207 CENTRAL ST SITE PLAN & CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT

SP# 02-26 & CUP# 02-26

STAFF REPORT

May 13, 2026

SITE: 207 Central Street, Map 176/Lot 041,44,45

ZONING: Business (B), General - 1 (G-1)

PURPOSE OF PLAN: to propose a residential and mixed-use development that includes three (3) residential apartment buildings within the south-central portion of the property, and one (1) mixed-use building located on the northern portion of the property.

PLAN UNDER REVIEW:

Meadows Non-Residential Site Plan, SP# 02-26 & CUP# 02-26, Map 76 Lot 041, 44, 45, 207 Central Street, Hudson, NH; prepared by: Verdantas LLC, 176 Newport Road, New London, NH 03257; prepared for: Meadow Properties LLC, 195 R Central St, Hudson, NH 03051; consisting of 43 sheets and general notes 1-11 on Sheet 2; dated August 29, 2025, last revised March 3, 2026.

ATTACHMENTS:

1) Request for deferral dated April 5, 2026 – Attachment "**A**".
2) Public Comments dated March 25, 2026 – Attachment "**B**".

APPLICATION TRACKING:

- January 16, 2026 – Site plan & CUP applications received.
- February 11, 2026 – Public Hearing deferred to March 11, 2026.
- March 11, 2026 – Public Hearing cancelled due to lack of quorum.
- March 25, 2026 – Public Hearing held. Application continued to May 13, 2026.
- May 13, 2026 – Public Hearing scheduled. Deferral requested to July 22, 2026.

DRAFT MOTIONS:

TO DEFER:

I move to defer the Site Plan and Conditional Use Permit applications for the 207 Central Street Mixed-Use Development ("Meadows"), SP# 02-26 and CUP# 02-26, Map 176 Lots 041, 44, 45, located at 207 Central Street, Hudson, New Hampshire, to a date certain of July 22, 2026, per the applicant's request.

Motion by: _____Second: _____Carried/Failed: _____

Dubowik, Brooke

From: Bryan Walsh <bwalsh@verdantas.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 5, 2026 2:46 PM
To: Dubowik, Brooke; Dhima, Elvis; Stickney, Doreena
Cc: Gradert Benjamin; Steve Reichert; Erin Clement; 'Don Dumont'; Kirkland, Donald; James Hayden; Will Davis; Dillon Dumont
Subject: RE: 207 Central Street

Hi Brooke,

Thanks for taking my call. After reconvening with the team, we'd like to request to be on the agenda for July 6th Conservation Commission, and July 22nd Planning Board.

Thank you,

Bryan Walsh, PE
C: 857-288-8213

207 Central St.- Meadows, LLC - Public Input ***Mar 25, 2026***
116 apartments, 1 & 2 BR spanning 4 buildings, 3 stories
(1 mixed use retail building with 7,000 SF retail, 8 dwelling units over)
278 parking spaces

Dear Planning Board Members:

Given that this case has appeared on the agenda on four different occasions and on each one I have shown up expecting to provide public input, I would request leniency on any time restrictions you might have. I'll try to speak clearly and quickly.

I have two areas of concern tonight although the peer review by Fuss & O'Neill has pointed out others:

1. **Staff Report: Refer to Attachment "C"** – There appears to be 38 comments from Engineering, DPW and Fire listed with the last comment being *"Fire cannot approve the current plans"*. I believe many of the questions have been answered in **Attachment "D"** but the questions from Fuss & O'Neill have not been addressed yet.

2. **Traffic Impact Study** – Using the Feb 11th packet, since the Traffic Impact Study (TIS) is listed there and isn't mentioned in the last two packets.

   p. 208 thru p. 294. Can I get a show of hands, how many have actually read the entire study? I hope so. I know I have. On p. 211 Under Existing Conditions, Section 2.2 "Study Intersections" indicated Three (3) intersections were studied:
   - Central Street at Burnham Road/Cumberland Farms (Signalized)
   - Central Street at the proposed western site entrance (Unsignalized)
   - Central Street at the existing eastern site entrance (Unsignalized)

