



# 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 – FEBRUARY 11, 2026 - DRAFT

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

#### I. CALL TO ORDER BY CHAIRPERSON

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

#### II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Mallery 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 Clerk to call for attendance.

#### IV. SEATING OF ALTERNATES

No alternates were seated at this time.

#### V. MEETING MINUTES

- 14 January 2026 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Oates moved to approve the 14 January 2026 meeting minutes.

Motion seconded by Mr. Ulery. Motion carried 5/0/2 (Crowley and Malley).

#### VI. CORRESPONDENCE

None at this time.

#### VII. OLD BUSINESS

- A. Erickson Foundation Solutions Lot Line Relocation & Site Plan      14-18 Clement Road  
SP# 13-25      Map 161/Lots 49 & 50

Purpose: to depict the proposed parking expansion and associated improvements on Lot 49, and the proposed gravel laydown yard and associated improvements on Lot 50  
(Continued from January 14, 2026).

44

45 Pete Madsen, Keach Nordstrom Associates, explained that the applicant is seeking conditional  
46 approval of the site plan which was presented to the Board in January. Since the January meeting,  
47 the applicant has cleaned up the plans per Fuss & O'Neill and staff comments. The Board previous  
48 asked about pulling the slope back around the existing foundation of the existing house and this  
49 has also been adjusted on the plans. The engineer comments flagged three additional items within  
50 the regulations that waivers were recommended for and so three additional waiver requests have  
51 been submitted. These mostly relate to existing site conditions that are non-conforming to the  
52 current regulations.

53

54 Mr. Madsen stated that the first waiver is from § 275-8.(C).4 Parking Space Dimensions. This is  
55 regarding seven spaces which are proposed as 9'x18'. This waiver also includes reduced parking  
56 space dimensions for existing spaces, specifically along the northern side of the building and  
57 northern property line. These spaces are currently undersized. If they were to be brought into  
58 compliance with the regulations, the applicant would have to increase the pavement and  
59 encroach over the side setback line. The second waiver, from § 275-8.(C).5 Driveway Aisle  
60 Dimensions, is for minimum aisle widths. The existing aisle width is approximately 22.5' where  
61 24' is required. To bring this into compliance, the applicant would have to encroach on the side  
62 setback and alter the existing parking lot, which would be a financial hardship. Many of these  
63 waiver requests deal with existing conditions of the building which predate many site plan  
64 requirements. The site's parking and maneuverability have operated successfully for many years.  
65 Finally, the requested waiver from § 276-11.1.(B).(25) Parking in Setbacks deals with two spaces  
66 in the front setback. These are parallel spaces and the proposal is to remove them in order to  
67 make a drive aisle. There will still be a bit of encroachment into the front setback for a couple of  
68 the proposed spaces, as well as some of the existing spaces. There is nowhere else to put the aisle  
69 in order to gain access to the backside of the building. Fire access is proposed to be provided,  
70 where it was not originally provided.

71

72 Mr. Crowley asked if there is a NH DES inactive asbestos site number assigned to this site. Mr.  
73 Madsen stated that there is, though he does not have the number at hand. Mr. Crowley asked if  
74 the site has been capped. Matt Erickson, owner, stated that when the rear portion of the building  
75 was built, additional fill was added on top of the cap. The area is covered with a specific type of  
76 rip rap. Mr. Crowley asked about making sure asbestos will not spread onto Lot 50. Mr. Madsen  
77 stated that this was factored into the design. Additional fill will be brought onto the site. There is  
78 a note on the plan that the owner shall employ a contractor licensed by NH DES to perform work  
79 on asbestos disposal sites, as necessary. A test pit was dug on site and no asbestos was found.  
80 This is located close to where the sediment forebay is proposed.

81

82 Mr. Crowley asked if the applicant would agree to have a NH DES certified asbestos abatement  
83 supervisor on site at the start of excavation of the forebay and infiltration basin areas to  
84 determine if abatement procedures are necessary. Also, during placement of the asbestos cap  
85 materials.

