



TOWN OF HUDSON

Planning Board



Vincent Russo, Chairman

Rick Maddox, Selectmen Liaison

12 School Street • Hudson, New Hampshire 03051 • Tel: 603-886-6000 • Fax: 603-594-1142

-- FILE COPY --

HUDSON PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES April 10, 2013

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Russo called this Planning Board meeting to order at 7:09 p.m. on Wednesday, April 10, 2013, in the Community Development's Paul Buxton meeting room in the Hudson Town Hall basement.

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman Russo asked Mr. Hall to lead the assembly in pledging allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America.

III. ROLL CALL

Chairman Russo asked Secretary van der Veen to call the roll. Those persons present, along with various applicants, representatives, and interested citizens, were as follows:

Members

Present: James Barnes, Glenn Della-Monica, George Hall, Tim Malley, Vincent Russo, Ed van der Veen, and Richard Maddox (Selectmen's Representative).

Members

Absent: None. (All present.)

Alternates

Present: Irene Merrill, Marilyn McGrath, Jordan Ulery, and Nancy Bruckerman (Selectmen's Representative Alternate).

Alternates

Absent: None. (All present.)

Staff

Present: Town Planner John Cashell.

Recorder: J. Bradford Seabury.

IV. SEATING OF ALTERNATES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chairman Russo noted that all regular members were present, so no alternates needed to be seated at this time but would be seated as necessary.

V. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING(S)

Chairman Russo said there no minutes of previous meetings in the packet to review this week.

VI. CASES REQUESTED FOR DEFERRAL

No cases had requested deferral from this scheduled date.

VII. CORRESPONDENCE

A. Request for Release of Library Impact Fees by Library Board of Trustees.

Chairman Russo read aloud the published notice, as repeated above.

Town Planner Cashell noted that there was a copy of the Library Board of Trustees' letter (from Connie Owens) in tonight's meeting packets, requesting release of the remaining library impact funds, as well as a legal opinion.

Mr. Hall moved to recommend for the Board of Selectmen to release the remaining Library Impact Fees, in the amount of \$14,182.31, plus interest, and for the said sum to be expended by the Library Board of Trustees for the exclusive purpose of completing the landscaping at the Rodgers Memorial Library, 194 Derry St., Hudson, NH.

Mr. Della-Monica seconded the motion.

Mr. Barnes noted there was a questions as to whether this was an appropriate use for this money. He asked Town Planner Cashell if there were a termination date by which the funds would have to be expended. Mr. Cashell said Town Counsel had said this was an appropriate use, noting that the Planning Board was no longer collecting impact fees for the Library.

Mr. Barnes asked if there were a time limit by which the money would have to be returned, noting that some were older than others. Town Planner Cashell said these were the most recently collected.

VOTE: Chairman Russo called for a verbal vote on the motion. All members voted in favor, and Chairman Russo declared the motion to have carried unanimously (7-0).

VIII. PERFORMANCE SURETIES

No **Performance Sureties** items were addressed this evening.

VIX. ZBA INPUT ONLY

**A. 99 River Road/Hudson Realty Trust
ZI# 01-13
River Road**

**Map 256/Lot 001-000
99**

Purpose of plan: Amend previously approved site plan to allow a dual use on the property. First floor is previously approved convenience store. Proposing to add one-bedroom residential apartment on second floor. No external changes to previously approved building or site layout proposed.

Chairman Russo read aloud the published notice, as repeated above.

Town Planner Cashell said he had nothing to add to his staff report.

Ms. McGrath noted that she also sat on the ZBA and was conveying a message that the ZBA wanted input from the Planning Board. She said she did not feel this presented her with a conflict.

Mr. Cris Rice, from TF Moran, appeared before the Board as the representative of the applicant, along with Atty. J. Bradford Westgate, of the firm of Winer & Bennett, 111 Concord Street, Nashua, NH, legal representative for the applicant.

Mr. Rice affixed a plan on the wall and then discussed details of the application and previously discussed issues. He noted that the previous occupant of the site had been a landscape business, saying he felt the proposed development would be a major improvement. He said the building was under construction, and the owner had asked how to get a one-bedroom apartment on the second floor, adding that they had been to the Zoning Board of Adjustment on this issue and had been deferred. He said the owner was aware that this was not to be rented out, saying it was for the living space of an employee working in the store on the first floor. He noted that the lot lacked sufficient frontage and acreage for a dual use, saying they did not feel the added apartment would be detrimental to the site, as the footprint would not change. He said they were willing to restrict the resident of the apartment to one parking space, noting that the Town of Tyngsboro had asked that the plan return to them out of courtesy if the request were approved by Hudson.