   - I agree with the Fuss & O'Neill peer review inquiry under **Section 4. Traffic**, *item i. "The applicant should confirm if any consideration was given to analyzing the Central Street at Kimball Hill Road signalized intersection due to its proximity to the project site."*
   - Let's look at the crash data provided by HPD in **Attachment H** in Appendix B on p. 265 compiled from Jan 1, 2022, through Nov 30, 2025. At the Burham Rd/Central St intersection there were 19 identified crashes, 3 reported injuries. At the Kimball Hill Rd/Central St intersection there were 43 vehicle crashes, resulting in 10 reported injuries. **Question:** Wouldn't you agree that it would have made sense to study the intersection that had more than twice the number of accidents? Btw the total number of crashes between the Burham St light and Kimball Hill Rd light was 75! This seems awfully high in my opinion even though it spans over nearly 4 yrs.
   - I'm going to read the following items from Fuss & O'Neill because I think too often the public is not aware of questions and comments that get made in the packet by the engineering firms which review the plans. I'll be looking for answers to these questions and comments.

     f. The applicant should confirm if peak hour factors were calculated for the intersection turning movements or approaches for the capacity analysis. They all appear to be 0.92 which is the default setting in the capacity analysis reports provided.
     h. The applicant should confirm if Central Street (Route 111) is under NHDOT jurisdiction in this area and if so, was NHDOT involved in the scoping process of this traffic study.

   - Other questions: Why was only one weekday considered? Why not a Sat or Sunday when there could be considerably more cars going to Benson's and traveling along Central St?
   - Did the modeling consider the Central St Gas Station plan for traffic counts since that project has already been approved? Are these numbers in the study? If so, please confirm to the planning board.
   - Staff Report points to a memo dated January 20, 2026, concluding as follows:

Ref: Unsignalized intersections:
Central St at the Western Site Driveway:
"The site approach is expected to experience some delay during the AM and PM peak hours, operating at LOS F, with 55.5 seconds and 70.4 seconds of average delay, respectively. This is not unexpected, and it is typical for a minor approach entering a high-volume major street at an unsignalized intersection to experience some delay during the peak hours."

***Central St at the Eastern Site Driveway**: "The capacity analysis shows that the projected traffic conditions at the proposed site driveways will be very similar.*
The site approach is expected to experience some delay during the AM and PM peak hours, operating at LOS E and LOS F, with average delays of 39.7 seconds and 67.2 seconds, respectively. It is typical for a minor approach entering a high-volume major street at an unsignalized intersection to experience some delay during the peak hours. In our opinion, this is not an unreasonable amount of delay and vehicles should be able to exit safely."

I strongly disagree with that statement. Note: Both are long waits. At 70.4 sec, you are 41% over the qualifying threshold of a 50 sec/vehicle delay time for a Level of Service of F. I'd say that is unreasonable! Motorists will not be able to get out onto Central St. In fact, they are basically "a parked car" at these delays. I'd call it a LOS G if that was a category.

Reference Item 22 Attachment 'D' p. 36. Staff questions under Engineering, so Elvis…*"It is unclear how left turns to the apartment complex would be possible or not cause backups on Central Street, without any proposed off-site improvements, taking in consideration the traffic volumes during peak hours, proximity to the existing traffic light and the bottleneck effect." The answer from engineering firm Verdantas was* " • The enclosed Traffic Analysis did not identify significant constraints or necessary off-site improvements."

I seriously do not understand how that statement can be true when adding two LOS F intersections. Can someone explain? I'd be interested in what Fuss & O'Neill's response to this is.

Ref: Signalized intersection
"The capacity analysis indicates that the traffic generated by the proposed project will have a minimal impact on the signalized intersection of Central Street and Burnham Road. During the Post-development condition, there is minimal change to each movement's average delay, and all movements will continue to operate at LOS D or better." As if this is good? This is still a bad rating, isn't it?