86

87 Mr. Ulery stated that migration of material is limited by the "tub" of the cap, which is packed  
88 clay in this case. Fill and rip rap are then placed on top of this. The known asbestos pits in the

89 area are encapsulated. Only if the encapsulation is broken would a supervisor be needed on the  
90 site.  
91

92 Ms. Paquin noted that the applicant is not digging or building in the area of the cap but instead  
93 adding more fill to it. Mr. Madsen agreed.  
94

95 Mr. Crowley noted that the plans show an 8,000 s.f. laydown area on Lot 50 for the benefit of  
96 Lot 49. He asked if this is a new use for Lot 50. Mr. Madsen stated that this area is currently an  
97 edge of gravel and used as a laydown area. The proposal is to expand the area a bit. Mr. Erickson  
98 stated that some trucks, small equipment, and miscellaneous dirt materials are proposed to be  
99 stored in this area.  
100

101 Mr. Malley noted that the Zoning Ordinance requires any location used for the parking of  
102 vehicles or equipment to be paved. Mr. Crowley noted that it also has to be provided on the same  
103 lot as the principal use. Mr. Oates asked if other types of parking material could be acceptable.  
104 There was a suggestion to stipulate that vehicles and equipment cannot be stored in the area.  
105

106 Ms. Dubowik noted that this reminds her of the laydown yard approved for SL Chasse which  
107 was not paved. Material and construction machinery were proposed for that area.  
108

109 Mr. Crowley asked about driveway profiles. Mr. Madsen stated that these are existing driveways,  
110 and neither is proposed to be altered. Site distance plans were provided for both, though  
111 additional information was not requested.  
112

113 In terms of the requested waiver from the open space requirement, Mr. Oates stated that  
114 eliminating nine of the parking spaces in the setback would likely make up for the requirement.  
115 Mr. Madsen stated that, based on the existing conditions such as the location of the building to  
116 the street, there is not enough room on the site to create additional parking without impacting the  
117 open space. The existing parking spaces vary in size. Mr. Oates suggested shrinking down the  
118 parking spaces to eliminate the open space waiver. Mr. Madsen explained that he does not  
119 believe the applicant can meet the open space requirement if additional spaces are being  
120 proposed on the site.  
121

122 Ms. Paquin explained that the purpose of the proposal is to allow for additional parking. Mr.  
123 Erickson stated that there is currently no access to the back of the building and there was a small  
124 fire last summer which led to concerns regarding this access.  
125

126 Mr. Oates stated that the proposal is approximately one parking space away from meeting the  
127 open space requirements, if the other spaces are not added. The plan could likely be amended  
128 slightly in order to meet the 40% requirement. Mr. Madsen stated that the site is currently at  
129 39.6% open space where 40% is required. The site is already out of compliance, and the proposal  
130 is an opportunity is to gain more spaces. Losing nine spaces would hurt the applicant's growing  
131 business.  
132

133 Mr. Crowley stated that the proposal would reduce the open space to 30.7%. He suggested  
134 changing the lot line relocation in order to make the open space requirement work. Mr. Madsen

135 explained that this was considered but the lot lines were drawn in order to make sure the building  
136 setbacks were met and the laydown yard was adequately sized. Creating an odd-shaped lot to  
137 meet open space requirements may not be the best idea in this situation. The open space created  
138 would not be valuable for landscape areas.

139  
140 Mr. Malley noted that the site is required to have 47 parking spaces, but 86 are proposed. He  
141 asked the need for the proposed number of spaces. Mr. Madsen stated that the applicant has had  
142 parking issues on the site as the business has expanded. Mr. Erickson stated that the extra spaces  
143 will hopefully allow him to stay in Town for years to come.

144  
145 Mr. Van der Veen noted that the Board should consider that the existing conditions of the  
146 building are not safe for fire personnel and there should be some leniency due to the access  
147 proposed.

148  
149 Mr. Crowley expressed concern with moving forward with a waiver request when there may be  
150 works around it. Mr. Madsen noted that the existing leach field also weighed into the lot line  
151 adjustment.

152  
153 Mr. Oates asked if the proposed fire access road to the back of the building is independent of the  
154 parking. Mr. Madsen stated that the fire access is a secondary benefit of the plan. Mr. Oates  
155 asked if the fire truck will be able to access the rear of the building, if all of the proposed parking  
156 spots are filled. Mr. Madsen stated that the plan has been reviewed by the Fire Department and  
157 there were no exceptions taken to it. Mr. Oates stated that he did not see that the Fire Chief made  
158 a statement commenting on the rear fire access. Ms. Dubowik noted that concerns are normally  
159 commented on by the Department.

160  
161 Mr. Crowley asked about there being an additional buffer line from the residential area shown  
162 for Lot 49. Mr. Madsen stated that the house on the lot is not currently used residentially, but  
163 instead for the business' training program. The plan focused on a buffer for a residential use  
164 across the street.