Atty. J. Bradford Westgate, of the Devine, Millimet, & Branch Professional Association, 111 Amherst Street, Manchester, NH, legal representative for the applicant, noted he had been involved in this case back in 2010 and 2011, when it first came before the Planning Board. Noting that Town Planner Cashell had pointed out the requirements for a dual use, he said the approval was granted two years ago and the Planning Board obviously had recognized at that time that the improvements justified that approval, so they would respectfully request that any recommendation or input from this Planning Board to the Zoning Board of Adjustment not be conditioned on any concern that the lot did not meet the now current dual-use requirements with

respect to frontage or lot area. He said adding an apartment to a structure that would have no footprint change was contrary to what this Planning Board had decided—that this property could serve for that use.

He said the lot did not meet the now current requirements but could function adequately, saying the apartment would have minimal impact on how the lot would work out.

Mr. Rice said they would be coming back to the Planning Board if the variance request were approved.

Chairman Russo opened the meeting for public input and comment, in favor of the application. No one coming forward, Chairman Russo asked if anyone wished to speak in opposition or to provide comments or questions concerning the application.

Mr. Roget Coutu, 10 Rita Avenue, acknowledged that he had a bias, as he owned another convenience store in that same neighborhood, but said he was present to oppose the dual use, saying he had been watching this with a little bit of envy, because it was a beautiful building. He said he had originally opposed the original plan because he thought it was saturating the neighborhood and would result in a lot of traffic problems. He said he had noticed while watching the building be constructed that the upstairs space left for what was originally supposed to be an office and storage space was about the size of a trailer, and he had questioned why. He said he questioned the dual use, noting that the basement of that building was approximately ten feet high, and he asked if the dual use would allow them to do something with the basement. He noted that the Board had heard a promise that they would only have one tenant, but he wondered if there might be two later. If having an apartment required two parking spaces, he said, that took customer parking space away. He said having the store there was a stretch for him, and allowing the apartment would be an every greater stretch. He said he understood that the Planning Board had become very business friendly, which was an asset to the community, but he disagreed with the vote that had passed and adding more to that property for the size they had would be a stretch.

Atty. Westgate said the focus of the Planning Board's conclusions should be the things typically considered for a site, as opposed to building design issues or what had happened in the past. He suggested the Board should focus on what was happening this evening, which was a request to allow the upper floor to be used for an apartment, for an employee—adding that he supposed it could be a husband and his wife, both of whom would be store employees—noting that this would be a one-bedroom apartment. He said they were simply asking if that did any violence to how the site worked, and they would respectfully submit that it did not, because the site would work, with that apartment there or not, saying all the apartment did was add one or two residents, perhaps with one or two vehicles. He said the parking requirement was 11 plus 2 under the standard parking regulations, so the Board would have to waive that, but the Planning Board could make a decision on that when they returned for a site plan amendment, and it was not a material issue. He said having an apartment there provided a little security and safety for the site.

Mr. Rice said he would need a parking space for an employee driving to the store if there were not one living upstairs. He reiterated that the owner had agreed to a one-vehicle limit for the apartment.

No one else coming forward, Chairman Russo declared the matter before the Board, asking if any members of the Board had any questions.

Ms. Merrill said it narrowed down to at least two parking spaces, as the resident might have visitors. She asked if the owner would be the occupant. A negative answer was provided.

Ms. McGrath said a dual use, once approved, would carry with the property, even if the store use changed, noting that the Zoning Board of Adjustment would have to grapple with that problem. She said she lived near that site, noting that it had not been an approved landscaping site and also had not been an approved bus depot, saying the last approved plan was for Hudson Auto, a number of years ago, and that use had been discontinued for many years. She pointed out that there would be no control over the convenience store owner hiring someone and having them move upstairs, and she questioned if the Town had the capability to track that. If the store owner sold the property, she added, she questioned how the new owner would be bound by that agreement. She then concluded by asking what would prevent a future owner from converting the space to a retail use or some other use.

Mr. van der Veen said there had been a lot of discussion about this site, with most members feeling too much was being proposed for the lot. He said the Board had approved what it thought would fit on that lot, and he thought this was going beyond what had been the intent.