So basically, we're going to wind up with two LOS F intersections while retaining the one LOS D intersection. I appreciate what the applicant wants to put in here, and I know housing is needed, but before we create what could turn into an "attractive nuisance", let's take a much harder look at this and DO BETTER. I don't need to mention that this project abuts what is probably the most valuable and environmentally sensitive assets this town has, Benson Park.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Edward R. Thompson

Edward Thompson
22 Burns Hill Rd
Hudson, NH 03051

[Enclosure: Level of Service Summary]

Table 5A Level of Service Summary												
Intersection/Movement	2027 Pre-Development						2027 Post-Development					
	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour			AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
	Delay (sec./veh.)	LOS	V/C Ratio	Delay (sec./veh.)	LOS	V/C Ratio	Delay (sec./veh.)	LOS	V/C Ratio	Delay (sec./veh.)	LOS	V/C Ratio
1. Central Street & Western Site Driveway (Unsignalized)												
Central St - NE Thru	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.0	A	-	0.0	A	-
Central St - NE Right	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.0	A	-	0.0	A	-
Site - NW Left/Right	-	-	-	-	-	-	55.5	F	0.391	70.4	F	0.335
Central St - SW Left	-	-	-	-	-	-	9.5	A	0.009	11.0	B	0.031
Central St - SW Thru	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.0	A	-	0.0	A	-
2. Central Street & Burnham Road/Cumberland Farms (Signalized)												
Burnham Rd - SE Left/Thru	27.0	C	0.85	27.0	C	0.87	27.7	C	0.85	29.6	C	0.88
Burnham Rd - SE Right	17.7	B	0.06	16.7	B	0.09	18.0	B	0.06	17.5	B	0.08
Cumberland Farm - NW LTR	51.3	D	0.72	47.5	D	0.79	53.0	D	0.73	49.7	D	0.79
Central St - NE Left	32.9	C	0.16	37.4	D	0.38	34.1	C	0.16	40.2	D	0.39
Central St - NE Thru/Right	13.5	B	0.43	21.6	C	0.77	13.8	B	0.44	22.9	C	0.79
Central St - SW Left	16.4	B	0.03	29.6	C	0.15	16.9	B	0.03	31.9	C	0.15
Central St - SW Thru	20.3	C	0.66	24.8	C	0.68	20.8	C	0.67	25.7	C	0.68
Central St - SW Right	8.1	A	0.62	8.2	A	0.54	8.0	A	0.63	8.0	A	0.54
Overall	*17.2*	*B*	-	*21.3*	*C*	-	*17.5*	*B*	-	*22.5*	*C*	-
2. Central Street & Eastern Site Driveway (Unsignalized)												
Central St - NE Thru	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.0	A	-	0.0	A	-
Central St - NE Right	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.0	A	-	0.0	A	-
Site - NW Left/Right	-	-	-	-	-	-	39.7	E	0.167	67.2	F	0.341
Central St - SW Left	-	-	-	-	-	-	9.5	A	0.016	10.8	B	0.021
Central St - SW Thru	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.0	A	-	0.0	A	-

Level of Service Criteria for Signalized Intersections		Level of Service Criteria for Unsignalized Intersections	
Level of Service	**Total Control Delay (sec/veh)**	**Level of Service**	**Total Control Delay (sec/veh)**
A	Up to 10.0	A	Up to 10.0
B	10.1 to 20.0	B	10.1 to 15.0
C	20.1 to 35.0	C	15.1 to 25.0
D	35.1 to 55.0	D	25.1 to 35.0
E	55.1 to 80.0	E	35.1 to 50.0
F	Greater Than 80.0	F	Greater Than 50.0

PB HEARING MEADOWS MARCH 25, 2026

Debra Putnam 59 Rangers Dr.

I am presenting a statement to bring key concerns to the forefront and to have this information in the formal minutes. The information I present might prove to be especially pertinent in the future if due diligence is not done prior to the start of this ~~multi-faceted~~ project. mixed use development

I acknowledge that the Builder has made the point that they will be converting land that is not producing income for the town into land that is generating income in the form of property taxes.

In the field of Geology converting polluted land to income producing is called creating a "Brown Field."

The information I am presenting comes from my own experiences as an owner of a property on Rangers Dr. where a proper geological assessment of the proposed design of the subdivision was not done. This has resulted in the flooding of basements near the top of a mountain with certain ones relying on French drain systems to keep their basements dry! - SUCH AS MY OWN HOUSE.

With the project being presented tonight we are talking about long recognized wetlands!

The overriding concern should be **hydrostatic pressures** due to the wetlands and the asbestos fill.

The New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services has Geologists on staff.

Due to my own experiences and an over 40+-year friendship with the former lead Geologist of the State of Georgia.....