165  
166 Mr. Oates asked that the applicant consider strengthening the buffer along the line to help  
167 mitigate the view for abutters. Mr. Madsen stated that the revised landscape plan includes an  
168 additional row of arborvitaes in this area for screening.

169  
170 Ms. Paquin asked about the elevation of the building site above the street level. Mr. Madsen  
171 explained that the existing single-family house is at elevation 290 and the parking area is at  
172 elevation 306. Headlights would not likely shine directly into any of the windows.

173  
174 Mr. Erickson noted that the existing home has been mothballed to allow for it only to be used for  
175 training exercises.

176  
177 Mr. Oates moved to grant a waiver from **§ 275-8.7.(D) – Landscaping Requirements - Shrubs**  
178 to allow for 34 shrubs where 83 would be required, based on the Board's discussion, the  
179 testimony of the Applicant's representative, and in accordance with the language included in the  
180 submitted Waiver Request Form for said waiver.

181 Motion seconded by Mr. Van der Veen. Motion carried 7/0/0.  
182

183 Mr. Oates moved to grant a waiver from § 276-11.1.(B).(24) – **General Plan Requirements -**  
184 **Open Space** to allow 30.7% open space where 40% open space is required, based on the Board’s  
185 discussion, the testimony of the Applicant’s representative, and in accordance with the language  
186 included in the submitted Waiver Request Form for said waiver.

187 Motion seconded by Mr. Van der Veen. Motion carried 5/2/0 (Oates and Crowley).  
188

189 Mr. Oates moved to grant a waiver from § 276-11.1.(B).(22) – **General Plan Requirements –**  
190 **Green Space** to allow impact to the green space buffer in order to access the proposed parking  
191 expansion, based on the Board’s discussion, the testimony of the Applicant’s representative, and  
192 in accordance with the language included in the submitted Waiver Request Form for said waiver.

193 Motion seconded by Mr. Van der Veen. Motion carried 6/1/0 (Oates).  
194

195 Mr. Oates moved to grant a waiver from § 276-11.1.(B).(12).(C) – **General Plan Requirements**  
196 **- 100’ Residential Buffer** to allow access and improvements within one-hundred-feet of a  
197 residential property, based on the Board’s discussion, the testimony of the Applicant’s  
198 representative, and in accordance with the language included in the submitted Waiver Request  
199 Form for said waiver.

200 Motion seconded by Mr. Van der Veen.  
201

202 Discussion:

203 Mr. Oates stated that he supports this waiver because this has been an existing condition of the  
204 site for quite some time.  
205

206 Motion carried 7/0/0.  
207

208 Mr. Oates moved to grant a waiver from § 275-8.(C).4 – **Site Plan Review - Parking Space**  
209 **Dimensions** to allow for reduced size parking spaces where 10’x20’ spaces would otherwise be  
210 required, based on the Board’s discussion, the testimony of the Applicant’s representative, and in  
211 accordance with the language included in the submitted Waiver Request Form for said waiver.

212 Motion seconded by Mr. Van der Veen.  
213

214 Discussion:

215 Mr. Crowley stated that the smaller spaces make sense for this site. Mr. Van der Veen agreed  
216 that this is for business parking.  
217

218 Motion carried 7/0/0.  
219

220 Mr. Oates moved to grant a waiver from § 275-8.(C).5 – **Site Plan Review - Driveway Aisle**  
221 **Dimensions** to allow for a reduced width aisle of 22.5’ where 24’ would otherwise be required,  
222 based on the Board’s discussion, the testimony of the Applicant’s representative, and in  
223 accordance with the language included in the submitted Waiver Request Form for said waiver.

224 Motion seconded by Mr. Van der Veen.  
225

226 Discussion:

227 Mr. Crowley noted that this only applies to 1.5 parking spaces on the site.

228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273

Motion carried 7/0/0.

Mr. Oates moved to grant a waiver from § 276-11.I.(B).(25) – **General Plan Requirements - Parking in Setbacks** to allow for four parking spaces in the front setback where none would otherwise be allowed, based on the Board’s discussion, the testimony of the Applicant’s representative, and in accordance with the language included in the submitted Waiver Request Form for said waiver.

Motion seconded by Mr. Van der Veen.

Discussion:

Ms. Paquin asked if the four parking spaces are needed and if removal of these four would meet the green and open space requirements. Mr. Madsen stated that the spaces are needed and many more parking spaces would need to be removed in order to meet those requirements.