Selectman Maddox said it had been brought up at the beginning, when the plan first came before the Board, and now they were back. He noted the plan was to have 40 feet of cooler in the store, saying product would be pouring out and there were going to be multiple employees. He said he had not voted for it the first time, saying this was only a quarter of the size the building should have been, and he could not agree with a dual use.

Mr. Della-Monica said he tended to agree, saying the first plan was putting a gallon into a pint jar and it had been trimmed down to put a quart in a pint jar to get approval. With all the discussion on potential parking problems, he said, having one car there permanently plus a car for another employee, was one more than there they should have there. He said the size of the lot was a problem.

Mr. Hall asked what the access would be. Mr. Price said there would be an interior stairwell, with no exterior stairs. Mr. Hall said that seemed to be a significant fire danger, if there were no exterior egress. He said his main concern was the parking issue, saying he understood the intent, and he predicted that there was a good chance over the years that the individuals in the apartment would not be employees, saying it would be unenforceable for the Town to go there and see if the occupant were an employee. He said it could be a man and a wife, and it might then be two people who were not employed there. He said it sounded good, but the Board had to look at all the possibilities that it might not work out—adding that the parking issue had been an issue to start with. He said he would have to be opposed.

Chairman Russo asked what the apartment size would be. Mr. Rice said he would have to check with the architect, but it was not very large, just a center corridor with truss construction. Chairman Russo said it sounded like 1,000 ft², adding that this

Board had to determine if there were concerns to be addressed to the Zoning Board of Adjustment regarding parking, and to evaluate what parking was needed, and that the Board had to evaluate what the owner had a potential to build. He expressed a belief that they were hearing the sentiments of the Board, noting that they could not control who was going to live there for certain. He said the proposal was just not enforceable, noting that this original plan was passed by this Planning Board by just one vote, and now the parking would be even more difficult. He said the Board could be fairly competent that people would be parking in spaces that were not feasible. If this employee had a child, he continued, the lot established for a business use would not be a suitable environment for that child.

Chairman Russo said this Planning Board had a strong opinion that parking was an issue, noting that this Board could waive that, but the Board would push it if it came back. He said a little better planning had to be involved.

Chairman Russo then addressed the dual-use requirements, saying the second use could be 50% more by special exception. Town Planner Cashell demurred, saying it could be anything. Chairman Russo said Atty. Westgate had given a strong argument as to whether it was required, saying that would have to be considered. He said he would have a hard time overcoming the parking issues, saying he thought the Planning Board input to the Zoning Board of Adjustment would have strong concern about that. He then expressed concern about allowing something that would not be enforceable, noting that the Board had asked about the second-floor use and had been told it would be an office.

Ms. Merrill asked if there were any windows right now on that second floor. Mr. Rice responded in the negative. Chairman Russo said he did not want to get into that at this time, but it would be an issue for the Fire Department and the Building Department—adding that the amount of windows might be issues for the Building Department, requiring some structural changes, and the Fire Department might say it had to be sprinklered.

Mr. Rice said he would have to check with the Fire Department, saying his understanding was that it would have to be sprinklered if an apartment were added, but he added that it would have to comply with all building regulations.

Chairman Russo said the size of the lot was also an issue, noting there had been a lot of discussion on that. He noted that a required amount of land was needed for each living unit in the Zoning Ordinance. Town Planner Cashell said he wanted to correct himself, saying the acreage could be reduced 50% but could go more by variance. Atty. Westgate confirmed that they were going for a variance. Town Planner Cashell questioned if they did not, technically, have to ask for a special exception as well. Atty. Westgate responded that he did not think so, as the Zoning Administrator had said a variance was required. He said the variance would meet any need for the special exception.

Mr. Rice said he had space on the site to add parking, but it would not meet all setback requirements. He asked if the Planning Board would be amenable to that. Chairman Russo said that would be up to the Planning Board.

Selectman Maddox held up his NO GOOD DEED GOES UNPUNISHED sign and said this had all been discussed the first time, when the Board had told the applicant that an apartment would not work. He said parking had just barely been met, and this was coming back to ask for a second bite of the apple with nothing having been changed.

Mr. Della-Monica noted there were new problems with the outdoor space if they were constructing a residence, as the barbecue & swing set, should there ever need to be one, would go either next to the propane tank or the compressor pad, if they were to exist, and both of those would be inappropriate as a family space. He said there had to be some outdoor family space, noting this was part of the reason for requiring additional acreage for a dual use.