I am proposing that the site be assessed by a Phd in Geology with a Professional Geologist license.

The documents in the respective packet note:

Page 36 of Attachment "D"

19. It is unclear how an oil spill or gas spill can be contained within the paved parking area without curbing or catch basin, taking in consideration the entire project is surrounded by wetlands.

• Curbing and swales are shown on the plan around the parking areas, which will divert surface runoff towards the proposed forebays. The forebays are designed to be lined and

can be used to capture and contain oil spills, in addition to the pretreatment of stormwater. In summary, no untreated stormwater will discharge into the wetland areas.

Two concerns....we live in New England- cracks exist and are enlarged every freeze – thaw cycle....thus the presumed asphalt curbing and swales will need to be lined with an impermeable layer (most likely heavy plastic) as eventually the curbs and swales will no longer be functioning as required.

Second concern...we already know any basin/forebays will be no deeper than 4' with an impermeable liner. But the liner needs to be double layers just like the requirement on oil tankers....double hulls. Then the construction needs to be able to handle the higher hydrostatic pressure that will most definitely occur during heavy rains and hurricanes.

Bringing the concern right back into our own community – there was an inground lined swimming pool up the street from my home where, reportedly, the liner raised up due to the hydrostatic pressure from below!

So now that we have looked at the importance of proper designs and materials we come back to the immediately preceding item #18

18. The plans don't indicate where catch basins are proposed, if any.

• No catch basins are proposed due to the shallow groundwater table. The stormwater plan is largely bases on surface sheet flow. Again, the final stormwater design will be provided.

Will the stormwater design address a probable overflow of the proposed forebays?

The overflow from any forebay designed to capture and contain oil spills and pretreat stormwater will most likely pollute the surrounding wetlands – wildlife areas and Benson Park.

In summation, it is my humble opinion that while the goals are to turn the land into a Brown Field – generating tax income for the town...if the matters I have presented are not addressed.....should the PB approve? IF SO - At What Price to the Environment – especially Benson Park??

Nashua Regional Planning Commission

30 Temple Street, Suite 310
Nashua, NH 03060

Location: Driveway into Benson Park
Town: Hudson
NRPC Local - 2024
June, 2024

Site Code: 992299460000

6/24/2024 Time	6/24/24 Mon	6/25/24 Tue	6/26/2024 Wed	6/27/2024 Thu	6/28/2024 Fri	6/29/2024 Sat	6/30/2024 Sun	Average Mon - Fri	Average Mon - Sun	Graph
12:00 AM	*	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	
1:00	*	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	1	
2:00	*	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	
3:00	*	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	
4:00	*	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	
5:00	*	5	3	3	4	0	3	4	3	
6:00	*	14	14	15	13	10	18	14	14	
7:00	*	44	36	24	28	41	36	33	35	
8:00	*	60	52	51	45	56	63	52	54	
9:00	*	88	77	75	78	67	82	80	78	
10:00	*	108	86	116	118	89	83	107	100	
11:00	*	82	75	116	130	95	103	101	100	
12:00 PM	*	62	82	80	134	132	94	90	97	
1:00	*	70	66	80	117	127	77	83	90	
2:00	*	52	60	64	112	134	61	72	80	
3:00	109	54	48	55	134	140	48	80	84	
4:00	93	74	54	78	129	80	44	86	79	
5:00	111	82	77	96	134	31	30	100	80	
6:00	96	81	78	100	113	21	15	94	72	
7:00	58	86	36	60	81	13	17	64	50	
8:00	33	44	32	20	29	12	15	32	26	
9:00	10	4	4	8	8	5	5	7	6	
10:00	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	1	1	
11:00	1	2	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	
Total	511	1016	882	1041	1414	1062	796	1102	1052	
Percent	7.6%	15.1%	13.1%	15.5%	21.0%	15.8%	11.8%			
AM Peak		10:00	10:00	10:00	11:00	11:00	11:00	10:00	10:00	
Volume		108	86	116	130	95	103	107	100	
PM Peak	5:00	7:00	12:00 PM	6:00	12:00 PM	3:00	12:00 PM	5:00	12:00 PM	
Volume	111	86	82	100	134	140	94	100	97	