Mr. Oates stated that he believes removal of these four spaces and those next to them would meet the requirements.

Motion carried 4/3/0 (Paquin, Crowley, and Oates).

Mr. Oates moved to approve the **Non-residential Site Plan** for Erickson Foundation Solutions, SP# 13-25 Map 161; Lots 049 & 050, 14 & 18 Clement Road, Hudson, New Hampshire; prepared by: Keach-Nordstrom Associates, Inc., 10 Commerce Park North, Suite 3B, Bedford, NH 03110, for: Clement Warehouse LLC, 14 Clement Road, Hudson, NH 03051 and 18 Clement Road, LLC, 29 Boyd Road, Hudson, NH 03051, Consisting of sheets 1-17, with general notes 1-34 on Sheet 1; Dated October 27, 2025, last revised January 27, 2026; and:

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

Subject to, and revised per, the following stipulations:

1. All stipulations of approval shall be incorporated into the Development Agreement, which shall be recorded at the HCRD along with the site plan.
2. All improvements shown on the Plan, including notes 1-34, shall be completed in their entirety and at the expense of the Applicant or his/her assigns.
3. Prior to the Planning Board endorsement of the Plan, it shall be subject to final administrative review by Town Planner and Town Engineer.
4. Prior to the issuance of a final certificate of occupancy, a L.L.S. certified “As-Built” site plan shall be provided to the Town of Hudson Development Services Department, confirming that the site conforms with the Planning Board approved plan.
5. Construction activities involving the subject lot shall be limited to the hours between 7:00 A.M. and 7:00 P.M., Monday through Saturday. No exterior construction activities shall be allowed on Sundays.
6. Hours of refuse removal shall be exclusive to the hours between 7:00 A.M. and 7:00 P.M., Monday through Friday only.

- 274 7. The applicant shall employ a contractor licensed by NHDES to perform any work on the  
275 asbestos disposal site.  
276 8. Prior to application for a building permit, the Applicant shall schedule a pre-construction  
277 meeting with the Town Engineer.  
278 9. Applicant shall install Conservation markers at 50-foot intervals along the 75-foot  
279 wetland buffer.  
280 10. In the event that ownership changes between Lots 049 and 050, an easement related to  
281 the detention basin shall be drafted and subject to final administrative review by the  
282 Town Planner, and Town Engineer prior to recording, for the benefit of Lot 049.  
283

284 Motion seconded by Mr. Van der Veen.  
285

286 Discussion:

287 Mr. Crowley asked about stipulation #8, as a building permit is likely not needed for this work.  
288 He suggested that there be a preconstruction meeting with the Town Engineer and a NH DES  
289 certified asbestos abatement supervisor prior to mobilization of construction personnel and  
290 equipment entering the site to perform onsite grading.  
291

292 Ms. Paquin stated that the supervisor may not be needed as no excavation or disturbance of the  
293 asbestos area is proposed. Mr. Crowley noted that Lot 50 was never fully examined for asbestos.  
294

295 Mr. Malley stated that requiring the applicant to meet with someone who may never need to be  
296 hired may not be appropriate.  
297

298 Mr. Ulery noted that if digging begins on the site and asbestos is seen, all work must halt, based  
299 on State law.  
300

301 Mr. Oates stated that he believes a building permit encompasses the entire site and any  
302 improvements on it.  
303

304 Mr. Madsen suggested that this stipulation be made prior to any mobilization of construction  
305 activities or prior to pulling any other permits for work on the site.  
306

307 **The Board agreed that the wording for stipulation #8 be amended to read, "Prior to the**  
308 **mobilization of construction activities, the applicant shall schedule a preconstruction**  
309 **meeting with the Town Engineer."**  
310

311 Motion carried 7/0/0.  
312

313 **VIII. NEW BUSINESS**  
314

- 315 A. The Meadows Mixed Use Development 206 Central Street  
316 SP# 02-26 & CUP# 02-26 Map 176/Lots 41, 44, 45  
317 Purpose: to propose a residential and mixed-use development that includes three (3)  
318 residential apartment buildings within the south-central portion of the property, and one  
319 (1) mixed-use building located on the northern portion of the property. This Site Plan

320 Application also includes a separate Conditional Use Permit Application, which is a  
321 request to allow encroachments into the wetland buffer areas. Application acceptance &  
322 hearing.  
323

