
- 333 3. Prior to the Planning Board endorsement of the Plan, it shall be subject to final
334 administrative review by Town Planner and Town Engineer.
- 335 4. Prior to the issuance of a final certificate of occupancy, a L.L.S. certified "As-Built" site
336 plan shall be provided to the Town of Hudson Development Services Department,
337 confirming that the site conforms with the Planning Board approved plan.
- 338 5. Construction activities involving the subject lot shall be limited to the hours between 7:00
339 A.M. and 7:00 P.M., Monday through Saturday. No exterior construction activities shall
340 be allowed on Sundays.
- 341 6. Hours of operation shall be limited to 7:00 A.M. to 7:30 P.M. Monday through Saturday,
342 and 8:00 A.M. through 5:00 P.M. on Sunday.
- 343 7. Hours of refuse removal shall be exclusive to the hours between 7:00 A.M. and 7:00
344 P.M., Monday through Friday only.
- 345 8. Prior to application for a building permit, the Applicant shall schedule a pre-construction
346 meeting with the Town Engineer.
- 347 9. Extend the sound wall by 25 feet, as referenced in Attachment I, page 2.
- 348 10. Shall work with the Town Engineer and State to construct a right turn slip lane on Derry
349 Road, if permissible by DOT.
- 350 11. In the event that Lot 15-1 and Lot 16 are not under common ownership, a utility access
351 easement between the two lots shall be recorded.
- 352 12. A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), as required by EPA NOI, shall be
353 submitted to and approved by the Engineering Department.

354
355 Motion seconded by Mr. Lyko. Motion carried 5/1/0 (Hurd).

356
357 *The Planning Board recessed at 8:42 PM. The Planning Board reconvened at 8:48 PM.*

358
359 *Mr. Van der Veen rejoined the Board at 8:48PM.*

360
361 **VIII. NEW BUSINESS**

362 A. LeClair Drive Extension

12 LeClair Drive

363 CUP# 03-26 & SB# 01-26 Map 147/Lot 006

364 Purpose: to depict the subdivision of Map 147/Lot 006 into seven (7) residential lots,
365 consisting of six (6) new residential lots and (1) existing residential lot. The proposed
366 development will utilize the existing wetland crossing and includes an increase in
367 wetland disturbance. Application acceptance & hearing.
368

369 Mr. Lyko moved to accept the **Proposed Subdivision Plan** for LeClair Drive Extension, SB#
370 01-26, Map 147 / Lot 006, 12 Leclair Drive, Hudson, New Hampshire, 03051.
371 Motion seconded by Mr. Van der Veen. All in favor – motion carried 7/0/0.
372

373 Mr. Lyko moved to accept the **Conditional Use Permit** for LeClair Drive Extension, CUP# 03-
374 26, Map 147 / Lot 006, 12 Leclair Drive, Hudson, New Hampshire, 03051. Motion seconded by
375 Mr. Van der Veen. All in favor – motion carried 7/0/0.
376

377 Sam Foisie, Meridian Land Services, explained that the proposal is a seven lot subdivision,
378 creating six new lots at 12 LeClair Drive. The applicant has received comments from Fuss &
379 O'Neill and responded to them. There are some items that need to be further addressed. Waivers
380 have been requested for lot phasing and expansion of the plans to include a sidewalk. Town staff
381 comments were very reasonable, and the applicant believes they have addressed them. The
382 applicant was before the Conservation Commission on the 13th to present the Conditional Use
383 Permit (CUP) to show two impacts to the already impacted wetland buffer and wetlands. The
384 Conservation Commission is to hold a site walk on Monday, 4/27 at 6:00 PM. The applicant is
385 seeking subdivision and CUP approval. The applicant will also likely need a Hudson sewer
386 permit and a NH DES sewer permit. The plan will include a low pressure force main item, as
387 requested by Fuss and O'Neill. The applicant will submit a wetland impact permit. The applicant
388 will also need to file for a SWPPP and NOI because the project exceeds an acre of disturbance.
389

390 Mr. Foisie explained that the property is zoned Residential 2, which permits single family and
391 two family housing. The district is intended to provide a diversity of housing types, community
392 facilities, and recreational uses. The applicant is proposing six lots that can support single family
393 and two family uses. The applicant is required by zoning to have a minimum lot size of one acre
394 and a minimum buildable area of one acre. All of these lots have those items, exclusive of
395 wetlands, steep slopes, and floodplains. This property is subject to the Wetland Conservation
396 District, hence the CUP request. The property is situated adjacent to the Merrimack River, with a
397 single house and a driveway from LeClair Drive which crosses the wetland. The majority of the
398 property is yard or field area which has been maintained, including many of the buffer areas. Part
399 of this project would be allowing some of those buffers to revert back to a natural state, marked
400 with a placard to note that they should no longer be maintained. There is a wetland which bisects
401 the property. The eastern side of the property drops approximately 8'-10' down, with the
402 Merrimack River approximately 20' down. The proposal is to extend LeClaire Drive. The
403 existing portion of LeClaire Drive is approximately 280' and the extension would bring the total
404 length to 1,000'. There is a waiver requested for roadway geometry, as the requirement is 125' or
405 150' and the applicant is seeking to reduce the roadway radius to 100'. This is being done to
406 better align with the crossing, minimizing the amount of wetland and buffer impacts. The road
407 will curve back at the 100' radius to reserve enough continuous buildable area for the two
408 proposed lots. This should not adversely affect the safety of the roadway as it is a dead end road