Mr. van der Veen said he also recalled the discussion about the apartment in the first go-around, saying he supported Selectman Maddox's statement and did not think the Board had to go there again.

Mr. Hall moved to relate to the Zoning Board of Adjustment that the Planning Board had significant concerns about an apartment that would further exacerbate a problem with parking that already existed, adding that it also exacerbated issues with the size of the site to begin with, noting it was a substandard-sized lot.

Mr. van der Veen and Town Planner Cashell indicated a desire to work on the wording of the motion, and Ms. McGrath read aloud her version, that the Planning Board would convey to the Zoning Board that the Planning Board had substantial concerns that the apartment would exacerbate the parking problem that already existed on the lot and that the size of the substandard lot was an issue. Mr. Hall added further that it also exacerbated issues with the size of the lot, as well.

Chairman Russo said he had an issue with that text, as this Planning Board had determined by a 4-3 vote that there was sufficient parking, although he would agree to a statement that this was adding to the problem. Mr. Della-Monica suggested stating that the parking lot was already maximized, allowing for no additional room for further additional use that would increase the number of cars on the lot, and the existing remaining outdoor land was not sufficient to support a residential use. Chairman Russo said he could not say that for certain, as he had looked at the requirements, but he would say that a dual use would be overextending what that land was capable of providing.

Selectman Maddox said that he would also like to point out that what this Planning Board had already granted, including multiple driveways on a single lot, the 100-foot setback from residential use, the 35-foot green area between the right-of-way and the pavement, and all the other things that the Board had already waived, maximized the use of the lot.

Chairman Russo suggested taking a break and letting Town Planner Cashell, Mr. van der Veen, and Mr. Della-Monica to work out the final working of the message that would be sent to the Zoning Board of Adjustment. Chairman Russo then declared a brief intermission at 8:00 p.m., calling the meeting back to order at 8:17 p.m., noting that Mr. Della-Monica had made some changes to Mr. Hall's proposed motion.

Mr. Della-Monica moved to express the Planning Board's concerns with the apartment proposed, because the parking was already maximized on the lot and there

was no room for additional parking to accommodate a residential unit. Also, the substandard sized lot further exacerbates the problem, leaving no outside space for the usual and customary use by tenants. In addition, there were several significant waivers awarded to this site plan, and it was felt that the site was fully utilized as originally approved.

Mr. Hall seconded the motion.

VOTE: Chairman Russo called for a verbal vote on the motion. All members voted in favor, and Chairman Russo declared the motion to have carried unanimously (7-0).

X. DESIGN REVIEW PHASE

No **Design Review Phase** items were addressed this evening.

XI. OLD BUSINESS

No **Old Business** items were addressed this evening.

XII. DESIGN REVIEW PHASE

No **Design Review Phase** items were addressed this evening.

XIII. CONCEPTUAL REVIEW ONLY

No **Old Business** items were addressed this evening.

XIV. NEW BUSINESS/PUBLIC HEARINGS

No **New Business** items were addressed this evening.

XV. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Review/Discussion on Impact Fees.

Chairman Russo read aloud the published notice, as repeated above.

Town Planner Cashell said he had had another conversation with Town Counsel, who had requested that he bring this matter to the Board tonight, saying it really was essential for the Planning Board to update the present impact fee structure for the corridor accounts. He noted that he had prepared a draft motion in that effect.

Chairman Russo asked if the Board members had had a chance to review the attorney's discussion.

Mr. Barnes noted that Dracut Road was not included but nowadays carried a large amount of traffic, and he asked if that could be included. Town Planner Cashell said it was outside of the scope, noting that the south end of Route 3-A, the north end of

Route 102, and that portion of Route 111 east of Burnham Road were State maintained.

Selectman Maddox said he thought a new State statute allowed for collecting for State-maintained roads. Town Planner Cashell said that was for Hooksett, noting that Hooksett had been collecting them but did not have the right to do so. Mr. Hall noted that this was because Hooksett did not have a compact zone; Mr. Cashell concurred.

Mr. Ulery noted that the State had put in the turn lane down by the new medical facility.

Mr. Della-Monica asked if Dracut Road were State-maintained. Town Planner Cashell answered in the affirmative.