324 *Mr. Boyer recused himself at 8:19 PM.*  
325

326 Mr. Oates asked to confirm if any Board members have a personal, family, or professional  
327 relationship with the applicant, their authorized agent, or their immediate family that could create  
328 an appearance of bias. No Board members addressed this item further.  
329

330 Ms. Dubowik stated that, as of February 10, 2026, the applicant for 207 Central Street has  
331 submitted variance applications to address the portions of the proposal not in compliance with the  
332 Zoning Ordinance, as identified in the staff comment section of the staff report. The hearing on  
333 those variances is scheduled for February 26, 2026. If the submitted variance applications are  
334 approved by the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA), staff believes the Site Plan and Conditional  
335 Use Permits will then be in compliance with the Zoning Ordinance. Acceptance of these  
336 applications are at the Board's discretion.  
337

338 Mr. Crowley expressed concern that the plan at hand is not what was submitted to the ZBA. He  
339 cannot support a motion to accept the applications at this time.  
340

341 Mr. Van der Veen asked if there is a State law which states that the Planning Board cannot hold  
342 up a Site Plan while the applicant is also exploring other permissions, such as from the ZBA. Mr.  
343 Malley stated that this was included as part of the attorney's determination. Mr. Van der Veen  
344 stated that he does not believe the Board can deny approval of this application due to this law.  
345

346 Mr. Oates noted that he has not yet had enough time to review the application materials. It is  
347 unclear if the ZBA applications will be approved. If they are not, these plans will not move forward  
348 to the Planning Board.  
349

350 Mr. Oates moved to not accept the Non-Residential **Site Plan** for the Mixed-Use Development  
351 Meadows Non-Residential Site Plan, SP# 02-26, Map 176 Lots 041, 44, 45, 207 Central Street,  
352 Hudson, NH. Motion seconded by Mr. Crowley.  
353

354 Discussion:

355 Mr. Ulery noted that motions need to be made in the affirmative. The Board cannot vote to not  
356 even consider accepting the plan. The applicant has the right to present the project. The  
357 conceptual plan was only that.  
358

359 Mr. Oates stated that Town staff has stated that an acceptable motion is to not accept a plan. The  
360 motion was made and seconded based on staff comments.  
361

362 Ms. Paquin stated that the staff report noted that staff recommended deferral of the application at  
363 this time in order to work through some of the concerns. Mr. Malley explained that the current  
364 motion is to not accept the application. This sends the applicant back to the beginning of the  
365 process. Ms. Paquin suggested deferring the application to after the next ZBA meeting, to see if

366 any of the concerns could be alleviated. Mr. Oates stated that the staff's recommendation was to  
367 not accept the plan.

368  
369 Mr. Crowley stated that staff's recommendation was to defer the plan. Mr. Oates stated that there  
370 is no point to defer something that has not yet begun. Not accepting the plan does not put the  
371 applicant back to square one, as the process has not yet begun.

372  
373 Ms. Paquin stated that she would like clarification on this. Mr. Malley explained that an  
374 application has been submitted and is technically complete. If the Board chooses not to accept  
375 the application, the application is gone and the applicant has to reapply. He will not support the  
376 motion as the applicant has completed due diligence in the process by obtaining a zoning  
377 determination from staff. This determination did not state that the applicant is in violation. This  
378 was determined after the applicant had applied. The applicant then applied for the proper  
379 variances which have yet to be heard.

380  
381 Mr. Guessferd stated that denial of the motion at hand would not mean that the Board is thus  
382 accepting the application. Mr. Malley agreed and stated that there could be a further motion to  
383 defer the application. Mr. Guessferd stated that the zoning issues may not be the only reason to  
384 defer. There were other outstanding technical review items mentioned by staff. Correction of  
385 these items could make the plan more palatable.

386  
387 Mr. Malley stated that there is a checklist of criteria for application acceptance. If an application  
388 meets the criteria, it is typically accepted. The application made it through an initial review but,  
389 upon further review, zoning issues were flagged. The Board has the discretion to accept the  
390 application and begin the review process. Mr. Guessferd stated that he would prefer to defer the  
391 application.

392  
393 Mr. Van der Veen stated that, if the application checklist has been completed and State law says  
394 that the Planning Board cannot hold this back for other board approvals, then it should be  
395 accepted.

396  
397 Ms. Paquin stated that there are other issues than zoning items. It may be better to defer the  
398 application for now to fill the missing pieces. Mr. Malley noted that every plan received by the  
399 Board has issues to work through and this usually occurs during the Board's review process.