409 and only seven lots are proposed. There should not be vehicles traveling at a high rate of speed in
410 this area. The applicant discussed roadway slopes with the Town Engineer. The Town
411 requirement is 1%, but the Town Engineer recommended that this project increase it to 2% as it
412 allows for water to drain easier to the curb line. Further supporting the waiver of the roadway
413 geometry, the Fire Department asked about turnarounds for apparatus. The applicant thus
414 provided a turn analysis through the property, showing that a fire truck can access and go around
415 the cul-de-sac.

416
417 Regarding stormwater, Sam Foisie explained that the plan shows two proposed infiltration
418 basins, one just before the wetland crossing. The collection occurs via two catch basins at the
419 low point at the wetland and this will be conveyed back to the stormwater basin. The majority of
420 the stormwater basin is outside of the wetland buffer, with the outlet of the stormwater basin
421 being just inside the wetland buffer. The second infiltration basin is at the center of the cul-de-
422 sac. This will be a benefit in terms of the proposed snow storage area. This will be treated before
423 it runs into the wetland area. Both of these basins provide water quality, water attenuation,
424 volume reductions, and are designed to comply with the Town regulations and New Hampshire
425 DES. The applicant is not seeking an AoT permit as the project will not trigger the 100,000 s.f.
426 threshold.

427
428 In terms of utilities, Sam Foisie explained that the applicant originally proposed overhead
429 utilities for electric, but per comments from Fuss & O'Neill, determined that the Town requires
430 these to be underground. This has been revised on the plan. The water line will be extended from
431 LeClair Drive around the loop back to itself. The applicant is providing two fire hydrants,
432 complying with the Town's coverage requirements. The existing manhole in LeClair Drive was
433 fairly shallow and would likely be in conflict with the wetland crossing. Thus, a low pressure
434 force main is proposed that would connect to each unit. The units would each have their own
435 pumps outside of the right of way and within a private easement, privately maintained by the lots
436 that benefit from it. A request of the Town Engineer was to make sure that the force main is
437 privately maintained. This will pump across the wetland through a sleeve.

438
439 Sam Foisie stated that the existing culvert is a 36" corrugated metal pipe which is not in good
440 shape. The proposal is for a 36" reinforced concrete pipe, embedded 6" to allow for natural
441 substrate for any aquatic life movement. Hydraulic modeling showed that a 36" pipe would
442 suffice for the 50 year storm. The reinforced concrete pipe will be approximately 70' long. The
443 applicant is proposing 11,500 s.f. of permanent buffer impacts and 1,800 s.f. of temporary
444 impacts. The temporary impacts mostly deal with removal of the existing driveway, allowing it
445 to go from an impervious to pervious state. There will be 450 s.f. of wetland impacts associated
446 with the expansion of the culvert crossing. A wetland buffer does not currently exist as it should
447 on the site with trees and natural vegetation. Much of the area is maintained as manicured lawn.
448 The temporary wetland buffer impacts will be a benefit to the wetland buffer in the end. The
449 Conservation Commission had some concerns regarding the applicant pulling the end of the cul-
450 de-sac towards the wetland. This is to make sure there is adequate buildable areas for the two
451 lots. This is not seen as a negative, as this is in an area that the buffer is already impacted.

452
453 Regarding sidewalks, Sam Foisie explained that per Town regulations, every road must have a
454 sidewalk. This road is for seven lots on a dead end street which connects to a roadway that does

455 not have a sidewalk until Shoreline Drive. The small amount of vehicle and pedestrian traffic
456 will not likely lead to many conflicts that would justify a sidewalk. This would include additional
457 impervious areas, requiring more stormwater improvements.

458
459 In terms of lot phasing, Sam Foisie explained that, per the regulations, 6+ lots require 50% to be
460 built in one year, and 50% to be built in the next year. This project is on the cusp of that
461 threshold. The roads for the project will be built first and the lots will then be sold as the market
462 dictates. It does not make sense to only allow for only three lots sold one year and then three the
463 next year, whereas a five lot subdivision would be able to sell all five in the first year. This
464 requirement would be a hardship to the applicant.