Mr. Hall moved to have staff request a cost estimate from VHB, Inc., relative to having that firm complete a CAP Fee Assessment Update for the three major corridors in Hudson (i.e., NH Routes 102 and 111, and Route 3-A), and for the said assessment to include a section recommending the most appropriate manner for Hudson to continue collecting Corridor Impact Fees.

Mr. Malley seconded the motion.

Selectman Maddox suggested that the Board look at Dracut Road, saying he felt the Board needed to do some homework—adding that it would make more sense if the Town could collect fees on Dracut Road.

Chairman Russo asked Town Planner Cashell to ask Atty. Buckley about this.

Mr. Hall said he would like to move forward with the motion as it was, saying it would not be that big a deal for VHB to add to it later if the Board found out the Town could do more.

Mr. Della-Monica asked if it meant that the Board could not collect impact fees if someone owned property on a State-maintained road. Chairman Russo said he was sure there was a mechanism if a business had impact on the areas discussed.

Mr. Barnes noted that there were charts for the impact to all three corridors. Town Planner Cashell concurred, saying it did not matter where in the town a development was proposed. He said Hudson would have to have a State statute passed, as Hooksett had done.

Mr. Ulery suggested to Selectman Maddox that the motion that had been made was probably the most appropriate at this time.

Mr. Della-Monica said he wanted to make it clear that he had not been saying that the Town could spend money on the State roads, but that if the Board could show a nexus between some new development that was located on a State road and the compact-area road, the Town could charge an impact fee.

VOTE: Chairman Russo then called for a hand vote on the motion. All members present voted in favor except for Selectman Maddox, who voted in opposition, and Chairman Russo declared the motion to have carried (6–1).

Mr. Hall moved to defer further review, date specific, to May 14. Mr. Malley seconded the motion.

VOTE: Chairman Russo called for a verbal vote on the motion. All members voted in favor, and Chairman Russo declared the motion to have carried unanimously (7-0).

B. Discussion on the Industrial (I) Zoning District.

Chairman Russo read aloud the published notice, as repeated above.

Town Planner Cashell said there were no legal opinions on this matter. He referenced his staff report discussion about having had a discussion with a gentleman who wanted a lot rezoned. He said the owner was trying to sell the property but having a hard time doing it. Mr. Cashell noted the empty spaces throughout the Sagamore Industrial Park, saying it might be doing the Town a disservice, with the potential of that site, to have it listed as Industrial, and he suggested discussing this issue with consideration of changing it to Commercial or having an overlay commercial district.

Chairman Russo asked if Town Planner Cashell were saying that the Industrial categorization was having a negative impact on the property that the gentleman was trying to sell. Town Planner Cashell responded in the affirmative.

Selectman Maddox noted that sexually-oriented businesses were only allowed in an Industrial zone, and he questioned if the Board wanted to make that change, saying the ordinance would have to be reworked.

Mr. Malley said from what he read in the staff report Town Planner Cashell was not suggesting changing any requirements but just changing the name. Selectman Maddox asked if Mr. Malley would like to open a commercial business and then find out that someone else was going to open a sexually-oriented business next door. Mr. Malley said one could do that now. Selectman Maddox demurred, saying that sexually-oriented businesses could only be placed in an Industrial zoning district.

Mr. Ulery said the staff report suggested that it was the nomenclature of Industrial Zone that was a detriment, not what the requirements of the zone were. He said changing the name would not change anything, as the same requirements would still apply.

Ms. McGrath said this was one of those slippery slopes, saying on the face of it it was enticing to want to make changes that one thought would encourage businesses to come into the area. She said Sagamore Industrial Park was created a long time ago, and the Planning Board at that time had been sensitive to traffic, and the trip generation was far less than commercial. She said some of the site plans approved at that time specifically said that no retail would be allowed. She referenced another site in another community, where shared industrial and commercial uses were comingled, resulting in horrendous traffic situations. She said Board members needed to be cognizant of that and think about what they were doing. She said this would change the makeup of the town, and she questioned if the Board wanted to change the complexion of the town that way.

Mr. Hall said all those buildings were built as industrial buildings, and the voters would never believe that the only thing being changed was the name. He said he would have to have more people telling him they could not sell a building because it was in an industrial zone before he believed it. He advised to leave the matter alone.

Mr. Malley said he had read it as a simple name change, saying nothing was being changed—adding that the Planning Board would deal with any plans that came in—saying that if anyone came in and wanted to tear down an existing industrial building and put in a box store, such as Target, the Planning Board would deal with all the issues, anyway. He said the change would just give opportunity.

