



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

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

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

James Crowley	Julia Paquin	George Hurd	Todd Boyer
Member <u>X</u>	Member <u>E</u>	Alternate <u>S</u>	Alternate <u>S</u>

Dillon Dumont	Brooke Dubowik
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

- A. 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.

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

VII. OLD BUSINESS

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

9 Morgan Road
Map 156/Lot 016

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Public input opened at @ 7:21 PM.

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

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

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

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

Public input closed at @ 7:34 PM.

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

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

Mr. Boyer noted that the noise study contains a color rendering showing the distance in which the acoustics will travel from the site. He asked if the study recommended the use of stealth blowers in order to reduce the noise. Mr. Doherty stated that the noise will be much quieter than what the residents are currently presuming right. Mr. Boyer asked if the applicant could present data showing that the proposed system will be quieter than the typical system. He explained that the noise study contained decibel readings which may serve the public well in determining that the noise will not travel as far as they believe it will. The noise study also states that the applicant 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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Boyer moved to grant a waiver from **§276-11.1.B.(12) – Parking in Front Setback** – To allow for a travel way inside the 50' front setback where it would otherwise not 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. Lyko.

Discussion:

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

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

Motion carried 5/1/0 (Crowley).

Mr. Boyer moved to grant a waiver from **§275-8.C.(6).(a) – Loading Space**, to allow for zero loading spaces where one 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. Lyko.

Discussion:

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

All in favor – motion carried 6/0/0.

Mr. Boyer moved to approve the Washville Car Wash Application SP# 10-25, Map 156 Lot 016, 9 Morgan Road, Hudson, New Hampshire; prepared by: Jones & Beach Engineers, 25 Portsmouth Ave, PO Box 219 Stratham, NH 03885; prepared for: Hudson Enterprises, LLC, 69 Atlantic Avenue, North Hampton, NH 03862; consisting of 18 sheets and general notes 1-14 on Sheet 3; dated August 28, 2025, last revised March 24, 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, together with the Site-Plan-of-Record.
2. All improvements shown on the Site Plan-of-Record, including all Notes, shall be completed in their entirety and at the expense of the applicant or the applicant's 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 operation shall be limited to 7:00 A.M. to 7:30 P.M. Monday through Saturday, and 8:00 A.M. through 5:00 P.M. on Sunday.
7. Hours of refuse removal shall be exclusive to the hours between 7:00 A.M. and 7:00 P.M., Monday through Friday only.
8. Prior to application for a building permit, the Applicant shall schedule a pre-construction meeting with the Town Engineer.
9. Extend the sound wall by 25 feet, as referenced in Attachment I, page 2.
10. Shall work with the Town Engineer and State to construct a right turn slip lane on Derry Road, if permissible by DOT.
11. In the event that Lot 15-1 and Lot 16 are not under common ownership, a utility access easement between the two lots shall be recorded.
12. A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), as required by EPA NOI, shall be submitted to and approved by the Engineering Department.

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

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

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

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

A. LeClair Drive Extension

12 LeClair Drive

CUP# 03-26 & SB# 01-26

Map 147/Lot 006

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Public input opened at @ 9:28 PM.

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

Public input closed at @ 9:29 PM.

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

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

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

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

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

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

IX. OTHER BUSINESS

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

This item was not addressed during this meeting.

- B. 2026 Election of Officers

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

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

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

X. ADJOURNMENT:

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

Meeting adjourned at 9:45 P.M.

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