465
466 Mr. Crowley noted that Town departments mentioned comments about sidewalks and the
467 applicant should likely address this or request a waiver. Mr. Foisie explained that the sidewalk
468 on Shoreline Drive is on the opposite side of the road from this proposal. A sidewalk would not
469 be required for the existing portion of LeClair Drive and so there would be a gap in the sidewalk
470 area. There should not be conflicts between vehicle and pedestrian traffic for this proposal, such
471 as there is on Shoreline Drive.

472
473 Mr. Crowley stated that he did not see a typical roadway cross-section on the plans. Mr. Foisie
474 stated that this would be added to the plans. Mr. Crowley asked if there are outstanding items
475 that will be included in the revised drawings. Mr. Foisie stated that the main things are applying
476 for the full sewer design permit and comments from the Conservation Commission.

477
478 Public input opened at @ 9:28 PM.

479
480 Stephen Pease, 8 Scenic Lane, stated that he believes the proposal, upon review, will improve the
481 neighborhood and not detract from it. He is in support of the project.

482
483 Public input closed at @ 9:29 PM.

484
485 Mr. Crowley noted a number of items that he had questions regarding. One included that the
486 regulations state that a cul-de-sac shall not exceed 1,000' in length and shall measure from the
487 center point of the outside edge of the cul-de-sac turnaround. Mr. Dumont stated that he believes
488 the measurement is from the outside edge of the pavement. This is the way the Board has
489 interpreted this in the past. Mr. Crowley asked about the additional wetlands crossing required if
490 the measurement was to the 150' center line. Mr. Foisie stated that the Wetlands Bureau likes for
491 the crossing to be perpendicular, and this would lead for it not to be so. He does not believe the
492 DPW or Fuss & O'Neill expressed any concern with the reduced radius proposed. Mr. Crowley
493 stated that he believes tilting the cul-de-sac out of the buffer area would be better. Mr. Foisie
494 explained that Lot 147-6-3 has a buildable area of 44,700 s.f. and shifting the cul-de-sac would
495 lead to the loss of that lot. A majority of the buffer disturbance is an existing driveway.

496
497 Mr. Crowley noted that the proposed radius of the cul-de-sac is 70' and, per Town code, the
498 minimum right of way radius should be 75' and the minimum outside edge of pavement should
499 be 65'. Mr. Foisie stated that he would gather further information about this item.

500

501 Mr. Van der Veen asked about the Engineering Department being okay with the reduced radius.
502 It appears that they are ceding to the DPW, who is not in favor of the reduced radius. Mr. Foisie
503 stated that he would coordinate with the Engineering Department on this.
504

505 Mr. Boyer moved to continue the **Proposed Subdivision Plan** for LeClair Drive Extension, SB#
506 01-26, Map 147 / Lot 006, 12 LeClair Drive, Hudson, New Hampshire, 03051, to date certain
507 May 27, 2026.

508 Motion seconded by Mr. Lyko. All in favor – motion carried 7/0/0.
509

510 Mr. Boyer moved to accept the **Conditional Use Permit** for LeClair Drive Extension, CUP# 03-
511 26, Map 147 / Lot 006, 12 LeClair Drive, Hudson, New Hampshire, 03051, to date certain May
512 27, 2026. Motion seconded by Mr. Lyko. All in favor – motion carried 7/0/0.
513

514 **IX. OTHER BUSINESS**

515 A. 84 Lumber Company Site Plan Approval – Request for Stipulation No. 13
516 Reconsideration/Removal which states “The applicant shall comply with NHDOT’s
517 decision on the traffic signal warrant analysis, and shall fund any improvements as
518 necessary”
519

520 *This item was not addressed during this meeting.*
521

522 B. 2026 Election of Officers
523

524 Mr. Lyko moved to nominate Tim Malley as Chair of the Hudson Planning Board. Motion
525 seconded by Mr. Boyer. There were no other nominations. All in favor – motion carried 7/0/0.
526

527 Mr. Boyer moved to nominate Jordan Ulery as Vice Chair of the Hudson Planning Board.
528 Motion seconded by Mr. Lyko. There were no other nominations. All in favor – motion carried
529 7/0/0.
530

531 Mr. Van der Veen moved to nominate Timothy Lyko as Secretary of the Hudson Planning
532 Board. Motion seconded by Mr. Boyer. There were no other nominations. All in favor – motion
533 carried 7/0/0.
534

535 **X. ADJOURNMENT:**
536

537 Mr. Boyer moved to adjourn. Motion seconded by Mr. Lyko.
538 All in favor – motion carried 7/0/0.
539

540 Meeting adjourned at 9:45 P.M.
541
542
543
544
545
546

Ed Van der Veen
Secretary

547
548
549
550

*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.*

DRAFT