Mr. van der Veen said he thought the neighbors had something to do with it, and he expressed concern about changing the whole town because of one person's view. He said it would still be an industrial zone, adding that the Planning Board would deal with any plans that came in. He expressed a belief that Hudson needed industrial businesses—as hardcore tax-generating businesses—and he suggested leaving the designation the way it was.

Mr. Barnes said a rose by any other name was still a rose, saying a developer would have to look at the existing uses and realize what was there. Until the Board saw more demand, he said, the Board could consider it then. He did not see that changing the name would do much of anything.

Mr. Della-Monica said some people searched on the Internet to see what property was zoned as. He questioned why it was called "Industrial" if other things were allowed there.

Ms. McGrath noted that she was talking about Sagamore Industrial Park specifically, saying that was industrial when it was created, and it was voted in by the citizens of Hudson—adding that it was created piecemeal, and the owner of the subject property had wanted to rezone it as commercial a number of years ago and the Town had resisted, because the voters did not want commercial use on that site.

Mr. Della-Monica said his question was why the commercial uses were allowed, saying there was a lot more than industry that could be done there now. Ms. McGrath said that wasn't the intent, when Sagamore Industrial Park and Clement Industrial Park were voted in, noting that a number of changes were done a number of years ago, when that was farmland, when former Zoning Administrator Sean Sullivan came in, and perhaps some of them should not have been done. She said there were specific prohibitions of retail use on many of the site plans.

Mr. Della-Monica said one of two things should be done to make sense of the issue. If the zoning district were going to remain the way it was, with the definition it had now, he continued, it should be called Commercial—or, if commercial were not the intent of the Town in an industrial zone, then the definition of the zone could be changed to make it industrial. Right now, he said, the Town had an industrial zone that was not defined as industrial only, which he said did not make any sense.

Chairman Russo recommended that the board members look at the Table of Permitted Uses, saying there were a lot of things that were separate, set aside for the Industrial area.

Town Planner Cashell said "general retail" had nothing to do with what he was trying to convey. He said if one drove through Sagamore Industrial Park now many buildings were vacant, noting that the total had recently been estimated at 2,000,000 ft². He said it really was an overlay district, and he questioned what the most appropriate use would be, saying it had all the potential for being whatever the market demanded of it. He said the market had evolved into a different use, expressing a belief that the Atrium firm was moving because it was moving up, to a more aesthetic site, and the Town was missing the potential for this industrial park to move up. He said that park needed all the help the Board could give it, but it needed a proper zoning designation to bring in high-end technical jobs. He noted that there were a lot of businesses down there putting in a lot of money to improve their property.

Selectman Maddox said he had been told that Atrium was moving because they did not have sufficient space at the current location. He asked if the Town had met with the owner of the industrial park. Town Planner Cashell said there was not one owner. Selectman Maddox noted that the Town was repaving a road down there that was in tough shape, to make it a more attractive setting. He said he thought the Town had a low tax rate, a good workforce, and great service for the industrial park, but it was the owners that needed to make the decision of whether they were going to spruce up their buildings. He then suggested that Town Planner Cashell and the Town Administrator should meet with the owners.

Mr. Malley said it was not being proposed to prettify the buildings, but the park was moving toward commercial, noting that he did business with a lot of wholesale/retail businesses down there.

Ms. McGrath suggested it might be worthwhile for the Planning Board to have a discussion about creating a new type of industrial use, that would allow for the wholesale sales that Mr. Malley was talking about, without having a lot of traffic. Mr. Malley said he wanted to clarify that no changes of use were being proposed, just changing the name to make it fit the uses that were allowed. Chairman Russo asked if Mr. Malley had input from the Chamber of Commerce about businesses that were down there or looking for a place. Mr. Malley said he did not, but could look for that sort of information if the Board wished.

Selectman Brucker said she was in favor of bringing more business to the town, noting that the voters had shown that they did not want their tax rate to go up. She said she would be in favor of that, if it could help, saying she saw no problem with changing the name. She asked what improvements Town Planner Cashell had been talking about, asking if the Town would be responsible.

Town Planner Cashell said he was talking about any type of investments, that the Town could do, saying the Town would be looking for development grants to improve the infrastructure. He suggested "research and development park" as an overlay, not allowing a percentage of retail within the buildings but not allowing big business. He said a campus style was what was desired. He said he would not want to create retail down there, but would want a place for high-tech jobs, as it was perfectly located.