400  
401 Mr. Crowley stated that it appears any applicant can present the Board with information in a  
402 shortened timeframe from the required seven days and have to accepted.

403  
404 Mr. Ulery stated that the issue is acceptance of the application. If the application is accepted or  
405 deferred, the information provided becomes part of the record. The Board generally grants  
406 conditional approvals, with one condition being to obtain other necessary approvals and permits.  
407 He noted that the last minute information was not provided by the applicant, but by Town staff  
408 for the Board's benefit. That can be provided at any time before the meeting starts.

409  
410 Mr. Van der Veen stated that he does not see how the seven day requirement argument holds  
411 water.

412  
413 Mr. Oates stated that RSA 673:14 states that a Board member with a personal or financial  
414 relationship which could affect impartiality must disqualify themselves. He respectfully  
415 requested that the Board address this before moving forward because participation by any  
416 conflicted member(s) could invalidate the decision. Any resident could use RSA 673:14 to have  
417 a decision invalidated in court. There are some potential conflicts on the Board.

418  
419 Mr. Hurd stated that other applicants have come before the Planning Board before going to the  
420 ZBA and it was not an issue.

421  
422 Mr. Ulery asked that the potential conflicts of interest mentioned be called out specifically. Mr.  
423 Oates asked if anyone on the Board is friends or has personal relationships with any members of  
424 the applicant team. Mr. Ulery stated that this is not a conflict of interest. He stated that he is off  
425 the Board in one month and has nothing else to do. He knows where this case will go and has  
426 RSAs on his side.

427  
428 Motion failed 3/4/0 (Guessferd, Malley, Ulery, and Van der Veen).

429  
430 Mr. Oates moved to defer the Non-Residential **Site Plan** for the Mixed-Use Development  
431 Meadows Non-Residential Site Plan, SP# 02-26, Map 176 Lots 041, 44, 45, 207 Central Street,  
432 Hudson, NH, to date April 8, 2026. Motion seconded by Mr. Crowley.

433  
434 Discussion:

435 Mr. Oates stated that the April 8<sup>th</sup> date appears appropriate based on staff's comments. The  
436 applicant team stated that the next available Board meeting is adequate timing. This has already  
437 been before the ZBA and there are two allowable uses for the site. There was a mix-up between  
438 staff and the applicant team. The ZBA is favorable of this. He was directed differently than by  
439 staff in order to redo the ZBA items, which he did. Mr. Oates asked which staff members were  
440 involved. The applicant team asked if this was relevant. He asked if he should pick out a  
441 personal vendetta. Mr. Oates stated 'sure.' The applicant team stated that Mr. Oates knows  
442 exactly what he has done.

443  
444 Mr. Oates asked why he is being threatened by the applicant. The applicant team stated that they  
445 were not presenting any threats, nor did they intend to. Mr. Oates asked why he was told by the  
446 applicant 'you know what you've done.' The applicant stated that this was a general comment.

447  
448 Mr. Oates asked if when the applicant would like a deferral to. The applicant stated that, in  
449 fairness to him, he would like a deferral to the next meeting in March.

450  
451 Mr. Oates **AMENDED** his motion to read deferral to March 11, 2026. Motion seconded by Mr.  
452 Crowley.

453  
454 Discussion:

455 Mr. Malley noted that the Conservation Commission has decided that it would like a site walk  
456 for this application in conjunction the Planning Board. The applicant cannot return to the  
457 Conservation Commission until a site walk is scheduled with the Planning Board.

458  
459 Mr. Guessferd asked if there is a completed checklist for the application and it is ready for  
460 acceptance. Ms. Dubowik agreed with this.

461  
462 Motion carried 4/3/0 (Van der Veen, Guessferd, Malley).

463  
464 Mr. Ulery asked Mr. Guessferd what the process is when Board members are threatened with  
465 official intimidation. He asked if there is access available to the Town Counsel. Mr. Guessferd  
466 stated that he would believe so.

467  
468 *Mr. Boyer rejoined the meeting at 8:59 P.M.*

469  
470 **IX. ADJOURNMENT:**

471  
472 Ms. Paquin moved to adjourn. Motion seconded by Mr. Van der Veen.  
473 All in favor – motion carried 7/0/0.

474  
475 Meeting adjourned at 8:59 P.M.

476  
477  
478  
479 \_\_\_\_\_  
480 Ed Van der Veen  
481 Secretary

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