Mr. Barnes said development was going to happen over time. He suggested that the Town needed to get into discussion with the business owners to find out what the Town could do to help them.

Mr. Della-Monica said the term “industrial” suggested something between the boiler factory and the skunk works—but someone searching for industrial property probably wanted it to be called that.

Chairman Russo said he agreed with Mr. Barnes and Selectman Maddox, suggesting that the Board needed to hear from business owners. He said he agreed that elsewhere one saw huge complexes where there were supporting uses for a campus-type complex.

Ms. McGrath said that did sound attractive, and she thought a majority of the Hudson residents would support it—as opposed to having a suggestion to have a Target store in the middle of the industrial park. She said it might be good to have the Board of Selectmen create some sort of committee having citizen involvement, that could come up with some ideas and present them to the Planning Board and the Board of Selectmen.

Town Planner Cashell said he appreciated the degree of discussion, saying it was a diamond in the rough. He said he had wanted to put this issue on the Board because Hudson had a great industrial park that needed a lot of help.

Selectman Maddox said there was a tab on the Town’s Website for Economic Development, listing Town Planner Cashell, and he asked how many contacts Mr. Cashell had had in the past three months. Mr. Cashell said there had been a lot, referring to the memo he had sent, and noting that he had recently had a discussion with Mr. Seabury about it. He said business had come down from a peak, and now property investors were gobbling up raw land and existing buildings. Selectman Maddox said he had asked a simple question: how many? Mr. Cashell said every day his office was occupied by people, including residential subdividers and commercial property investors.

Selectman Maddox said the market would drive this issue wherever it would go, and he suggested talking with those people. He suggested the Selectmen ought to take a look at this if there was so much interest, adding that he had thought ten years ago that the Sagamore Park area would become a second Pheasant Lane, because there was so much need for retail space.

Chairman Russo asked what the goal would be for future discussion. Town Planner Cashell said he would like to contact Selectman Maddox and some of the property owners and report back here for the May 22nd meeting. Mr. Malley said he would contact the Chamber of Commerce for further input.

Chairman Russo noted that the Planning Board would be deferring this item, date specific, to the May 22, 2013, Planning Board Meeting for update by staff and Selectman Maddox. He ruled that no motion was necessary at this time.

VII. CORRESPONDENCE (Continued)

B. Tax Map update

Chairman Russo noted that there was another correspondence item, consisting of a request to spend \$2,800 for the 2013 tax map update.

Mr. Hall moved to favorably recommend to the Board of Selectmen the expenditure of up to \$2,800.00 from the Town's Tax Map Updating Account for the purpose of updating the Town's Assessing Maps and Digital Data for 2013.

Mr. Della-Monica seconded the motion.

Chairman Russo asked how much time was involved with the updates, that was not done in-house. Town Planner Cashell said this was farmed out to a consulting firm, noting that what had not been done was locating some buildings, and adding that he and the Assistant Town Assessor were going through a review process with vendors. Chairman Russo asked what the benefits would be for the Town. Town Planner Cashell replied that every town ought to update its maps every ten years.

Chairman Russo noted that it was expensive. Mr. Hall explained that there was an involved process. Town Planner Cashell said there was now software available that would do this a lot faster, easier, and less expensively.

VOTE: Chairman Russo called for a verbal vote on the motion. All members voted in favor, and Chairman Russo declared the motion to have carried unanimously (7-0).

XVI. ADJOURNMENT

All scheduled items having been addressed, Mr. Barnes moved to adjourn; Mr. Hall seconded the motion.

VOTE: Chairman Russo called for a verbal vote on the motion. All members voted in favor.

Chairman Russo then declared the meeting to be adjourned at 9.25 p.m.

Date: December 9, 2013

Vincent Russo, Chairman

J. Bradford Seabury, Recorder

Edward van der Veen, Secretary

These minutes were accepted as amended following review at the 02-26-14 Planning Board meeting.

-- FILE COPY --

**HUDSON PLANNING BOARD Meeting Minutes
April 10, 2013**

Page 15

-- FILE COPY --

**HUDSON PLANNING BOARD Meeting Minutes
April 10, 2013**

Page 16

The following changes were made to the draft copy in accordance with review comments at the Planning Board meeting of 02-26-14:

Page 5, 3rd paragraph, 1st line — corrected mistyped word “sad” so that the sentence now reads “Ms. McGrath said a dual use, once approved,